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ABSTRACT

The fall of the Byzantine Fortress of Babylon in 641 CE allowed invading Arab armies to move beyond the Lower Nile region of Egypt and ultimately conquer the whole of the province from the Byzantines, effectively ending centuries of almost totally uninterrupted Roman rule. The paper examines this pivotal moment in Islamic history in order to identify four salient features of early Islamic expansion: the struggle of the early caliphate for power and authority; the role of religion; the development of an organized and effective military; the nature of early Islamic approaches to warfare and foreign policy.
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### CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

**Arab Conquest of Egypt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius Crowned Emperor</td>
<td>5 October, 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Conquest of Egypt Complete</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Hijra from Mecca</td>
<td>11 July, 622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Evacuation from Egypt</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad sends Letters to Rulers</td>
<td>627-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus established as Imperial Patriarch to Alexandria</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Muhammad</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Conquest of Palestine and Syria</td>
<td>629-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of Egypt Begins</td>
<td>12 December, 639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelusium Falls</td>
<td>January, 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amr’s raid into the Fayum</td>
<td>May, 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival of main body of reinforcements</td>
<td>6 June, 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of <em>Ayn-Shams</em> (Heliopolis) and capture of Misr</td>
<td>July, 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Babylon</td>
<td>9 April, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Nikiu</td>
<td>13 May, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitulation of Alexandria</td>
<td>8 November, 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation of Alexandria by the Romans</td>
<td>17 September, 642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Siege of Babylon (640-1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 640</td>
<td>Battle of <em>Ayn-Shams</em> (Heliopolis) and capture of Misr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 640</td>
<td>Siege of the Fortress of Babylon Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 640</td>
<td>Negotiations between Cyrus and al-Muqawqis take place. Rejection of the proposal by the Byzantines. Failed sortie results in capitulation. Treaty of Babylon offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 640?</td>
<td>Word of the rejection of the treaty and the removal of Cyrus makes it way to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-February, 640</td>
<td>Failed sorties by the Byzantines against the Arabs. General Theodore attempts to send reinforcement army to Babylon. In response, 'Amr sends a force which prevents them from ever arriving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 February 641</td>
<td>Death of Heraclius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early March, 641</td>
<td>Word of the death of Heraclius makes its way to Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April, 641</td>
<td>Final Arab attack and the surrender of Babylon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARAB SIEGE OF EGYPTIAN BABYLON, 640-641: A CASE STUDY IN ISLAMIC EXPANSION OF THE 7TH CENTURY

Good Friday, 6 April 641. The Byzantine garrison of the Fortress of Babylon in Egypt lay waiting for the inevitable fall of their citadel. For nine terrible months this force had remained within the walls of the fortress and watched helplessly as an Arab army swept into the Nile Delta and conquered the surrounding city of Misr. Just two months prior they had received word of the death of Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, and it was now clear there were to be no reinforcements. They had been abandoned. Their failed sorties against the Arab besiegers had resulted in disaster, only further weakening their diseased and hungry bodies. That evening, al-Zubayr ibn al-'Awwâm placed a siege ladder against the wall of the castle, and moments later came leaping over with a party of Arab soldiers. The Fortress of Babylon had fallen to the forces of Arab general 'Amr ibn al-'As.

It was the success of this siege and those events leading up to it which allowed the invading Arab armies to conquer the whole of Egypt from the Byzantines, effectively ending centuries of almost totally uninterrupted 'Roman' rule. The importance of this siege, along with the attention given to it in both Arab and Byzantine histories, make it an appropriate choice for a case-study in Islamic expansion during the 7th century. Given the incredibly diverse nature of Islamic expansion, (which varied according to parties involved, geography, leadership, as well as a whole host of other
factors), the goal here will be to outline some of the salient elements of expansion during the first decades of Islam.

It will be argued here that there were four principle elements, as exemplified in the invasion of Egypt and the siege of Babylon, which drastically influenced the nature of expansion and the development of the early Islamic state: the struggle of the early caliphate for power and authority; the role of religion; the development of an organized and effective military; the nature of early Islamic approaches to warfare and foreign policy.

Examining the role of the caliph in expansion is vital in determining level of authority which he possessed and the degree to which the invasions of new territories were under his control. The function of religion is doubtless crucial in attempting to understand both the drive of the Arab soldiers, as well as the acceptance of various predominately Christian populations to Muslim rule. Regardless of which factors may have facilitated the explosive growth of Islam, one necessary component was military power. As such, the development and organization of the armies of the early Islamic state were also fundamental parts of expansion. Similarly, examining the negotiation methods and battlefield tactics gives insight into the development of foreign policy during this period. Due to its exhibition of these key elements, the Arab siege of Egyptian Babylon will be used to illustrate how, in the 7th century, the early Islamic state embarked on its course as a medieval superpower.

The Arab invasion of Egypt is an event around which there is a great deal of confusion in the Arab histories. Even the entrance of general ‘Amr b. al-‘As (d. 656) and his army into the region itself remains, on some level, a topic of debate. The
controversy regards whether 'Amr initiated the invasion on his own or was ordered to do so by caliph 'Umar. This distinction is significant because it helps us gauge the autonomy with which 'Amr operated his army and the control which the caliphate held over its generals at the time.

Caliph 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭab (r.634-644) was only the second man to lead the Islamic community since the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632, yet it was during his reign that the Islamic state experienced its greatest period of expansion and development. So fantastic were his accomplishments that one historian would be led to suggest "'Umar was without doubt the greatest ruler of his time...[and] did more than any other caliph to formulate a system of government."¹ After first defeating the 'renegade tribes' of Arabia who left the community of Islam following Muhammad's death (known as the 'wars of the ridda'), he then directed his efforts toward the acquisition of territory outside the Arabian Peninsula. In 635, only one year after he had assumed power, the city of Damascus had surrendered to Muslims. Under his rule the Islamic empire would spread from Egypt to Persia, following successful campaigns against the two major superpowers of the world at the time, Byzantium and Persia.² Despite his abilities, the caliph at times had trouble maintaining his authority over this rapidly expanding empire. The invasion of Egypt by 'Amr ibn al-‘Ās and the subsequent siege of Babylon provide insight into the caliph's struggle to maintain order and authority over his armies, particularly as they moved farther away from the government in Medina.

² --, 53-55.
There was a clear disagreement among the Arab historians\(^3\) as to who decided to commence the invasion. Historian al-Baladhuri (d.892) recounted a tradition of in his Kitāb Futūh al-Buldān that caliph “Umar...wrote to him [‘Amr], rebuking and reprimanding him for following his own opinion, without consulting ‘Umar....”\(^4\) The source went on to say that `Umar had commanded ‘Amr to abort his invasion if he received the message before entering Egypt. If he had already crossed the border, though, he was to continue with the invasion. ‘Amr’s solution was to avoid reading the message until crossing into al-‘Arish (a border city on the Egypt side of the Sinai).\(^5\) Baladhuri’s traditions reflect the idea that the invasion of Egypt was an unauthorized campaign initiated by ‘Amr rather than the caliphate, but he also recorded a few traditions which observed that “It is asserted by others that ‘Umar wrote to ‘Amr ibn al-Asi, ordering him to proceed to Egypt.”\(^6\) Overall, however, the traditions in Baladhuri seemed to be of the opinion that the decision to invade Egypt was made by ‘Amr, rather than given to him as a command. The Arab general would have to have possessed relative autonomy in order to blatantly disobey the wishes of the caliph. If the accounts of Baladhuri were correct, the “authority” which ‘Umar held over and this general and his army would seem somewhat superficial.

Yet the accounts found in the history of al-Ţabarī (d.923) were often in opposition to this notion. For example, he cited a tradition of Sayf b. ‘Umar in saying

---

\(^3\) It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the nature of and problems concerning early Islamic historiography, and the author has assumed some basic understanding of the use of *ismāʾūl* in Arab histories. For a thorough explanation of this topic see Stephen Humphrey’s *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry, Revised Edition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).


\(^5\) One source even suggests that ‘Amr tried to pay the messenger off, (Hitti, 335).

\(^6\) ibid
that there was indeed an order from 'Umar to invade Egypt. His traditions contended that "'Umar...sent 'Amr b. al-'Asi to Egypt and appointed him governor over it, were God to conquer it for him." 7 A similar tradition reportedly coming from Ibn Ishaq (d. 767) explained that 'When 'Umar had finished taking measures pertaining to all of Syria, he wrote to 'Amr b. al-'Asi that he was to march upon Egypt with his army." 8 On the whole, the accounts of Tabari gave the impression that 'Amr's invasion of Egypt was an order of the caliphate. The traditions of Tabari depicted a caliphate in control of its forces, an image which stands in sharp contrast with majority of those traditions found in Baladhuri.

A third report, that of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (d.871), was recounted in his Futuh Misr. He recounted the story of 'Amr requesting permission to move into Egypt. 'Umar then sanctioned the invasion and 'Amr set off with his army towards the Sinai. Permission had been granted, though, with the understanding that "he would soon receive a letter from the caliph, and if he received any retreat order before reaching Egypt, he must return from the expedition." 9 One curious detail that was added to al-Hakam's account was that "'Amr headed out in the pit of night" 10 with his army. This phrase could imply that the action was somewhat clandestine, thereby explaining the swift reaction of the caliph's letter. The rest of the story followed along the same lines as that of Baladhuri, in which 'Amr's hesitation in opening the letter allowed him to

---

8 Tabari, 163.
pursue his own agenda. In this account, 'Amr acted against the caliph's orders, but the tradition was framed in such a way that the caliphate did not appear as helpless in controlling its forces.

Some sources also purported to explain 'Amr's personal interest and motivation for entering Egypt. These traditions, such as the one from Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi found in the account of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam,\textsuperscript{11} recounted the story of 'Amr's venture into the region years before the conquest of the city of Mecca by the Prophet Muhammad (630CE). He was in Jerusalem on a merchant trip when he came upon a priest from Alexandria. As it happened, this man ended up indebted to 'Amr and "invited [him] to visit Alexandria and promised to give him two thousand dinars as diyyat (blood money) for saving his life."\textsuperscript{12} Thus, it is claimed that 'Amr traveled through Egypt to Alexandria and gained an appreciation and understanding for the architecture and wealth of the country. This story was followed by another tradition in which 'Amr requested permission from caliph 'Umar to enter Egypt with an army, "argu[ing] that with the conquest of Egypt Muslim strength will be more and more consolidated."\textsuperscript{13} Although the story of the priest needs to be treated with a certain degree of skepticism, it is interesting that such a story came about, helping to explain 'Amr's understanding of Egyptian geography that he demonstrated during the invasion. The existence of this story could be interpreted as further evidence for 'Amr's own initiation of the invasion in that they demonstrate his own personal interests in Egypt rather than those of the caliphate.

\textsuperscript{11} See Torrey, 53-55.
\textsuperscript{12} Raisuddin, 278.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{ibid}
The truth is likely somewhere in between these various accounts. The decision of some Abbasid-era historians to portray the invasion of Egypt as a command was likely an attempt to avoid tarnishing the image of the power that the caliphate held over its armies. Baladhuri and Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam were writing in the 9th century during the zenith of Abbasid scholarly learning and development. The veneration of the Prophet and his companions (among whom both ‘Umar and ‘Amr figured prominently) would have been thoroughly developed by that time. One clear example of this veneration was the appearance of massive collections of oral traditions (hadith) regarding the sayings and doings of those individuals.\footnote{For example, the largest and most respected of the Sunni hadith, those of Bukhari (d.256 /869) and Musim (d. 261/874), are both compiled around this time.} The accounts of these historians can hardly be expected to have cited too many traditions which challenged the authority, prestige and leadership of either of these esteemed companions of the Prophet Muhammad.

Yet these accounts give reason to suggest that, as Albrecht Noth argued, ‘Amr entered into Egypt on his own account, and it was only afterwards that this was supported by caliph ‘Umar.\footnote{Albrecht Noth. Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen frühhislamischer Geschichtsüberlieferung (The early Arabic historical tradition: a source-critical study), trans. Michael Bonner. (Princeton, N.J : Darwin Press, 1994), 182-5.} That is to say, ‘Amr likely commenced the invasion of Egypt on his own initiative and ‘Umar, realizing that it was too late to have him turn back, sanctioned the invasion after the fact. This would suggest, then, that the caliphate was unable to restrain the initial invasion. ‘Umar’s influence was not so powerful as to stop an ambitious general from launching an attack on Egypt.
In December of the year 639, ‘Amr and his forces began their invasion of the Byzantine province of Egypt via Palestine.\textsuperscript{16} This was hardly the first attempt at expansion by the armies of the caliph. The invasion followed a series of successful campaigns against the Byzantines in Palestine and Syria, and was contemporary with the conquest of parts of the Sasanian Empire to the east. The key battles of Yarmuk in 636 and Gaza in 637, in particular, opened the way to Egypt for the Arab armies.\textsuperscript{17} Historian Walter Kaegi argued convincingly that the fall of Syria-Palestine made the conquest of Egypt inevitable.\textsuperscript{18} Unable to hold back the advancing Arab armies in Syria, the Byzantines would hardly have been able to keep the Arabs from invading Egypt regardless of whether ‘Amr took action when he did, especially given the geographic separation from Byzantine territory. Warfare with the Byzantines in Syria-Palestine provided the Arabs with valuable war experience, meaning this would have been a decisive period in the development of the army of the Islamic state. Indeed, their effectiveness as a military force would be reflected well in the coming battles and siege of Babylon.

It is important to discuss briefly the number of troops entering under ‘Amr’s command because this may provide further evidence for the general having acted on his own accord. The size of the invading force, at least as the sources portray it, is relatively clear. Balādḥuri gives 3,500 as the approximate number of troops under ‘Amr’s

\textsuperscript{16} Alfred J. Butler, The Arab Invasion of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion. Containing also the Treaty of Mīr (1913) and Babylon of Egypt (1914), 2nd Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 198.
\textsuperscript{18} --., Byzantine Egypt During the Arab Invasion of Palestine and Syria: Some Observations, American University of Cairo Newsletter, Vol 121. (Cairo, 1983),15.
command upon his entrance into Egypt.\textsuperscript{19} This estimate is likewise confirmed in a tradition of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.\textsuperscript{20} Such a force would have been small for the period,\textsuperscript{21} and would no doubt have been insufficient for the conquest of the entire Byzantine province. It can be guessed that, had he planned an invasion of Egypt at that time, ‘Umar would have sent a much larger force with ‘Amr. Even the very size of the army, then, could support the notion that decision to invade was ‘Amr’s.

Once in Egypt, it is safe to assume that it was general ‘Amr who was in complete control and that the opinion of the caliph was of little consequence. It is in these early engagements with the Byzantines that the tactical skill of both ‘Amr and his army was demonstrated. The army made its way across the Sinai Peninsula, and by the end of January the city of Faraqa (Pelusium) on the eastern edge of the Nile Delta fell to the Arab forces. After moving into the delta, ‘Amr engaged and defeated a small Byzantine force consisting of light cavalry troops led by John of Barkaina.\textsuperscript{22} Following this defeat, the Byzantine armies in the region --the largest of which was led by commander-in-chief Theodorus\textsuperscript{23}-- shifted their positions in order to defend the key cities of Misr and Nikiu. ‘Amr and his forces moved west and attempted to take the Fayyum,\textsuperscript{24} but they risked backtracking in order to rendezvous with the incoming reinforcements sent from ‘Umar over fifty miles to the northeast and across the Nile.

\textsuperscript{19} Baladhuri, 335.
\textsuperscript{20} Torrey, 56.
\textsuperscript{23} Nikii, Chapter CXI, 1.
\textsuperscript{24} See Appendix B, Figures 1 & 2 for the locations of these cities.
‘Amr broke from battle with Theodorus and made a dash for the city of Ayn-Shams. The retreat was successful, but a small portion of the force had to remain on the eastern bank of the river. Following their withdrawal, Theodorus then moved his troops to serve as a garrison for the Fortress of Babylon in Mısır.25 Although a retreat, ‘Amr’s move certainly demonstrated his tactical skill, as well the ability of his army to move quickly and effectively. Indeed, that Theodorus did not attack his enemy on the run is either evidence for ‘Amr’s ability as a military commander or the Byzantine commander’s lack thereof.

The traditions surrounding the reinforcements exhibit a considerable degree of variance. Although Zubayr b. al-’Awwām was often listed as the general of the force, there was mention of “four leading commanding officers, Zubayr b. al-’Awwām, Miqdad b. ‘Amr, ‘Ubādah b. Samit, and Maslama b. Mukhallad [emphasis added].”26 Typically, however, it was Zubayr who is given credit for having led the main force, and the others were mentioned as being in charge of minor parties which joined the invasion at different times. The successful rendezvous of these various armies is further evidence of their ability to function as a proper military force. In terms of numbers, the chronicler John of Nikiu (c.690), typically regarded as the most accurate and clearly the nearest to being a contemporary resource available, gave this account:

And 'Amr the son of Al-As sent a letter to Omar the son of Al-Khattab [sic] in the province of Palestine to this effect: 'If thou dost not send Moslem

---

25 John of Nikiu, 179-80.
26 See footnote 39 in Raisuddin for the list of the primary sources.
reinforcements, I shall not be able to take Misr.' And he sent him 4,000 Moslem warriors.27

This number for the reinforcements appears again in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam.28 Baladhuri, however, numbered the reinforcements at 10,000-12,000.29 The variance in numbers is due to the entire reinforcement army having been comprised of around 12,000 men, but the first arriving force was made up of 4,000.30 Indeed, 12,000 seems to be the consensus among most modern historians and is a much more realistic number of troops for carrying out an invasion than the original 3,000. Whether ‘Amr requested the reinforcements or ‘Umar sent them seems to be a bit more uncertain, though. As is evidenced by the passage above, John of Nikiu was under the impression that they were dispatched at the request of ‘Amr. Ṭabarī did little more than mention that the reinforcements were sent, making no note as to whether they were requested or sent by ‘Umar on his own accord.31 Baladhuri wrote that while ‘Amr was beginning his invasion, the governorship of Egypt was offered to Zubayr, who “replied, ‘I do not care for it, but would like to go there on a holy war and cooperate with the Moslems’.... (And) With this understanding, he left.”32 This tradition suggests that ‘Umar was taking the initiative in sending troops under Zubayr. If it is asserted that ‘Amr entered Egypt on his own and was later supported by ‘Umar, it would not have been unlikely for the caliph to have sent the forces in an attempt to avoid the annihilation of the army -- which would have been grossly outnumbered at 3,500. A tradition from ‘Amr an-Nāqîd

27 John of Nikiu, 180-1.
28 Butler 226, Footnote 1.
29 Baladhuri estimates the numbers in his own account at 10,000-12,000 on 336, and later mentions two traditions from Yazid ibn-abi-Habib which give 12,000 as the number on 337 & 338.
30 Butler, 226.
31 Ṭabarī, 166.
32 Baladhuri, 336.
recorded by Balādhuri indicated that ‘Umar sent reinforcements “in solicitude and fear,” presumably at the thought of having the entire force annihilated. Given the growth and success of expansion efforts during the reign of ‘Umar, though, it is unlikely that the caliph would have needed a request from ‘Amr to know that such a small force was going to be insufficient for a prolonged campaign against the Byzantines in Egypt. Furthermore, ‘Umar clearly did not support the invasion from the beginning and the idea of allowing this ambitious general to dictate the deployment of troops would have been a serious compromising of the power and authority associated with the office of the caliphate. If the earlier assertion regarding ‘Amr’s own commencement of the campaign is maintained, it is likely that ‘Umar would have sent the reinforcements shortly after discovering ‘Amr’s potentially disastrous entrance into Egypt.

The next major engagement with the Byzantines would prove the abilities of the Arab army. Following his retreat from the battlefield in the Fayyum, ‘Amr made his way toward Ayn-Shams (Heliopolis), where Zubayr and the reinforcement army were preparing for an attack on the city. The union of these two Arab forces had not gone unnoticed by Theodore. Confident in his troop numbers and their ability, the Byzantine general moved his garrison out of the Fortress at Babylon in Misr towards the Arab army seven miles northeast, outside the city of Ayn-Shams. Here, the two armies engaged in July of 640, with the Byzantines suffering a significant loss; one which left them with only 300 soldiers. Following the defeat, the small Byzantine force which

---

34 John of Nikiu, 181.
35 Estimated date given by Butler, 235.
36 Butler, 233.
survived scrambled its way back to Babylon. Various groups of horsemen “scoured the country” following the battle, presumably to run down survivors. The battle at Ayn-Shams had clearly demonstrated the Arab’s ability to engage and defeat an organized enemy force of Byzantium.

‘Amr and his forces then moved on to take the cities of Ayn-Shams, Fayyum, and all but the citadel of the city of Misr, known to Arab sources as Bāb-il-yūn (Babylon) or Qasr ash-Shama. Thus, “the whole province was brought under Muslim dominion.” That is, except the key sites of Nikiu and Alexandria. ‘Amr knew it was necessary to take the former before any venture toward the city of Alexandria—the ultimate goal—could be undertaken. But Nikiu was well defended, and the state of the Arab army was not sufficient to conduct a siege. The setting was described well by the scholar of the Arab Invasion of Egypt, Alfred Butler:

...the alarm now became a panic, which spread through every town of Egypt. From all parts the inhabitants streamed towards Alexandria, abandoning lands and houses, goods and chattels, cattle and crops...But ‘Amr was not prepared to follow the flying crowds northwards. The Nile, now rising fast as August waned, was making the country impassable: besides, he had no wish to leave in his rear the powerful fortress of Babylon unmasked, while to mask it such a number of

37 John of Nikiu, 181.
38 Butler, 235.
39 Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam reads: "Amr encircled the castle which was called Bab al-Yun," Torrey, 61. The name of the castle, however, has several different spellings in each manuscript.
40 Butler, 234.
troops were needed as would leave him no army capable of conquering
Alexandria. His next step therefore must be the reduction of Babylon.\textsuperscript{41}

It would be the fortress at Misr, the castle of Babylon, which would serve as the linchpin
to ‘Amr’s Egyptian campaign. If the forces could be free of this danger, they could move
on toward Nikiu and achieve the final goal of ousting the Byzantines from Alexandria.

Ultimately affecting the outcome of the siege were two major factors: the
position and layout of the castle, and the numbers and equipment of the two armies.
Quickly examining the geography and the layout of the citadel itself helps to
demonstrate the effectiveness of the castle as a point of defense. The city of Misr was a
key site at the opening of the Nile Delta, less than twenty miles south of the first fork in
the river. The fortress of Babylon itself was built atop a previously existing structure of
ancient origin, positioned in what is today “Old Cairo.” The name of the fortress as
either “Qasr ash-Shama” or “Qasr Bāb al-Ŷūn”\textsuperscript{42} varies from source to source, and a
great deal of debate has developed over the development of these names and whether or
not they refer to the same location.\textsuperscript{43} The fortress as it stood at the time of the conquest
was likely an ancient structure rebuilt by Trajan around 100 CE.\textsuperscript{44} Its surrounding walls
and the walls of the towers were 2.70 meters thick at the bottom. The towers were over
sixteen meters high, which was four meters higher than the walls.\textsuperscript{45} For obvious
defensive purposes the fortress was built along the eastern bank of Nile, adjacent to the

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} See footnote 36.
\textsuperscript{43} Władysław B Kubiak, Al-Fustat: Its Foundation and Early Urban Development. (Cairo: American
University in Cairo Press, 1987), 50-52. See Footnote 36.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 55. (See also Butler, Ancient Coptic Churches, Vol. 1)
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid
fortified Island of Raudah.\textsuperscript{46} It seems that this island is in fact all that remains of a larger one which "extended farther south and was shorter on its northern side."\textsuperscript{47} At the southern end of the fortress there was a large iron gate which provided the primary means of entrance into the city. This gate could be opened and closed in order to control the ships that came in and out of the castle into a walled harbor. In the event of a land siege, this gate could also allow vessels to make trips unmolested over to the Island of Raudah.\textsuperscript{48} There was apparently a 'boat bridge,' meaning a series of vessels strung together to serve the purpose of connecting the fortress on the southeastern side to the Island of Raudah and then continuing on to connect the western bank, which would have spanned a solid 350 meters across the eastern stem.\textsuperscript{49} Edward Gibbon described the coastline and Raudah as having been "united by two bridges of sixty and thirty boats."\textsuperscript{50} The existence of this bridge would offer an explanation for the two towers which stood at the southeastern side of the wall. Also, perhaps one of the most important defenses of the city would have been the Amnis Trajanus moat, which surrounded it.\textsuperscript{51} This would have made the fortress particularly effective in its defense against 'Amr in 641. It should also be pointed out that the topography within the fortress itself was likely higher than that of outside the fortress,\textsuperscript{52} adding a further tactical advantage to the Byzantine defense.

\textsuperscript{46} See Appendix B.
\textsuperscript{47} Kubiak, 47.
\textsuperscript{48} For a more detailed description of the castle, look to Butler's The Fortress of Babylon in Arab Conquest, 238.
\textsuperscript{49} Kubiak, 55, 48.
\textsuperscript{50} Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Volume 3, (New York: Random House, 1932), 171.
\textsuperscript{51} --, 35. Butler describes the moat and the appearance of its mention in various sources on p245. Depictions of the fortress, (See Appendix A), also make the existence of the canal apparent.
\textsuperscript{52} Kubiak, 37.
A description of the general state of either army is also essential because the numbers and equipment ultimately determined the procedures of siege warfare itself. Furthermore, a description of the Arab army (as well as that of its opponent’s forces) aids further the attempt to understand the nature of Islamic expansion during this period. ‘Amr’s forces are difficult to describe with any certainty, but a few general points may be noted. It is likely that the Arab forces amounted to around 15,500 men. This number is easily derived from the ‘Amr’s initial army of 3,500 and Zubayr’s reinforcement army of approximately 12,000.\textsuperscript{53} This was by no means a nomadic, tribal army; the armies of the early expansion period possessed a hierarchy of leadership, and their soldiers were not accompanied by families or possessions.\textsuperscript{54} Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam indicated that at least a few Greeks and Persians were included in the ranks in Egypt.\textsuperscript{55} Also, it is not unreasonable to presume that at least a few soldiers from the previously conquered Egyptian cities may have joined the Arab army as well. Indeed, such an instance was noted by John of Nikiu when he referred to the invading army at the Battle of Ayn-Shams as “those Moslem, accompanied by the Egyptians who had apostatized from the Christian faith and embraced the faith of the beast....”\textsuperscript{56} The importance of these forces has been noted by Hugh Kennedy:

\textit{Such groups of renegades may have been important in stiffening the Muslim armies and introducing new military techniques, and their role is likely to have been underplayed in the Arabic sources.}\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{53} See Discussion on page 8.
\textsuperscript{55} ibid., 5; Torrey, 129.
\textsuperscript{56} John of Nikiu, Chapter CXIV, 1.
\textsuperscript{57} Kennedy, 4.
That being said, although the army was comprised of more than just the initial Arab forces, there is nothing to indicate that these additions amounted to any serious increase in numbers.

The issues of weaponry and tactics are particularly problematic because of the tendency of later Arab historians to assume similarities between themselves and the people of the past, projecting their equipment and organization into the days of the early conquests.\textsuperscript{58} Again, however, mentioning a few general characteristics contributes to the overall picture of the expansion period army. As both Donner and Kennedy have noted, the weaponry of the conquest period would undoubtedly have included swords, spears, bows, and some sort of mail, as well as horses and camels.\textsuperscript{59} Indeed, some of the success of Muslim expansion during this early period should be attributed to the use of the camel, “which allowed them [the Arab armies] to move rapidly from front to front.”\textsuperscript{60} It is certain, though, that some of the most essential weapons for besieging this fortress were absent. Namely, the sources make no mention of siege towers and it appears that the army possessed no other artillery for siege warfare.\textsuperscript{61} The resulting image of the expansion army is one of ten thousand or more lightly armed soldiers under the command of various captains lead as a whole by general ‘Amr guiding their course. This force would have been able to move relatively quickly, given that there is little evidence to suggest they carried with them any siege equipment.

The lack of siege equipment was destined to make this battle a long one. In the case of Babylon, though, there was one piece of equipment that the Arabs did possess

\textsuperscript{58} Kennedy, 2.
\textsuperscript{59} Donner, 222-3. Kennedy adds mail to this list, 5.
\textsuperscript{60} Grunebaum, 53.
which would have been particularly useful: boats. John of Nikiu noted that following the
capture of Fayyum, ‘Amr sent the Prefect of Heracleopolis 62 "to bring the ships of Rif in
order to transport to the east bank of the river the Ishmaelites who were upon the
west." 63 This shows that Arab forces were indeed in control of some vessels. A later
selection from the same chapter, however, indicates that ‘Amr had a bridge built outside
Babylon in order to hinder any boats hoping to make their way out of the city toward
Alexandria. 64 If they were indeed in control of boats, the army apparently did not
possess knowledge of how to use them to their advantage in besieging the castle or
blockading the river. These factors, that the army did not possess artillery and did not
use effectively the boats which they had, help to explain how the Byzantines managed
to hold out from September of 640 to April of the following year.

Understanding the Byzantine force is equally important because it helps
demonstrate the level of opposition which the Arab army faced. The population of
Byzantine Egypt as whole, and more specifically the number of the troops garrisoned at
Babylon, can only be estimated. Kaegi suggested the population of Egypt during the 7th
century to have been at somewhere around 5 million, and the entire defensive forces of
Egypt at somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000. 65 As for the Byzantine garrison at the
fortress, Butler estimated their number to have been no more than five or six thousand.
While the numbers of the troops may be uncertain, there quality as soldiers is apparent.
It is telling that the troops which defended Babylon would not have been highly trained
Byzantine soldiers but locally recruited Egyptians:

---

62 Identified as such in Butler, 235.
63 John of Nikiu, CXIII, 1.
64 Ibid
65 Kaegi, Egypt..., 38.
...these were not elite troops; most were probably of Egyptian origin...Byzantine military forces garrisoned in Egypt had never been the empire's best troops, who were not recruited from or stationed there.66

As for the citizens of Misr, many of the inhabitants of the city would probably have attempted to flee towards Alexandria by this point. From this it could be deduced that the individuals remaining within the city would have been mostly the soldiers or religious personnel. Nevertheless, it is important to note that Babylon itself was “a medium-size fortified town, and not a purely military settlement,” 67 and thus it is certainly possible that the “several thousand souls” which normally inhabited the city might not have had the chance to flee. Indeed, some of the people of Misr remained because it is with them that ‘Amr’s treaty was offered following the fall of the citadel. Lastly, the isolation of these defenders of Babylon, cut off from the Byzantine stronghold of Alexandria by the Nile Delta, would have been a major disadvantage. Although the Byzantines were clearly in a stronger position given that that they were behind castle walls, the Arabs appear to have had a three to one numeric advantage. Furthermore, a number of the people occupying the fort were civilians; those who were not were inadequately trained soldiers. Therefore, main factor in determining the outcome of this siege seems to have been the castle, given that the Arabs possessed both numeric and strategic advantages over their opponents.

Command of the Byzantine force also contributed to the ability of the Arab army to conquer Babylon. The active Byzantine general was identified in Arab histories as al-

66 Kaegi, Egypt..., 38.
67 Kubriak, 55.
Araj, a name which Butler interpreted as a corruption of the name ‘George.’ However, because Byzantine General Theodorus had by that time gone to Alexandria, the figure known to Arab historians as al-Muqawqis became the de-facto leader. This identity of this man is agreed upon by modern scholars as having been Viceroy of Egypt and Patriarch of Alexandria, Cyrus. It is certain that it was al-Muqawqis whom Emperor Heraclius ultimately held responsible for the loss of the fortress and it was he who controlled negotiation with ‘Amr’s army.

The final group of people who would play a role, albeit an indirect one, in the Arab conquest of Babylon was that of the Coptic prisoners, which John of Nikiu mentioned in his chronicle. The Coptic population of Egypt had suffered persecution under the country’s viceroy Cyrus (al-Muqawqis) for nearly a decade. Cyrus had originally been appointed to the position of Imperial Patriarch of Egypt in an attempt to reconcile the Malachite and Coptic churches, but when he was unsuccessful he turned to more drastic measures. He was able to carry this out through his dual appointment as both Imperial Patriarch and Viceroy. Although there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that the Coptic population in any way significantly aided the Arabs in their invasion (and less in particular in the case of Babylon), the ultimate success of the Islamic state in ruling the people of Egypt and the wider Middle East stemmed from its tolerance for the Coptic churches. Indeed, all Christians were to be treated with relative tolerance alongside Jews as *ahl al-kitāb* or “People of the Book.” These groups
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68 Butler, 250.
69 Little doubt exists that the *al-Muqawqis* was, in fact, Kyros of Alexandria. For a detailed discussion of the identity of *al-Muqawqis*, see Appendix 5 in Butler. Prior to the Arab invasion, Kyros (or Cyrus) had been responsible for a vicious decade-long persecution of the Coptic citizens of Misr. For a detailed description see Butler, *Arab Conquest*, XIII.
70 John of Nikiu, 187.
71 See Butler’s “Persecution of the Copts by Cyrus” in *The Arab Invasion of Egypt*, 168-193.
(dhimmi) would be instructed to pay a special tax (jizyah) in exchange for their protected status.\textsuperscript{72} Although this still afforded them second class citizen status, the Copts would no doubt have considered this situation better than the heretical status awarded to them by al-Muqawqis.

The siege proper began in September of 641, following the victory at Ayn-Shams. The Nile was in flood by that time, and so Byzantine defenses would have been at their most effective level. The Arab army could do little but camp at the northwestern side of the fortress and await the recession of the river or the surrender of the castle.

By October, al-Muqawqis came to the conclusion that the chances of reinforcements arriving before the Nile receded were slim. He thus called a council with the various figures of authority and suggested that negotiations be opened between the Arabs and themselves in an attempt to salvage what little control the Byzantines still held in the region. The council agreed that such negotiations should commence, but it was decided that the soldiers should not be told.\textsuperscript{73} This decision was likely made in an attempt to avoid demoralizing the garrison any more than they would have already been as well as prevent any unrest which capitulation might have caused among the rank-and-file. The dialogues between the envoys that followed reveal the limited nature of negotiation and foreign policy of the early Islamic State.

When night came, al-Muqawqis and the envoy made their way out to the Island of Raudah. Al-Araj, the general in charge of the Babylon garrison probably stayed behind. Butler added that “Cyrus removed all the pontoons, so that, in case a panic


\textsuperscript{73} Butler, 253-4.
seized the garrison they would be unable to leave the fortress.” Following their arrival on the island, an envoy departed for the Arab camp. The argument made by the Byzantine envoy was simple and arrogant. They confidently warned the Arabs that besieging the castle was a mistake on their part because of their inferior numbers and ability. They should sue for peace before the Byzantine reinforcements (which would inevitably arrive) came and destroyed the whole of their army. The Arabs decided to deliberate on the issue for a couple of days, and in the meantime the envoys were given freedom to walk around the camp and observe. The Arab response was hardly what the Byzantines wanted to hear. In a tradition recounted by Ṭabarî, it was explained that al-Muqawqis had three options:

...we call upon you to embrace Islam. He who is willing to do so will be like one of us. To him who refuses, we suggest that he pay the jizyah [tribute tax] and we will give him ample protection...If you accept our proposition, we will give you constant protection...[if not] I shall fight you.

A similar account was given in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s Futuh Misr:

[And so it was] upon them, ‘Amr and his message: “Between me and you all there are these three conditions only: (1) enter into Islam so that we are brothers and [so that] what was to you is what it is to us, (2) [or] for you all who refuse we offer the jizyah in exchange for protection with subservience. (3) Either these
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74 Butler, 255.
75 Ṭabarî, 167-8.
or we will fight against you with patience and fight ‘until Allah judges between us, and He is the Best of Judges.’ 76

The choices were clear: convert, pay tribute, or fight. This formulaic set of options represents the extent of wartime negotiation during the early age of Islamic expansion, and it was this message that the envoy relayed to a very displeased al-Muqawqis.

The messengers returned not only with information regarding negotiation, but also with observations which provide an interesting view into the world of the besieging Arab army. Butler’s account of al-Muqawqis speaking with his negotiators, the details of which he derived from the account of historian al-Maqrizi (d. 1442), had the members of the party explain as follows:

‘We have seen... a people who prefer life and humility to pride. They sit in the dust, and take their meals on horseback. Their commander is one of themselves: there is no distinction of rank among them. They have fixed hours of prayer at which all pray, first washing their hands and feet, and they pray with reverence. 77

This dialogue, which is likely nothing more than an interpretation of an imagined conversation, nevertheless helps us to put into perspective the nature of Arab warfare during this early period of Islam. Although the army is clearly effective in battle, organized under a militaristic hierarchy, and capable of moving long distances, it

76 عليهم عمر و مع رسول الله ﷺ ليس بيني وبينكم إلا إحدى ثلاث خصال إما ان دخلتم في الإسلام فكلتم إخوانا كأن كم لما لنا أن و أبكم فاعظكم الجزية عن بدر والتم صاغرون إما و إن جاهدناكم بالصبر القتال و حتى يحكم الله بيننا و هو خير الحاكمين, Torrey 65.

77 Butler, 256 & the story is likewise told by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, (Torrey, 65).
retained its Arab-Islamic character. That is to say, the centrality of religion was not be compromised and a kind of tribal equality was extended to all of its members.

Not surprisingly, Cyrus’s colleagues were less than intimidated by the envoy’s description of their foes and were certainly in agreement that none of the options offered would suit their position. Still the Patriarch requested that another party be sent in hopes of further negotiation. ‘Amr responded by sending a group of representatives headed by a dark-skinned man named ‘Ubadah across to the island of Raudah. What followed demonstrates the way that the Byzantines in Egypt might have perceived skin color and its relationship with cultural superiority. Al-Muqawquis was amazed that a black man had been chosen to lead the discussion, and demanded that he be removed from his presence, exclaiming, “Remove this black man from my presence! Bring me another.”78 The response of the Arab envoy was one of equal astonishment. A member of the group replied, “‘Amr has chosen and entrusted this matter to him above us and has ordered us not to contradict it.”79 ‘Ubadah then proceeded to explain to al-Muqawquis that there was no distinction made between men within Islam, regardless of the color of their skin. His words surprised the patriarch, but while al-Muqawquis acknowledged the devotion and piety of the Muslims, he remained firm in insisting that the Roman forces would overwhelm the Arab army. He offered payment for each head in the army, and more for ‘Amr and the caliph, in exchange for the withdrawal of the Arab forces.80 No doubt somewhat annoyed at the patriarch’s negotiation tactics, ‘Ubadah

79 ibid
80 Butler, 257-8.
proclaimed that no options existed other than those already presented. This time, however, he made clear that if they surrendered

...both their persons and their property would be respected; that they would retain full control over their possessions and all existing rights of inheritance; that their churches would be left uninjured, and the practice of their religion unmolested.\textsuperscript{81}

These conditions are again part of the larger strategy of the early conquests, in which the Arab armies would leave the government and social institutions intact, and simply reap the economic benefits of victory.\textsuperscript{82} This approach ensured stability and contributed significantly to the ability of the Arab armies to conquer vast amounts of territory in a short period of time.

Al-Muqawqis may have been willing at this point to yield to these terms, but his contemporaries were clearly not. Although Butler despairingly described the ‘silence’ of his most trustworthy source, John of Nikiu, on this subject, little information is needed to understand that the envoy was sent away without an answer. Instead, there was a request by the Byzantines for an armistice so that the issue could be debated.\textsuperscript{83} As a result of this second envoy, the Byzantines were given three days to come to a decision.\textsuperscript{84} When the emissaries returned to al-Muqawqis for the second time and the same terms were offered, the generals of Misr, like their Arab counterparts, remained

\textsuperscript{81} Butler, 259.
\textsuperscript{82} Examples of this practice are noted in “Military Organization, Migration, and Settlement” in Donner, \textit{The Early Islamic Conquests}, 221-50.
\textsuperscript{83} \textsuperscript{T}abar\textsuperscript{i}, 168.
\textsuperscript{84} Butler gives 3, But \textsuperscript{T}abar\textsuperscript{i}'s account (168-9) says that 'Amr awarded them an extra day (making 4), which logically corresponds with subsequent events. \textsuperscript{T}abar\textsuperscript{i}'s account also read in reference to \textit{Ayn-Shams}, but it seems clear from the context and the treaty listed later that the event being described is the siege of Babylon.
unmoved in their refusal to negotiate. Ṭabarî wrote that the people of Misr were told by their leaders:

_As for us, we shall do our best to defend you and we would not return to the Muslims —after all, four days have passed by now during which you came to no harm—were it not for the fact that we hope that therein might lie immunity for you._  

Regardless of its authenticity, this quotation provides us with an ominous foreshadowing of events to come. Negotiation had failed; all that remained was to fight.

What came next was a final desperate effort by the Byzantines. On the fourth day following the Arab envoy’s departure, “the Byzantines sallied out over their drawbridges and fell upon the camp of their unsuspecting enemy.” Ṭabarî may have been referencing this attack when he said, "Nothing surprised 'Amr and al-Zubayr more than the sudden attack...one night, but 'Amr was prepared." Even with the element of surprise on their side, though, the Byzantine forces were dramatically outnumbered, and a greatly depleted force retreated back into the fortress. Following the devastating failure, it was agreed that negotiations for surrender should be re-opened. This time the Byzantines were in no position to bargain, and the previous option of subjection and tribute was chosen, and a treaty was drawn up. The purpose of it was less to end the hostilities as it was to determine the fate of the city of Misr under Islamic rule. This document was then brought to Alexandria, by al-Muqawqis himself, where it was then
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relayed to Emperor Heraclius in Constantinople. It is interesting that the conditions following this last effort by the Byzantines did not alter the terms of negotiation -- the Arab army still offered the same conditions for surrender. Although the Byzantines were clearly weakened, the fact remained that the besiegers still did not possess the equipment necessary to take the fortress.

As is evidenced by his reaction to the letter, Heraclius remained convinced the Byzantine could maintain their defense. Several negotiations with the Arabs had hitherto been made independently without the consent of Heraclius in Mesopotamia by figures comparable to al-Muqawqis, and they had ended in “crushingly expensive agreements to pay tribute in return for holding off raiding and invasions.” Heraclius was determined not to allow such a negotiation to take place without his approval, and in this case he was not going to allow it to happen at all. Surrender of the key site of Babylon would have caused quite a disturbance in Constantinople because of the chief fiscal importance of Egypt to the Empire at that time. The emperor appears to have reacted ferociously to the request, and various sources described the public humiliation of al-Muqawqis in Constantinople. Upon receiving the message in mid-November, Heraclius

*recalled to Byzantium Kyros [al-Muqawqis], the bishop of Alexandria, and held him under severe accusation of having surrendered to the Saracens the affairs of all of Egypt. He pursued these charges at the time in front of a large gathering of*
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91 *Egypt on the eve...,* 36. Here he suggested that close to 30 percent of taxes from the eastern empire and describes Egypt at as “integral part of the broader Byzantine and Mediterranean economy and its financial contributions were essential to Byzantine fiscal integrity at the start of the seventh century.” It is interesting, though, to note that the Empire survived a confiscation of the province by the Persians in the first decade of the 7th century.
citizens... [Following al-Muqawqis's explanation, the emperor became] incensed
with him and threatened him with death, [and then] handed him over to the
prefect of the city for punishment.\textsuperscript{92}

Cyrus's rationale in offering monetary tribute was unacceptable and had apparently
infuriated the Emperor. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam wrote that the Emperor called the
patriarch's suggestion "shameful, [and] called him impotent....\textsuperscript{93} Heraclius saw the
payment of tribute to the Muslim armies as only exacerbating the economic problems of
the empire. Not surprisingly, he was confused as to how such an initially small number
of Arab forces could just appear out of nowhere and defeat the Egyptian armies of
Byzantium. Following his interview with the emperor, al-Muqawqis was effectively
removed from negotiations with the Arabs, and the fortress was left on its own.

It would not have taken long, probably by early December, for word of the
rejection of the treaty to make its way back to the garrison. Although supplies and
morale must have been at an all-time low, the Byzantine soldiers were still unwilling to
surrender. As the waters of the Nile receded, exposing more of the fortress to land, the
defenders cast iron spikes down into the muddy trench in an attempt to deter an attack.
But the problem of disease, which would easily have escalated into an epidemic, soon
fell upon the garrison. Meanwhile, the Arab army responded by filling in portions of the
trench to make land bridges right up to the castle walls in preparations for an assault on
the city.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{92} Nikephoros, 71-72. Quoted in Kaeo, \textit{Heraclius}, 286.
\textsuperscript{93} Quoted in Kaeo, \textit{Heraclius}, 286. Translated from Torrey, 71.
\textsuperscript{94} Butler, 265.
During the months of January and February, the water which had previously protected the fort was all but dried up, exposing the castle to a land-based attack and thereby eliminating the biggest obstacle to victory for the Arab, their lack of siege equipment. The Byzantine garrison made a few minor sorties against their besiegers. These likely took place at night and during prayer, when the Muslim army would have been most vulnerable. It is possible that by conducting these sorties the Byzantines were attempting to hold off a major attack because they had received word of reinforcements from Alexandria. General Theodorus was in command of a sizable force marching southward towards Misr to engage the Arab army. 'Amr was not interested in waiting around for a Byzantine army to disrupt his siege, and so he moved a portion of his army across the river and struck northwards for the city of Samanud, on the western bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile. Theodorus sent a force to protect the city, and the Arabs suffered significant losses. A series of minor battles followed which brought little advantage to either side. What the battles did do, however, was prevent Theodorus's arrival in Misr. The garrison was left without its reinforcements, and it was clear that very soon the fortress would fall.

The final blow to troop morale came in early March when "a great shout went up in the Muslim camp." Soon after, the garrison received news that Emperor Heraclius had died. Because succession to the throne was complicated, there was fear of revolution. As a result, the focus of the Empire shifted away from Egypt and toward
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Constantinople, leaving the province to fend for itself. Yet even then the Byzantine troops were unwilling to surrender, and the siege trudged on for two more months.

The two dramatically different psychological mindsets of the opposing armies during the siege should also be considered. The Arabs had just conquered vast amounts of territory, and the psychological effects of momentum and troop morale would not have been insignificant. The religious fervor of the Arabs should also not be underestimated. On the minds of the Muslims “was the drive towards the existence as a great state...[which] derived its moral justification from the Koran, in the summons to fight the unbeliever.” Byzantine troops, by contrast, had suffered severe food shortages, disease, and failed sorties, all of which would have dealt some serious blows to their confidence by the last days of the siege. Also, they would have known that the Arab armies had shortly before annihilated Byzantine forces in Syria and Palestine. What sort of chance could one fortress expect to have against an army with such force? If all of these factors are added to the fact that the garrison was made up of poorly trained Egyptians who were watching their homeland become overrun, it is difficult to see how the psychological state of the soldiers could not have played some role in the ultimate loss of the fortress as well as in the larger success of the Arab conquest of Egypt.

If this was indeed the mindset of the Byzantine soldiers at this point, their fears would have been duly confirmed on the night of 6 April 641, Good Friday, when the famous scaling ladder of al-Zubayr was placed against the wall of the fortress,
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ultimately resulting in the Arabs gaining possession of the castle.\textsuperscript{100} The ladder is said to have been placed against the south-eastern wall of the city.\textsuperscript{101} probably near the Suk al-Hammam (Market of the Bath).\textsuperscript{102} The explanation for how the attack itself happened became an issue of great debate among Arab historians. The importance of the event is significant beyond the basic historical record of the event. The early system of taxation in the Islamic empire distinguishes carefully between territories that had become Muslim peaceably, that is to say by voluntary surrender (sulhan) and those that had been acquired by force (‘anwatan). The former retained their property and paid a collective levy which could not be arbitrarily increased by the government,...the latter had forfeited their property rights but held their land against payment of a tax assessed by the government.\textsuperscript{103}

In most major chronicles or histories, there are traditions speaking of two basic versions of the story. The first describes the historical scaling of the wall by al-Zubayr and his triumphant declaration, “Allahu Akbart”\textsuperscript{104} This is then quickly followed by the surrender of the fortress to the Arab army, thus making it a victory “by force.”\textsuperscript{105} Another tradition describes the same deeds of al-Zubayr, but at almost the same moment the people of the city are said to have opened the gates to ‘Amr and agreed to a treaty. This would, by contrast, make it capitulation “by way of peace.”\textsuperscript{106} It appears that where al-Zubayr entered the fort, there were walls which prevented him and his men from moving onto the rest of the castle and conquering it. The inhabitants of

\textsuperscript{100} Butler, 270.
\textsuperscript{101} See Appendix A.
\textsuperscript{102} Butler, see Footnote 3 on pages 270-1 for a detailed description of the location of the scaling itself.
\textsuperscript{103} Grunebaum, 56.
\textsuperscript{104} Baladhuri, 336.
\textsuperscript{105} الزَّكَرُ مِنْ قَالَ مَا فَتَحْتَ مِصْرَ عَنْدَهَا، Torrey, 88.
\textsuperscript{106} الزَّكَرُ مِنْ قَالَ مَا فَتَحْتَ بِصَاحٍ. Torrey, 84.
Babylon, upon seeing the Arab soldiers within the walls of the fortress, finally agreed to capitulation and opened the gates.

Indeed, the fall of Babylon was no typical medieval conquest. Almost any citizen who wished to depart from the city was allowed to do so,107 and a tax of two dinars was applied to all who wished to remain.108 Such freedom would indicate that the treaty which was originally offered to al-Muqawqis to relay to the Emperor was more or less the same offer given at the time of the fall of the fortress. In any event, the Byzantines who chose to leave were allowed to gather what they could by the evacuation date, which was set for the following Easter Monday, 9 April 641.109 Presumably, the citizens of the city would have held their final church services in the city that Sunday before leaving the city.

With Lower Egypt firmly in the hands of the Arabs, ‘Amr and his forces were able to move northwards toward Alexandria. Babylon had served as a key site to military success in the Delta, and with its surrender came the conquests of Nikiu in May and Alexandria in November.110 The symbolic importance of Babylon was again seen on 8 November, 641,111 when it served as the site of official political surrender of Egypt to the Arab army.

CONCLUSION & SUMMARY

The success of the Arab conquests and the development of the Early Islamic State during the 7th century are to be attributed to numerous historical factors, each of

107 Baladhuri, 339.
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109 John of Nikiu reads, “And it was in this way that the citadel of Babylon in Egypt was taken on the second day after the (festival of the) Resurrection.” CXVII.
110 Butler, 544-45. See also Butler, Appendix D for an analysis of the chronology of the conquest.
111 --, 329.
which is deserving of a great deal of research and explanation. The intention here has not been to attempt to explain, but rather to identify major themes in the formation of the Islamic State during a crucial period in its history. These themes – the struggle of the caliphate for control, the role of religion, the development of the military and early approaches to foreign policy and warfare—have been identified through the use of one of many events in the period of expansion, the siege of Egyptian Babylon.

The controversial accounts of the entrance of General ‘Amr b. al-Ās into Egypt give insight into the caliphate’s attempt to assert itself in a time of rapid expansion. The swift and effective retreat from the Fayyum and the subsequent rendezvous with a reinforcement army are demonstrations of tactical sophistication by both ‘Amr and his army. Likewise, the successful engagement at the Battle of Ayn-Shams confirmed the ability of the Arab army to hold its own against the armies of the Byzantines. The eight month long siege, lasting from September of 640 to April of 641, was an impressive show of tenacity by both the Arabs and the Byzantines. The role of religion was seen in two ways. First, the religious persecution of the Coptic Church by al-Muqawqis likely helped to weaken what little allegiance it might have had to Byzantium as well as contributing the Copts’ later submission to Islamic rule as a beneficial alternative. Second, faith in the Islam served as both a motivation to fight and a reassurance of victory with every Muslim soldier believing that theirs was the cause of God. The negotiation between al-Muqawqis and the Arab envoy portrays the classic scenario of expansion period negotiation with its uncompromising choices of conversion, payment, or death. Surrender of Babylon came following the heroic storm of the castle by al-Zubayr, though that is to be attributes less to his actions than to the decisions of the
Byzantines that they had had enough. The surrender of Babylon on Good Friday of 641 was completed with a treaty, which confirmed the promises of ‘Ubadah and the Arab envoys. From Babylon, the Arab army aimed itself toward Alexandria and the conquest of Egypt continued until the surrender of that city in November of 641.

A history of the Arab Siege of Egyptian Babylon therefore serves as an excellent example for observing four of the most significant elements of early Arab expansion and the formation of the early Islamic State.
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APPENDIX C
TREATY OF TABARI

The following is the treaty of Tabari as translated by Gautier H. A. Juynboll. Other translations exist, including the two others by Goeje and Zotenburg, which Butler used for his book.112

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

This is the text of the covenant that Amr b. al-‘Asi has granted the people of Misr concerning immunity for themselves, their religion, their possessions, churches, crucifixes, as well as their land and their waterways. Nothing of these will be interfered with or decreased.

Nubians are not allowed to share their homesteads. It is incumbent upon the people of Misr, if they agree on the terms of this covenant and when the rise of the Nile water comes to a half, to afford the jizya, to wit fifty million (dirhams).

They will have to account for the crimes committed by robbers from among them.

If anyone refuses to comply with the terms of this treaty, jiza’ obligations will be lifted from them commensurate with their numbers, and we will be exempt from awarding protection to those who do so. If their river fails to reach the highest point when the rise of the water has come to a half, then, commensurate with the losses suffered, their jiza’ payments will be reduced.

Those Byzantines and Nubians who are willing to accept the same terms as in the covenant with the people of Misr will have the same privileges and duties as the latter.

He who refuses to accept these terms and chooses to part will enjoy immunity, until he has reached his destination where he can be safe, or has moved out of the territory where our authority prevails.

It is incumbent upon them to comply with the following terms: in three installments, every third part of the years, they will have to afford one third of what they have to pay.

112 Butler, Babylon of Egypt, 7.
For the terms of this document the covenant of God and His protection, as well as that of His Messengers, that of the Caliph, the Commander of the Faithful, as well as the protection awarded by all the Muslims, are guarantees.

It is incumbent upon the Nubians who have accepted the terms of this treaty that they help (sc. The local government) with so many men and so many horses, in the understanding that no raids will be mounted against them and that they will not be prevented from trade, export or import.

Al-Zubayr, his sons 'Abdallah and Muhammad, have witnessed the concluding of this covenant, Wardan has put it down in writing and was present.113

---

APPENDIX D
TREATY OF TABARI

Below is my own translation of the Treaty of Misr found in Tabari. When creating my own version, I made note of Butler’s translation as well the translation of Gautier H. A. Juynboll from his edition of Tabari’s History (found above).

In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

This is what ‘Amr ibn al-‘As gave the inhabitants of Misr for security upon their persons, faith, property, churches, crosses, land and river: There shall be no interference with or decrease in these things.

There shall be no living of the Nubians among them (the inhabitants of Misr).

If they gather upon this settlement and if the final swelling of their river is 50 millions, the jizya (poll-tax) shall be levied upon the inhabitants of Misr.

Upon them is the choice of (how to deal with) criminals.

It shall be up to their discretion to pay the tax, and those who refuse shall have the tax lifted from them “in proportion.” Those who refuse, however, shall not receive our protection.

If their river does not reach its limit, the tax shall be lifted from them “in proportion.”

Upon those from Rome or Nubia who enter this agreement in peace there shall be granted rights like what they (the inhabitants of Misr) have.

Upon those who refuse this agreement there shall be granted peaceful passage until they arrive to safety or have exited from our power (domain).

Upon them there shall be three payments. One-third of this is what shall be paid each time.

---

115 See Butler, Treaty of Misr, 38.
116 Juynboll used the phrase “commensurate with their numbers,” which is perhaps more fitting (See Juynboll, 171)
117 ibid
The contents of the agreement are observed by God and shall receive his assurance, the assurance of His Prophet, the assurance of the Caliph, the Commander of the Faithful, as well as the assurance of the believers.

Upon the Nubians who choose to enter this agreement shall be the obligation of number of heads\textsuperscript{118} and sheep in exchange for no raids against them and no restraining of their merchant trade, whether it be importing or exporting.

This agreement was witnessed by al-Zubayr, as well as by his sons, ‘Abdullah and Muhammad. It was written by Wardan, who was present.

\textsuperscript{118} This is an interesting place for the appearance of the work رأس ("heads"). It would be assumed that it would either be the heads of slaves or soldiers which are being referenced. The word is immediately followed, though, by a request for sheep which suggests that the 'heads' refer to those of another animal. Butler interpreted this as the 'heads (of cattle)," 34. Juynboll chooses to translate this, perhaps more appropriately, as "so many men," 171.
APPENDIX E

FUTUH MISR OF IBN 'ABD AL-HAKAM

The following is a translation in progress of a chapter from Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's "Futuh Misr wa Akhbarnaha." The passage is entitled "The account of the entrance of 'Amr b. al-As into Egypt," and describes the story of how the Arab general became acquainted with Egypt. The translation was made from the 1922 edition of the text compiled from several manuscripts by Charles C. Torrey.119

He then returned to the report of 'Uthman b. Salih who said that it was in the 18th year [18 AH] that 'Umar al-Khawlya finished with 'Amr b. al-As and so he ['Umar] permitted him to march to Egypt. 'Amr had already entered Egypt in the jahiliya (the Age of Ignorance). He knew its routes and had seen much of what was in it.

The reason for 'Amr's entrance into it [Egypt] was told to us by Yahya b. Khalid al-'Adawi from Ibn Lah'nu and Yahya b. Ayub from Khalid b. Yazid. It reached him that 'Amr proceeded to Jerusalem for trade with a band from the Quraysh. Suddenly, they were with a Byzantine priest from the people of Alexandria. He had proceeded to pray in Jerusalem so he went out into some of its mountains and roamed around them. 'Amr was feeding his camel and the camels of his companions. The grazing of the camels was done in shifts between them. 'Amr was feeding his camel when that priest passed by. An intense thirst then came upon the priest, and it was an intensely hot day. So he stopped by 'Amr to ask him for a drink. 'Amr gave him a drink from his water skin and the priest drank it until his thirst was quenched and he slept in his place.

Beside where the priest slept there was a hole and from it came a terrible snake. 'Amr noticed it so he struck it with an arrow and killed it. When the priest awoke he saw the terrible snake and how God had kept it from him. And the priest said, "What is this?" but then he understood that 'Amr had thrown it (the dart) and killed the snake so he kissed his forehead and said, "Twice already God has saved my life by you: one time from vigorous thirst, and another time from this serpent! So I will proceed with you through these lands."

And so he proceeded with the companions. 'Amr said, "We desire bounty in our trade." So the priest said to him, "How many camels do you all hope that you procure in your trade?" 'Amr said, "My hope is that I will procure enough to buy one camel so that I do not own only two camels, but will have another one and so there will be three." And so the priest asked him, "How much blood money is their between us?"

'Amr said to him, "100 camels." So the priest said to him eloquently, "My people are not the companions of the camel, we are the companions of Dinars. 'Amr said, "It will be 1000 dinars." But the priest said to him, "I am a strange man in these lands. I proceeded to pray in the Church of Jerusalem and I roamed into these mountains. For one month that was solemnly designated upon me. I have finished, and I now desire to return to my country. Will you follow me to my land? You have the protection of God and his covenant as an oath from me that I will give you two diyyat, because by the glory of God I have life by you twice!"

'Amr said, "Where is your country?"

The priest said, "Egypt, in a city called Alexandria."

'Amr said, "I don't know it and have never before entered it."

The priest said, "If you had entered it you would not have entered anything like it before."

'Amr said, "Will you keep with what you said and be true to the oath and covenant?"

The priest said, "By God, I will keep this oath and covenant and return you to your companions."

'Amr said, "How long will my stay be there?"

The priest said, "You will need to have a month free to go with me for 10 days. [Because] I estimate we will depart and travel for 10 days and you will return in 10 days. And I must remember that you will need to go [in that amount of time] and I will dispatch with you someone who remembers [the way to return]."

'Amr said, "I am unsure until I ask my companions about it."

So 'Amr proposed it to his companions. The oldest of them gave the priest his word and The priest said to them, "May you all judge me until I return to you all and you all have upon me the oath that I gave you. Will you [also] divide a man from you all to keep company with me? I will keep him company." And they consented and searched for a man among them.

'Amr and his companion left with the priest for Egypt until they reached Alexandria. 'Amr perceived from its architecture and a lot of its people great wealth and wonder. He said, "I have never before seen anything like its wealth in Egypt." He looked to Alexandria and the architectural quality of its building and its great population. From the wealth in the city his amazement increased.

'Amr stopped at the entrance of Alexandria where there was a celebration. There was a great throng wherein there were kings and elders. They had also one other who went adorned with a crown and he threw a ball to their kings and they received it with their sleeves. And from this they found out whoever dropped it would leave and whoever caught it would own them all until he died.

When 'Amr proceeded to Alexandria, the priest’s generosity increased and he gave 'Amr a silk robe of (Basalt!) and 'Amr and The priest sat with the people in the sitting room where they were throwing a ball and catching it with their sleeves. A man from among them threw it so that it fell until landing in the sleeve of 'Amr. On account of that, they were amazed. They said, "This ball never lies except this one time, for this Arabian will never rule over us."

The priest walked into the people of Alexandria in order to tell them that 'Amr saved his life twice and that he already guaranteed him 1000 dinars and he asked them to collect it among themselves. So they did and it was paid to 'Amr.

'Amr and his companion left. The priest sent a guide and a messenger with them and they continued to be generous with them until 'Amr and his companion returned to their companions. So it was by this that 'Amr knew the entrance and exit of Egypt. And from what he saw he learned it was one of the most bountiful and wealthy countries.

When 'Amr came to his companions he distributed 1000 dinars among them, keeping 1000 for himself. He said, "It was the first money of his compact and I became rich by it."
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CHAPTER I

THE CONQUEST OF EGYPT AND AL-MAGHRIB [MAURITANIA]

'Amr moves against Egypt.' After the battle of al-Yarmuk, 'Amr ibn-al-'Aṣi laid siege to Caesarea [Kaisariyah]. When Yazid ibn-abi-Sufyān assumed power, 'Amr left his son in his place at Caesarea and led, all of his own accord, an army of 3,500 to Egypt. 'Umar was angry because of it and wrote to him, rebuking and reprimanding him for following his own opinion, without consulting 'Umar, and ordering him to return home in case the message was received before his arrival in Egypt. 'Amr, however, received the message in al-'Arish. It is asserted by others that 'Umar wrote to 'Amr ibn-al-'Aṣi, ordering him to proceed to Egypt. 'Amr received the message as he was besieging Caesarea. The one who delivered the message was Sharīk ibn-Abi-Dahh, to whom 'Amr gave 1,000 dinārs, which Sharīk refused to accept. 'Amr asked him to conceal the matter and not disclose it to 'Umar.

Al-Fustāṭ. The advance of 'Amr against Egypt took place in the year 19. He first stopped at al-'Arish and then proceeded to al-Fārāmah, in which were troops ready for the fight. 'Amr fought and defeated them, taking possession of their camp. Thence he advanced straight on to al-
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Cairo, for himself [ikhātd] and built a well-known mansion in which 'Abdallah ibn-az-Zubair resided when he invaded Irāq in the company of ibn-abi-Sarh. The latter which az-Zubair used is still in Misr.

Affān ibn-Muslim from Ḥishām ibn-‘Urwa:—Az-Zubair was sent to Misr; and when he was told there were in it warfare and pest, he replied, "We have come here only for warfare and pest." The Moslems put ladders up and climbed on them.

Amr an-Nākil from Yāsīn ibn-abi-Bakhr:—Amr ibn-al-‘Aṣi entered Eygpt with 3,500 men. When 'Umar ibn-al-Khaṭāb heard about the situation in Egypt, he was affected with solicitude and fear and despatched az-Zubair ibn-al-‘Awām at the head of 12,000 men. Az-Zubair took part in the conquest of Misr and marked out its certain limits.

The division of the land. Amr an-Nākil from Sufyān ibn-Wahl al-Khaṭāb:—When we conquered Misr without making a covenant with it, az-Zubair rose and said to Amr, "Divide it!" but Amr refused. Then az-Zubair said, "By Allah, thou shouldest divide it as the Prophet divided Khaṭbar." Amr wrote that to 'Umar who wrote back: saying, "Leave it as it is, so that the descendants of the descendants may profit by it."

A tradition to the same effect was communicated to me by 'Abdallah ibn-Wahl on the authority of Sufyān ibn-Wahl.

Amr and az-Zubair conquer Egypt:—Al-Kaṣim ibn-Salām from Yāsīn ibn-abi-Bakhr:—Amr ibn-al-‘Aṣi entered


2 Ṭabarī, vol. iii, pp. 75-76.
Egypt at the head of 3,500 men. Just before that, 'Uma was sent as an envoy to the head of 12,000 men. As Zubair took up with 'Amr in the conquest of Egypt and marked out to himself two lots in Misy and Alexandria.

Ibrahim ibn-Muslim al-Khawarijmi from 'Abdallah ibn 'Amr ibn-al-'Aas': The latter said: 'There is a disagreement regarding the conquest of Misy: some say it was conquered by force, and others by capitulation. The fact is that my father ['Amr ibn-al-'Aas] arrived in it and was resisted by the people of Al-Ainah. He finally took possession of it by force and led the Moslems in. [Az-Zubair was the first to climb its fort. The chief of Misy said to my father, 'We have heard of what ye did in Syria and how you assessed poll-tax on the Christians and Jews, leaving land in the hands of its owners to utilize it and pay it kharit. If ye treat us the same way, it would do you more good than to kill, capture and expel us'. My father consulted with the Moslems and they all advised him to accept the terms, with the exception of a few men who asked him to divide the land among them. Accordingly, he agreed on every adult, excepting the poor, two dinars as poll-tax and on every land-owner, in addition to the two dinars, three iddabs of wheat, two fists of oil, two fists of honey and two fists of vinegar, to be given as a subsistence allowance to the Moslems, and gathered in the public house of provision [dhur ar-riziq], where it is divided among them. A census was taken of the Moslems, and the inhabitants of Misy were required to provide every one of the Moslems with a woollen upper gown, an upper cloak or turban breeches and a pair of shoes per annum instead of the woollen gown, a Coptic robe would do. To this end, a tax
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ent was written, in which it was stipulated that so long as they lived up to these terms, their women and children would neither be sold nor taken captives, and their possessions and treasures would be kept in their hands. The statement was submitted to 'Umar, the 'Commander of the Faithful' who endorsed it. Thus, the whole land became Misy. Because, however, 'Amr signed the contract and the statement, some people thought that Misy was taken by capitulation.'

After the king of Al-Ainah had made arrangements for himself and for the people in his city, he made terms on behalf of all the Egyptians similar to the terms of Al-Ainah. The Egyptians consented, saying, 'If those of us who are protected by fortifications have accepted such terms, and are content with them, how much more should we be content who are weak and have no power of resistance.'

Dinars was assessed on the land of Egypt to the amount of five dinars and three iddabs of wheat on every jard; and two dinars on every adult. The statement was submitted to 'Amr ibn-al-Khattab.

The terms made with 'Amr. 'Amr an-Nakhr from Yabid to Al-Maghrib: Al-Mus'ailis: the terms made with 'Amr ibn-al-Khattab stipulating that 'Amr should let those of the Greeks go who wanted to leave, and keep those who wanted to stay, on certain conditions, which he specified, and that he would assess on the Copts, two dinars per head. Having this, the king of the Greeks was enraged and sent his


*Marcus, vol. 11, pp. 78-84.

*The name of Al-Muslih—perhaps Cyrus, the viceroy and archbishop of Alexandria under Heraclius. See Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt, pp. 508, 724; Basag, Relieffs, 1903, p. 1506; Casanova, "Histoire et la Fin du Monde", p. 22.
troops, who, closing the gates of Alexandria, summoned to 'Umar their readiness for war. Al-Mukhaitsi presented himself before 'Amr and said, "I have three requests to make; do not offer to the Greeks the same terms 'Umar had offered me, because they have distrusted me; do not violate the terms made with the Copts, for the violation was not started by them; and when I die, give orders that I be buried in a church at Alexandria (which he named, 'Amr answered, "The last is the easiest for me."

__Bilhī, al-Khāis, Sulṭa and Alexandria.__ Certain villagers in Egypt resisted the advance of the Moslems, and 'Amr carried away some of their inhabitants as prisoners. These were the following: Bilhī, al-Khāis, and Sulṭa. Their captives were carried away to al-Madīnah. 'Umar ibn al-Khāṭīb sent them back and made them, together with the Coptic community, dhimmīs. The covenant they had, they did not violate. The following is the report of the conquest of Alexandria made by 'Amr to 'Umar: "Allah has given to us the possession of Alexandria by force and against its will, without covenant or contract." According to Yaḥyā ibn-abi-Ḥabīb, however, the city was taken by capitulation.

__The tax of Egypt.__ Abu-Ayyūb ar-Rakī from Yaḥyā ibn-abi-Ḥabīb: The _khārāj_ and poll-tax which 'Amr exacted from Egypt amounted to 2,000,000 _dinār_; but that raised by 'Abdallāh ibn-Sa'd ibn-Abi-Sarh, 4,000,000. When 'Uthmān remarked to 'Amr, saying, "After thee the mule-camels have yielded more milk," 'Amr replied, "This I because ye have emasculated their young."

In the year 217, 'Umar ibn al-Khāṭīb wrote to 'Amr ibn-ai-

---
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144, informing him of the straits in which the inhabitants of al-Madīnah were, and ordering him to transport all the food he had collected as _khārāj_. Accordingly, the food with the oil was carried there; and when it reached al-Jār, it was received by Sa'd al-Jārī. Later it was kept in a special house at al-Madīnah and distributed among the Moslems by measure. At the time of the first insurrection, the supply was cut off. In the days of Mūʿāwwiyah and Yazīd, it was again carried to al-Madīnah. Then it was cut off until the time of 'Abd al-Malik bin-Marwān, after which it was carried until the caliphate of 'Abū-Ju'far, or a little previous to that.

Rakī ibn-abi-Ḥabīb from Yaḥyā ibn-abi-Ḥabīb: After the first peace was made, the tax-payers in Egypt made new terms in the caliphate of 'Umar, stipulating that instead of the wheat, oil, honey and vinegar they offered, they would pay two dinārīs in addition to the other two dinārīs. Each one was bound to pay four dinārīs; and they consented to that and preferred it.

Aḥmīd, _Shama, al-Fāṭimīyān and other places reduced_. Abu-Ḥayyā ibn-Abī-Rakkī from Yaḥyā ibn-abi-Ḥabīb: The latter said, "I heard it stated by a number of those who witnessed the conquest of Egypt that when 'Amr ibn-al-'Āṣi; reduced al-Fustāt, he despatched to 'Aḥmīd Shama; 'Abdallāh ibn-Hūdīfah as-Sahmī, who took possession of its land and domains with the inhabitants of its villages similar to those of al-Fustāt. Likewise 'Amr despatched Khārīj ibn-Hūdīfah al-'Adawi to al-Fāṭimīyān, 'Abdūmūsain, 'Abī-

---

Husayn, _Sīrī madār al-Arāb_, p. 47; line 17 (ed. Mūller).
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mim, al-Bashandar and the villages of upper Egypt, which he reduced on the same terms. Amr also sent 'Umar ibn-Wahh al-Jumahi to Tinmi, Dinayd, 'Umair, Damira, Chega, Dikahlah, Bana and Bishir, which he reduced on the same terms. Amr also sent 'Ubaid ibn-Abd-al-Malik al-Jumahi; others say 'Amr’s freedman, Wardan, after whom the market Wardan in Egypt is named, to the rest of the villages in the lower part of the country and he did the same. Thus did 'Amr ibn-al-'Asi effect the conquest of all Egypt and make its land kharij land.

The Copts have no covenant. Al-Kasim ibn-Sallam from Alyab ibn-abi-l'Alyah's father.—The latter said, "I heard 'Amr ibn-al-'Asi say from the pulpit, 'I have occupied this position and am bound to none of the Egyptian Copts by covenant or contract. If I want, I can kill if I want, I can take one-fifth of the possessions; if I want I can sell captives. The people of Antiquites are excluded because they have a covenant which must be kept.'"

Al-Maghrib and Egypt taken by force. Al-Kasim ibn-Sallam from Musa ibn-'Ali ibn-Rabab al-Lakhmi's father.—All al-Maghrib was taken by force.

Abu-'Ubaid from as-Salt ibn-Abi-'Asim, the secretary of Halyan ibn-Shurah.—The latter said that he read the letter of 'Umar ibn-Abd-al-'Asi to Halyan, his 'amal over Egypt, stating that Egypt was taken by force, with no covenant or contract.

Poll-tax of the Copts not to be increased. Abu-'Ubaid from Bahkahlah ibn-abi-jassar.—Mawiyah wrote to Wardan, a freedman of Amr, ordering him to increase the poll-tax of every Copt by one dinar, but Wardan wrote back, "How can I increase it while it is stated in their covenant that their tax should not be increased?"


The Conquest of Egypt and Al-Maghrib

Anzir. Hearing this, Heraclius, the chief of the Greeks, was enraged with anger, and sent the troops to Alexandria and closed its gates; but 'Amr reduced the city by force.

The poll-tax of the native villages of umm-Irashim was nullified. Isdal-Kard, i.e., Abu-Maad, from ash-Sha'ib—Ali ibn-al-Husain, or al-Husain himself, interceded with Mu'awiyah regarding the poll-tax of the fellow-villagers in Egypt, the mother of Ibrashim, the Prophet's son; and it was cancelled. The Prophet himself used to recommend that the Copts be favorably treated.

The Prophet recommends the Copts. 'Amr from Malik and al-Lahith from a son of Ka'b ibn-Malik. The Prophet said, "If ye conquer Egypt, treat the Copts favorably, because they have dhimmah and blood-relationship." It is stated by al-Lahith that umm-Ismail was a Copt.

Umar confiscates 'Amr's possessions. Abu-l-Husain al-Maddini from Abdallah ibn-Mubaharah—Umar ibn-Khattab used to record the possessions of his dhimmis at the time of their appointment; and whatsoever was later added was partly or wholly confiscated by him. He once wrote to 'Amr ibn-al-Asi, "It has become revealed that thou ownest commodities, slaves, vases and animals which thou didst not possess when thou wast made governor of Egypt." 'Amr wrote back, "Our land is a land of agriculture and trade; we, therefore, get as income more than what is necessary for our expenses." To this, 'Umar replied, "I have had enough experience with the wicked dhimmis. Thy letter is the letter of one disturbed because justice has been meted out to him. Therefore, my suspicion has been aroused against thee, and I have sent to thee Muhammad ibn-Maslamah with a view to dividing with thee what thou hast. Reveal to him thy secret.

2. The reference is to Egeria.
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The stately golden doors of the Temple (the Holy of Holies) opened in the center of the city, and the crowd assembled to witness the momentous occasion. The High Priest entered, escorted by the Levites, bearing the Ark of the Covenant. As the Ark was carried into the Holy of Holies, a cloud of glory filled the room, signifying the presence of the Lord. The priests and Levites sang and praised the Lord, lifting up their voices in jubilation.

The people of the city stood in awe, their eyes fixed on the Ark as it was placed in its designated position within the Holy of Holies. There, it remained, a symbol of the divine presence, amidst the bustling city life outside.

The Chronicler of John, Their Excellencies' Bishop of Niny,
Here I am. Where was I? I have a date with a God I know.

I am writing notes on the history of the church. I am at the point where I need to describe the events that led to the formation of the church. I am trying to understand the development of the church from its early days.

The church began as a small group of people who believed in the teachings of Jesus. They met together to learn from each other and to share their faith. As they grew in numbers, they formed a community that would become the early church.

The church faced many challenges in its early days. It was a time of persecution and hardship. The early church members were often persecuted for their beliefs, and they had to be very careful about how they lived their lives.

Despite these challenges, the church continued to grow. It spread throughout the Roman Empire and eventually became a major force in society. Today, the church is one of the largest and most influential organizations in the world.

As I continue to write, I will try to capture the history of the church and its impact on society. I hope that these notes will be helpful to others who are interested in the history of the church.

BISHOP OF NIKIA

Chapter CVIII.

Chapter CXXII.

The Chronicle of John.
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Given in the name of the Emperor, on May 5th according to the Emperor's
Chapter XX

I. The voice of the prophet.

"Wherefore art thou mourning and with tears running down thy face? What seest thou in the vision? What beholdest thou?" The prophet said: "I see two baskets of bread in the temple of the Lord, one filled with good bread, but the other filled with mould, and dry, and wormwood.

2. And it came to pass, as I beheld, and I heard the voice of him that spake unto me, saying: "Take both these baskets of bread, and go, set them before the elders of the children of Israel, and say unto them: 'Thus saith the Lord God: 'These are the words of the Lord, saying: “The bread that is good shall be eaten, but the bread shall be burnt; and the good shall be as the word of the Lord, that it shall be fulfilled."'

3. And I went forth, and took the bread, and gave it unto the elders of the children of Israel, and said unto them: 'Thus saith the Lord God: “Ye shall go into the land of Israel, and there shall ye eat this bread; for the Lord shall provide for you there. And if ye hear the voice of the Lord, and do that which is right in his sight, ye shall eat many things, and be filled; but if ye rebel against the Lord, and follow the words of the prophet, ye shall eat but a little, and be hungry."'

4. And it came to pass, as I spoke these words, there was a sound of a great noise from heaven, and the voice of the Lord said: "If ye repent, and turn unto me, ye shall eat this bread; but if ye continue in sin, ye shall die in your sins, and the Lord shall cast you out of his land, and ye shall perish in the wilderness."
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it and to its clergy. After this he made arrangements for his son Constantine to assume the consulship and appointed Henkleios, the son of Martina, Caesar.

20. After a short lapse of time the Saracens overran the region round Antioch. Straightway Henkleios, together with his wife Martina and his son Henkleios, went forth to the eastern parts. When he arrived there, he became incensed at his brother Theodore, for it was rumored in some quarters that the latter was raling at the emperor on account of Martina and saying that “His sin is continually before him.” So he dispatched him to Byzantium and instructed his son Constantine to have him dishonored in front of a public assembly and to hold him in prison. And he appointed commander of the eastern (forces) Theodore surnamed Trithyrios, the imperial treasurer. Now Sergios kata Niketas died in the following manner. The Saracens, having paid a sum of 30,000 gold which they normally received by way of commercial gain, and for this reason they began to lay waste the Roman land. On this account Henkleios ordered Theodore not to join battle with the Saracens; but his subordinate commander did not act according to the emperor’s wishes because he had rebellion in mind and (the men) were induced to fight so as to overcome the enemy unexpectedly: they believed that victory would be on the side of the insurgents against the emperor. And so he joined battle with the Saracens at a place called Gathita. But they, having set ambuscades beforehand and

---

19, 20
20, 21, 22, 23

προλοχήσατε καὶ ἄλλων τισίν ἀκριβολογήματα. Ρωμαίοις ὁπώρονε, εἰσεπιστοῦσι δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνδρῶν ἐξαιτη- 
σαίνων, καὶ μᾶλιν ἀπολαβότετος πολλῶν ἔκτεινον στρατιώτα τε καὶ ἀρχιστίτε

21. Κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον Μαρία ἡ ἀδελφὴ Ἱερακλείου χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὸν χαμόν ἄβαρον ἐπέμεινε καὶ τὸν ἥν τὸν ἔ

τελευταίου ἐπέλεξε. τοῖς δὲ ταὐτίσις ἄφθοος ἤρικες ἤ ἄβαρος ἢ λείπουσαν ἕκκαλη στὰ ἄνακα, ὡς καὶ ἀνθιμε-

22. Ὅποι δὲ τὸν αὐτόν καὶ ἄλλων ἐπανεύθεσε Κοσμάτως ὁ ἀνεμοῖς ὁ ἐφιάλης Ἀργαίς ἐκ τῶν ἐκ τῶν Ἀβαρικῶν χωρίς καὶ οὔ 

ἐστιν παρέχον μετὰ αὐτῶν, ἔστιν ἐφυλακαὶ μᾶρα τῷ 

23. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀναστολικοῖς μέροι διάβασε Ηερα-

κλείους, ἵππον τὸν Βαρκάλην στρατηγὸν προερχόμενον καὶ πάλιν διάβασε, κατὰ διάλογον τοὺς ἐν λυπάντες ὑπὸ συμβαλλόν 

τέττα τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς του Ἕλληνων ἐκτετρα-

ευμένων ἡγεμόνων συμμετέχει αὐτοὶ ἤξησαν, πολὺ τὸ στρατευ 

άσβολον καὶ αὐτῶν μόλις διαστάθη. μετὰ ἐκείνων προ-

βάλλεται στρατηγὸν Μαρίους καὶ μεταμορφώντας παρὰ Ρω-

μαίοι τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ πέμπτων ἐκείνοι, παραγεγένεται ὡς ἀνα-

κατόπτρυχος Κύρης τῷ Αὐρωπῆς ἵππος, καὶ ἀν 

κατὰ βοώρεσιν διὰ τοῦ τοῖς Σαρακενῆς διάλογον. Κύρης δὲ δὲν ἔδει πασχάλοις βασιλείς ὁπλίζεται ἐπὶ τελευταίων 

αὐτοῖς ἤξησαν, πολὺ τὸ στρατευ 


28 ἀκριβολογήματα. L: ἵππον τὸν Βαρκάλην στρατηγὸν προερχόμενον καὶ πάλιν διάβασε, κατὰ διάλογον τοὺς ἐν λυπάντες ὑπὸ συμβαλλόν

21: 2 χρόνον L: ἵππος, καὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐγένος L.

22: Ἰωάννου τῆς Αὐγουστίνους, L: ἢ παραβασίαν L: τὸ ἔκλεισιν διὰ τοῦ τοῖς Σαρακενῆς διάλογον. Κύρης δὲ δὲν ἔδει πασχάλοις βασιλείς ὁπλίζεται ἐπὶ τελευταίων

23: 5 τε τοῦ L: ἕτος L: ἕτος τοῖς Σαρακενῆς διάλογον.
23, 24, 25

ρατικο των πολιτών δεν θα αφαιρούν. (He also recommended) that the Augusta Eudokia or another of the emperor’s daughters should be offered in marriage
(to Ambros) with a view to his being consequently baptized in the holy bath and becoming a Christian; for Ambros and his army had confidence in Kyros
and regarded him with great affection. But Heraclios would not brook any of
this. Since Marianos, too, was aware of these matters, he rejected the policy of
Kyros and, having attacked the Saracens, fell in battle as did many of his
soldiers.

24. At this time Heraclios returned home and resided in the palace
called Hiera; for he was afraid of embarking on the sea and remained un-
moved by the noblemen and citizens who repeatedly begged him to enter the
City. On feast days he would dispatch only his sons who, after attending holy
liturgy in the church, immediately returned to him. And likewise, when they
watched the hippodrome games, they went back to their father. While he was
dwelling there he was informed that his son Atalarichos and Theodore, who
had the rank of magister (the son of Theodore, the emperor’s brother),
together with some others, were about to plot against him. He was persuaded by
the informans and cut off the noses and hands (of the conspirators). He exiled
Atalarichos to the island called Prinkipos and Theodore to the island called
Gaudomelit, with instructions to the local commander to amputate also one of
(Theodore’s) legs upon his arrival. He punished in the same manner those
who were privy to the conspiracy.

25. After a considerable lapse of time the noblemen of the court caused
the prefect to collect a great many ships and tie them one next to the other so
26, 27, 28

ρήσεων ἀπελλάθα, τῷ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν ὑπάρχων ὡς αἰκισματικῶς παραδίδωσιν.

27. Ἡ ἡμέρα ἐξικαλοῦ τῶν ιοῦν Ἱρίκλειον ὑπατοῦσα. Δαβίδ τε καὶ Μαρτίνας τοὺς ιοὺς αὐτὸν Καισάρας ἀντιγράφεσσαν, Ἀγγείας δὲ καὶ Μαρτίνας τὸς Πολιτείας Ἀγαύστας. χρόνον δὲ ἰδελθόντος πόσον ὑπέρμικτως περιστάντως, καὶ ὡς τὸ πάθος δυστατοῦ ἕπετε τοῦ ἑρώτημα γιὰ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀθητῶς καὶ κατὰ τὸ προκοπῶς αὐτῶν τὰ ϊμα τὰ ἔργα ἔφεραν. ἔμελλος δὲ ἦν τοῦ τῆς παραπομπῆς τῆς ομολογίας, ὡς ἦν τοῦτο δύσλογον ὑπάρχον εὐθύμοντας τοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀναγνώρισιν τῆς ὁδοῖς γύρω. διαθήσας χωρὶς δεξιότης, ὡστε Ἀκτανάντως καὶ Ἰρίκλειον τοὺς ιοὺς αὐτῶν βασιλεῖς ἱστοτήμων εἶναι, καὶ Μαρτίνας τὴν αὐτῆς γυναῖκα τρίταις παρ’ αὐτῶν ὡς μητέρα καὶ βασιλεύσαν, ἐκ τούτου λατρείας ἔπεσαν ύποτέλες ὑποτέλες ἄτη καὶ ἔχοντας, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ διανοίας ἐπὶ τρίτων μέγας ταύτας ἑμέρας ἐδ. διέστη δὲ εἰς τὸν ἑαυτῶν παντοκράτορα ἡμέρας, περιστάντως τοῦ βασιλείας ἀναγνώρισθαι, ὡς ἦν διάταξαν ἐπὶ περίπλοκο, τὸ ὑποδημαχεῖν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἄμετρα διελέγεται μὴν, περισσοτέρως ἀναγνώρισθαι ὑπερτάσσει.

28. Ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦτο Μαρτίνα ἢ Ἀγαύστα προσκολλάται Πύρρον τῶν ἄρρητων καὶ τοῦ βασιλείας ἄμετρως, ἐκείπασαν καὶ τοῦ περὶ τῷ Ἱβάζατος λαὸς, τὰς τε διαθήκας Ὡρίκλειον ὑποδεικνύον, ὡς περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν τέκνων διέστη, ὡς ἦν διάταξαν τοὺς βασιλείας ἐπεξεργάσασθαι ἢ δὲ ἦν τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμα διελέγετο ὑπερτάσσει ἤτοι τῆς βασιλείας τὰ πρῶτα εἰς τῆς βασιλείας φέρεσθαι, τειχίαν τὸ τῆς συντροφίας λαὸς ἀνενόμωσαν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὡς ἦν σὺν

26, 27, 28

censued with him and threatening him with death, (Herakleios) handed him over to the prefect of the City for punishment.

27. After this he thought fit that his son Herakleios should assume the consulsip. He proclaimed Caesar his sons David and Martin in, and his daughters Augusta and Marina Augustas. Sometimes later he fell ill with the dropy and realized that his disease was difficult to cure, for it grew to such an extent that when he was about to urine, he would place a board against his abdomen; (otherwise) he private parts turned round and discharged the urine in his face. This was in reproof of his transgression (namely, his marriage to his own niece) on account of which he suffered this ultimate punishment. He set forth a testament whereby his sons Constantine and Herakleios were to be emperor of equal rank and his wife Martina was to be honored by them as mother and empress. So he died of this (disease) at the age of sixty-six at a reign of thirty years, four months, and six days. He was buried in the church of the all-praised Apostles and for three days, as he had ordained while he was still alive, the tomb containing his body remained uncovered and attended by ministering eunuchs.

28. After this the Augusta Martina summoned the archpriest Pyrnone and the dignitaries of the court, and having gathered the people of Byzantium in an assembly, showed the testament of Herakleios and the provisions he had made concerning himself and her children. All the people who were present clamored for Emperors Constantine and Herakleios; so she brought them out while expressing her claim that she, as empress, would have the first place in the empire. But some of the people present cried to her: "You have the honor
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[December 21, 640 – December 9, 641]

The Campaigns of the Muslims and Other Matters

Tabari said: According to Ibn Humayd – Salamah – Ibn Ishāq, Egypt was conquered in this year. It was conquered in the year 20 [641]. Abū Ma’shar has the same [date], according to Ahmad b. Thābit – his authority – Ishāq b. ‘Isā – himself: Egypt was conquered in the year 20 [641], the Muslim commander was ‘Amr b. al-‘Aṣī.

According to Ahmad b. Thābit – his authority – Ishāq b. ‘Isā – Abū Ma’shar: Alexandria was conquered in the year 25 [646].

547. In Arabic, the name of Egypt is Mīr. This name has given rise to some confusion, since an ancient city, situated south of the fortress of Bāb al-Yūn [in Greek Babylon], but on the opposite bank of the Nile, was also called Mīr [see Butler, p. 271]. Bāb al-Yūn eventually became the name the whole settlement on the Nile was known by, including the city of Mīr, which also comprised a part called al-Fusṭāṭ, or Fustāt Mīr. It was here that the Arabs allegedly first set up camp, see Butler, Babylon, ch. 3. In the following I shall render the name Mīr by Egypt, when I think the country is meant (in which the city of Alexandria does not seem to have been included), and I shall leave it untranslated when I think this ancient city is meant. However, one cannot always be sure which interpretation is correct.

548. In the following I have preferred this name to the Arabic Iskandariyyah.

549. The conquest of Egypt has never been analyzed better, it seems to me, than by Alfred J. Butler in his The Arab conquest of Egypt and the last years of the Roman dominion. Here the second edition, printed together with two brief treaties that have also been drawn upon, is used. See the Bibliography.

550. Also called Babylīyūn, that is in Greek Babylon, see n. 547 above.

551. The text reads as if the isnād ends in Ibn Ishāq and as if Tabari mentions a new strand, but I think it more feasible to consider this as one isnād running from Tabari via Ibn Ishāq to the eyewitness, Ziyād b. Jaz’. I therefore propose to delete wa– preceding haddathāni in 1. 2. When verbs like haddathāni are preceded by wa– in the middle of an isnād the compiler of the tradition collection introduces a new isnād [strand], which is obviously not the case in the present context.

The Conquest of Mīr and Alexandria

Tabari said: We have mentioned the different opinions of the historians concerning the year in which the conquest of Mīr and Alexandria took place. Now we will mention the events leading to their conquest and at whose hands this occurred, including the historians’ differences concerning this issue too.

As for Ibn Ishāq, according to Ibn Humayd – Salamah – himself: When ‘Umar had finished taking measures pertaining to all of Syria, he wrote to ‘Amr b. al-‘Aṣī that he was to march upon Egypt with his army. So ‘Amr departed and finally conquered Bāb al-Yūn in the year 20 [641].

Tabari said: There is a difference of opinion about the date of the conquest of Alexandria. Some say that it was conquered in the year 25 [646], two years after the beginning of the caliphate of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān under the supervision of ‘Amr b. al-‘Aṣī.

According to Ibn Humayd – Salamah – Muhammad b. Ishāq – al-Qāsim b. Quzmān, a man of Egyptian origin – Ziyād b. Jaz’ al-Zubaydi, who reported that he was a fighter in the army of ‘Amr b. al-‘Aṣī when Mīr and Alexandria were conquered: We conquered Alexandria during the caliphate of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb in the year 21 [642] or 22 [643]. He went on: When we had conquered Bāb al-Yūn, we advanced on all the villages in the countryside lying between Bāb al-Yūn and Alexandria, one after the other, until we ended up in Bahbīb, one of those rural villages.
called the Village of Prosperity. In the meantime, the people we had taken prisoner had arrived in Medina, Mecca, and Yemen.

He went on: When we arrived in Balhib, the ruler of Alexandria sent a message to 'Amr b. al-ʾĀṣi that ran, "[Listen,] you Arabs, in the past, I used to pay the jizyah to people who were more hateful to me than you, Persians and Byzantines. If you want me to pay you the jizyah, I am agreeable, on the condition that you will return to me all those people from our region whom you have captured."

The eyewitness went on: Then 'Amr b. al-ʾĀṣi sent that ruler a message that said, "Above me there is a commander without whose consent I cannot do anything. If you want me to suspend hostilities, while you do the same, so that I can write to him about the proposal you have made to me, I shall certainly do that. If he accepts that condition from you, I will too, and if he orders me to do something else, I will carry out his order." The man agreed. He went on: So 'Amr b. al-ʾĀṣi wrote to 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. Our leaders never kept secret for us the letters they wrote. So in this letter he mentioned to him what the ruler of Alexandria had proposed. All the time, the remainder of the Egyptian prisoners had been in our care. Then we stopped at Balhib and stayed there waiting for 'Umar’s letter, which finally arrived.

"Amr read it out to us. In it were the words,

"Listen, I have received your letter, in which you mention that the ruler of Alexandria has proposed to give you the jizyah on the condition that you return to him all those prisoners of his region who have been captured. Upon my life, a fixed jizyah that comes to us, and will be coming to those Muslims who live after us, is in my view preferable to booty, which seems never to have been there once it is divided up. So you must propose to the ruler of Alexandria that he give you the jizyah in the understanding that those of their people who were taken prisoner and who are still in your care, be offered the choice between Islam and the religion of their own people. Should anyone of them opt for Islam, then he belongs to the Muslims, with the same privileges and obligations as they. And he who opts for the religion of his own people has to pay the same jizyah as will be imposed upon his coreligionists. As for those captives who have been scattered over Arabia and have arrived in Mecca, Medina, or Yemen, those we cannot return and we would not like to enter into a peace treaty with anyone on the condition of a pledge which we cannot fulfill for him."

'Amr sent a message to the ruler of Alexandria informing him of what the Commander of the Faithful had written, whereupon this ruler sent a message back that said, "I agree."

He went on: Then we assembled all those captives who were still in our care, and the Christians among them were grouped together. Then we began to bring forward every single man from among them and we gave him the choice between Islam and Christianity. When he chose Islam, we all shouted, "God is great," even louder than we had done when that village was conquered, and we gathered him within our ranks. When he opted for Christianity, the Christians would snort and pull him back into their midst, while we imposed the jizyah on him. All the time we were subject to great uncertainty as if one of us was about to cross over to the other camp. The eyewitness went on: This is how we went about it, until we had dealt with all of them. Among those who were thus brought forward was Abū Maryam 'Abdallāh b. Abd al-Rahmān. [The transmitter of this eyewitness, al-Qāsim (b. Quzmān) added at this point: I have set eyes on this Abū Maryam; he was the 'arij of the Banū Zubayd. The eyewitness went on: We positioned him (i.e., in front of the people) and offered him the choice between Islam and Christianity. Meanwhile, his father, mother and brothers had already opted for Christianity. But Abū Maryam chose Islam, so we made him step into our ranks. However, his father, mother and brothers pounced on him, struggling with us for control of him, until they tore his clothes from his body. Today he is our 'arij, as you see. Then God conquered Alexandria for us and we could enter the city. This rubbish heap, which you see, Qāsim, is in the vicinity of Alex-

552. For more on this ruler, see n. 564 below.
553. That is, of course, very unlikely, since the ruler himself was a Byzantine. This is the sort of inconsistency that Butler analyzed so fully, see n. 549 above.
andria. It is meant for garbage. It is enclosed within [a girdle of] stones, so that it has not grown or shrunk in size. He who says something else, for instance that Alexandria and the surrounding villages had no jizyah imposed upon them, or that its inhabitants had no pact with us, that man is a liar, by God!”

Al-Qāsim went on: This account did not fail to give rise to the story that the kings of the Banū Umayyah used to write to their governors of Egypt: “Egypt could only be conquered after we used force. Therefore, the inhabitants are no more than our slaves, whose taxes we can increase if we so desire and with whom we can deal as we want.”

Ṭabarî said: As for Sayf, according to al-Sarī—Shu‘ayb—himself—al-Rabi‘ Abū Sa‘īd, Abū ʿUthmān and Abū Ḥārithah: ʿUmar stayed at Ilyā. After its inhabitants had been granted a peace treaty. He entered the city and stayed there a few days. He sent ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣī to Egypt and appointed him governor over it, but God intended for him. Then he dispatched al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwām after him as reinforcement and he directed Abū ʿUbaydah al-Ramāḏānī to come God conquered it for him, to return to his province.

According to al-Sarī—Shu‘ayb—Sayf—Abū ʿUthmān—Khālid and ʿUbādah: ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣī left for Egypt after ʿUmar had returned to Medina. ʿAmr journeyed until he arrived at Bāb al-Yām. Al-Zubayr followed him in his tracks and joined up with him right at the spot where Abū Maryam, the metropolitan of Miṣr met them, in the company of the bishop and some people of purpose. The Muqawiqīs had sent the metropolitan so that they might defend their land. When ʿAmr reached them, they prepared to fight him. Then ʿAmr sent them a message that read, “Do not prompt us to come down heavily upon you, for now you will realize what you can do best.” Thereupon they held their fighters back. ʿAmr sent them another message that said, “I shall come forward, let Abū Maryam and Abī Mīrām approach me.” They consented to this and they granted another safe-conduct. Then ʿAmr said to the two Christian prelates, “You two are the ecclesiastics of this region. Listen. God sent Muhammad with the truth and He ordered him to hold to it. Muhammad transferred to us every command He was given, then he passed away—May God have mercy upon him—having accomplished everything He had been told to do. The instructions that He left us are crystal clear: among the things He enjoined upon us is that we should do our utmost in admonishing the people with whom we come into contact. Therefore, we call upon you to embrace Islam. He who is willing to do so will be like one of us. To him who refuses, we suggest that He pay the jizyah and we will give him ample protection. Our Prophet informed us that we would conquer your lands and he has determined that we

---

562. The Arabic term jāṭalīq is arabicized from the Greek katholikos. According to Lane, 369, right column, he is the highest ranking in the Christian hierarchy. However, this title was given to the head of the Christian church under the Byzantines (see Vasiliy, L, 121) and, strictly speaking, not have been given to an Egyptian Christian. See also Butler, Treaty, 58 f.

563. The Arabic reads ahī al-nīyāt, literally “the people of the intentions.” It is not clear who are meant here, but the “intentions” are probably military rather than religious. At any rate, the reading nīyāt is dubious.

564. He is a controversial figure. It seems to me that the most authoritative adoration on him is given by Butler, 508–26, esp. 521. He identifies him as the retary and [Melkite] archbishop of Alexandria, appointed by Heraclius. See also Butler, Treaty, 54–33.

565. I base this rendering on Lane’s interpretation of idhār “taking extraordinary pains in exhortation” (1984, left column, below).

566. Presumably that is the name of the bishop present, this is suggested in note 3 of the previous page, 2584, of the edition. The vocalization is that of Ibn Hayyūsh.

567. Literally, “the two monks”; perhaps the term is used here to humiliate those addressed.

568. See n. 565 above.
keep you from harm because of our family ties among you. If you accept our proposition, we will give you constant protection. Among the orders we received from our Commander (i.e., in Medina) was the order, “Take the interest of the Copts to heart, for the Messenger of God enjoined their best interests upon us, because they have ties of kinship with us and are therefore entitled to our protection.”

“It is truly a distant relationship,” the prelates answered, “one that only prophets can establish.” [Hagar] was a well-known and noble woman who was the daughter of our king. She belonged to the people of Manf, where the monarchy was established. Then the people of ‘Ayn Shams were granted victory over them; they killed them and wrested their kingdom from them, whereupon the people of Manf embarked on a vengeful life. As a result of that she became Abraham’s property. He is heartily welcome! Grant us immunity, until we return to you.”

‘Amr answered, “A man like me cannot be deceived, but I will grant you a delay of three days so that you see how things stand with you and can discuss the matter with your people. If you do not promise to return in time, I shall fight you.” “Give us more time,” they pleaded, so he gave them one day longer. “Give us
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more time,” they asked again, so ‘Amr gave them one more day. Then they returned to the Muqawqis, who took ‘Amr’s proposition into consideration. But Artabun refused to accept it and ordered an attack on the Muslims.

The two prelates addressed the people of Mısır, “As for us, we shall do our best to defend you and we would not return to the Muslims—after all, four days have passed by now during which you came to no harm—were it not for the fact that we hope that therein might lie immunity for you.”

Nothing surprised ‘Amr and al-Zubayr more than the sudden attack of Farqah one night, but ‘Amr was prepared. They confronted the Muqawqis, who was killed with his men. Then the Muslims pursued those who had fled. Thereupon ‘Amr and al-Zubayr headed for ‘Ayn Shams, where they had their assembly point, and he sent ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Sabbāh to al-Farama, where he duly arrived, and to Alexandria he sent ‘Awf b. Mālik, who also duly arrived there. Each one of them said to the inhabitants of the city on which he was ordered to march, “If you surrender, you will be granted immunity.” They agreed. Then the Muslims exchanged messages with them and waited there for the Muslim army, which was at ‘Ayn Shams at the time, to arrive. In the meantime, they took prisoners.

‘Awf b. Mālik said, “People of Alexandria, how beautiful is your city.” They replied, “Alexander the Great once said, ‘I shall build a city that is in need of God and can do without people.’ Or he said, I shall certainly build a city that is in need of God and can do without people.’ That is why its splendor has lasted.”

Likewise, Abraha said to the inhabitants of al-Farama, “What a ramshackle town this is, of people of al-Farama.” “Yes,” they answered, “al-Farama once said, ‘I shall build a city that can do

---

560. Muslim tradition has it that Hagar, the maidservant of Sarah, by whom Abraham fathered Ishmael (that is, Isma'il), the ancestor of the Arabs, was of Egyptian origin. It is reported that, for this reason, the Prophet had enjoined upon his followers to treat the Egyptians well after they had been subjugated, in particular because of this “kinship.” The tradition collector Muslim b. Hajar (d. 261/875) has preserved a Prophetic hadith to this effect in his Sahih, IV, 1970, see also ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, 2:1. A variant of this report (see the same sources) has šīr “relationship by marriage” instead of “kinship,” taken to be a reference to Maryam, the Coptic wife of the Prophet and the mother of his son Isra‘il, see also Salih, 219, and Maqrizi, I, 24.f.

570. Although the context refers unmistakably to Hagar, the name itself is lacking in Tabari, and was supplied from parallel versions of this story, for instance ibn al-Athir, II, 440.

571. The arabized name of the ancient city of Memphis, see E P, s.v. Manf (U. Haarmann).

572. This is a place at three parasangs (18 kilometers) north of al-Fustat, see Yaqt, Mu‘izz, III, 762 f., it is probably identical with Helopolis, which seems to have been bigger than the present-day suburb of Cairo bearing that name (see Butler, 231).

573. It is not clear who is meant. If we read bi-du with the edition, the reference may be taken to point to Abraham, the Prophet or ‘Amr. If we read bi-kum with the edition, “welcome to you” gives an understandable text.
without God but not without people.' Thus its splendor has faded." Alexander and al-Faramā were brothers.

Ṭabarī said: Al-Kalbī said: Alexander and al-Faramā were brothers. Then he related a similar story in which both cities were associated with the two brothers. In al-Faramā, something collapsed every day and its outward appearance deteriorated, whereas Alexandria kept its gloss.

According to al-Sarī—Shu’ayb—Sayf—Abū Ḥārithah and Abū ‘Uthmān: When ‘Amr descended upon the Egyptians at Ayn Shams, a place governed jointly578 by Copts and Nubians, and al-Zubayr had joined ‘Amr there, the people of Mīṣr said to their king, "What do you want to accomplish against warriors who defeated the armies of the Persian king and the Byzantine emperor and overpowered them in their own countries? Conclude a peace treaty with these warriors and enter into a pact with them. Do not resist them and do not order us to resist them." That occurred on the fourth day [since the Muslims’ arrival]. But [the king] refused.

[2588] So the Muslims attacked them and fought them. Al-Zubayr scaled the wall of the city. When those inside spotted him there, they opened the gate for ‘Amr and rushed out, begging for a peace treaty, to which he agreed. But [inside the wall] al-Zubayr fell upon them with force. In the end he passed through the gate, making his way to ‘Amr together with the Egyptians. After they had taken care579 of the casualties, they concluded a treaty. The Muslims took the same measures against those who were overpowered by force as they had taken in the case of those who had surrendered on the condition of a treaty. They were all placed under "protection."

The text of their peace treaty reads as follows:

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

This is the text of the covenant that ‘Amr b. al-‘Aṣi has granted the people of Mīṣr concerning immunity for themselves, their religion, their possessions, churches, crucifixes, as well as their land and their waterways. Nothing of these will be interfered with or decreased.

578 Or "alternatively?"
579 Or "taken stock of."
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Nubians580 are not allowed to share their homesteads. It is incumbent upon the people of Mīṣr, if they agree on the terms of this covenant and when the rise of the Nile water comes to a halt, to afford the jizyah, to wit fifty million [dirhams].581

They will have to account for the crimes committed by robbers from among them.

If anyone refuses to comply with the terms of this treaty, jizā obligations will be lifted from them commensurate with their numbers, and we will be exempt from awarding protection to those who do so. If their river fails to reach the highest point when the rise of the water has come to a halt, then, commensurate with the losses suffered, their jizā payments will be reduced.

Those Byzantines and Nubians who are willing to accept the same terms as in the covenant with the people of Mīṣr will have the same privileges and duties as the latter.

He who refuses to accept these terms and chooses to depart will enjoy immunity, until he has reached his destination where he can be safe, or has moved out of the territory where our authority prevails.

It is incumbent upon them to comply with the following terms: in three instalments, every third part of the year, they will have to afford one third of what they have to pay.

For the terms of this document the covenant of God and His protection, as well as that of His Messenger, that of the Caliph, the Commander of the Faithful, as well as the protection awarded by all the Muslims, are guarantees.

It is incumbent upon the Nubians who have accepted the terms of this treaty that they help [sc. the local government] with so many men582 and so many horses, in

580. On the Nubians, see Butler, index s.v., especially 432; see also his Treaty, 37–46.
581. Butler surmises on reasonable grounds that this amount is a later gloss not relied upon, see his Treaty, 46–8.
582. Presumably slaves are meant. Butler, Treaty, 35, interprets ra’s as heads of cattle, but he does mention "contingents of horse and foot" as a possibility
the understanding that no raids will be mounted against them and that they will not be prevented from trade, export or import.

Al-Zubayr, his sons 'Abdallāh and Muḥammad, have witnessed the concluding of this covenant, Wardān has put it down in writing and was present. All the people of Misr entered into this covenant and accepted the peace treaty. Then the horses were rounded up.

‘Amr organized al-Fusṭṭāt as a garrison city, whereupon the Muslims took up residence there. Abū Maryam and Abū Mīrām presented themselves and spoke to ‘Amr about the prisoners captured after the battle. ‘Amr said, “Have these prisoners a pact and a covenant with us? Did we not come to an agreement with you two, and were we not attacked the very same day?” Then he kicked them out, whereupon they returned saying, “Everyone you have captured up to the time of our return you will be placed under your protection!” ‘Amr replied, “Would you launch an attack against us while they are under protection?” “Yes,” they answered, “we would.” Then ‘Amr divided those prisoners among his men, who distributed them, whereupon they ended up in the lands of the Arabs.

After that, a messenger approached ‘Umar with some fifth parts of the war booty. ‘Amr sent emissaries [see to Medina]. ‘Umar questioned them and they gave him a complete account, until they touched on the story of the metropolitan and his companion. ‘Umar said, “Surely, I think that they showed sense, whereas you acted foolishly, without any sense at all. He who fights you has no immunity, but he who does not fight you, and is subsequently dealt with by you in the same way the villagers were treated, does have immunity during those five days until they have lapsed.” Then he sent messengers in all directions, until all those prisoners who had been captured from among those who had not taken up arms during the five days were returned, except those who had engaged in fighting afterwards. Thus the Muslims sent those captives back to Egypt, one after the other, except those who belonged to that last category.

Meanwhile, some Copts had come to ‘Amr’s living quarters. He was informed that they had been saying, “How worn out these Arabs look, how little care they take of themselves; we are of the opinion that people like us should not be obedient to people like them.” So ‘Amr feared that this appearance of the Arab warriors would prompt the Copts to rebellion. Therefore, he ordered that several camels be slaughtered and cooked in water and salt. Then he ordered the army commanders to assemble, after they had notified their troops to do likewise. ‘Amr sat down and beckoned to the people of Misr to join him. Then the meat and the broth were served. (Servants handed it out to the Muslims, who began to eat in typically Arab fashion, tearing at the meat with their teeth and slurping the broth, dressed in their woolen cloaks and unarmed. After a while, the people of Misr dispersed with their ambitions and courage boosted.

The next day, ‘Amr sent word to the army commanders to come [i.e. to his tent again] with their troops. He ordered them to come dressed in Egyptian clothes and footwear, bidding them that they order their troops to do likewise. They complied. Then ‘Amr invited the people of Misr again who saw something completely different from what they had seen the previous day: erect figures dressed in Egyptian colors standing by, the Arabs eating Egyptian food, behaving in an Egyptian manner. The Copts dispersed, perturbed this time, muttering, “We have been made fools of!”

‘Amr sent word to his army that they had to arm themselves for the roll call to be held the next day. Then he went to the parade.

---

581. He was a client of 'Amr b. al-Âsī, see Ibn Sa'd, VII 2, 301.
584. Presumably when it was signed. Butler, Treaty, 53, thinks that the treaty is possibly authentic in its main outline.
585. The context does not seem to make clear why.
586. Presumably the fifth of more than one battle or conquest.
587. See n. 565 above.
588. A reference to the prisoners taken in the villages mentioned above on p. 3587.
589. See those who had joined in the battle after the five days of truce.
590. The subject is not expressed. Grammatically, the Copts could be the subject, but I do not think that that is meant.
591. Presumably of servants. The dictionaries do not seem to list a connotation for qa'awiym that fits the present context. Conceivably, it could also be “banners” or “standards.”
and permitted the Copts to be present. He showed his troops to them and said, “I am aware that you considered yourselves to have panache when you saw the frugality of the Arabs and their simple life style. But I fear lest you perish. Therefore, I wanted to show you what sort of people they really are, under what circumstances they lived in their own country, then what they have come to in yours, and how ready they are for war. They have defeated you, warfare is their life. They were anxious to take possession of your country even before they appropriated its customs as you saw on the second day. And I also wanted you to realize that those you saw on the third day will not abandon the life you saw depicted on the second day, nor will they resume the lifestyle you saw depicted on the first day.” Thereupon the people of Miṣr dispersed saying to one another, the Arabs have smitten you with this one hero of theirs.

News of these events reached 'Umar, who said to his companions, “By God, 'Amr's military campaign has become truly easy, no more attacks or assaults like the ones in battles against others. 'Amr is indeed a crafty fellow!” Then he installed 'Amr as governor of Miṣr, where he stayed.

According to al-Sarī—Shu'ayb—Sayf—Abū Sa'id al-Rabī b. al-Nu'mān—'Amr b. Shu'ayb: When 'Amr and the Muqawqis came face to face at 'Ayn Shams and their respective cavalries began to do battle with one another, the Muslims started to swerve some way toward the far end (i.e. of the battlefield), but 'Amr urged them to attack. Then a certain man from Yemen said, “We are not made of stone or iron!” “Shut up, you dog!” 'Amr shouted, but the man retorted, “In that case you are the upper dog.”

The transmitter went on: When that contingent began to draw more closely together, 'Amr shouted, “Where are the Companions of the Messenger of God?” Then those Companions who had participated in the evasive action came along and 'Amr roared, “Advance, through you God will grant victory to the Muslims.” So they went forward. Among them that day were Abū Burdah and Abū Barzah. The other warriors attacked the enemy, closely following the Companions. Then God granted victory to the Muslims who vanquished the enemy in a glorious manner. Miṣr was conquered in the month Rabi’ I of the year 16 [April 637]; there the authority of Islam stood firm.

On the whole, Islam began to spread over peoples and kings. Thus the people of Egypt started to engulf [Ifrīqiyyah596 and its ruler] al-Ajall,597 likewise the people in Munkar overran Rāṣil and Dāhir,598 the people in Sijistan overpowered the Shāh and his nobles, and the people in Khurāsān and Bāb [al-Abwāb]599 their respective Khāqāns,600 as well as less powerful nations. 'Umar held the conquering armies back out of concern for the lives of the Muslims. Had he allowed them to go where they liked, they would have gone anywhere where water was available.

According to 'Ali b. Sahl—al-Walid b. Muslim—(Abdallāh) b. Lahi'ah—Yazid b. Ḥabīb:602 When they had conquered Miṣr, the Muslims launched an attack on [northern]603 Nubia. But they returned having sustained injuries and with many people having been blinded because of the Nubians' superior bowmanship. That is why the Nubians were nicknamed “the eye shooters.” When Abdallāh b. Sa'd b. Abī Saḥr governed Egypt, over which 'Uthmān b. Affān had appointed him, he concluded a peace treaty with the Nubians on the condition that they offer a gift, namely a number of people from among them (i.e., to be used as a labor force), whom they were to deliver into the hands of the Muslims. In exchange, every year the Muslims would present them with certain specific foodstuffs and equally well-specified garments.

According to 'Ali—al-Walid—Ibn Lahi'ah: 'Uthmān and those governors and commanders who lived after him stuck to this

596. In this particular context, it is the name of the North African coastal region west of Egypt; but see EI, s.v. Ifriqiya [Talha], for the many different denotations of this name.
597. According to a gloss in Ibn Hubaysh [Berlin], this is the title of the ruler of Ifriqiyya, it means something like “the most noble.” He is mentioned once more in a subsequent volume of this series.
598. These are the names of local rulers.
599. This is a city on the western shore of the Caspian Sea, north of Baku. Nowadays it is called Derbent. See Yaqūt, Mu'tamar, I, 437–42.
600. This is the [Persian] title of local rulers.
601. Literally, “they would have reached every watering place.”
602. On this important Egyptian historian, see GAS, I, 341 f.
603. In Arabic, Nūbat Miṣr, probably that part of Nubia bordering on Egypt.
peace treaty and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz confirmed it out of consideration and concern for the well-being of the Muslims.

Sayf said: When the month Dhū al-Qa'dah of the year 16 [November–December 637] had begun, 'Umar stationed the armed forces of Egypt along all the coastal regions, the reason for this being that Heraclius was launching attacks on Egypt and Syria from the sea while he assaulted the people of Himṣ in person. That occurred after three and a half years of 'Umar's reign had elapsed.

Tabârî said: In this year, I mean 20 [641], Abû Bahriyyah al-Kindi 'Abdallâh b. Qays made a raid into Byzantine territory. It is alleged that he was the first to invade it, but another opinion has it that Maysarah b. Masrûq al-Abî was the first to do so and to return safely, laden with booty.

[Tabarî] said: Al-Wâqîdî said: In this year, 'Umar dismissed Qûdâmah b. Maz'ûn as governor from al-Bahrâyny and had him flogged for wine drinking. In the same year, 'Umar installed Abû Hurayrah609 as governor of al-Bahrâyny and al-Yâmâmah.

Tabârî said: In the same year, 'Umar married Fâ'îmah br. al-Wâlid, the mother of 'Abd al-Râhîm b. al-Ḥârîth b. Hisbâm. He continued: Also in the same year Bilâl b. Rabâh605 passed away. He was buried in the cemetery of Damascus.

In the same year, 'Umar relieved Sa'd from the governorship of al-Kûfah on the strength of complaints filed against him. People said that he could not perform the salât properly.

In the same year, 'Umar divided Khaybar606 among the Mus-

604. He was reputedly a Companion of the Prophet, whose role in the dissemination of prophetic hadîth has occupied scholars in East and West until the present day. For his biography, see the somewhat uncritical study of him by Helga Hengsberg, Abû Hurayrah, der Gefahrten des Propheten, Frankfurt/Main, 1965, and for his alleged role in hadîth transmission, see Juynboll, Authenticity, ch. VII, idem, Muslim tradition, 190–206.

605. He is described as a black Ethiopian slave who had embraced Islam very early. After Abû Bakr had bought him from his cruel Meccan master, he manumitted him. Bilâl later became Muhammad's official mu'addhin, the man who called the faithful to prayer. See Ibn Ḥajar, Isâbah, I, 336 f.

606. Khaybar is an oasis comprising settlements, cultivated soil and palm-groves, ninety-six miles/154 kilometers north of Medina, captured by Muhammad in 7 [628], it used to be occupied by Jews. See EI, s.v. Khaybar (Vecca Vaghieri).

607. Who this man was could not be established with certainty.

608. A village not far from Khaybar, see op. cit., which surrendered to Muhammad when he marched on Khaybar, as it says in the sources.

609. Tabarî's text appears to have a lacuna, my translation is based upon Pyra's emendation, which is derived from Balâdhuri, 39, 32. See also Yaqût, Mu'jam, III, 85, and Wâqîdî, II, 731, which has nakhl "palma."

610. Wâdi al-Qûrâ is a wâdi running from Medina to Syria in which there were several villages. The Jews who lived there were said not to have been expelled, since Wâdi al-Qûrâ is not part of the Ḥâzbut of Syria.

611. The registers in which stupors, etc. were entered, see the monograph of C. R. Pum.

612. In vol. XII of this series.

613. That is, during 'Uthmân's reign.

614. Usayd was a nobleman from the Ḥâlûyiyyah, who could write Arabic and was an excellent swimmer and archer. He who possessed these qualities was called al-Kâmil "the perfect one". He embraced Islam early, see Ibn Sa'd, III/2, 735–7.

615. This Zaynab was the wife of the Prophet's adopted son Zayd b. Ḥârîthah. When the Prophet married her, after Zayd had repudiated her, it is reported that
In this year, 'Umar led the pilgrimage. His governors in the garrison cities were the same in this year as in the previous year with the exception of those whom I have mentioned as dismissed or replaced by others. The same applies to his judges, who were the same persons as in the previous year.

The Qur'an abolished adoption. Thus Muhammad could not be accused of incest by marrying his "son's" wife. This episode has been analyzed by western as well as oriental scholars, but with quite different results. For an interesting account of both treatments, see Muhammad Husayn Haykal, Hikayat Muhammad (first published Cairo 1935, now also in English translation) ch. XVII, latter half.

The Events of the Year [2596]

(December 10, 641—November 29, 642)

Tabari said: In this year the battle of Nihawand occurred as related in the account of Ibn Ishäq according to Ibn Humayd—Salamah—himself. Abū Ma'shar has the same according to Ahmad b. Thābit—his authority—Ishäq b. Isä—Abū Ma'shar. Al-Waqidi says likewise. As for Sayf b. 'Umar, he has it that the battle of Nihawand took place in the year 18 (639), in the sixth year of 'Umar's reign, according to al-Sarī—Shu’ayb—Sayf.

The Battle of the Muslims and the Persians at Nihawand616

The beginning of this episode was as follows according to Ibn Humayd—Salamah—Ibn Ishäq: (A basic element) of the story of Nihawand was that al-Nu'mān b. Muqarrin was governor of Kas-

616. For a detailed source analysis of this battle and a comparison with the accounts concerning the conquest of Isfahan, see the fundamental study of Nosh, "Isfahan-Nihawand," in ZDMG, CXVII (1968):274–98.
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The Futūḥ Misr of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam is the earliest surviving account, from Arab sources, of the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt and the West, the first Arab settlements in and about al-Fustāṭ and Alexandria, and allied topics concerning the occupation and early history of the land under the rule of Islam. The text here presented is published for the first time, on the authority of all the known manuscripts.

The author of the work, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam ibn Ayyān ibn Laith, Abū ʾl-Qāsim al-Qurašī, was born about 187 A.H. (Taḥdīḥ at-Taḥdīḥ), and died at al-Fustāṭ in the year 257 (A.D. 871). He was thus a contemporary of Beladhuri († 279) and Ṭabarī († 310), and a pioneer in the period in which the first comprehensive Mohammedan histories were constructed from the unwieldy mass of oral and written tradition. On the author and his work see Ibn Hujair, Taḥdīḥ at-Taḥdīḥ (Haidarah 1326) VI 208; Dozy, Recherches, 3e éd., 86 ff.; Wästefeld, Geschichtsschreiber n°. 63; Braid, Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes III 3 (1846) 329 352; De Slane, Journal Asiatique 1844, pp. 335 348, 351 354 ff.; Thunon-Guest, Governors and Judges of Egypt, Introduction, pp. 22 ff. Also Ibn Khallikān, n°. 322, 631 (Trans. Slane, II 14, 508); Suyūṭī, ʿUsūl al-Mahāḍara (lith.), I 134, 136, 206; Abū ʾl-Maḥāsin I 629; Hājī Jalīla IV, p. 386; Broekelmann, Geschichte der arab. Litteratur, I 118, II 692; The article “Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam” in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, and the editions and translations of portions of the Futūḥ Misr mentioned below.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was by training and inclination rather an expert authority in the science of tradition than a historian. The family of which he was a member was renowned in Egypt and abroad, in its day, for its achievements in the various branches of ḥadīth and fiqh. The father of the family, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, was one of the leading authorities in these fields. Himself a ṭābiʿ of high rank, he had also written books on tradition and jurisprudence, and was the head of the Mālikite school in Egypt. The four sons of ʿAbdallāh were all men of importance: Muḥammad,
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widely celebrated as a jurist and the author of numerous works, which have
perished, his father’s successor as leader of the Malikiites of Egypt; ‘Abd
and ‘Abd ar-Rahman, after-ward generally known and quoted as “Ibn ‘Abd
214 (830 A.D.), when about sixty years of age. Thirteen years later than
by the caliph al-Wathiq, since they, like most leaders of the orthodox
account in al-Kindi, pp. 151, and Guest’s Introduction, p. 23.
In the year 237 the family met with a disaster in which it lost per-
inent its reputation and influence. The account of the matter is given
r. 4—5, 12; r. 1—5; space is given to it here because it seems to
Fath Mürd abu sayn’s commentaries on the doctrine of the created Koran. See the
very considerable property of the former
by the government; in the meantime several of the prominent men of Egypt,
temporary charge of the estate. When at length the emissaries of the caliph
was confiscated and foremost among them the Banu ‘Abdallah ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, had taken
al-Mutawakkil arrived in Egypt to claim the money for the state treasury,
against the Banu ‘Abdallah ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, was for the sum of 1,604,000
‘Abd al-Hakam, died under torture. The others were soon released from
but the fall of the once honored house was complete. You have strange
time after these events, “you give weight to the testimony of this
daur if ‘Abd al-Hakam is discredited as a witness (μιστήριον).” Whereupon
trust, nor laid claim to what was not my own.” (Kindi, p. 115).
The main purpose of ‘Abd ar-Rahman was to collect, except, and
classify the voluminous Muslim tradition relating to Egypt. Others before
him had made less ambitious collections; how much these included, and to
what extent the material was already classified, we have no means of knowing,
but it is evident that some of them were of very considerable volume and
importance. The sources used by ‘Abd ar-Rahman were in part purely oral,
for there were many in Egypt — his father ‘Abdallah was one — who
prided themselves on their ability to report from memory a large body of
habit in the time-honored way; and the frequent
in the Fath Mürd can be taken at their face value. On the other hand, it is
certain that a very large part of his material was derived from written
collections. The distinction between the two modes of transmission, oral and
written, cannot be sharply drawn, to be sure, for many authorities had been
sent to write down, for convenience, the single traditions or the extended
versions which they at the same time held perfectly in memory; what already
stood in a book might be, and still usually was, handed on by word of
mouth. The Fath Mürd itself was presumably dictated by ‘Abd ar-Rahman
to companions of his house, assembled for the purpose; and he had un-
continually written much. From similar dictation, in addition to preserving care-
fully the manuscript works of some of his chief authorities. He of course
made reference to persons, not to writings; we do, however, find in one
two places (160, 184, 14) mention of a book of Tahsin ibn ‘Abdallah
ibn Bakkur — one of his principal authorities — which had been given to
him by its author. A book containing historical material. The allusion to
it is found in 189, 197, 197, and of course to a written work. In another place
290, 23, 35, he speaks of having found in the document on which he
relied as a certain 97 was the certain source which an expert in tradi-
tion had assured him was incorrect. By this “book” he presumably meant
his own manuscript, but there is some evidence that this also was
the copy of a document, rather than the record of oral tradition, inasmuch
as it is reported from Ibn Labi, who died before our author was born,
and whose material was available in written form. In more than one place
where ‘Abd ar-Rahman expresses his own doubt as to a word in the hadith
which he is reporting, and gives an alternative, the ground of the uncer-
ainty is very obviously graphic. See 285, 20 (κότ) and 291, 22
(κότ) and 291, 22 (κότ) and 291, 22 (κότ) and 291, 22 (κότ) in both of which cases the tradition is derived from Ibn
Labi, who is generally believed, on good evidence, to have compiled books of
hadith. The frequency with which ‘Abd ar-Rahman, especially in the
seventh division of his work, reports directly from Ibn Labi, without any
intermediate authority, is additional evidence at this point. Moreover, it is

1 There is a gap in p. 49, line 3, which an interesting bit of narrative must orig-
inally have stood. This is one of numerous places in the Kindi Ms. where a passage of some

2 In p. 49, line 4, there is another of the various gaps in the Kindi Ms.

3 In p. 59, line 4, there is another of the various gaps in the Kindi Ms.
obvious enough from the large number of verbal variations, purely graphic in character, in the traditions as they circulated at the end of the second century A.H., that imperfect written transmission had already played its important part. For other examples in this book see 309, 10, 505, 20 f., and the Glossary s.v. زراعة.

I had originally intended to give here some account of the traditions most frequently cited by our author, but the very full and accurate treatment of this whole subject by Mr. Guest, in the admirable Introduction to his edition of al-Kindī, renders the task superfluous. The reader of the Fath Mīr will find all the most necessary material conveniently tabulated and thoroughly discussed there. The names of the rawis on whom Ibn 'Abd al-Baqī ibn Sābi of chief relics can be seen by consulting the Index of the present volume, where every occurrence of each name is tabulated.

Ibn 'Abd al-Baqī's work is ordinarily cited as Fath Mīr, but the title also appears in several expanded forms, the chief of which are Fath Mīr, with some account of the land and its history (thus, regularly, Ms. B and C, and the title page of A), and Kitāb wa-fi-tāmir al-Baqī fī al-siyāsah, the History of Egypt, North Africa, and Spain (thus for example Ms. A, fol. 17a). Even these expanded titles do not cover the contents of the work. The material is divided into seven Books, or Divisions (القسم), corresponding to divisions of the subject matter which are obvious or even necessary. The principal contents are as follows (for further detail see the Table). Book I deals with the characteristics and Excellences of Egypt (القسم مخصوص لمصر), and the history of the land from the beginning down to the time of the Muslim conquest. The episode of the Children of Israel, the history of the kings and queens of ancient Egypt, the Persian-Roman conflict for possession of the land, and the origins of Alexandria, are the chief topics of the historical portion. Book II treats in detail of the Mohammedan conquest under 'Amr ibn al-'Asī. Book III, which is of especial interest, deals mainly with the khītas, or primitive settlements, of the Muslim invaders in al-Fasqī't and Gizeh; also with the history of the numerous wells and similar grants, and with the Muslim holdings in Alexandria. Book IV describes the organization and administration of Egypt under 'Amr ibn al-'Asī and 'Abdallah ibn Sa'd; the invasion of the Fayyum, Buraq, and Tripoli under the former, and of Nubia and a portion of North Africa under the latter, the revolt, and second conquest of Alexandria; and various matters which must be termed the "Fath Mīr" under early Mohammedan rule; covering the history down to the death of 'Amr. Book V gives an account of the conquest of North Africa and Spain, down to the year 117 A.H. 2

Book VI is a concise special history of the qādis (judges) of Egypt, carried to the year 248, i.e., about ten years before the author's death. Book VII, the most extensive of all the divisions, contains a selection of religious traditions derived from those Companions of the Prophet who came to Egypt, namely such traditions as are distinctly Egyptian and recognized as such among those learned in the science. Fifty-two Companions are named, beginning with 'Amr and his son 'Abdallah, and under each name those traditions are given which are regarded as well-attested. These are followed by a few anacles handed down, in Egypt only, from fourteen other Companions, and these in turn by traditions reported from three others whose names in Egypt is known only through the traditions of other countries. Finally, those (seven in number) are named from whom neither tradition nor narrative is reported, together with still others (nine) who are said by Whiston and other authorities to have entered the land. Thus Ibn 'Abd al-Baqī in his seventh Book takes some account of every member of the Shābān who is credibly declared to have set foot in Egypt.

The work itself was made by the author himself, and was preserved unpublished by his successors, 3 especially the evidence furnished by the two appendices. In Book I, Tert. 1, note 17, 44, note 4, 2 in connection with what is said below. There is also somewhat fortuitous and very incomplete subsumption into chapters indicated by brief titles. To what extent that represents Ibn 'Abd al-Baqī's own division is doubtful; in the cases where they agree, we can only be sure that corresponding headings stood in the single imperfect copy which came into the hands of Ibn Quaddūm, in regard to this, see further below. In one case the title of the chapter is in the wrong place, having been inserted carelessly, to all

1 For the names of these kings in the Arab tradition, for which our text of the Fath Mīr is not always to be relied on, see Ahmad Kāmil, "Recherches sur les rois Arabes des anciens rois d'Égypte," in the Bulletin de l'Institut Égyptien, 1908; and Dedek in the Rassegna degli studi orientali II (1909), 712 f.; III (1910), 177 f.; IV (1911), 47 ff., 207 ff.

2 Although the same names are omitted, in certain cases where the two passages properly belong, I have not always in this present work noted the interesting testimony which they give. Many ancient sources have suffered seriously through similar accidents.

3 For a list of the references see the footnotes below.
material could be fully understood only in the author's own day, or at least, while the copy remained substantially the same which it had in the first half of the third century A.H. The later discussions of this subject, such as those in Ibn Dahi and al-Mufid, while largely based on Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, are obliged to omit as no longer comprehensible a large part of what he had given, and to revise other portions in accordance with later conditions. In the narrative portions of the history, also, it is usually the case that the chains of tradition are dispensed with, the variegated material being worked over into a continuous account, with mention, from time to time, of the principal authorities on whom the author is relying. This is the second just to mention the invasion and reduction of Egypt, Uthman ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn Maslama. The other chief authorities named here, Ibn Bukair and 'Abd al-Malik ibn Maslama, the latter, though perhaps more trustworthy, is, in their more extensive and well digested. To what extent, when evidence appears to be wanting, by him is not known. Our author seems to have been well acquainted, especially with the account in the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥat Misk, and the Futuḥ
Šāhilī, he is known as one of the Egyptian authorities who could quote exactly from memory a great body of historical tradition (see Guerri, p. 26 f.); nevertheless the way in which he is cited by Ibn Ḥākim suggests that some, at least of his materials was available in written form.1

Abd al-Rahmān’s special interest in the Qādīs of Egypt, whose history, carried down to the last decade of his own life, is sketched in the sixteenth century, is doubtless due to the intimate connection of his family with this branch of the Muslim administration. His father and brothers, especially Braun, were noted jurists, as has already been observed, and his father, Abd al-Rahmān, had been associated with the qādīs as a censor of witnesses. Abd al-Rahmān shows himself chiefly concerned with the period of the Companions and their immediate successors; hence in his treatment of the qādīs he gives much space to the earlier, but less and less to the later ones down to the time of his writing. The material of the seventh juz, containing the traditions preserved in Egypt from the Companions who entered the land, is of course given in a strictly conventional form. The principal authority here, as has already been said, is Ibn Lahir. Some of the minor rāwits in the ināds are of doubtful authority, but the collection as a whole is interesting and instructive. Not a few of the traditions recorded here have already appeared in earlier chapters of the book, in various connections. Attention is usually, though not always, called to this fact in the notes.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam occasionally criticizes his sources, as any expert in tradition might; see for example 64, 9; 221, 11 ff.; 230, 17 ff.; 205, 14 ff.; 205, 11 ff.; 301, 18 ff.; 310, note 2; but in general it cannot be said that he shows great ability as a historian, either in his selection of material or in his treatment of it. Nevertheless, he has given us a most valuable collection of the Egyptian memoranda, producing a book which not only was widely used itself, but also served as the starting point and basis of a number of Egyptian historical works of high importance.

The manuscripts of the Futūḥ Misr now known to be in existence are four in number, of which one is in London in the British Museum, two are in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the fourth is in the Library of the University of Leyden.2 The following is a brief description of them.

The London ms. (A), which is made the basis of the present edition, is a very old and excellent codex. See Ruin’s Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic Mss. in the British Museum, 1894, No. 520 (Stowe Or. 6), where it is fully described. It is not exactly dated, but contains evidence showing that it was written in the sixth century A.H. It is written in a calligraphically neat but unusually legible script, in which the incised points are likely to be omitted except where they are really needed. The dialect of the voweled is also helpful to a degree which is rare in sparingly pointed Arabic ms. Equivocal forms, unusual proper names, and the like, are usually vocalized, almost always correctly. Marginal notes in the original hand furnish occasional corroboration, explanation, variant reading, or critical comment. In short, there is abundant evidence that this codex, far from being the work of mere professional copyist, came from the hand of a scholar of rank. As to its origin, see the evidence given below. There are the usual conventional marks used to indicate expressly the muhāsabat (17b) (27b) (28b) (29b) (30b) (31b) (32b), etc., which form the basis of the glossing after the Prophet’s name is always abbreviated to (p. 17b) (28b) (29b) (30b) (31b) (32b), etc. Other habits of orthography are not sufficiently remarkable to need mention here.

The title page of the ms. reads as follows: 10

The title page of the ms. reads as follows:

The text of the new chapter then begins, p. 1, lines 3-4, except that in two instances (fol. 17b, 97b) the first rāwī in the series is Shafīʿ. This is not mentioned, the chapter beginning: ‘Anfūs ‘Ammār (fol. 17b, 97b) while in the four other cases (fol. 55a, 55b, 57b, 88b) he is merely referred to as the first rāwī in the chapter beginning: ‘Anfūs ‘Ammār (fol. 17b, 97b) instead of the words of the printed text, which are not given in the transcription, see below.

1. Other traditions known to us, not already mentioned, who are frequently cited by Ibn Ḥākim, and whose written works are likely to have been consulted in compiling the Futūḥ Misr are: Abd al-Mālik († 181); Ṣafī Ṣafī († 220); Ṣafī Ṣafī († 220); and Ṣafī Ṣafī († 220).
2. There is also in Göttingen a transcript of a portion of the work, made by Ewald, from the two Paris Ms. See Meyer’s Exodus der Indischen (13th century) in Pionnentur ini Inschriften. 1. Hannover, 1812, pp. 945-963. (fol. 55a, 55b, 57b, 88b).
It is written in a vigorous, flowing naskhi, the work of a professional scribe. Peculiar points, of whatever sort, are generally lacking. The titles of chapters, and similar headings, are in red. The copyist did his work rapidly, and there are a great many small omissions and errors, rectified however to a large extent generally in the margin, by means of collation from another manuscript. The page narrowly damaged, with the loss of some portions of the text, reads as follows: كتب فتح مغرب ملك شام وفلسطين وعمان وقبرص وقبرسيس وقد كتبه محمد بن علي ابن الأنصاري علي بن علي ومحمد بن علي ابن سعد بن محمد بن علي. The words and letters in brackets I have supplied by conjecture. The beginning of the text (fol. 17; حكينما أبو عمر: بني جعفر بن الحسن) is followed by a note: بني جعفر بن الحسن. The title which this formula of transmission assumes has been carelessly and hurriedly written; however, what was intended is بني جعفر بن الحسن. The beginning of the Second Division of the book is given in more extended form, see p. 45, and the correctness of this information will be discussed later. Fourth, and Fifth, Divisions, B has simply بني جعفر بن الحسن. The text of B differs in no important details apart from the fact that, except in point of verbal correctness, it disregards the type of text of the Fath Misk. In general, the abbreviations of B are as abbreviated as possible. The numerals are usually written in decimal, feminine forms in place of masculine, and vice versa. The words of the formula written in place of چی, as is so often the case in early Arabic texts. Such variations I have not recorded, except for some special points.

3. The second Paris manuscript (C) is numbered 1697 in Saine's catalogue. The title which the scribe wrote on the front of the manuscript has been cancelled in the ms., apparently by the copyist himself. This would hardly be worth mention if it were not for the noticeable fact that the capital of the country has taken place in another of Egyptian ins., of high importance. See Nicholas Kennedy, 'History of the Genres of Egypt', by Al-Khānqāh, New York, 1908, Introduction, p. 2, where it is mentioned that in the anonymous biography of Al-Khānqāh on fol. 38a of the Brit. Mus. Ms. 12584, the title had been cancelled three times. Apparently, there was a time when the corrections of the scribe were desired.
of the Arabic Ms. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and is dated in the year 776 A.H. (1375 A.D.). It is a large and magnificently executed codex, the work of a calligraphist of no ordinary skill. The scribe gives his name at the end, in the colophon (p. 447), as Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ibrahim al-Asharti al-Hanafi. The text is full of errors, and needs the constant control of the other ms. It is plain that the codex from which it was copied was very carelessly written, often hardly legible, and the scribe of C in the troublesome places seemingly makes no attempt to understand his text, but puts down the characters which he thinks he sees before him, even if they make a meaningless combination. The ms. thus often gives us mere nonsense, carelessly written in a beautiful hand. As it could serve no useful purpose to record these monstrousities, I have not burdened the notes with them. See however the notes on 85, 8; 88, 10; 107, 10; 114, 2; 174, 6, for specimens of the more common variants. In the parent ms. final ن must have been written like an elongated ن, whence these variants in C of which the notes on 48, 18; 77, 9; 123, 2; 217, 20; 817, 11 give examples. The l of ابن is very commonly written where it is not in place; باي (plur. constr.) is frequently written before or في. The consonants are very often left unpointed, evidently because the points were lacking in the parent ms.; vowels are used sparingly, and are likely to be incorrect. Chapter headings and other superscriptions are in red. It seems frequently to have been the case that red ink was not at hand; hence numerous titles are lacking, blank spaces being left for them. This ms. has quite a number of superscriptions of its own; thus 118, note 16; 119, note 1 (3); 229, 11; 231, note 14; 233, note 4, etc.

or two; see p. 199, note 3. From Division VI, dealing with the Qaddis, we have brief excerpts, which pass over, without any indication of a new subject, into the traditions of Division VII, of which only scanty selections are given. It has seemed to me desirable to print here the text of D in full from the point mentioned above to the end of the excerpts from the Futuḥ Miṣr. After adding, in regard to Qais ibn Sa’d ibn Ubada, the item:

Dar aššu ’l-‘Iraq al-thālib al-muṣṣal bi-nasr al-muṣṣal bi-nasr (printed text 274, 5 ff.), D proceeds (Ms. p. 294, line 10):}

This is a continuation of the previous text, discussing the conquest of Spain. The author mentions that they have included brief excerpts from Division VI, dealing with the Qaddis, which transition naturally into the traditions of Division VII. The text concludes with an excerpt from the Futuḥ Miṣr, adding information about Qais ibn Sa’d ibn Ubada.

---

1 As the beginning of this Division, moreover, the ms. not only abridges greatly, but also makes a good many slight verbal alterations, as though not trying to reproduce exactly.

2 I have supplied many of the discreet points, as well as the marks of punctuation.
itself, that A and D represent a line of descent in which the original form of the chapter has been preserved, while B and C represent a different line in which the accidental corruption had taken place, cannot be accepted as the true explanation. In the first place, B and C do not otherwise bear the marks of such an immediate common origin; secondly, there is the very early date of B, joined to the fact that C is a manuscript of the Silafti text; and thirdly, the facts which will presently be set forth render another explanation virtually certain, namely, that the superior text of A not only coincides with the fact that in the ancestor of C, which not as-Silafti himself appears from the fact that in the ancestor of C, which the evidence of the evidence afforded by our four manuscripts of the Fath Miṣr reveals a very interesting and somewhat surprising fact, namely, that the text of Ibn Qudaid, from which all our MSS. come, was derived from a single faulty codex, whose manifestly defective and disarranged text study of the evidence afforded by our four manuscripts of the Fath Miṣr. A striking example of misplaced supplementary matter is to be seen in the two addenda to Jan, pp. 43, 44-45, which see the footnotes there. They are utterly out of place where they stand, have no connection with each other, and contain no direct indication of the contexts to which they belong. They were probably added to make a complete piece of paper. A similar example is in the paragraph of p. 146, at the end of the chapter entitled دكر شمس مصر. It has no connection whatever with the preceding or the following context, and doubtless originally stood at the end of the chapter entitled مدناع. Its displacement was probably connected with the accidental transposition of leaves in pp. 133-135, already mentioned. An excellent example of a misplaced clause, found in all our MSS., is that of the reading of the Fath Miṣr, p. 14, lines 15 f.; see note 14. Another instance, even more striking, is shown on p. 201; note 12. A most interesting illustration of a clause inserted in the wrong place is 172, 1 f.; see note 5. We find the same false order in Yaqit, who quotes the passage, and what is more, tells us that he is giving an old and uncommonly exact ms.; see the Glossary p. 5. (What is true in this case seems to be true everywhere else: the only known text of the Fath Miṣr is the text of Ibn Qudaid.)
example is in S4, 1 and 88, 19. A doubtful instance is the remark in 107, 13 ff.; not that there is any doubt as to its being out of place, it certainly belongs immediately after 104, 21, but its insertion where it now stands might possibly have been an oversight on the part of the author himself. Finally, there is the remarkable disarrangement in pp. 135—139, which has already been mentioned. It was observed, above, that the seemingly correct version given by Ms. A, which has been followed in the printed text, is in reality the result of a conjectural emendation of the version given by B and C. Strong corroborative evidence of this is furnished by two brief passages which are now isolated, evidently by reason of the mischance which befell this portion of the codex from which ours were all derived. The first of the passages is the one just mentioned, 145, 14—18, which is out of place not only in Ms. B and C but also in A and D. As was remarked above, it must originally have stood at the end of the chapter containing the transposed page, i.e., immediately after the paragraph 107, 4—139, 2. The other passage is the remark which now is found only in B and C, printed here on p. 139, note 3, where the correct reading is (see the Errata).

The fact that some of the most palpable and certain of those purely scribal errors are found also in the citations from the Futūḥi Miṣr in Yağūt, Abū-l-Ma'aiṣir, Maqrīzī, and Sayūtī’s Risāl al-Maṣālik al-Maṣkūr must not be overlooked.

It remains, to find probable answers to the questions, how Ibn Qudādī came into possession of this one faulty codex, and why he transmitted it to his pupil in this imperfect state, without correction. It is to be observed, in the first place, that there is no good evidence that Ibn Qudādī was ever a pupil of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam or received traditions from him orally. The best native biographical treatises do not claim this for him, and in the few cases where the assertion is made it is undoubtedly due simply to his transmission of the Futūḥi Miṣr. His attitude, throughout this work, is plainly that of an editor who occasionally adds his own marginal notes (such as those given in note 10 on pp. 107 ff., in 247, 15 E., 300, 14 f., etc.), rather than that of a pupil transmitting a work received from his master. There is a noticeable absence of any indication that he had himself heard Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam; in the one passage where this has the appearance of being the case, namely 69, 7 and note 10, where Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam is said to have prescribed the reading بَيْتُ اللَّهِ بِالسَّمَاءِ لَوْلَا يَأْتِىَ الْجَمِيعُ أَبَى البَيْتُ بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ, the explanation is furnished by the parallel passage, p. 280, in which ‘Abd ar-Rahmān remarks (lines 16 f.) that Abū-l-Awād, from whom he received the tradition, used to pronounce this name with final مُنْئَ, It was in the year 937, when Ibn Qudādī was eight years old, that the family of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam fell into the disgrace from which it never recovered. It is not likely that ‘Abd ar-Rahmān, who at that time was about fifty years of age, gained any new adherents after that date; but it may well be that a few of his former pupils remained by him. It would seem that after the death of the master his history was not circulated, but was allowed, by those of his own gene-

---

1 These marginalia of Ibn Qudādī are sometimes reproduced in all the mss., sometimes in only one or two. Thus, the case just cited is found only in B; 29, note 13, gives one which is

---

immediate context. 229, 13 and note 15, قَيْسُ instead of مُسَيْسُ. See also 270, note 10; and 292, note 1.
ration and their immediate successors, to drop out of sight. Even after it was rescued from oblivion, and its material began to be used extensively in other works, the discredit attaching to the name of its author seems to have lingered for some time. The way in which al-Kindi, in writing of the qaṣṣa of Egypt, makes frequent and direct use of the Futūh Mīṣr, while avoiding the appearance of doing so, is highly significant. He bases his treatise on that of his predecessor even to the extent of making it end with the year 246, and yet, as Guest remarks (Introduction, p. 24), in using the same traditions he prefers not to cite Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, but instead employs, wherever possible, another chain of authorities. We may suppose that not long after the death of our author Ibn Qudād came into possession of a ms. of the Futūh Mīṣr which was either the work of one of the pupils of the discredited historian or else the copy of such a work. He had nothing more authoritative with which to compare it and by which to correct it, and therefore handed it on as he found it, like a true rāwī.

We have seen that the edition of the Futūh Mīṣr which was delivered by Ibn Qudād to his own pupils, with his numerous brief additions and comments, was transmitted from him by Muhammad Ibn Ahmad al-Qavmūd; and also, that in the older Paris manuscript it is repeatedly asserted that its text was handed down from Ibn Qudād by his more famous pupil, al-Kindi. The question of the authenticity of this latter information at once suggests itself, since the text of Ms. B is practically identical with that of the other witnesses, and we have no other direct testimony that al-Kindi was concerned with the transmission of this work. It is intrinsically probable, however, that this should have been the case, seeing that his teacher and chief authority (Guest, Introd., p. 18) gave out an edition of it with his own comments and slight additions. It is a work of just the sort which would be most likely to interest al-Kindi; we know that he was acquainted with it (he could not possibly have been ignorant of its existence!) and even that he made use of it — probably much more extensively than we are able to recognize. The claim made in Codex B, moreover, is not found in a marginal note, colophon, or title, but in the body of the work, four times over, in varying form. There is additional internal evidence, slight, but not to be disregarded. In spite of the inconsiderable variation in the ms. of our history, and the comparatively small number of cases in which al-Kindi professes to be following Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, it is possible to observe that the B text agrees more closely than its fellows with al-Kindi. An example

is the tradition p. 152, 8 ff., cf. Kindi ṭīr, 10 ff. The traditionist's habit of repeating the word ḥās after each member of the chain of authorities may also be admitted as evidence. This habit is everywhere followed in B, but not in the other three mss., and is also regular in the Kindi codex. Cf. for example 90, 10 ff. (in a tradition found only in B) with Kindi ṭīr, 9 f.; ṭīr, 9 ff., etc. Again, what is still more significant, B shows a certain independence in reporting the comments of Ibn Qudād. There is a series of brief notes by Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam himself, among those which Ibn Qudād must either have found in the margin of his codex or have received orally from a former pupil of the historian, preserved in Ms. B, but nowhere else. These are the following: 93, note 10; 161, note 13; 291, 7 ff.; 301, 18 ff.; 307, note 6; 308, note 5; 310, note 2. These seven notes form a group which is especially worthy of notice when it is observed that no other manuscript of the four contributes even one note of this particular sort which is not preserved also by the rest. On the other hand, there are two instances in which editorial remarks of this general nature are present in the other mss. but wanting in B. One of these, 316, 14 f., is a note of Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, like those just mentioned, but of less consequence; the other, 174, note 2, is an interesting annotation by Ibn Qudād, which A, C, and D give in slightly varying form. In 300, 5 (see note 3) B simply adopts the correction of Ibn Qudād without noticing the older reading (given by the ms.). The evidence at hand thus seems to support the assertion of Ms. B, that its text came from Ibn Qudād through al-Kindi.

From the facts here stated it is evident that from our four manuscripts of the Futūh Mīṣr we can restore the text of Ibn Qudād's codex with remarkable certainty, and in so doing can make a very close approximation to the text of Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam himself. From the time when Ibn Qudād published this important book, it was extensively used by other writers and made the basis of numerous works dealing with the history and traditions of Egypt, some of which works soon supplanted the pioneer collection. Al-Kindī made it the basis of his own monograph on the Qaṣṣa, and unquestionably also of his treatise on the Khiṭṭas. As Guest (p. 24) suggests, Ibn ʿAbd al-
al-Hakam’s chapters on the Fad′īl Mīr (see above) furnished the younger al-Kīnī much material for his work bearing this title. 1 Muhammad ibn ar-Rabī′ ibn Sulaiman al-Ja‘f (932–944) wrote a work on the Companions who entered Egypt (extensively quoted in the Hūsain al-Muḥādara), and also one on the Qurʿān, for both of which works the Futūḥ Mīr must have been a chief source. Such writers as Ibn Zu‘dāt and Qurṭūzī still further expanded and continued the works of their predecessors. 2 In regard to other early historians, such as Ibn Yūnus, we have no basis for conjecture as to the extent to which they were indebted to the Futūḥ Mīr. The debt cannot have been small. Yaqūt’s work in extenso for a large part of his Egyptian and North African material. Suyūtī’s Hūsain al-Muḥādara is to a considerable extent a transcript of it, or of others who have incorporated it, and it furnishes Maqrizi with many chapters. It not infrequently happens, in all those works, that long extracts are given; in more or less altered form, without mention of their source. One of the very early histories of which the Arabic text has been lost, but which is preserved in translation, is l’Egypte de l’horat El. Bokhara, translated by Pierre Vattier in 1661, a work of which we are told that the original text was edited by al-Šīrāzī. The book is rare, and I have not seen it; my only knowledge of it comes from Mr. A. G. Ellis.


1 J. C. Torrey, Uber Ibn Mubāḥath al-Kindī’s Historicae Aegypti, in the Verh. d. K. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Kopenhagen, 1890, No. 4. It is an interesting fact that this book also was reprinted by al-Šīrāzī.

2 See, for example, the material of the Futūḥ Mīr cited from Qurṭūzī in Ibn Yūnus I 13.
through Mr. Ellis, the task, at that time precarious, of getting the parcels of manuscript safely to the printers in Leyden.

In editing the text, the readings of Ms. A have been preferred wherever they could reasonably be regarded as the original. The same principles of vocalization have been observed as those adopted by the editors of Tabari's great work. The notes, which might easily have been considerably increased in volume, are intended to supply only what is most necessary. There is probably no need to apologize for the amount of space given to the glossary. The great age and comparative certainty of the text, the influence which the book exerted in the learned Muslim world, and the need of cited material, of definite date and undoubted authenticity, for an Arabic dictionary compiled on scientific principles, constitute a sufficient excuse for discussing unusual words at some length, and for including usage already recorded in Dozy's Supplement (generally, it is true, from works much later in date than the Fihrist Miṣrī). The reader who compares our text with the extensive excerpts from it given by Suyuti, Maqrizi, and other writers of the later period will be interested, and perhaps surprised, to see how often the words and phrases listed in this glossary are either omitted altogether or else replaced by others which are more usual. The reader is urged to consult the table of Errata, before making use of the book, and to enter in the text the corrections there indicated.

The editor takes this opportunity to thank those who have assisted, in one way or another, in the preparation of this edition: the officers of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the British Museum, and the Library of the University of Leyden, for the aid so readily and unreservedly given; the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Fund, for their uniform courtesy and consideration; the managers of the Yale University Press, and the publishing house of E. J. Brill in Leyden, for the care which they have bestowed on all the details of printing and publication; Mr. A. J. Ellis, formerly of the British Museum, afterward of the India Office, for his unflagging helpfulness in many ways; Professor Snouck Hurgronje, of the University of Leyden, for generously offering to read a proof of the work, and for some valuable corrections of the text which I have included, accompanied by his name, in the table of Errata. To my colleague, Professor Clay, to whose energy the inception of the Yale Oriental Series is due, I am indebted for much help and encouragement. Dr. George Alexander Kohut, of New York City, has shown a keen personal interest in the publication of this volume, and it is especially fitting that it should appear under the auspices of the fund established in memory of his father.

New Haven, Conn., September, 1921.

CHARLES C. TORNEY.
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which, having been displaced by some accident, have now been copied at the end of the chapter. The first of the two was written by the author himself as the continuation of page 28, line 13. The other was designed by him as the continuation of page 65, line 8. See also the Introduction. D. om. the following, as far as the name. 1) The following is quoted from Ibn Abd al-Hakam in Jussi 1:29, below middle. 2) B. add: B. inc. 3) ACD. 4) C. add: 4) D. add: B. 5) C. add: 6) D. inc. 7) C. inc. 8) D. inc. 9) C. inc. 10) D. inc. 11) ACD. 12) ACD. 13) ACD. 14) ACD. 15) ACD. 16) B. add: 17) B. om. At this point the first main division of the book ends, in all the ma.
ذكر: كتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى المقيمين.

(...)

1) Here begins, In all the Mas., the second main division of the History.
2) This superscription is wanting in Q, but space is left for it.
3) B omits:
4) C om.
5) D.
6) B.
7) C.
8) A (fully pointed) and C have final 1, B and D.
9) 10) The following is in Haen I 47ff., Magr. I 20ff.
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما يحدثلون. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما يحدثلون. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما يحدثلون. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما يحدثلون. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما يحدثلون. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
لا أكن أعلم كيف أستطيع أن أكتب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسبب ما حدثت. (1)
السَّلَامُ عَلَى بُنَيَّنَا مَسَّاَبٍ وَبَلَِّيْباً بِالْقَوْمِ الْمُفْتَرِسِينَ، وَالرَّحْمَةُ لا يُمْلَأُ مِنَ اللَّهِ ضَرَّعًا ثُمَّ هَاعَلَهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ، وَكَلَّمَهُمْ بِالْقَوْمِ الْمُفْتَرِسِينَ، وَالشَّيْطَانُ الْمُفْتَرِسُ. 1

من هو أحمد بن أبي حنيفة، رجل الدين الذي كتب كتبًا مشهورة في الفقه الإسلامي؟

1) حي. 2) معتدل، بالعكس.
2) مس. 3) في السياق.
4) أ. 5) شرعي.
6) في تأويل.
7) B. 8) B. 9) A. 10) C.
أن بعثها قبضها قبل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. وَأَيَّاهَا الْيَهُودَ، يَا بُنَائِبُ الرَّحْمَةِ، أُبْدِعْتُم مَّيْلًا. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَكَأَنْ أَسْبَعَ فِي يَأسٍ يَغُضُّ نَمْذَةَ الْخَيْرٍ. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَلَكِنْ أَنَّا نَذَاكِرُ الْحَقَّ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ مُكَافَرًا. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَلَكِنْ أَنَّا نَذَاكِرُ الْحَقَّ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ مُكَافَرًا. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَلَكِنْ أَنَّا نَذَاكِرُ الْحَقَّ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ مُكَافَرًا. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَلَكِنْ أَنَّا نَذَاكِرُ الْحَقَّ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ مُكَافَرًا. وَإِنْ تَمَسْنَاهُم مَا فِيهِ مِنْ عُقُومٍ مَّعَنَّى عَلَيْهِ. وَلَكِنْ أَنَّا نَذَاكِرُ الْحَقَّ عَلَى مَنْ كَانَ مُكَافَرًا.
الرسول ﷺ في منزل والدته مجددة. لبى الله ﷺ ما رحبت إلى رضي الله عنه، بعد جمع التحرير فنقل إلى
مشاهدته، وكتب أن تقيمه على كل ذلك أعلم ﷺ أنه لا يوجد نقل الله ﷺ ما لا يحب، كان ﷺ في الإيمان ﷺ.
يرجى ﷺ أن يُنُفِّق إن كان ﷺ مُنَفِّقًا، يرجى ﷺ أن يُنْفَق إن كان ﷺ مُنَفِّقًا، إن كان ﷺ مُنَفِّقًا.
أرسل الله ﷺ لما بحث أشتكيك ﷺ ما هو، إذ ﷺ ما هو، إذ ﷺ ما هو. إذ ﷺ ما هو، إذ ﷺ ما هو.
حب الله ﷺ إن يُحَبَّب أن يُحَبَّب أن يُحَبَّب أن يُحَبَّب أن يُحَبَّب.
1) B. 2) BCD. 3) د. 4) الـ. 5) D. 6) D. 7) 0. 8) 0. 9) 0. 10) 0. 11) The narrator confuses جمعين ﷺ.
12) B. 13) 0. 14) 0. 15) B. 16) 0. 17) B. 18) 0. 19) B. 20) 0. 21) 0. 22) B.
13) In the remaining traditions of this chapter, 0 abridges and omits very extensively.
14) B. 15) 0. 16) 0. 17) B. 18) 0. 19) B. 20) 0. 21) 0. 22) B.
15) In 0 altered to كم ﷺ. The traditions in somewhat improved form in Bokh. 1 929.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المكتوب بالخط العربي في الصورة. من فضلك قدم النص العربي باللغة العربية أو الإنجليزية أو أي لغة أخرى يمكنني قراءتها.
لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.

لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.

لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.

لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.

لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.

لا يزال باديوم أم إبرهيم كما حذفنا القلمي عن حسبين بن عبد الله بن عمي.

الله إن عابس عن عربة عن ابن عباس الله إن ما بلغتم تهذيب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم تعلموا. وإن كان إبرهيم ابن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم مما حذفنا عن بن.

هذا السبب عن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن ابن عيسى قبلا بعثه على اليمين.

 понравت هذا فهذا رجل يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا يرحب الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن لا يظهر في الدنيا.
في بعض جلبيها، ينصح بإلهامه وراقبه في إظهاره. وذكى رجسية الأمل في لما تعلمه. تعلم من إلهامه إلهامه عصره. إذا عاشه الدماغ، وذكره ملائكة نعم لجهب الشمسم. إن حُروبوه فرحت، فمنها إلهام، جم، يرى عمله فترُف، فجعله في حربه. إن حُروبوه فرحت، ومنها إلهام، عصره. إذن، يرى عمله فترُف، فجعله في حربه.
ذكر فتح مصر

حدثنا عطاء بن صلح حدثنا أبي ثيحة عن عبيد الله بن أبي جعفر ومياش

الأمير محمد بن عبد الكريم حُREFERENCE 2* لَبيب، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، لِيقطع نفقات أموره، وهو في موضع عالٍ، L

1) Marginal note in Arabic: "..."
فلم يمكن العثور على السلمين فقال عروج عن معتد النسطور تعلم أن هذه الطيحة من معرفنا بل إلى ما كان أمير المومنين عبد الله الأموي أن عرف به الخطأ وكان مسلمين سراً وغصر عليه. 

لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة. إذا كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة بخصوص نص آخر، يرجى إرساله وسأساعدك.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
من عبد الرحمن بن شريح فصل عربية عن معهد حتى نزل على الجاهلية حتى
سأله: إن يسرى له من 12 عام واحد. وفقطنا له أن يسلم فقال:
"فإنك؟" عرفك لكل رجل من الجاهلية دينارًا وجثة ورأسًا ومقدمًا ومخالبًا وكسورًا.
"أن يُسلم له من الإيمان؟" ونفّذنا عن قلوبنا قلوبهم. فقيل: إن عبد الله بن عبد
"ما لهم أن يُسلم له من الإيمان؟" ولنكافحهم صنيعاً فعمله. فعندما أبلغ الله في وعده
في حينه فأجاب فوراً من طعام سبأ رأى عرو. كم التقلم قلوا عشرين ألف دينار قال
"لا حاجة لننا بما تجهيزك بعد اليوم أتولى اللعب عشرين ألف دينار. جئوا الشارع
من القطب. فمساحتها إلى غرفة واقف قلنا لعمر كيف رأى الثور امرأنا كلا. فكره،
حتى قال الرجل الذي قال في البحر الأول ما أن قال إنّك لن تزالوا تثبرون. فأمس
10 كان من ليس ابن حنيفة ينفونوا خرجوا رجلًا شبيه عرو وأمموا بن طلحة الليثي.
واخرون. إنه لا يدي مقول حتى خلصوا لهما بلغ عينه، فقال عرو بن ليلبوب ارسل
في طلب ملالة القبط: لو وجهته؟ فقل هلاق فنجيح رأى عرو من فوله، قال: يغب
قل عرو بن الحاسد فلمما حمل عرب من اللطاب لقال كل ما قل القبطي، فلما حددت
قد اقتله ابن لوزح رجل نجوا قلنا. هذا إنما من قلته السلمون
15 فلما قابل عمو أوضع إن ما قل الرجل حقه قال ابن في حينه، فلما رفوا من
صلعب ابن عرو بن الحاسد فج Keeper: لقوله. ورامي أن جرحنا لذيذ فصنع لم
التربيد والعمق. فراعه ابن من إبليس لا أقسم. اشتصل القلب، والقعد على الركبت. لما
حصر الرجل وضع كلّ القبائل. فلいませんها عليه وأسلمت (200) الحرب الإجبار
فجعل الرجل من العرب يرقد في القمّة العالية من الفريق، وينيب من ذلك للحم.
20 فينطير على من لب جنبد من الروم ينبلج. وكالما 12 ألسنة لله الذي
كنا أوها قبل ذلك. فلما أبلغوا، اجتمع الحفاة ورحلوا. اجتمع للورم. فقل ولد مبعث
في نعم القرآن 13. وفجًا غير هذا 14.

حدثنا عثمان بن صالح أخبرنا ابن أيوب عن عبد الله بن اق جعفر ومنى
أي علماء، وهم قاس: بريء، يعمم على بعض أن أمرك بن المال، حصره بالقرص، الذين يقال له بطليس، فحيث أن كنتم كنتما، كنتم قد وجدتم، فلما انتهوا الفع، عليه كتب لرجل من الطلاب، ومعتمه دخله. تقول:  لا، ل
حفر الوسيلة في العالم. 33 فأتم ألاحرج ونعيش في دار علغة فنفط، عوو ترّاءن. 34 فبلغنا أن أنثى ونسلم أن كمن فنفط عدو مارا. 35 إلى أن غنيت أمن أن لا يعنون أن مارا. 36 وعندنا أن 37 أحمد أن لا يعزز. 38 فأنتم أن لا يعزز. 39 في موضع، 40 يعمر. 41 بأمر. 42 من 43 في موضع. 44 في موضع. 45 في موضع. 46 في موضع. 47 في موضع. 48 في موضع. 49 في موضع. 50 في موضع. 51 في موضع. 52 في موضع. 53 في موضع. 54 في موضع. 55 في موضع. 56 في موضع. 57 في موضع. 58 في موضع. 59 في موضع. 60 في موضع.
كل منا في الألسن النصري ، من عبد الربّ يحيى بن عبد المطلب ، بن قتادة إطلاق عصل.

أين يتلمّس الضالون من تكبير؟ أين يبتغى من أمين الفزع أن يقتله في الجزيرة؟ إن أحسن من زمان رُحل الله علّمته ، يا كنار! كنار، أحيأ على من يطيب من الذبح.

أين تحمّل به النصف حتى أن أحدنا يشيطنه الله تعالى بالخير، ولا يلمسه الشر؟ فهذا مجد ونور، ينال الله فتحه، فلما يسبح ي הוא في مهابة. يجلب الله من من كنت أن يشطينه أتمنى أن أتبيّن من أن (280) سلالة الشيينة التي محتضنها. يجلب الله من يكون هو وراء عصروين يمسح، يجلب على يد الملك بهذا.

46. إن أحسن من يعلم في قلبه، قلنا أن ينفع، على وجه بين الحسابي في الربيع، أو أحسن من ينفع في قلبه، أحسن من أن ينفع الله به، على أن ينفع ترهيب، أو أحسن من ينفعه، أي أن ينفعه، على أن ينفعه. إن أحسن من ينفعه، أو أحسن من ينفعه.

47. إن الله قد جعل لمن لا ينفعه، أو أحسن من ينفعه، أو أحسن من ليس له، في دينه، في مهابة.

48. إن الله قد جعل لمن لا ينفعه، أو أحسن من ينفعه، أو أحسن من ليس له، في دينه، في مهابة.

49. إن الله قد جعل لمن لا ينفعه، أو أحسن من ينفعه، أو أحسن من ليس له، في دينه، في مهابة.

ورد مع الرفيق الذي كتبه، بن فضل الله بن نُوَّال، بن يسركس، وقلت: "وُلَّى الرجاء، ولا يُرْجِهِ، ولا حيَّةٌ بَلْ يَبْلُغُ الْمَالِيمَةَ فَبَشِّرُهُ بَشِيرًا عن نَاحِيَةٍ إِنَّكَ أَجَابَ". فقيل: "فلا ترى، الذي كتب، وهذا في الرجاء، ولا يُرْجِهِ، ولا حيَّةٌ بَلْ يَبْلُغُ الْمَالِيمَةَ فَبَشِّرُهُ بَشِيرًا عن نَاحِيَةٍ إِنَّكَ أَجَابَ". فقُلْتُ: "فلا ترى، الذي كتب، وهذا في الرجاء، ولا يُرْجِهِ، ولا حيَّةٌ بَلْ يَبْلُغُ الْمَالِيمَةَ فَبَشِّرُهُ بَشِيرًا عن نَاحِيَةٍ إِنَّكَ أَجَابَ".
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
السامس 5 حديثا صيداً. بين İki نعمر كأب‌الملك عن العرب عشرة فما طول كِرٍ
رجل من عزيره عالية (848) عينه في السماوات السماوات. ثم رفع إلى حديثه.
فيها كلما علم أنه يكون مكبلاً في الدم والأرجا جهان إذا هكذا نحوه يا لواء إذ
أحرجو هذه الملك عقبته إلى أسرة ضيقي ففي مركب إلى ذلك عينه. وما رفع إلى
هذا الملك عقبته إلى أسرة ضيقي ففي مركب إلى ذلك عينه. وما رفع إلى
هذا الملك عقبته إلى أسرة ضيقي ففي مركب إلى ذلك عينه. وما رفع إلى
هو سيدنا بختية بالقلم عليه يا لا يرجع جميعاً لا له ولا له يا لواء ودود أمر
الاسم رجاء ما لواد لواداً كان لا يخفى رجاءه ولد ودود أمر دينه نياً
12 هكذا اسمه السيكتم فإنا ينفي أن يكون هو دركنا نهوا كلا إن لو كأن اسم
كنا في له من أصلنا مرجعنا وينصنا شعبنا وعلنا ونوراً وليس ينكر الحسان فينا
REDENTIAL الفنون لعلماً تعلموا يا لواء ولد ودود أمر دينه نياً.
13 أربعت لملكة قنبرة فتعلم الملك عليه فلا يعجب متلاقاه ونوراً إذا حائلت
ومن الجعل الفنون رجل أمر دينه نياً. لا ضملاً ينكر طبقاً على وعدها.
14 أقبح لا نملك ولا ندف ولد له ولد أثر شباب وفقاً مع ذلك لما جعل الصلاة لا يفعلن ملة
وهل من مذوى لا استقبل جمعاً ونحلك انتقال ولدنا إما ضمنا ونحلك
الله ينحيل رضوانه ليس عيناً عند عيناً على حارب الله ترقبه في الدنيا لا
علياً للاستظلل عليها إلا أن الله قد أحل ذلك لنا ملمحاً من مكان حيالة
ياه ينحيل رضوانه ليس عيناً عند عيناً على حارب الله ترقبه في الدنيا لا
ومن الدعاية أرقاً إلا أنها يسهم في جدوله الليل يحملون ضملاً ما في أفقهن لا
6 بمقهى وف). 7 بفقيرات و (2)
للصلب 6) B. و (6) B. و (3) B. و (1) B. و (2) B. و (7) B. و (8) B. و (9) B. و (10) B.}

أصبحت بختية بالقلم عليه يا لا يرجع جميعاً إلا له ولا له يا لواء ودود أمر

وعده في غزوة، فقصفه عليه. فلзна سمع لله في نزلة منه كل شيء فعَل
معهم من كل يومه، فقال: "اقد قلت". فهذا منظور، يا قلوب أهل كل شيء
منهم أن هان واصف، وأنا أرجو أن الله يرحمهم ما ألقى. لم أكن إلا
rails. فلذام الله عليهم، أين قابل الفوس على مدين يهتادا، فإنها أهل الرحيل المصلي قد
سعة مقاتلاً. ما دكرت عنه، فعند إختصاد، وفجأ ما بلغتم. إلا ما بصره
ذكرت وما طورم على من طورم عليه إلا (196) في الالتفاضا ورغم فيها وجمة
رضأ الله أنما لفتناكم من جمع الرم ما يَبْخَسَ عَلَهَا فم مورعون بلحجة
والشاقة ما يمل أيدهم إلى يد ولا من قبل ولا للعلم أنم لتفووا علماً
وأن تشعروا لشباكم بلقد وقعتن ويد أظلم عن أهلها. والد في ظلماء، وجدت من الفاسك في علماً ما عند ما وهبنا
معاك وحلاكم. دخى نبأ علكم لمحكم وفقكم يهتادا ما يبديكم. وما تطيب
بأمساك أحقنا على أن تየش لكن زوج منكم ثنايتي نذمارًا وذكركم مملوء
ديار كل كنكم فبراكينها ونحوروا أن بلادكم فقط أن يشقكم. لا
إبام أن يدعى. فقائل عبادة بن السائب بأباد لا بفعل يرسل إمما
حترى الدهم نهارًا. فوافقكم وترككم وما لا ترى عليهم الأمور ما هذا
بتأتي عينًا. ونولا ببجي يبقينا ماً حس به أن كأن ما نقل حقاً فلاللا، والد
ورى ما يكون. إذ أنا إلى ذلك كنتم ولا علماً. إن كلما عان الله
دعاها أن كأنا من أكناها. كأنما كان يمكن لنا في رؤوه. كنتو ما مت الطهير
بغيوم ولا أطيب أنها من ذلك. وإن منكم حينما كان الله وجه إلى أحدهم الشبيب، إذا أن
نعم الله لعل ذلك. فاسكن الدنيا. إن كان ظارم أو عندها الآخر أن طورم ما وجدناها
أحسف الصدين. إليه بعد الاجتهاد. فنفق على الله غزوة وجلَّ قول لنا: أين كان... كل شيء كمن ذهب
لكن بلغ البعث. لا فكت كن كن، إلى الله بالله مع المشردين، ما لنا بالله، وله يهدم
ما صواب، إلا يصوم أن ترى دينه الشبيهة، ولا يهدم لا يهدم ولا لا لا إهدل
رهب، وليس لوا حدبنا فما فعله؟ دحد أشهد مثال واحد من ما رأى الله أولمها

1) BD + al.
2) B (sec. man.)
3) AC + 9.
4) B
5) BD
6) B
7) B
8) Sura 2, 259.
9) Thus pointed in A; BD خلق الله تعالى.
لا يُنفِّقُ مَنْ عَقْلَهُ مَنْ أَعْلَى. وَإِذَا قَرِبََ أَنْ نَنْفِقُهُ، فَبِلَاءٌ مَّتَىٰ مَا أَعْلَى، وَكَثِيرًا مَّا قَرَبََ أَنْ نَنْفِقَهُ، فَبِلَاءٌ مَّتَىٰ مَا أَعْلَى. وَكَثِيرًا مَّا قَرَبََ أَنْ نَنْفِقَهُ، فَبِلَاءٌ مَّتَىٰ مَا أَعْلَى. وَكَثِيرًا مَّا قَرَبََ أَنْ نَنْفِقَهُ، فَبِلَاءٌ مَّتَىٰ مَا أَعْلَى.
تمت إعطاؤا معين للماء insurgent وما حضري من انواع مهرها ومن أرك الورم،
منه في الورم مربع وحيت ان الغوطة الدحسن في الورم خالصة حتى كتب إلى
ملك الورم ب ООا فأنا قال ذلك ورودية جار عليه ولا كنا جميعنا على
ما كنا عليه، وكنيها به، كتب الغوطة إلى الملك الورم كما رفع عليه ورد
لا، بل كتب إلى الملك الورم بأسم رأى ويعثر ورد عليه ما فعل ورود في
فعداد، إن الله في البر، كما كنا كنا العينوس، بها من كثرة عدد القبط، ما
ينفي أن كان القبط كنهوا الأثقال، وضحا إلا بعدين لا ظهر، ولا رأفة، على
سماء معرة من الورم الثلاثة، من معاه أكبر من مكة إلى مكة المغيرة، والغيرة،
فجاهم، وصولاً يتغلب على ما قد، أوما، ورود في عن نظام، ورجعي أن تنويه
من معاه من الورم، في حوار الفنادق، لا يقانك لقين من مكة من الورم، حتى
تجرد أو أضواء، بل كنا ضم على مر ترجموك، ورود على مر جلود
رجل واحد. إننا كتمه فيه، لا يكون له رأى في غير الله، وكني كتب الورم على
كما لأ جلادة الورم، فنا الفنادق، لا أننا كتب ملك الورم ياه الله، على تقدم
وعم تدهر معا، ما على كتفي، ومتنا أن الإجابة الواحدة، منهج لعهد، ماره
جبل ما يعلو لدن قرب الورم النحو الحب إلى إجابة من الله، يتقن الرجل، وما هو
مستفيد، ينبغي أن يرجح إلى ألمة ولا بلده، ولا يجعلنا، وودود أن الآيت معينة
بين كلها من بطولين، إن كان كتبنا دخلك لله وليس ل распространен في الدنيا، لا
ناء لا يدرك لنهي السمع من الغزال، واللابس، وجميع الورم، كما به، ورود
لعبة كمك، تئن وحمل، وكيف تهنئ ممن عبد، كما معره الربيع، ولا
وود، كما تخليد فين ولا حضتي الحب على رأسهم؟ كتب على مختلفة، لا أر
رأي حق، وينسيه، إن لم كتب إلمحني وعده، لا قد تدين، ورود، ووجد (288)
ما لا يعينه الله رده رده، ونحذره، مما نحذره، إننا، إننا إلمح، لا
هو للرساله، ولا وحده، وضحى في السعفة، لا أقفل القبول لا درو، من النشأ
كل، إن الإجابة قد كم ما تخليد وحده، وكني إلى واق مثلا، الورم أن لا مثلا

1) D 8) B om. 5) HCD
2) B om. 4) B om. 6) B om. 7) A om. 8) Mat. 9) B om.
بما تكون جاهزة ل😊، يمكننا مساعدتك على فهم ما هو معنى كلمة "لا تقلق" في المنطق. هل يوجد نص يقنعك بذلك؟

لا يوجد نص يقنعك بذلك.

أفقية: لا تقلق, بالعكس, يمكننا مساعدتك على فهم ما هو معنى كلمة "لا تقلق" في المنطق. هل يوجد نص يقنعك بذلك؟

لا يوجد نص يقنعك بذلك.
لا يأت من هليلون رأى نمن في البلد في الليل في أي يختص أَفْقِ غَيْفه أُثْرُّين أَعْنِانه
ف رجع إلى خميسين حتى أُتِح إلِى أن أعْتُم من الناس بالطين حين امكَن
ل الزج ومعي جماعة من رمّة السلم وقد اصطوا إلى الباب والآن ألم يجبر
المدفول هم لم يقتلين، فإنا على ما أرادوا من نقلهم جميع بِجمالهم الزجين
الكسائيين. وَهَم يتعثرين عليهم مراكب كثيرة من أرض الزج (269) فيها جمع
من الزج متشابكة وسجال لزج النهم فهو بين الناس من السلم جريحًا لا
الاستعداد، فلم يلبص بهم أحدا حتى بلغ ترُبُطُهُ، فقلق بها تلقائد من الزج لِتُبَلَّغ
ضلا خيالها فِي حُور النهار بخصوص من زج حين قد فلَح له ترَبُطُهُ، يجرحون الزج
تقتادوه فَلَتِلَّه الْمُلْلَة. فَلَنْ تَمَّ يَتَكْلَمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا.
ابن العادل شريك بين سُمُّين في الزج كما حدها عبد اللطيف أن يجيب
يكون من يديه أن يجيب فادهم عند الزج الذي يقال له: كُرُز خيامه
شراب، فهل هم كل غم عند اللتان بين سماحة طف قلبية بِلود غريزة، وإن على
سماحة زج بين السلم، وأسر يرْبُطُهُ، فإنَّهم إذا الكوم التمسك به، خلق الغريزة
ية فِي تَلْبِيَة، أَنَّهُ يَقُولُ، فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا. فَلَنْ يَتَكَلَّمُوا.
ابن الابن شريك بين سُمُّين في الزج في الكتابة، وإن يجيب
يتكلمون، فإنا قد أتى إبنا اللتان بين غم عبد الخلاص، وهو حسب
الوس الأشقر الذي يقال له: أَنْتُم، صافين لأن لا يجيرون: فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا
عنهم، فقولهم أنهم لم يقفوا، فإن أَنْتُم، غاصين منهم لو جلس
العلم وله تكلم، إن لم تكنوا حتى أن يسوا، فأخبر فأنا لموَّنَّها كمور
نعم أن الزج مجرد لقربا، فهل الخضرة تكُن دير معروف مُردَّها كمور
بِنَّاءً يُقَرَّ فَلُوَّنَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ، فِي سَماَّهُ.
الله يُجِرَّهُ فِي بَلَدَة، أَنَّهُ يَقُولُ، فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا. فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا. فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا. فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا. فَلْسَة تاكَلَّمُوا. 

---
1) A. with redded 2) B. cor. to 3) Om. BD. 4) Ye.
5) T. V. 880 6) B marg. 7) B. clearly 8) B.
9) Om. BD 10) A. 11) In B after 12) A. 13) B. 14) B.
15) A. 16) B. 17) B. 18) A. 19) B.
في ما قال في كتابه "مما تذكره من الحديث" عن عبد الله بن يحيى بن عبد الله بن يح
عن حـمار من قتـم الاستكـانـدرية قـلـكُم علاءُ شـقاى ونـي لـساحب أسـب يطـير،
من بطـارقة الـرم، مـثل مـالك، لـان تذـهـب بـنـا حـتي تـنـظر الـمـى. الـعـرب الذي
يقابلنـا، كـثـر لـم نتـبـع. وعـلى صمـامٍ، ورـكـب بـشرَهـا سيـنـا كـبـر،
الـلـهـام، وركـبنا عـلى الأمام. حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
ما، كـلها عـلى الأمام. حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
مـعـطى عـلى هـا. وعـلى صمـامٍ، ورـكـب بـشرَهـا سـيـنـا كـبـر،
وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـتـى أـلا، مـن نـمو، كـلها حـتـى باـوراً على
"وـهـلـا". 4 أـلا، حـت~
لقد مرأنا نساءً دفنت أولهن بالكعبة، ثم دفنت بناتهن، ثم دفنت بنت بناتهن، ثم دفنت بنت بنات بناتهن، وهكذا إلى آخر الأرض.

الإجابة: نساء دفنت أولهن بالكعبة، ثم دفنت بناتهن، ثم دفنت بنت بناتهن، ثم دفنت بنت بنات بناتهن، وهكذا إلى آخر الأرض.

1) من مصر. 2) Following tradition omitted in A; wanting also in Maqr. 164. 3) O S. 4) D om. 5) B D om. 6) B D om. 7) B D om. 8) B D om. 9) B D om. 10) B D om. 11) CD B D om. 12) B D om. 13) So pointed by AB. 14) B D om. 15) B D om.
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لا يُضاف أي نص.
Cairo

stone, three of brick, which give the surface a striped look. It is possible that the Arabs, who were not builders when they came to Egypt, borrowed this construction technique from this fort and eventually developed it into a beautiful and sophisticated architectural decoration of their own — the striped walls which you can find in hundreds of mosques from Samarkand to Casablanca.

When we had returned to the top of the wall I asked Victor Gergis if there was any real relic of the Arab conquest left in the fort, since this was the place where Moslem Egypt began.

"No," he said. "Nothing monumental anyway. The Arabs preferred to start afresh, so they built their own little city just outside the walls of Babylon. Just over there." He pointed vaguely northward.

He was talking about Fustat — the town of the tent. Fustat became the Arab capital of Egypt, and the more fabulous part of Cairo's history begins almost from the moment that Amr Ibn el-As decided on the site and began to build his modest but very famous mosque, which is still standing, just outside the walls of Babylon.
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THE TREATY OF MİŞR IN ṬABARĪ

In returning to the very obscure and difficult subject of the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, I desire generally to correct any important error proved against my former work1 by well-founded criticism, to deal with, and if possible overthrow, certain objections which seem to be ill-founded, and to set out revised conclusions based on later reflection and research.

But the scope of this essay must be limited: and I cannot hope or pretend to give here such a list of corrections and additions as would be required if a second edition of Arab Conquest were demanded. No such demand is likely to come in my lifetime: and, the wider field of travel being forbidden, all I can do is to select some area which seems rich in opportunities for the kind of excursion which I propose. Such an area seems to be provided by the traditions which Ṭabarī has recorded in his great work, and to which I have not hitherto devoted the detailed study which possibly they merit, and in particular by the Treaty of MİŞR.2

2 The reference is to de Goeje's well-known edition of Ṭabarī. I have been justly criticized for using Zotenberg's edition, and that
THE TREATY OF MİSR

It may tend to clearness if these various traditions—or the chief of them—are set out in the order of Tabari, although that does not correspond to any order of chronology. As a rule a rough paraphrase or mere outline will suffice: where questions of importance arise, a literal translation will be given: and for the actual treaty the Arabic text must accompany its English rendering. The traditions are mainly seven in number—A, B, C, D, E, F, G—which I will give, each with its exordium.

A. Ibn Ishāk says, as said Ibn Humaid, that Salamah said on his authority, that:

Omar after subjugating the whole of Syria wrote to ‘Amr ibn al ‘Asī to march to Egypt with his army. So he set out, and captured Bāb al Yūn (Babylon) in the year A.H. 20. There is a difference of opinion concerning the date of the taking of Alexandria, some giving the year as A.H. 25.

B. Ibn Humaid says that Salamah says thus, on the authority of Ibn Ishāk, who says that Al Ḳasim (an Egyptian) ibn Ḳusman told him—on the authority of Ziyād ibn ‘Yazīd, who said he was in ‘Amr’s army when he took Miṣr and Alexandria—the following story:

We took Alexandria in the Caliphate of Othman in the year A.H. 21 or 22.

After the capture of Bāb al Yūn we captured gradually those villages of the Delta which were between us and Alexandria, one after another, till we reached Balḥib. Our prisoners had already reached Mecca, Medina, and Yemen at the time when we reached Balḥib: when the commander of Alexandria sent to ‘Amr, saying, ‘I have already paid tribute to Persian and Roman, whom I hate more than you Arabs. I will pay you tribute, if you please, provided that you restore the prisoners of Egypt whom you have taken.’

‘Amr answered, proposing in effect an armistice till he could consult Omar and get his reply upon the question: and this was agreed. They stayed at Balḥib till Omar’s answer came, when ‘Amr read it out. It refused to restore the prisoners who were already in Arab lands, as impracticable, but offered to allow all prisoners in ‘Amr’s custody a free choice between Christianity and Islam. These terms were accepted by the commander of Alexandria.

Thereupon the captives were all mustered, and each one had to pronounce in presence of the Arab army and a large gathering of Christians. Every decision was followed by shouts on one side or the other, the Arab cheers being louder than the cheers.

1 How could any Roman governor of Alexandria speak of having paid tribute to the Romans? That would imply that he was in revolt against the emperor. There is further no evidence whatever to connect any one occupying the position of governor or commander at this time with the period of Persian domination in Egypt.

2 This may be a reminiscence of the eleven months’ armistice recorded by John of Nikiou.
when a village is taken. The Arabs claimed that the great majority chose Islam.

Al Kāsim (the contemporary soldier) says: 'Among the prisoners was 'Abdallah ibn 'Abd ar Raḥmān abū Maryām, who in my lifetime became chief of the Banū Zubaid. When we gave him the choice between Islam and Christianity, though his father, mother, and brothers were among the Christians, he chose Islam, and we transferred him to us. Then his father, mother, and brothers sprang out upon him, assailing us with abuse, and they tore his garments. But he became our chief, as you may see this day.'

'After this Alexandria surrendered and we entered it... He who thinks otherwise, viz. that Alexandria and the cities round about were not brought under tribute, and that there was no treaty with the inhabitants, by Allah he is a liar.'

Note. This tradition claims to be derived from a soldier of the conquest. It insists that Alexandria was surrendered under treaty, and it has some points of correspondence with the history of John of Nikiou. But it begins with the capture of Babylon and says nothing about any treaty there.

C. Taḥbārī writes that Saif says in the letter which As Sarī wrote to me (Taḥbārī) that Shu'aib informed him on [Ibn Ishāq's] authority and that of Ar Raḥba and that of Abū 'Uthmān and that of Abū Ḥārithah, as follows:

1 De Goeje, p. 2584.

IN ṬABARĪ

Omar remained at Jerusalem after making the treaty of peace there, and sent 'Amr to Egypt. He also sent Zubair in support.

Note. Here the authorities go back from Sarī, contemporary with Taḥbārī, to Abū 'Uthmān, who died some seventy to eighty years after the subjugation of Egypt. It is obvious that very many links in this chain of tradition are missing: nor is there anything to show what documentary evidence, if any, was available to Sarī when he made his communication in writing, or to what extent he relied on mere oral tradition.

D. As Sarī has written to me on the authority of Shu'aib on the authority of Saif, who says Abū 'Uthmān has told us on the authority of Khalīd ibn Miḍān and 'Ubādah,1 as follows:

"'Amr set out to Egypt after Omar returned to Medina,2 and marched till he came to Bāb al Yūn. Zubair followed, and they joined forces. Here Abū Maryām, the katholikos of Miṣr, met them, with him being the bishop [Abū Maryām] and the officials, he [the katholikos] having been sent by Al Muṣākūkīs to protect their country."

There was fighting then between these people and 'Amr, who proposed a parley, details of which are given by Taḥbārī.3 But the dialogue is too lengthy for useful quotation, and the next words seem to

1 Khalīd died 103 or 103 a.h., and 'Ubādah 119 a.h.
2 This obviously disagrees with C.
3 pp. 2585–6.
record a story of treachery as follows: 'Quite suddenly a raid was made on 'Amr and Zubair at night by Farkab. 'Amr was prepared, and met him; he and all his followers were killed.' Ibn al Athir says 'the tribune was killed', which implies that Farkab was the military tribune. But the story is very confused, and continues thus:

'Amr and Zubair marched straight for 'Ain Shams; in it were a large number of them (the enemy). 'Amr sent Abrahah ibn as Sabbah to Al Farama, and 'Auf ibn Malik to Alexandria, and he encamped against it. Then each of them said to the men of his city, "If you capitulate, you shall have the status of protection at our hands," and so forth.

Note. This tradition like the last appears to hang upon the evidence of Tabari's contemporary Sari, and a weak chain behind him. The same is true of the following traditions, E and F.

E. As Sari has written to me (Tabari) on the authority of Shu'ail, on the authority of Saif, on the authority of Abū 'Uthmān and Abū Harithah, that these two said as follows:

When 'Amr encamped against the people at 'Ain Shams, the rule was between the Copts and the Nubians. Zubair came with him. Then said the people of Miṣr to their king, "Why do you go out

against a people which has smitten Chosroes and Caesar (Heraclius) and vanquished them in their countries? Make terms with the people and get a treaty from them and do not expose yourself to them nor us to them."

'And this was on the fourth day.'

What is meant by the fourth day is not clear: probably the fourth day of a truce, which seems to be referred to above (pp. 2586-7). Fighting followed: Zubair mounted the wall of the fortress and descended among them by force, while the people from within the fortress are described as issuing out of the gate to make terms with 'Amr.

The terms of the treaty of peace are now given textually: and--

All the people of Miṣr accepted this treaty, and the horses were collected: 'Amr founded Fustāṣ, and the Muslims stayed there. Abū Maryam and Abū Maryām appeared and spoke to 'Amr about the prisoners captured after the battle (?) Helipolis.

Then follows the well-known story of the Muslim meal and the Egyptian banquet, with other matter neither clear nor important.

F. As Sari has written to me on the authority of Shu'ail on the authority of Saif on the authority of Abū Sa'id ar Rabī'a ibn an Numān on the authority of 'Amr ibn Shu'ail, as follows:

When 'Amr and Al Mukaukis met at 'Ain Shams and their cavalry began to fight, there were signs of insubordination in the Muslim ranks, and the Muslims

p. 2592.
were very hard pressed for a while, though in the end they won a complete victory. . . . ‘Miṣr was captured during the first Rabī’ in the year 16 and the sovereignty of Islam rose therein.’

G. ‘Alī ibn Ṣaḥḥ informs me saying, Al Wālid ibn Muslim has related that Ibn Lahīṭah told him on the authority of Yasīd ibn Ḥabīb that:

‘When the Muslims had conquered Egypt, they sent an expedition to Egyptian Nubia’—and the expedition clearly was a failure.

p. 2593.

Having now sketched out the main traditions with which we are concerned, I come to a discussion of the treaty. The tradition in which it occurs depends on the letter of Ṭabarî’s contemporary Sārī, who got it from Shu‘aib, Shu‘aib from Saif (who died about 180 A.H.), and he from Abū ‘Uthmān (who died about 100 A.H.). But these narrators can hardly have repeated the text of the treaty, which Sārī professes to give and which he may have got from an independent source. It is even possible that he or some informant may have seen an original document or a copy. On the other hand, there are certain obscurities and difficulties, both in the form and in the substance of the treaty, which suggest that it has suffered from a process of handing down, whether by word of mouth or by written record. Dr. Stanley Lane-Poole thinks that, speaking, the treaty bears on its face the seal of its own authenticity: but the words giving the total of the poll-tax and the method of its payment, as well as some other points, seem by their uncertainty to denote at least the hand of a copyist. We know that some early treaties were preserved: Omar is said to have had a box full of them. They were probably executed in duplicate, so that one copy at least remained with the conquered people; and in this case either the original or a copy may conceivably have been seen by Ṭabarî, or rather by Sārī his informant, 300 years later. But it requires a somewhat robust faith to believe, as Dr. Lane-Poole seems to believe, in the verbal inspiration of the text.
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However, if the Treaty of Mişr is genuine, I must grant that Tabari associates it very closely with the fall of Babylon and not with the surrender of Alexandria. Consequently, if Tabari is right, I was wrong, as Dr. Lane-Poole alleges, in calling it the Treaty of Alexandria and in identifying it with the very important Treaty of Alexandria given by John of Nikiou.

I propose, however, to reserve this question of the genuineness of the treaty in Tabari to a later stage in the argument: to take Tabari's version of events as it stands; and to discuss

i. The time and place of the treaty:
ii. The parties to the treaty:
iii. The meaning of the treaty:
iv. The authenticity of the treaty:
and v. The identity of Al Muṣkaṭis.

1. The moment at which the treaty was made and the place.

On these matters there is little room for doubt, if Tabari is to be believed. Tabari's story is as follows. There had been at some point a parley between the belligerents and a truce for four or five days, which ended in the decision of the Romans to reject the Muslim terms; and there is some evidence that the truce was broken on the fourth day treacherously. Fighting was renewed; but how long the siege lasted after this rupture Tabari does not record. Victory, however, determined in favour of the Arabs at a moment when Zubair scaled the walls and

fought his way down into the fortress. At the same moment tokens of surrender had been made, and some of the defenders were on their way out to arrange a capitulation. Zubair and his victorious following joined the envoys of the garrison, and accompanied them through the fortress gate to 'Amr's presence. Thereupon the brief but solemn treaty of peace was drawn up and attested by Zubair himself and his two sons, 'Abdallah and Muhammad. Such is the somewhat unconvincing story.

There can be no question that the incident is described as relating to the surrender of the Castle of Babylon or Kaşr ash Shama'. Dr. Lane-Poole in his account of the matter remarks that Tabari does not name the fortress or city wall which Zubair scaled. True; but other Muslim writers leave no shadow of doubt. They name the fortress Babylon: they give the point at which the assault was made: and Zubair's scaling-ladder was long preserved at Fustat as a relic of the siege. Moreover, Dr. Lane-Poole himself, in citing Maqrizi's account, says:—

'Fighting with the garrison of Babylon was accordingly renewed: but finally Al Muṣkaṭis persuaded the people that resistance was hopeless, and 'Amr's terms were accepted.' He urges, however, that 'the capture of the fort, i.e. the capture of the castle, al-ṣāḥīb, i.e. Babylon. He bases this conclusion upon the supposed discrepancy between the date given by John of Nikiou for the surrender of the fortress of Babylon, i.e. 9 April, 641 (which date is unimpeachable), and Maqrizi's statement that the negotiations between

1 P. R. I. A., p. 240.
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1 P. R. I. A., p. 242.

2 P. R. I. A., p. 245.
'Amr and Al Muqaukis began at Raudah at the time of high Nile, which would be about six months earlier. But I think the discrepancy does not lie here. We know that the negotiations failed and the war continued: but there is no warrant for compressing the duration of the renewed struggle into a few days instead of six months. The endeavour is made in order to identify the negotiations as described by Makrizi with the four days' truce mentioned by Tabari. But this truce almost certainly occurred shortly after the arrival of the reinforcements under Zubair. It is true that just before this event the fact is recorded that 'Amr set out for Egypt and marched till he came to Bab al Yun': but this, taken as a general description of the march, is not inconsistent with the insertion of detail which follows, nor with the fact (which seems established) that Zubair joined 'Amr's army before it had reached Babylon. I therefore regard this parley and the four days' truce as a quite distinct incident from the Raudah negotiations at the time of high Nile, and as having occurred some weeks earlier, and prior to 'Amr's arrival at Babylon. So I disagree with Dr. Lane-Poole's statement where he says: 'According to Tabari, after the Arabs had reached Babylon, there came to meet them on the part of Al Muqaukis a patriarch (gathalab catholicus) and a bishop... This was before reinforcements had reached the Muslims.' On the contrary, Tabari says: 'Zubair followed, and they joined forces. Here Abu Maryam, the katholikos of Misr, met them,' with him being the bishop,' and again 'Amr and Zubair marched straight for 'Ain Shams'.

But the accounts, both in Tabari and in Makrizi, are so wanting in clearness and precision that the construction of any continuous narrative or orderly sequence of events must admittedly be largely a matter of remote inference or even conjecture.

Dr. Lane-Poole, however, in order to uphold his theory has to connect the treaty, not with the fall of Babylon, i.e. Kasr ash Shama, but with the fall of a fort on the ridge of rocky ground to the south, on which, according to Strabo, there stood in his day a fort originally erected by the Persians some 500 years earlier. This attempt to deprive Trajan's fortress of its well-known name of Babylon assumes the survival of the old original Persian fort in the seventh century, an assumption which rests upon no proof whatever, but is contradicted by explicit evidence of the Arab historians. It might suffice to say that Abu 'l Ma'hasin definitely calls the fortress Kasr ash Shama, while Makrizi agrees with other writers in stating that the fortress was opposite the island of Raudah, as Dr. Lane-Poole himself admits. No other fortress but Trajan's (or Kasr ash Shama) corresponds in any way with this description, and the suggested identification of the fortress in Tabari with the Istabl Antar is altogether impossible. Indeed, it is a mistake into which no one familiar

1 De Goeje, p. 2586.
3 P. R. I. A., p. 244.
4 This identification occurs in Dr. Lane-Poole's Cairo Fifty Years Ago, pp. 146-7, to which he refers (Murray, 1896).
with the topography of the region could possibly fall; and Lane's evidence proves at most the existence of a Roman embankment at the foot of the ridge. There is not a single trace of any ancient building upon the ridge. Severus, too, expressly says: 'The Arabs... arrived at a fortress built of stone, situated between Upper Egypt and the Delta and called Babylon... Then the Arabs called that place, namely the fortress, Babūn al Fustāt and that is its name to this day.' Severus uses the terms حصن and قصر indifferently, and I venture to say that there is no warrant whatever for distinguishing them. Dr. Lane-Poole says: 'The capture of the fort, the الحصن, must evidently be distinguished from the fall of the castle... Makrīzī mentions another fortress besides Kašr ash Shama... and this other fortress which was situated on a rocky hill to the south-east of Kašr ash Shama, and was within the city, was particularly called the fortress or palace قصر of Babylon.' What is the authority for this statement? It may rest on the mistaken evidence of Al Kuḍāī, which Makrīzī cites, but admits to be at variance with the much higher authority of Ibn 'Abd al Hakam.3

But M. Casanova, in his learned edition of Makrīzī lends countenance to a theory at once similar and dissimilar to that of Dr. Lane-Poole. Commenting on the statement in Makrīzī's text that the Muslims laid siege to Bab al Yūn, in which were Romans, Copts, and the Muḥqāqīs, Casanova writes:—'Cette tradition, en effet, semble en contradiction avec la première. Mais il est à remarquer qu'il s'agit cette fois de Bab aliūn, et puisque ce nom subsiste encore, il faut en conclure qu'il y a eu deux sièges distincts, celui de Kašr ash Cham' et celui de Bab aliūn'; and he goes on to say that Strabo's description excludes the Kašr ash Shama, while it fits the height of the modern Babūn, 'qui est très escarpée du côté du Nil', thus assuming the existence of the old fort at the conquest. So he makes two sieges and two forts: but whereas Dr. Lane-Poole says that the ḥisn was Kašr ash Shama, while the kašr was on the rocky ridge, Casanova says that the ḥisn was the fortified enclosure of the town, while 'le kašr désigne tout particulièrement la forteresse de Babylone'. But I confess that I find his reasoning hard to follow. For at one moment he says that Kašr ash Shama, 'qui représentait la ville, fut prise de vive force,' and the next that 'le ḥisn répondrait mieux à la ville même'; and when he charges me with failing to see the difference between the two forts and the two Arab traditions, and of error in describing Kašr ash Shama as 'the Roman fortress of Babylone', I stand not only impudent but more convinced than ever that my description is correct, that the name Babylon was applied to Kašr ash Shama as well as to the town of Miṣr, that Bab al Yūn or Bab aliūn is a mere blunder for 'Babylone',

1 Casanova, p. 121 n.
2 Casanova, p. 121 n. I pointed out the difference between Strabo's fort and Kašr ash Shama' built by Trajan, at least twenty years before Casanova's work was published, viz., in my Ancien Copte Churches, vol. i, pp. 171-4. The charge against me therefore is not very well founded.
and that in all the hazy and confused statements about the fortress made by the Arab historians, the reference is to Каšr ash Shama’ and not to the early Persian fort, of which no trace remained at the conquest.

For Makrizi himself definitely calls the fortress хишн. He identifies the site, rightly or wrongly, with that of an early Persian fort, which, he says, lay in ruins 500 years before the Romans rebuilt it. Moreover, he quotes Ibn ‘Abd al Ḥakam in the same connexion as saying that ‘the Persians founded the fortress (хишн) which is to-day at Fustat Miṣr’: and he further cites Al Kuḍa’i as remarking of the Каšr ash Shama’ that it was begun by the Persians, but finished by the Romans, who held it till the Arab conquest.

Now two things are clear from this: (1) that at the date of the conquest, i.e. some seven centuries after Strabo’s time, all trace of the original Persian fort had vanished, and (2) that Arab writers identify, however mistakenly, the site of the two fortresses, the Persian and the Roman, and not only fail to distinguish them, but are not conscious that any question of a distinction could arise. That Zubair’s exploit is connected with Каšr ash Shama’ by them, is certain: and if, as Casanova urges, the fortress in question were Strabo’s fortress on the steep ridge,

1 Casanova, p. 181.

1 This, of course, is wrong. Something at least of the old Persian fort survived in Strabo’s time, and Каšr ash Shama’ was built by Trajan. Yet it is quite possible, indeed very probable, that Trajan found Persian remains, whether of temple or fort, on the site of Каšr ash Shama’, as the stories of Muradī and Yakūt indicate.

the incident of ‘Ubādah, which turns on Roman horsemen issuing from the fortress gate and being chased back to it, would be impossible even of invention—it would be too ludicrous. Makrizi, however, not only connects the fortress of the conquest with the island of the arsenal or Raudah, but he says that boats were moored against this fortress. It is absolutely impossible to apply such a description to any fortress but Каšr ash Shama’; that it was true of Каšr ash Shama’ is proved by the whole tenor of the Arab stories of the siege, and the proof has been confirmed and rendered visible lately by the excavations which have revealed the channel or waterway and small quay at the very foot of the Iron Gate of the fortress. Lastly, I would urge that even if a detached fort existed on the ridge, the capture of such a secondary position could not be the determining factor in the operations round Miṣr, so long as the huge and immensely powerful fortress erected by Trajan—the fortress in which the Roman commander had his head-quarters—still defied the Muslim arms.

Both the military exigencies of the case, therefore, and the records of the Arab historians point to Каšr ash Shama’ as that castle of Babylon which they represent as capitulating under the Treaty of Miṣr. Indeed the evidence of their intention is so

2 Casanova, p. 119.

2 Casanova remarks, in objecting to my contention—‘Il serait étrange qu’une forteresse fut en plaine et immédiatement dominée par une hauteur.’ To this I reply, that the strangeness does not alter the fact, and that it would be much more strange if boats were moored to a fortress on the top of a hill.
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overwhelming, that any other theory is untenable: although I must assert with emphasis that the question what the Arab historians intended to represent is totally different from the question whether their representation of the facts is correct. And while I think Ṭabarī's opinion very clear, I think it no less mistaken, as will be shown.

II. The Parties to the Treaty.

Granted that the treaty is genuine, it bears its own witness to the fact that it was made between 'Amr, the commander of the Arab forces, and the people of Miṣr in general.

It is also clear that, according to Ṭabarī, the treaty was made on the side of the people of Miṣr by plenipotentiaries who came out of the fortress, in other words by the defenders of the fortress. Unfortunately in the early Muslim treaties it was not the practice for both parties to set their hand to the instrument. The signing, sealing, and delivering was all done by the Muslims: and the treaty is rather a grant of security and protection conditional upon terms to be observed than a deed of mutual covenants solemnly entered into and executed between two parties. Hence in this case there is nothing in the document to show who actually negotiated the treaty on behalf of the people of Miṣr, and the question can only be settled by external evidence.

Dr. Lane-Poole says boldly: ¹ 'It is abundantly evident that this is a treaty with the Copts, not with the Romans. . . . The people of Miṣr, not the Roman army of occupation, still less the emperor

¹ P. R. I. A., p. 239.
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Heraclius, were the contracting parties on the other side. As there is no indication in the treaty itself that the Romans were consulted in the matter, we must conclude that this treaty was made behind their backs; that it was a compact between the Copts and the Arabs without the authority of the Roman garrison, though these last had the option of accepting the same terms.' Again,² 'It was, as is evident, a treaty with the Copts of the city of Miṣr as against the Romans: once more; ³ 'Ṭabarī's story fits perfectly with the contents of the treaty, which is thus shown to be a treaty with the Egyptian people against the wish of the Roman army of occupation:; and finally, ³ In each story' (i.e. Ṭabarī's and Makrizī's) 'it is essentially a treaty with the Copts, not with the Romans.'

Now what is the justification for all this? It is neither more nor less than the fact that to the people of Miṣr was conveyed the grant of security under the treaty. Starting with that fact, Dr. Lane-Poole lays down the proposition that the people of Miṣr were Copts: he then argues that the Copts were hostile to the Romans, and that consequently the treaty was made in favour of the Copts: and he concludes that the treaty, being in favour of the Copts, was not only 'without the authority of the Romans', but 'against the Romans' and 'behind their backs'. Such is the logical process, which now has to be examined.

Who were the people of Miṣr? In the first place, as Dr. Lane-Poole remarks, the term Miṣr has a double meaning—the capital city and the country of Egypt
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—and we do not even know for certain which was intended. But he adduces the analogy of other early Muslim treaties—those of Damascus, Lydda, and Jerusalem—and argues that the practice of the Arabs was to make a treaty, upon the capture of a chief town, with the townsfolk. Accordingly Miṣr in the present case should be taken as meaning the city of Miṣr, which lay over and spread beyond the region now miscalled Old Cairo, though it seems to have been identified loosely at times with the ancient Memphis and its environs on both banks of the Nile. How far the city of Miṣr extended at the time of the conquest, and what fortifications it had besides Kašr ash Shama', cannot be known. But there is evidence that it extended somewhat widely. The outpost of 'Umm Dunain (the Tendounias of John of Nikiou) lay at a point now represented by the Esbekiah in Cairo, and the very ancient churches in the Ḥārat ar Rūm and Ḥārat az Zuwallāh were apparently considered within the old city of Miṣr, as Abū Šāliḥ seems to indicate; and the same writer also describes the city of 'Ain Shams as lying outside the city of Miṣr. But there is no evidence of any wide circumvallation: for the battle of 'Ain Shams and the fall of Tendounias seem to have been followed quickly by the Arab occupation of Miṣr and the siege of the formidable fortress of Babylon. Here the resistance of the Romans was concentrated: but it is quite certain that there was also a large population in the city of Miṣr.

Of what race or creed was this population? The answer is plain—Egyptian—though there was doubtless some small admixture of Jews, Arabs, Berbers, and Nubians. But it must be remembered that the Egyptians at this time, though all Christian, were of two races and two creeds, viz. by race either Copts or Graeco-Romans (Byzantines), by creed either monophysites or melkites. But the racial cleavage by no means coincided with the religious division: in other words a Roman might hold the Coptic form of faith, and a Copt might hold the melkite (or Roman or Chalcedonian) form.

Now if there is one thing indisputable in all this tangled story, it is that for the ten years preceding the time of the Arab invasion, and at that time, the Copts suffered the severest persecution at the hands of Cyrus, the nominee of Heraclius as patriarch of Alexandria and governor-general of Egypt. It is certain also that the Copts had neither bishop nor leader in the city of Miṣr, since their patriarch and all their prominent men had been driven into exile into the mountains and deserts. Whatever the relative number of the Copts might have been—even if they were as numerous at this military centre as the Romans and Roman sympathizers—it is not conceivable that there should have existed then in the city of Miṣr a body of Copts in a position to enter upon a treaty with the victorious Arabs.

Apart from this, however, one must not exaggerate the distinction between Copt and Roman. It must be remembered that the Graeco-Romans at this time

---

2 pp. 86–7, and notes: but the matter is not clear of doubt.
3 Note that John of Nikiou in his chapter-headings clearly distinguishes the capture of Miṣr from the fall of Babylon.
were not an alien army of occupation, as Dr. Lane-Poole seems to imagine them. The country had been Graeco-Roman for 700 years, and for centuries longer if we date the mixture of race, as is right, to the early Greek settlements and trace it through Ptolemaic times. It was the Hellenes, and not the Italians, who contributed and maintained that element of the population which came to be called in later times Roman or Byzantine. And during all those centuries there had been a continuous mingling of the two races; so that although the Egyptian racial type probably prevailed by reason of that unchangeable and invincible vitality which has ever marked it, yet the dominant civilization of the country at this time was Hellenic, whether called Byzantine or Graeco-Roman; and from Pelusium to Barca, from Alexandria to Syene and Meroe, the land was covered with cities bearing Graeco-Roman names—cities in which the arts, the architecture, the language and the letters were far more Graeco-Roman than Coptic.

Nor is there any reason to think that the city of Misr or city of Babylon, as it was also called, presented any exception to the rule.

To say therefore that by the term people of Misr only the Copts could be meant, is to make a quite baseless and unwarranted assumption.

But there are other obvious objections. A good deal of the confusion caused by the use of the term Copts in the Arab historians springs from the fact that the term did not originally bear the precise and limited meaning which it now bears in common parlance. There is no doubt that at the time of the conquest the Arabs frequently used the term Copts as synonymous with Egyptians, i.e. as denoting the people of Egypt generally, and that a distinction between the Coptic and the Graeco-Roman elements in the population was not ordinarily present to their minds. Of course if a special reinforcement of imperial troops entered Egypt at any time by order of Heraclius, those troops would be called distinctively Roman by the Arabs, and are perhaps so referred to in the Treaty of Misr, in which—be it remarked—the Copts are not even mentioned. But that the Graeco-Roman inhabitants, as well as the Coptic, were often included under the term Copts is unquestionable.

This fact explains much that is otherwise inexplicable. For instance, Dr. Lane-Poole quotes Makrizi as saying that Al Mukaukis ‘left the fortress of Babylon in company with the leaders of the Copts’, and crossed to the island of Raudah. Whoever Al Mukaukis was, he was the Roman governor of Egypt: and it is certain from John of Nikiou that the Copts within the fortress during the siege were actually in prison, and were barbarously treated by the Romans. Again Ṭabarī records a representation in favour of peace made by the people of Misr to their king (مَلِك مِسْر). This king cannot possibly mean Heraclius, who is called Caesar in the same passage, and can only mean ruler, i.e. the viceroy Al
Mukaukis. And that meaning is placed beyond doubt by the words of Mas'udi, who calls Al Mukaukis king of Mısır and lord of the Copts, and says that he used to spend part of the year in Alexandria, part in the city of Menf or Memphis, part in Kaşr ash Shama. Now it is clearly ridiculous to speak of Al Mukaukis as king or ruler of the Copts as opposed to the Romans, or in any other sense than as ruler of the Egyptians. Indeed that supposition is refuted by Dr. Lane-Poole's own words, where he gives Makrizi's story as follows:

"Fearing that the fortresses would fall, he (Al Mukaukis) opened negotiations with the Arabs. He urged that the Romans were far more numerous and better equipped than the Muslims. . . . But Al Mukaukis could obtain no modification of the terms. Fighting with the garrison of Babylon was accordingly renewed; but finally Al Mukaukis persuaded the people that resistance was hopeless, and 'Amr's terms were accepted—a poll-tax of two dinars a head, &c.'

Clearly here Al Mukaukis was speaking as representative not of Copts but of Romans. I need not labour the point: but I pass on to another of even greater importance. If the treaty is genuine, it was a military convention between belligerents marking the surrender of a great Roman stronghold: and it is sheer absurdity to imagine that the Copts, who had no separate existence as a belligerent party, could have arranged such a convention in their own favour 'behind the backs of the Romans' and 'against the Romans'.

---

1 II. 412, ed. Barbier de Meynard.  
2 P.R.I.A., p. 244.
III. The Meaning of the Treaty

It remains now to give the text of the treaty and to consider its interpretation. Dr. Lane-Poole points out very justly its close correspondence with the earlier treaty, which was granted by the Caliph Omar at the capitulation of Jerusalem, and he remarks that 'Amr ibn al 'Aṣî, who made the Treaty of Miṣr, was present and subscribed the Treaty of Jerusalem as witness: moreover the two treaties 'contain not only practically identical clauses but even absolutely identical words and phrases': 'Amr therefore modelled the Treaty of Miṣr on the Treaty of Jerusalem. I propose further to follow Dr. Lane-Poole in setting out both the treaties, though on the comparison I shall have to base some conclusions quite at variance with his.

The Arabic text is as follows (De Goeje, p. 2588):

الله الرحمن الرحيم هنا ما أعطى عمو دو العاصي
اهل مصر في الإسلام على اذغتهم ومعاتم واموالهم
وكناكمش ومسليم وودهم ويخركم لا يدخل عليكم شيء
من ذلك ولا يتعمل ولا يسبكم النوب وعليهم أهل
مصر ان يقطوا الجمهور انا احتسب على هذه الصلح
واحتسب زياده دارهم خمسين الف ألف ومعهم ما جنبي
لصرحهم فان أبي احب من ان يجيب من رفع عنهم
من الإجراء فقد بهم وياتعنا مهن أبي ديدا وان فص
دربه من غايته انا انتهى رفع عنهم بعده ذلك ومس
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دخل في صلحهم من الروم والتواب فله مثل ما لهم
وعليه مثل ما عليهم ومن ابي واختار الذهب في
آس حتى يبلغ مأتمه أو يخرج من سلطاننا عليهم ما
عليهم اثناً في كل ثلاث جباية ثلاث ما عليهم
على ما في هذا الكتاب عهد الله ونعتنا ونعت
وذة الخليفه امبر المؤمنين ونعت المؤمنين ونعت
النوبة الذي استجابوا ان يعنوا بكذا وكذا رأسا وكذا
فبرًا على ان لا يغروا ولا يبشعوا من تجارتنا صادرة ولا
وأرية شهد بذلك الزعيم عبد الله وخيص ابناء

One may translate as follows:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.

1. This is what 'Amr ibn al 'Aṣî granted the people of Miṣr—to wit, security for their persons and their religion and their property, their churches and their crosses, their land and their water. In none of these things shall there be any encroachment nor any abatement of their rights.1

Dr. Lane-Poole translates doubtfully ‘There shall not be taken from them anything of this nor diminished’. He quotes De Sacy's rendering: ‘On n'attentera à leurs droits relativement à aucune de ces choses et on ne leur fera éprouver aucun tort.’ Mémoires de l'Institut (Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres), v. 35. Caetani renders, ‘In nuina di queste cose entrerà (il governo Arabo) e nulla sarà tolto’ (Annali dell'Islam, vol. iv, p. 504). I am following Caetani in numbering the clauses of the treaty for the sake of convenience, just as he follows my numbering for the Treaty of Alexandria given by John of Nikû.
2. The Nubians shall not settle among them.

3. The people of Misr are bound to pay the poll-tax, if they agree upon this treaty of peace and the inundation of their river has reached full level—fifty millions.

4. They are responsible for any acts of their brigands.

5. If any of them refuse [the terms of the treaty], the total of the poll-tax shall be reduced for them in proportion; and we are free of obligation to protect those who refuse.

6. If their river does not rise to its usual level, then the sum [of taxation] shall be reduced for them in proportion.

7. Whosoever of the Romans or the Nubians enters into their treaty, for him are the same rights as for them (i.e. the people of Misr) and the same obligations.

8. Whosoever refuses [these terms] and chooses to depart, he shall be safe until he reaches his own place of security or quits our dominion.

9. The tribute imposed is to be paid by three equal installments, one-third at each payment.

10. For what is written in this treaty stands the pledge and warranty of God, the warranty of His Prophet, the warranty of the Caliph, the Commander of the Faithful, and the warranty of the Faithful.

11. For the Nubians who come under this treaty, it is prescribed that they shall furnish so many head (of cattle) and so many horses; and in return they shall not be plundered nor hindered in their trade, coming or going.

Witnesses, Az Zubair and 'Abdallah and Muhammad, his sons. Waradan wrote the treaty, and there were present . . . (so and so—names omitted).

Such is the Treaty of Misr. I now give the Treaty of Jerusalem, mainly in Dr. Lane-Poole's translation:

In the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful.

1. This is what the servant of God, Omar, Commander of the Faithful, gave to the people of Jerusalem in pledge of security. He gave them security for their persons and their goods and their churches and their crosses, and its sick and its sound, and all of their religion: their churches shall not be impoverished or destroyed; nor shall [ought] of it be diminished, neither of its appurtenances nor of its crosses nor of anything of its provisions. And they shall not be forced against their faith, and not one of them shall be harmed.

2. None of the Jews shall dwell with them in Jerusalem.

3. The people of Jerusalem are bound to pay the poll-tax as the people of Madain (Ctesiphon) pay it.

4. They are bound to expel the Romans and brigands from [the city].

---

1 The Arabic denotes the other side of the bargain: i.e. they gain immunity from plunder and freedom to trade.

2 No son of Zubair named Muhammad is known to history.

3 The use of pronouns here and elsewhere is irregular, but the sense is generally clear.
5. Whosoever [of the Romans, &c.] goes away, shall be safe in person and property until they reach their own place of safety; and whoever remains shall be safe and under the same obligation as the people of Jerusalem to pay the poll-tax.

6. Whosoever of the people of Jerusalem prefers to take his goods and to depart along with the Romans, and leave their churches and crosses, they shall be safe in person until they reach their own place of security.

7. Whosoever of the people of the country was in Jerusalem before the fighting, if he wish to settle, on him is binding the like as what [is binding] on the people of Jerusalem, the poll-tax; and if he wishes to depart with the Romans or to return to his own people [he may do so].

8. Nothing shall be taken from them [i.e. the people of the treaty] until the harvest is gathered.

9. For what is in this treaty stands the pledge and warranty of God, the warranty of His Prophet, the warranty of the Caliph, and the warranty of the Faithful, provided that they pay the due amount of the poll-tax.

Witnesses, Khalid ibn Walid, 'Amr ibn al 'Asi, 'Abd ar Rahmân ibn 'Âsî, and Mu'âwîah ibn Abî Sufân.

Though on the whole I have taken Dr. Lane-Poole's translation, I have thought it better to arrange and number the clauses, and in cl. 1 to 6 I have made verbal changes; but in cl. 7 and 8 I have given what I think is the right translation in correction of Dr. Lane-Poole's rendering, which seems to miss the sense completely—indeed to make no sense at all. He renders:

'And whoso of the people of the land was in it [Jerusalem] before the fighting, if he wish to settle, on him is binding the like as what [is binding] on the people of Jerusalem, a poll-tax, and if he wishes to depart with the Romans or to return to his own people, nothing shall be taken from them [i.e. in poll-tax] until the harvest is reaped.'

Either the words 'and if he wishes to depart with the Romans or to return to his own people' are redundant and should go out of the text; or after them must be understood words like 'he is free to do so'; or, as I think better, the text must be rendered in the way I have rendered it. In any case a break is required before the words about the collection of the poll-tax, which must be marked off and stand apart, because they obviously apply not to those who depart, but to all who come under the treaty. And this provision for collecting the tribute after harvest clearly corresponds to the provision in the Egyptian treaty for the collection after high Nile.

Returning now to the Treaty of Miṣr, one may note that the first clause grants security for the persons, property, and religion of the Christians, thus agreeing with the first clause in the Treaty of Jerusalem.

In cl. 2 I read a similar agreement: for just as the Treaty of Jerusalem prohibits the Jews from dwelling in the Holy City, so the Treaty of Miṣr prohibits the Nubians from settling in Miṣr. But Dr. Lane-Poole will have none of this agreement. He destroys the obvious correspondence by banishing
the Nubians altogether from the treaty, reading the Arabic نُومَيْن (which means Nubians) as نُومَيْن and giving it the entirely novel meaning of garrisons: so that he renders cl. 2, 'The garrisons shall not settle among them.' I shall try to show that this rendering is not only wrong but impossible.

Of course I admit that the analogy between the case of the Jews at Jerusalem and that of the Nubians in Egypt at the date of the respective treaties is not very striking. When the Treaty of Jerusalem was concluded, it was but twenty years since the Christians had suffered the massacre by thousands of their women and children, and the plunder and destruction of their churches, at the hands of the Persians; and they remembered that in all this work the Jews had sided with the Persians and had goaded them on to deeds of ferocity. The Christians, therefore, had good reason to bargain for the expulsion of the Jews from the city. Now it cannot be shown that the people of Mısır had the same reason to bargain for the exclusion of the Nubians from their city; but it can be shown that they had quite sufficient reason to claim protection against the Nubians, and to debar Nubians from settling in the country. Nothing more is required for my argument.

1 On the mere question of grammar نُومَيْن may be accented as نُومَيْن, but there is no authority for its use in the sense of garrisons at so early a date, even if it was ever used with that extended meaning. It means literally times or turns, and so turns-about, à tour de rôle; and then in later usage something like a change of guard, or finally a guard-post subject to relief at stated times. But Dossy, whom Dr. Lane-Poole cites in support of his rendering, is altogether against it: q.v.

Dr. Lane-Poole refers to Tabari's statement (or rather tradition) that 'when the Arabs reached 'Ain Shams, the rule was between the Copts and the Nubians,' and contends that it is unintelligible; whereas if it be rendered 'between the Copts and the garrisons', and if the garrisons are identified with the Romans, then all is lucid.

Now in the first place I see no difficulty whatever in accepting the obvious sense, 'between the Copts and the Nubians.' One has only to remember that politically Nubia at this time was a powerful and populous kingdom under its own rulers and practically independent of the Roman dominion: while geographically it was conterminous and continuous with Egypt and formed an essential part of the Nile country, with undefined frontiers, or frontiers defined only at a single frontier post, Syene. Nubia even to-day is called the Egyptian Sudan, and what is more likely than that it was pictured in the mind of the early Arab historians as part of Egypt? Indeed, that Tabari so looked upon Nubia is absolutely proved by his own language in this very account of the conquest of Egypt; for he says later—'When the Muslims had conquered Egypt, they sent an expedition against Egyptian Nubia.' This corresponds to our phrase the Egyptian Sudan. Clearly to Tabari then as to us Nubia formed part of Egypt; and he or his informant might say with perfect accuracy that the rule in Egypt was divided between the Egyptians and the Nubians.

1 See Trad. E, p. 12 supra.
3 There is abundant evidence to show that in Roman times even
THE TREATY OF MİŞR

It may be asked, were the relations between Nubia and Egypt proper at this time such as to justify the expression? Upon this point Dr. Lane-Poole makes a most astounding statement. 'We read', he says, 'nothing in history about Nubian influence or Nubian settlements in Egypt at least since the Ethiopian dynasty of thirteen hundred years before.' Allegando bonus dormitorial Homer us; but of all the extraordinary statements ever made by a scholar and historian surely this is one of the strangest and the farthest from the truth.

In making it Dr. Lane-Poole apparently is thinking of the Meroitic dynasty of about 750 B.C., when Nubia was the centre of a great empire, in which Egypt was a mere province. But then and through a long series of reigns the culture and religion of the royal family and of the priests was derived from Egypt. The Meroitic era proper began in the third century B.C., when the king Ergamenes threw off the bondage of the Egyptian religion and adopted Hellenic culture, as Diodorus relates. Friendly relations with the Ptolemies generally prevailed, and we read of Blemmyes or Nubians born in Egypt and holding much the same position as Greeks born in Egypt. 'One of the last acts of Cleopatra was to send Caesarion and her two children by Antony down to the south in the hope that in Aethiopia they would find shelter.'

But we are concerned mainly with the Roman empire in Egypt. Has Dr. Lane-Poole never heard of Cornelius Gallus at Philae in 79 B.C.? of Queen Candace's expedition to Elephantine? of Gaius Petronius's victories in Nubia and annexation as far as Primit or Kasr Ibrim? About a.D. 250 the Blemmyes invaded Egypt and were not driven back till a.D. 261 by Julius Aemilianus. They soon returned, and actually occupied Coptos and Ptolemais in the Thebaid by a settlement which lasted till their expulsion by Probus in a.D. 276. A few years later Diocletian had the sense to abandon the country south of Syene, and at the same time he transferred the troublesome Nobatae and Nubae from the oasis of Khargah to Nubia, and agreed to pay tribute to both the Blemmyes and the Nobatae. Peace was thus secured for a long time; but in the days of Constantine raids as far north as Sabenna are mentioned. In the fourth century the edict of Theodosius united Nobatae and Blemmyes against the Shenouti and the Coptic Christians of Upper Egypt; and from this time onwards they are constantly found raiding Upper Egypt and the Thebaid and harrying the Christians; while in the middle of the fifth century the Blemmyes were now more than raiders; they were definitely settled in the Thebaid and assumed

the Thebaid was constantly distinguished from Egypt, and that Egypt was described as divided into three provinces, called Egypt proper, the Thebaid, and Libya. See Accad. dei Lincei, Rendiconti, 1903, p. 315, and the classical authorities there quoted.

1 P.R.I.A., p. 236.
3 Karanig, the Roman-Nubian Cemetery, by C. Leonard Wooley and D. Randall-Maclver, text, p. 88 (University Museum, Philadelphia, 1915), and references to the Rylands Papyri there quoted.
4 Karanig, p. 85.
5 See Egyptian Exploration Fund Report, 1903-4: Christian Egypt, p. 81. The MS. of Shenouti in the Cairo Museum (8066 in Crum's Catalogue) shows that these invasions were frequent.
لا بدُ علَّة في السلم، تُقدَّمَ له، فعن الله رفعه: الإسكندرية في يوم ذلك.
قد رفع إلى ملكه في النجوم، وكره أن يجتاز للسكندرية.
فأعطاه عمه في بحر النجوم، وفعته في بحر النجوم، وسرعان ما تبَّنَّه يتسبب.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1) BCD 2) جسم 3) ابن 4) BC 5) BC
6) فصل 7) E 8) B 9) لبليا 10) D
السالمي في جميع كلام ابن أمر الاستمدونة ما كلا إلى أن قلته اللتان.

وذكرت مقالة: "هذا وجالب بين الأشياء كما خذلنا مثبلا بن سلمان من ابن لبيعة مغيرة بن
(segments of text continue, readable but not legible due to handwriting style)
لا كتب أبو عيسى بعد ذلك ما حظيت به عن محمد بن عبيد، إلا
عندما طالب أبو عيسى بالجواب له. فكتب له أبو عيسى ما دำر من داربه، فإن
الجواب لا ينال منه غير أن يأخذه في يده ثم يكتب به. أما
المكتوب في الجواب، فهو يكتب به قبل أن يكتب به. وهي
الكلمة فقد كتبها أبو عيسى، ولكن ما تلقاه إبان لم يكتب
هناك. ومن ثم لا يوجد من مقتبس غربة هبوب. }الكلام
الذي خبرته فيما خبرته من صحبته، فإن رأيته في
المرأة عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فإن رأيته عن
تاجر بيع بن عبيد هو الذي يعتني بالسعى.}
1.  مسأله: 
2.  بحث: 
3.  مسأله: 
4.  نظر: 
5.  جمل: 
6.  تدريس: 
7.  المقال: 
8.  البحث: 
9.  مسأله: 
10. راجع: 
11. مسأله: 
12. بحث:
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة. الصورة تبدو كأنها من نص عربي، ولكنها غير قابلة للقراءة بشكل صحيح.
1) Repeated a third time in A.
2) O × ن (el-
3) The following trad. in Mahfs. I 20, Yaq. III 897, 10 f.
4) O × ن (el-
5) The vowel in A. Of Yaq. I 185, 15. The same name above, p. 19, 14, and mention of the same man below, fol. 89a. 6) A أبدا أبدا ن (el-
7) Priv. pointed in A. Of Hll. 389, 578. O × ن (el-
8) The dated in A. The same name above, p. 18. 9) O × ن (el-
10) Yaq. loc. cit. 11) BU بث (el-
12) عل (el-
13) B × ن (el-
14) D مراجع.
الله يهدينا الله يهدينا ألف الله يهدينا ألف الله يهدينا ألف...
من الناحية العلمية، فإن عقل الحيوانات الأليفة يعتمد على مجموعة من الأنابيب والذيل. وفقًا لذلك، فإن أنسب تفسير لتمثيل هذا النص هو أن النص يتحدث عن عقل الحيوانات الأليفة ووظائفه، مع التركيز على الأ لأنابيب والذيل.
ذكر في دعوة السادة:

2. تلميذي، رضي الله عنهم، غلباً، وأخبرهم بما وصل، على اختصار، قال:

3. لولا للسادة لا يجمعون، فإنما لا عين، فلا فعل، ولا يمنعون.

4. من قال، فتحت مصر علينا!

5. فان أخبرنا بل فتحت مصر (84) علينا، لا يمنع عين، فحصنا عبد الملك بن مسلمة، وعمه بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة. في ورد، بن ابن حبيب، على من مع عبد الملك بن عبد الله بن عبد الملك، برأه، وللذي يحمله على شيء، فذكر السائلين، وهم عبد الملك، بإذن، فإنما دفعه عبد الملك، فكفر عليه، ولله لا أقلمه له من البريك، والله لم ينصبه، كما حذر رسل الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

6. يكفر كل مصر، والله لا أقسمها على اختصار، لا لأسر اللد، فكثيره عبد الملك.

7. كان ينادينهم، حتى يخبرهم. يقول العبد، فلبن لهيعة، وحذافة، عبد بن سهيل، من عبد الله، عبد الله بن عبد الله بن عبد الملك، بن عبد الله بن عبد الملك.

8. لا يذكر، ولا يعكره. لا يذكر، ولا يكون، فإنما حذافة عبد الملك، في خطته، فإن لله، الذي يصوم على من، أمر بإسه. 

9. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله بن عبد الله.

10. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

11. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

12. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

13. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

14. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

15. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

16. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

17. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.

18. عبد الملك، عم عبد الملك بن سهل، لا حرصنا ابن لهيعة، عن عبد الملك بن عبد الله.
لا يكون شيء من نسبه إلا شيطان ولا عقل له. وحدثنا عبد الملك بن مسلمة حذيفة ابن ليهجة عن أبي الأسود عن عروة بن عامر قال: "حدثنا حذيفة بن عبد الملك بن مسلمة حذيفة ابن ليهجة عن أبي الأسود عن عروة بن عامر "أليس له نفس منك؟ هو من كنها". 

1) (التيارات; so also below.) 2) B. 3) B. 4) C. 5) M., Y. III 908. 6) D. om. seven following traditions. 7) So B. 8) H., and Y. III 908. 9) بريرة (i.e., بريرة دخيلة) 10) R. 11) مس. 12) Thus A; unpolished in B. 13) B. 14) H., and Y. III 908. 15) A.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة. القرن العربي أو النص العربي في الصورة غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي أو معقول.
ذكر البلط:

(ختماً حذفنا عني في صلتي حذفنا ابن لهجة عن يزيد بن أن حبيب أن عم بن الإحسان مما هو الاستثناء وأرى بهما ومناها م لما من أنه بسكتها)

وقد ذكرنا قبلاً قبلاً إلى آخر عبد بن الملك يمودة في لبلك أصل ملك فل نتخب نحن بيبي الحق في ذلك بل هو على النقل 2007

وأنه غير من عبر إلى أن استOLS اذ تدلل السريئ لم وللمل عن النحو وجاء في

سلسلة لا صلاة. فأذكروه في الامام عن الاستثناء والاستثناء حذفنا عبد

بن حذفنا ابن يزيد بن عبد عن بيبي تلل لدى في حذفنا. وحذفنا عند

إسحاق حذفنا ابن يزيد عن يزيد في أن حبيب أن عبر ابن

بابن كتب إلى معد بن أن وقيل وهو ذكر أن الكورث لا يفعل بها نحن ويسمح به المشهور على

برد الدال الإخبار على أنه على المنهج. فهذا معد بن أن وصوم من

كثني كثني initiated اللون ليوصل معتمب النحو من الكورث الذي كان فيه فدل

صلتي ولا حول إلا في الامام عن الاستثناء الاستثناء في تبسيل

السياق كما حذفنا ابن عين عبد بن يزيد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن بن عبد بن أن حبيب أن عبر يد

لا يذكر الون في الاستثناء الاستثناء إلا مبقل عن بها أن البند من يموت الاستثناء الإخلاص.

فلم يعلم نفسه؟ فهذا من عبر بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن أن حبيب أن عبر

كة إجابة له مصادف الصم. فهذا بل عبر بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن أن حبيب أن عبر

الاستثناء عبر على أن حبيبة على ممثث في موضع الركض الذي تعرف

أسلم بذل له. فهذا من عبر الصرف هو

مهد عبر بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن عبد بن أن حبيب أن عبر

1. (Here begins, In all the Men, the third main division (esp.) of the History. The following Esses I 65, Magr. I 386.) 2. (The usual introductory formulae prefixed in A, B and C (see Introduction). 3. (ختماً حذفنا عن) 4. (AC Bangladesh) 5. (D) cautious this passage, and om. following lines.) 6. (A + C) 7. (BOD)

فهـ. 8. (البر) 9. (ب)
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CAIRO

by James Aldridge

LITTLE, BROWN AND COMPANY
BOSTON / TORONTO
Up till a few years ago you could still take a tram from the middle of Cairo and ride it almost all the way out to the Roman fortress that founded the city. Nobody in Cairo except the very interested has ever known much about the old fort, and many educated Cairenes have never even heard of it. Christian Egyptians know it far better than Moslems because their most ancient Coptic churches are built into its walls. What all Egyptians now call this curious little corner of their city is simply Masr el Atika, Old Cairo, which is exactly what it is — the oldest part of Cairo, and it was here that Rome lost Egypt to the Arab conquerors, and here too that Egypt's unique form of Christianity somehow survived the persecutions of Rome and Byzantium.

The first fort was built in the sixth century B.C. by the Persians on a rocky ledge above the river, and you can still see where it was, high on the cliffs above Old Cairo. The Romans used the Persian fort for a while, but they soon found that it was far too vulnerable up there on the cliff. All the water for the fort had to be raised by a complicated and exposed system of screws and buckets, and a hundred and fifty men were permanently employed at it, so they abandoned the cliffs and came down to the river's edge. The Roman Emperor Trajan built the present fort, which is no longer attached to the river because in the last six hundred years the Nile has changed its course and left it high and dry.

The Romans obviously chose the river site for its military advantages, but there was already an old Pharaonic settlement thriving in the same place, probably as a Nile port for the grain and tropical goods which arrived from Upper Egypt. This older riverside settle-
One of the towers of the gateway to the Roman fortress of Babylon in Old Cairo. It adjoins the Coptic church of al Mu'allaka.
Babylon

ment was called Babylon, a name it kept until the Arab invasion, and Cairo was still called Babylon by Europeans for a long time even after that. Why the older settlement was called Babylon has always been in dispute. Almost certainly it is a corruption of the ancient Egyptian per-hapi-n-On which means the House of the Nile of On, the Egyptian name for the nearby island of Roda. But Diodorus the Sicilian says that some prisoners whom Sesostris had brought back from Babylon in Mesopotamia revolted when they had to work too hard. In Egypt they were probably quarrying stone at Tura, nearby, and the revolt was so successful that the Pharaoh gave them the present site as a free colony, which thereafter they called after their own city - Babylon.

Rome had complicated needs of Babylon. Trajan dug out the old Pharaonic canal, dating from about 2000 BC, which linked the Red Sea to the Nile, and he brought it out on the Nile near the fort. Trajan thus opened up a maritime link between the Mediterranean and Arabia, between Rome and India, and Babylon became a big port. In this sense the Amnis Trajanas, as it came to be called, was the first Suez Canal, because ships coming up the Red Sea from Aden, Arabia, India and Africa could turn into the canal at Kulzum (now Suez) and sail across the desert to Babylon on the Nile and then continue the journey downstream to Alexandria, into the Mediterranean and across to Rome.

What used to be so pleasant about riding down to Babylon in Tram No. 1 was that the tramline had been laid over the filled-in bed of the Amnis Trajanas, which was still full of dirty water as late as 1899. Now you can only ride down Shari' el Khalig (Canal Street) by bus or taxi, but it isn't quite the same thing because Cairo trams are built like galley ships and they dip and fall and roll and smash as they plow along the streets in permanent storm. Sailing down the Amnis Trajanas by tram was part of the old maritime tradition of the city.

Babylon itself was never the capital of Greek or Roman Egypt. As long as the occupying power of Egypt was a Mediterranean power it was Alexandria which had to be the capital. Alexandria literally tied Egypt to the European skin, to the European sea. All Greek and Roman roads in Egypt led to Alexandria, all authority led there, all art, all politics, all trade, all wheat and money and religion and corruption and pleasure led there. What came nearer to Babylon were the revolts of the Egyptian peasants and artisans, which were partly the reason for the fort's being there, because Rome needed Egyptian wheat, and at one moment in her history she would have starved without it.

The fort is all that is left of Babylon, because none of the dilapi-
dated streets around it in Old Cairo contains a remnant of Babylon township. And today, when you walk into the neat little gateway of the fort that is used as its ground-level entrance, you are really standing on top of the walls, not at the bottom of them. The walls themselves have been buried under thirty feet of debris, sand and mud, on top of which the surrounding buildings and roads of Old Cairo are built. But once you step through the gateway you have come visibly upon something that is no longer Roman at all and not even Arab, and if you have a little imagination here you can easily see how Egypt's hatred for conquerors is impressed in every grain of sand and in every flower in the gardens and in every brick of the old Coptic churches built into the fort.

Coptic Christianity came to Egypt illegally during Roman occupation, but only after Rome had broken the back of the older Egyptian religion, which was always the center of popular resistance. One of Rome's first decrees in Egypt took all property away from the temples and gave it to the state, thus breaking the last vestiges of real power which the pagan Egyptian priests had. Rome also laid down strict laws for Egyptian life, and legions were sent to forts like Babylon to put these laws into effect. The point was, of course, that Rome needed everything Egypt could produce. But Egyptian revolts staggered the Romans, and the ideology that finally brought Egyptian resistance to the very walls of this fortress was not the old native religion but a new Egyptian version of it — the subversive cult of Christianity.

Under pagan Rome the secret cult of Christ was the cult of the impoverished colonial artisan, the revolting slave, the rebellious peasant and the viciously treated minorities, all of whom found in pre-Platonic Christianity a simple creed that might help them support their miseries and unify their resistance. But as a religion it was not exactly new to Egypt. J. G. Milne, in Volume V of The History of Egypt (1893), has written: "It is not improbable that the conception of the Trinity, which formed no part of the original Jewish Christianity, may be traced to an Egyptian origin; the whole of the older Egyptian theology was permeated with the idea of triple divinity." Not only the trinity, but the old Egyptian ideas of resurrection, judgment, redemption, hell and heaven, life after death, the cross (the Egyptian ankh), Isis with her child Osiris, Horus attacking a crocodile (dragon) — all these Egyptian concepts go so far back into their Pharaonic past that they cannot even be traced. Christianity was therefore at home in Egypt.

About A.D. 323 a Rome in decay adopted Christianity as its own religion, and suddenly there were two Christianities in Egypt: the
Babylon

Coptic Christianity of the downtrodden Egyptian and the Melchite (orthodox) Christianity of their oppressive Roman rulers. In this situation a schism between the Christianity of the rulers and the older Christianity of the oppressed was inevitable, since the Egyptians still hated Rome. The superficial character of the split concerned the nature of Christ. The Copts said Christ had “one nature” and one nature only — a divine one “separate but inseparable.” Their orthodox rivals, the Melchites, said Christ had two natures — the divine and the human. This was no more than a tiny doctrinal difference but it was excuse enough for the orthodox Roman Church to set about annihilating the Egyptian Copts. Technically, Coptic Christianity was now legal, and even orthodox, but Roman executions of Copts went on more viciously than ever before, only now they were done in the name of Christian dogma.

For three hundred years Roman and Byzantine orthodoxy tried to suppress the Egyptian mind and the Egyptian peasant, and Egyptians went on resisting them bitterly with their own unique Coptic dogma as a national ideology. The old fort was one of the places where the conflict was sharpest, because Babylon was still Rome’s principal stronghold in central and southern Egypt. The old canal fell into disuse, but the town itself continued to be a vital port for the transport of grain downstream to Rome and Constantinople, and it was always full of the Egyptian traders, artisans, peasants and boatmen who organized resistance to Rome.

The conflict with Rome came to an end only when Arab horsemen, with the little green pennants of their new religion fluttering on their lances, crossed the northern borders of Egypt and made straight for Babylon. The Arab force was a small one, about thirty-five hundred horsemen, whereas Roman soldiers in the Babylon region alone numbered more than twenty thousand. Late A.D. 640 there were battles all around Babylon and Heliopolis, but finally the fort itself was besieged and the Arabs demanded its surrender.

Inside the fort was the Roman viceroy of Egypt, a Melchite orthodox bishop named Cyrus, and for the last ten years Bishop Cyrus had been persecuting the rebellious Copts of Egypt as no one had ever done before. In the name of his Byzantine orthodoxy he had ordered thousands of them to be whipped, burned, drowned and mutilated. In his ten years of power all Coptic churches were closed, the priests dispersed, the religion driven underground, and the ordinary follower of the Coptic ideology cut down wherever he stood up to announce his defiance of Rome. It was Cyrus who was in charge of Babylon’s defense.
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The story of the Arab conquest of the fort has always been complicated by a mysterious figure called "the Makaukus," who seemed to be a Coptic traitor inside the walls trying desperately to surrender it to the Arabs. But A. J. Bulter, an English scholar who came to Egypt in the 1850s to tutor the khedive's sons, proved brilliantly that the Makaukus was in fact none other than Bishop Cyrus himself, who wanted desperately to save what he could from inevitable defeat by talking his way out of abject surrender.

The Arab commander, Amr Ibn el 'As, offered Cyrus the classic Moslem alternatives: accept Islam or pay tribute or fight to the death. At first Cyrus tried to avoid all three, but there was no way out. One of the envoys whom Amr Ibn el 'As sent to negotiate with Cyrus was a Negro called Ubadah Ibn al Samit, and Cyrus the Christian was so shocked by the sight of a Negro that he said: "Take away that black man. I can have no discussion with him." The other Arabs pointed out that Ubadah, one of the select body called the Companions of the Prophet, was Amr's chosen negotiator, and that black and white were equal among Moslems. Ubadah himself said: "There are a thousand blacks as black as myself among our companions," and expressed his passionate devotion to God, and to the cause of Islam. Cyrus was so shaken that he turned to one of his followers and said: "Do you hear this? I very much fear that God has sent these men to devastate the world."

Bishop Cyrus reluctantly agreed to the Arabs' second alternative, tribute, and Amr Ibn el 'As allowed him to go down to Alexandria and on to Constantinople to get it from Heraclius, the Roman Emperor. Heraclius refused, exiled Cyrus, and told the legions in the fort to fight on, which they did until April 14, when the Arabs stormed the fort behind a romantic hero called Zubair. It was the excitable Zubair who first scaled the difficult walls of Babylon. He reached the top shouting "Allahu akbar," only to find that the part of the wall he had chosen happened to be bricked up at each end, and there was no way to reach the steps leading down to the inside of the fort. While Zubair was fuming helplessly at the top, the Roman commandant calmly walked out and surrendered the fort to Amr, to the disgust of Zubair, who later complained to Amr: "If you had only waited a little I would have been able to get down the wall inside the fort and then it would have all been over anyway."

There was one last tragedy for the Copts in the capture of Babylon. Even when they were about to surrender their fort, the orthodox Melchite Romans dragged out all the Coptic prisoners they had kept in jail for years. They were all scourged and their hands were cut off.
and then they were turned loose at the gates. The Coptic historian John of Nikiaou describes the groans and tears and cries and misery of these mutilated Copts, who literally walked out of the fort and into the arms of their Moslem liberators. On this sort of evidence there can be little wonder that the Copts had immediately welcomed the Moslem Arabs in Egypt, and Amir and his thirty-five hundred horsemen could never have operated so freely and effectively in Egypt without the help of the Coptic peasants and townspeople.

Babylon was now Moslem and Arab, and in effect so was Egypt. But the fort was never an attractive place for the Arabs, who hated to be shut up inside defensive walls, and what is still curious about Babylon today is its lack of any Moslem influence. It was the non-Moslems of Egypt who eventually reoccupied the fort and used it, and now it is a tight little island of the three main religious minorities of Egypt: Orthodox, Copt and Jewish. They all huddle together in this old compound as if clinging to the lost memories of their faded youth.

It is ironic that the first church you see as you step into the main west gate is an Orthodox church which is built on top of one of the Roman towers. It is ugly inside and out, and it was recently rebuilt in the worst possible taste. Over the southern gateway, and built into the walls of the fort, is the beautiful little fourth-to-sixth-century Coptic church of Mu'allaqat, called the Hanging Church because it literally hangs across the bastions. Its ceiling is ribbed and shaped like an upturned boat, an upside-down ark in fact. The third of the minorities, the Jews, have a dark but rather domestic little synagogue called the Ben Ezra. It used to be the Coptic Church of St. Michael, but the Jewish community bought it from the Copts in the twelfth century. There are other Coptic and Orthodox churches and monasteries hugging each other in the narrow alleyways inside the fort, and there is a village of sorts with streets, cemeteries, gardens, a museum and an avenue of eucalyptuses.

When I was last in the old fort, in 1966, I went there specifically to do three things: to find some of the mysterious passageways and cells that A. J. Butler, with schoolboy fascination, found in the tower churches when he was here in the 1880s; to see the main south gate, because the old Roman walls there were clear and visible; and to look once more at the Coptic Museum.

But following in Butler's Victorian footsteps was not easy because so much rebuilding had gone on. Like Butler I had a little difficulty getting into the Orthodox Church of St. George, which was locked. Relations are still not perfect between Copt and Orthodox (although the Copts now call themselves Orthodox), but a whistle down a side
street, a man's head at the window of a mud house, a few words in Arabic, and the guardian took me up the main steps and opened the big doors of the modern Greek façade. I wasn't much interested in the new church itself, but I wanted to find the staircase in the Roman tower under the church which Butler had persuaded a priest to open up for him in the 1880s. Butler had described the tower as "a place of mystery and horror, said to be peopled by devils, and unknown and undiscovered — happily even by the whitewashers."

At first I couldn't find any sign of the entrance, but then I realized I was looking too mysteriously for something that was now too obvious. What Butler had seen in 1882 was a boarded-up hole. What I saw in 1966 was a neat cellar doorway in the middle of the floor of the new church, with steps leading deep down into the tower underneath. Butler had plunged down here into darkness and mystery, stumbling over debris and neglect. He was "glad to escape from the thick black dust and spiders and centipedes and other noisome creatures." What I saw was a clean staircase lit by electric lights, and a clean descent to the very bottom of the tower. The noisome creatures, the centipedes, the dark mystery, the horror and the devils had unfortunately gone away.

Without the mysteries the Church of St. George had little else to offer, so I walked across the sanded interior of the fort to al Mu'allaka, the Hanging Church. I was very lucky there: the resident priest himself was sitting under one of the little windows in black robes, one swollen leg propped up on a cushion. This was the Reverend Father Shenouda Hanna, Chief Priest of the Church, and I arrived in the middle of his conversation with two handsome Egyptian women who were asking him just how credible any of the numerous Christian relics in Cairo really are.

This was a useful subject for me, because Egypt is the only foreign country the Holy Family visited, and Cairo is full of associations which make some claim on Christ and his family. Matariya (near the Heliopolis obelisk) has a sycamore tree called the Virgin's Tree which the Holy Family supposedly rested under in their flight into Egypt, and near it is a well which Christ the Child is reported to have brought from the earth. Fifty years ago Christian souvenir hunting was so bad that the angry owner of the sycamore tied a knife to the tree and put up a notice begging people not to hack at it any more with axes, and to leave some of it for others. Babylon itself is also full of Christian relics. There was once a date stone in al Mu'allaka, which had the Virgin's tooth mark on it. The bones of St. George himself (denoted by the Vatican in 1969) are in the Convent of Mari Girgis, where the old prioress in a dusty black dress took off her shoes and...
Coptic church of al Mu'allaqa (the Hanging Church), built into the walls of Babylon.
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led me into a chapel which was littered with old newspapers and took a green bundle out of a niche, unwrapped it, and offered me the cedar casket of St. George's bones to be kissed. St. George smelled rather sweet. The crypt of Abu Sagha, a Coptic church, is where the Holy Family "rested" or "slept" or "waited" for days. Even the Ben Ezra Synagogue proudly claims Christian associations. In the little booklet outlining its history, the Communauté Israélite du Caire says: "The Virgin Mary, Joseph and the Child Jesus fled to Egypt and sheltered in this crypt [in the synagogue] for three months. It is positively known that Joseph was a Jew, and that the logical thing for him to do was to go to his own people for a refuge for his family and himself."

Quite right, I decided.

It was therefore something of a small surprise to hear the Reverend Father Shenouda Hanna saying to his Egyptian friends: "Nobody knows where the Holy Family was in Egypt, or what they did. There is no historical support of any of these Christian claims." Father Shenouda Hanna is a cultured man and a strikingly handsome one. He has written a short history of the Copts, and as the ladies and I helped him to his feet he thanked us and then showed the Indies his Hanging Church, which looks so stubbornly Coptic and still stubbornly Egyptian. Everything in this fortress, in fact, looks stubbornly Egyptian and Coptic. Even the Ben Ezra Synagogue just across the courtyard looks Egyptian and Coptic, which is not surprising because these two religions were always minorities together here and got on very well. There have always been Jews in Babylon, and in the last count a few years ago there were still forty-two Jewish families among the 133,000 Mohammedans and 10,000 Copts in the town of Old Cairo itself.

I wasn't too sure what to expect in the synagogue of Babylon these difficult days, but I needn't have worried too much, because a very excitable guardian pushed his little cap back on his head and referred me to Jeremiah in the Old Testament to support the Jewish claim that this synagogue is built on the site of the original synagogue of Jeremiah. The Christians got the site, he said, by a mistake when the Romans were defeated and Amr handed back all seized properties to churches and synagogues. It was the famous Rabbi Abraham Ben Ezra who, in the twelfth century, he said, bought it back from the Copts and rebuilt it. Not only is Jeremiah himself supposed to be buried underneath the synagogue, but Moses had something to do with the rock of its foundation.

The enthusiastic old guardian of Ben Ezra gave me the old Torah to touch "for luck." The original Torah of this synagogue was very fa-
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ous, one of the oldest in existence, dating back to Ezra the Scribe, this one was a very modern copy of it. All the documents of the synagogue, as well as a huge number of books and Torahs, had been "taken off" to America in the last century by American-Jewish historians for safekeeping, just as so many Coptic furnishings and icons and books from Babylon's Coptic churches had been "taken off" to Europe by European-Christian historians for safekeeping (which made A. J. Butler furious.) But the original old Torah of Babylon has been cut up and sold and scattered all over the place. Parts of it are in Columbia University, the British Museum and the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

There is one other historical collection in this old fortress which I always dread going into—the Coptic Museum. The whole place opens up so many new avenues for speculation on Egypt's role in the history of religions that it would require a lifetime to follow up any single one of them, so I always leave feeling frustrated and ignorant. The mythologies of ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome and Christianity are so thoroughly entwined with each other in the artifacts of this museum that sometimes the origins of one religion in another seem almost crude.

In the year 300 Egypt was mainly (officially) pagan, but by 350 it was predominantly Christian. These were the thirty vital years when Rome was changing sides. In this Coptic Museum all the little altars for Egyptian shrines and temples up to the first half of the fourth century are pagan, but then suddenly like a biblical clap of thunder a little pagan Aphrodite shell substitutes the beautiful goddess for a deeply cut Christian cross—still in the shell.

Official Christianity had thus arrived in the pagan shrines of Egypt. Victor Gergas, the museum's chief curator, took considerable pride in showing me a sixth-century niche of Jesus being suckled by Mary, just as Isis had suckled Osiris three thousand years earlier. It was a modest boast of the continuity of his own Coptic ancestry from ancient Egypt into modern Christianity. Even Father Shenouda Hanna was proud of the origin of the Christian cross in the Egyptian ankh rather than in the crucifix.

It was Gergas who took me twenty-four feet down into the excavated bastion of the south gate of the fort, which had been cleaned up about fifty years ago. Down here one finally comes to the thick damp walls of Rome, the only part of the fort which does any kind of justice to Babylon's foundation in a powerful empire.

"There are the stripes," Gergas told me.

The construction of its walls was in the classical Roman five rows of
in a measure its civil government; the Roman troops that had garrisoned the frontier were prisoners in their hands, and Ptolemais seems to have been the regular base from which their forces terrorized the country to the north.\footnote{Karanig, p. 96.} Maximinus crushed these Nubians in A.D. 453 and concluded a peace which lasted more or less till the time of Justinian; but an extant letter, dated about A.D. 540, to John, Prefect of the East, from a landholder in Upper Egypt complains of two invasions by the Blemyes in three years. Then followed the well-known missions of Justinian and Theodora which evangelized the Nobatae, whose king Silko warred against the Blemyes and destroyed them. But Christianity did not change the habits of the Nubians. About A.D. 580 Aristomachus was sent by Tiberius II to chastise the Nubians;\footnote{John of Nikias, p. 525 (Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits, &c., t. xxiv, Paris, 1883).} and in the time of the emperor Maurice we find either Nubian troops or troops from Nubia employed in Egypt proper.\footnote{Id., p. 531.}

So all through the Roman dominion the relations of Egypt and Nubia were relations of continual hostility, of war and plunder, of invasion and counter-invasion.\footnote{See J. Leipoldt's article written as preface to Rudolph Haupt's Katalog 3 (Aegyptologie, &c.), pp. viii, ix (Halle a. S., 1906); \textit{Am allerhäufigsten benahmen sich aber die reichen Herren, wenn ein Einfälle der Eggoth (Nubier) drohte. In diesen Zeiten höchster Gefahr pflegten alle nordwärts zu fliehen ... Die ägyptische Regierung schon im vierten und fünten Jahrhundert recht machtlos war: nicht einmal ihre Soldaten hatte sie in der Gewalt, und die Verhinderung von Nubiereinfällen gelang ihr nur selten.}} And the Muslims in their turn found that the conquest of Nubia did not follow upon the con-

quest of Egypt; for \textit{Ṭabari} himself relates the failure of the expedition which ‘Amr made against Nubia, as soon as Egypt was subjugated.

I claim therefore to have shown that, during the whole of the thirteen hundred years in which Dr. Lane-Poole alleges that Nubian influence and Nubian settlements were unknown in Egypt, the tide of war had rolled over the land between Nubia and Egypt, ebbing and flowing at irregular intervals but with ceaseless recurrence; that Nubia was a thorn in the side of the Romans all through their dominion in Egypt, as it was a thorn in the side of the Muslims long after they had conquered Egypt; and that, so far from Nubian settlements being unknown in Egypt, it had been the regular policy and practice of the Nubians to crown a successful invasion by a settled occupation in Upper Egypt. It was therefore perfectly natural that at the time of the Arab invasion the people of Miṣr should bargain for protection against Nubian settlements.

If this is not enough to prove that \textit{Nub} in the treaty has its ordinary sense of \textit{Nubians}, let us consider the consequences of adopting Dr. Lane-Poole's rendering \textit{garrisons}. I have already taken the broad ground that, as the Roman Empire had been established in Egypt for at least seven hundred years, it is a mistake to speak of Egypt in A.D. 640 as a country held by alien Roman ‘garrisons’ and an alien ‘Roman army of occupation’. Such phrases fly in the face of history.\footnote{The Roman army in Egypt was largely recruited from the native inhabitants: see \textit{The Garrison of Egypt under the Roman Empire}, by Mr. Cheeseman in Karanig, pp. 106-14.} But further: if ‘Amr
meant garrisons, why did not he use the common Arabic word for garrison, خرسية? Again, if the Romans in Egypt are described as garrisons in the Treaty of Misr, why are they not so described, and why is the term Nūb not used, in the Treaty of Jerusalem? And if the term garrisons in the Treaty of Misr is equivalent to Romans, why does that treaty speak of 'Romans and garrisons', thus making a distinction between them? But the climax of absurdity is reached when we come to the last clause (111) in the treaty, which provides that the 'garrisons' are to furnish so many head of cattle or sheep and so many horses, and are to receive in return full freedom for trade to and from Egypt. What can this mean if the 'garrisons' are the Romans?

Dr. Lane-Poole sees the difficulty. 'The last clause relating to the garrisons', he remarks, 'is not very intelligible,' and he proceeds to quote what he calls Weil's translation as follows: 'And (it is binding) on the garrisons who consent (to this treaty) that they shall help the Muslims with so many men and so many horses that they (the Nūb) be not hindered from trade, coming or going.' Notice that Dr. Lane-Poole takes upon himself to substitute 'garrisons' for Weil's 'Nubians', and yet does not hesitate to change that inconvenient word back to 'Nūb' or Nubians in his own gloss explaining the pronoun 'they'! We may correct this procedure, and see what results. The clause will then run, according to the garrisons theory, as follows: 'The

1 This rendering is more probably correct than 'head of men', i.e. soldiers.

garrisons who come under this treaty are bound to furnish so many head (of cattle or men) and so many horses, so that the garrisons may trade freely, coming and going—which is very like nonsense. Dr. Lane-Poole argues that 'the clause may be understood to provide for a limited escort of friendly Romans to protect the caravans trading between Egypt and Syria; but such a provision appears extremely improbable'. Not only improbable, but impossible: it is the reductio ad absurdum of the garrisons theory.

But if, as I contend, Nūb means Nubians, then it is the Nubians in Egypt who have to furnish cattle and horses (possibly a contingent of horse and foot) and who are to be protected in their trade across the desert to Nubia. The trade in ivory and other products of the Sudan was much the same then as now, and as much exposed to danger from Beduin and brigands. The Arabs too were strangers to the country, and they may have foreseen the requirement of a corps of local guides to aid in patrolling the southern and western deserts. So interpreted the provision in the treaty is both intelligible and natural. Last but not least, the other Muslim historians who quote or comment on the

1 Juvenal, for example, mentions the ivory trade: 'Dentibus ex illis quoque multa porta Syrenae.' See also England in the Sudan, by Yakub Pasha Artin, p. 8 (Macmillan, 1911): 'All these temples and fortresses, whose ruins alone remain, could not have been constructed in deserts such as we see to-day. There must have existed from remotest times a considerable trade, at least a transport trade, between the Sudan and Egypt. Certain it is that there were wars both of a defensive and of an aggressive nature from at least the time of the twelfth dynasty.'
treaty never doubt for a moment that Nub means Nubians. Thus Ibn al Athir says, 'In this treaty even the Romans and Nubians inhabiting Egypt were included as forming part of the population of the country.'

So much for the strange theory of the 'garrison'.

It remains to notice one or two other points in the treaty. Clause 2 seems to fix the total amount of poll-tax, 'provided that the people of Misr accept the treaty and the river reaches its full level,' at 50,000,000—but the coin is not specified. I can hardly think Dr. Lanc-Poole correct in taking this as dirhems. The evidence of practically all the Arab writers agrees that the tax was stated in dinars—two dinars a head, old men, women, and children being excluded. Clearly, however, 50,000,000 dinars cannot have been intended: that would imply 25,000,000 able-bodied men in the population, which is absurd. But if 5,000,000 be substituted for 50,000,000 by a very slight change in the text (٥٠٠٠٠٠٠ for ٥٠٠٠٠), that would imply a taxable population of 2,500,000, which might be a fair rough estimate of numbers for the whole of Egypt at the time of the treaty. But whichever way the total of tribute be taken (dirhems or dinars), a great difficulty arises: because it is certain that any such total must refer not to a section but to the whole population of Egypt. In other words, 'the people of Misr' in this clause must mean, not the people of the city of Misr, but the people of Egypt. Yet

---


we have seen that it was the people of the city who were parties to the treaty; and اهل مصر cannot mean two different things in the same document. The only solution is to regard the numeral 50,000,000 (or 5,000,000) as a marginal gloss which has crept into the text. This solution commends itself the more as there is no total of poll-tax specified in the Treaty of Jerusalem. Caetani (p. 309) says that the omission of any capitulation tax is one of the points in favour of the treaty, because under Omar the two dinars per head was not known—only a lump sum being fixed. It also seems a priori most unlikely that the Arab commander would bind himself to accept an off-hand estimate furnished by the Romans, who would have every motive for reducing the total. It must further be remembered that Tabari's words immediately following the treaty run: 'So the people of Misr, all of them, entered into those covenants and accepted the treaty, and the horses were collected.' It is quite certain that the whole population of Egypt did not enter upon this treaty. Moreover, the collection of horses is recorded as an incident in close connexion with the acceptance of the treaty; and whether it refers to horses which the Nubians had to furnish, or, as seems more probable, to horses at once available and supplied by the people of the city, it shows the limited scope of the treaty at the moment. It obviously cannot refer to a collection of horses from all quarters of Egypt: for it is absolutely beyond question that, at the time when the Treaty of Misr was concluded, the Muslims had effected next to nothing in Upper Egypt, while the whole
of the Delta was still Roman and could not be described as coming under the treaty. Tabari's own words\(^1\) make doubt on this point impossible, apart from the overwhelming evidence of other Arab writers and of John of Nikiou: and Dr. Lane-Poole virtually agrees.\(^2\) Everything therefore seems to support the theory that the '50,000,000', which hangs very loosely on the text, is a gloss which should be removed.

One other point. The position of cl. 11 is curious and obviously suggests some kind of afterthought. Yet if this provision were a mere interpolation by a later writer, why should it be placed between the warranty clause and the attestation clause? It would have been more natural, and just as easy, for an interpolator to insert his fictitious addition somewhere in the body of the treaty. Indeed it might be argued, that the abnormal position of the clause is actually a point in its favour: though the same cannot be said of its obscurity.

Leaving, however, all criticism of the text, one may now sum up the conclusions reached about the treaty. It was a treaty made not with the Copts but with the Romans: it concerned primarily the population of the city of Miṣr, whom it ruled out as belligerents and brought under tribute, giving in return protection and religious liberty: it secured to the Arabs possession of the largest city in Egypt after Alexandria: it released their forces for the campaign

\(^1\) See Tradition B, p. 9 supra.

\(^2\) *F.R.I.A.*, p. 235: 'At the time of the treaty only a small part of the country was subdued, and most of the country was in Roman hands.'
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to Heraclius. Every modern authority agrees that John of Nikiou's evidence upon the date of the surrender is final. That date is 9 April, 641, and at that date Al Mukaukiş was not in Egypt and Heraclius was dead.

If, therefore, the treaty is genuine, it must have got into a wrong context. For in its present form it cannot possibly be identified with the Treaty of Alexandria, which John of Nikiou records: and alternatively, if it can be identified as a confused reminiscence of that treaty, the text cannot be regarded as authentic. To what then could it relate, if genuine? John of Nikiou shows clearly that the capture of the city of Mişr was anterior to the fall of Babylon, though all details of that capture are lost with the lost chapter of which the heading alone remains. Baladhuri also makes it clear that in the conquest of Egypt there were two treaties,1 one merely local and temporary, the other marking the final triumph of the Arabs and settling the terms for the surrender of the country by the Romans. If Ṭabarī's treaty can be identified with the minor treaty recorded by Baladhuri, it would not run counter to anything in John of Nikiou, and in spite of some difficulties might claim at least a measure of authenticity.

But the conclusions of Caetani are too important to pass over lightly. Dr. Lane-Poole, he remarks, does not avail himself of the precious information of Baladhuri: he ignores Wellhausen's criticisms and he regards all the authorities as of equal value. We find Saif displaying very imperfect knowledge of events in Egypt as in Syria, and arbitrarily filling the gaps with elements in part only good and flung together in wild disorder. The treaty, therefore, appears in bad company, and we may suspect that the text of the treaty is as disordered as the text of the narrative. The last article, no. 11, is a rock on which the theory of absolute authenticity must split. Nubians in the treaty are an anachronism, and this article must be an interpolation taken from a subsequent treaty between Arabs and Nubians after the conquest of Upper Egypt. 'Hence the treaty', continues Caetani, 'is not the authentic text of the Treaty of Mişr, but a text in which authorities of the Persian school are mingled with elements, in part ancient and perhaps contemporary with the conquest, of different provenance.' He proceeds to argue that article 2 cannot be of the time of the conquest: apart, however, from articles 2 and 11 the treaty has some genuine character. Moreover, the omission of the amount of the poll-tax per head is against it: but while some of the conditions recall those of the treaty of Alexandria as given by John of Nikiou, the main terms for the surrender of Egypt have little or nothing in common.

1 Caetani, p. 251, where Baladhuri is quoted, and Caetani comments as follows: 'In questa tradizione s'osservano due cose: in primo luogo che s'ignora il nome di al Muqawqis e che lo si chiama il signore di Alyūnah senza altre specificazioni. Si parla poi di due trattati ben diversi, e qui noi scorgiamo memoria dei due trattati, l'uno concluso alla presa di Babilonia con il signore della forterza (Sahib Alyūnah), e l'altro non specificato ulteriormente, ma senza dubbio quello di Alessandria, stipulato da Ciro.'

The term Al Yūnāh comes of course from Bab-al-yūn (Gate of Al Yūn), the form of Babylon which Arab writers got from a mistaken etymology.

1 Id., p. 398.
Finally he concludes that the Treaty of Jerusalem and Treaty of Miṣr are both mainly apocryphal, though parts may be taken from ancient and authentic documents. In both we have to note the intermixture of authentic conditions with apocryphal and with others which, being common to all treaties, have no special value. 'Generally these two treaties are artificial compositions of a later age with elements of various origin and diverse value. The historian must not ignore them, but must not found upon their slender support any important conclusion.'

Such is Caetani's opinion. I do not agree with his sweeping judgement, nor does it seem founded so much upon argument as upon assertion. The articles 2 and 11, which are cited in condemnation of the Treaty of Miṣr as anachronistic, I have already shown above to be justified historically; and though I agree that the sum total of the poll-tax given in the treaty must be wrong, no great stress can be laid upon an error in arithmetic in Arab documents. It seems to me also that both the points of agreement and the points of difference in the two treaties (Jerusalem and Miṣr) suggest a higher measure of authenticity in the text than Caetani is disposed to admit, although I fully concur with him in thinking the whole narrative in Tabari, or in the Saifan tradition, hopelessly disordered.

Beyond that, sure ground does not lie. Wellhausen accuses Saif of filling the gaps in his narrative with idle romancing (Kännegiesserel) and calls his narrative legendary. But the story of Zubair's escalade, for example, which Caetani would place

in that category, seems well enough attested, though the setting is doubtful. On the whole I am unable to accept Caetani's criticisms except in so far as I have here admitted their justice, or to base upon them any subversive modifications of the general narrative of events as set out in my eighteenth chapter of the Arab Conquest of Egypt.

But while I am disposed to think the treaty possibly in its main outline authentic, I confess that its exact position in the history is exceedingly difficult to determine. I have already shown that Tabari intended beyond all question to associate the treaty with the surrender of Babylon, i.e. Kaṣr ash Sham'a: Baladhuri seems also to associate his first treaty with the surrender of Babylon or Kaṣr ash Sham'a. It is reasonable to suppose, and unreasonable to doubt, that these two treaties refer to the same event. Either then the Treaty of Miṣr must be regarded as that made in October at the time of high Nile—the abortive treaty which I have described in the Arab Conquest—or it must be taken as relating to the capitulation of the city of Miṣr, as opposed to that of the fortress of Babylon—the capitulation which is barely recorded in a chapter-heading by John of Nikiou, but of which the whole description and detail are lost. The balance of evidence is perhaps in favour of the latter hypothesis: but no historian has yet issued from that inextricable labyrinth which the Arab writers have built around the central facts of the conquest with a key to its mysteries.

1 Caetani, p. 310.
V. The Identity of Al Muṣaḳūkis.

In dealing above with the parties to the treaty I have mentioned Al Muṣaḳūkis many times without diverting the argument to discuss the question of his identity. But Dr. Lane-Poole challenges my identification of him with Cyrus, the imperial patriarch and viceroy, and it is time to take up the challenge. Though most competent scholars both in Europe and in Egypt have accepted my theory at least in part, I have no wish to take shelter under their authority, or to regard it as outweighing Dr. Lane-Poole's criticisms: which I now proceed to examine.

After citing my evidence on the Coptic side (Severus, the Synaxarium, the Life of Samuel of Kālamūn) Dr. Lane-Poole says:

"Supposing these translations to be accurate, and supposing the MSS., which are chiefly late, to be faithful transcripts of early authoritative documents—a matter which I am not qualified to decide—these extracts taken together show that Cyrus and the Muṣaḳūkis were one and the same person in the opinion of the writers. This can hardly be contested. The only question is whether the writers were authoritative." ¹ "The whole question turns on the relative credibility of two or three Coptic authorities and the whole series of Arabic historians.² If we had nothing but these Coptic and Ethiopic data to go upon, the identification might perhaps be taken as proved. But when we look at the long series of Arabic writers, not only those who survive, but many who are cited by survivors but whose original writings are lost, and when we fail to find the slightest hint that any one of them suspected Al Muṣaḳūkis and Cyrus to be the same person, I confess that their evidence, negative as it is, seems to me overwhelming. How is it that not one of them says that Al Muṣaḳūkis was a priest, much less an archbishop? Why do they give him the name of George, son of Minā, or son of Kurkūb, if his real name was Cyrus?¹ Why does Abū Šalīḥ, who was a Christian, and wrote about A.D. 1200, state that Heracilius placed the government of Egypt under "George, the son of Minā, Al Muṣaḳūkis", and also cite the book of Janāb for the fact that "the bishop of the Romans at Miṣr and Alexandria was named Cyrus"?² How is it that not a single historian of Egypt, Muslim or Christian, has said in so many words "Al Muṣaḳūkis was a title or nickname given to the patriarch Cyrus"?²²

I have set out these extracts at some length because I am anxious to present Dr. Lane-Poole's argument fairly and fully. Briefly, then, he seeks to discredit the very positive evidence from Coptic sources, and he sets against it the negative results from Arabic sources—the silence and the confusion on the subject among Arabic historians.

Now first of all as to the Arabic writers. Of course this negative argument has a good deal of

¹ P.R.I.A., p. 250. ² Id., p. 252.

George, and Cyrus are not very unlike.

² Id., p. 253.
those of the Arabic historians that Al Mu'akūkis made peace with them. But these coincidences may be explained by the hypothesis that Al Mu'akūkis was the sub-governor who made the peace, and Cyrus the patriarch and supreme governor who accepted his subordinate's arrangement and reported it to the emperor.  

In order, therefore, to avoid the identification of Al Mu'akūkis with Cyrus, Dr. Lane-Poole has to identify him, not with the governor-general of Egypt, but with some sub-governor: and this hypothesis he further develops to the conclusion that 'So far as the Arabic evidence goes, except for his name, Al Mu'akūkis may have been Theodore', i.e. the military governor at Alexandria. Clearly if the Mu'akūkis's name was Theodore, he was not 'George, son of Minā': but the fact is that 'George, son of Minā' fits no person and fits no theory in this strange eventful chronicle, and must be regarded as erroneous. But let us examine the Arabic writers' evidence, and see in what language they describe Al Mu'akūkis. Now dealing first with Ṭabarī, it cannot be denied that he distinguishes in one tradition between Al Mu'akūkis and the katholikos of Miṣr. The question is what the latter phrase means. The term katholikos is not and never was a term rightly applicable to any church dignitary in Egypt. It is an Armenian, or Syrian, or Nestorian term, made familiar to Ṭabarī in Ṭabaristān or in Baghdad, and misapplied to Egypt. No doubt it means 'metropolitan', but it does not necessarily

1 P.R.I.A., p. 252.
2 See Tradition D supra, p. 17.
mean ‘patriarch’. Further, we have seen that Miṣr has the double sense of Egypt and the city of Miṣr. It follows that the phrase katholikos of Miṣr, for which Dr. Lane-Poole and others usually give the impossible rendering patriarch of Egypt, may mean nothing more or less than metropolitan of the city of Miṣr. That there was a metropolitan of Miṣr distinct from the patriarch is probable: for it is known that there was a bishop of Miṣr, and the title frequently occurs in Coptic history. There was also a bishop of Babylon, or ‘bishop of the Castle of Babylon’, a bishop of Memphis, a bishop of Hulwān; and the bishop of Miṣr doubtless had precedence over all bishops in the locality. Moreover, the title of metropolitan was given to the bishop of Damietta; and it is difficult to conceive that the bishop of Miṣr—the capital city after Alexandria—was of less importance and lower dignity, as would be the case, if he had not the rank of metropolitan. I may add that I have spoken of patriarch of Egypt as an impossible rendering; because it is an impossible title. The patriarch was patriarch of Alexandria: that was the invariable title. Such a title as patriarch of Miṣr or patriarch of Egypt is absolutely unknown, and to use it is as absurd as to speak of the archbishop of England. On the other hand, the title metropolitan of Miṣr does not rest on mere conjecture. I have found it actually used about A.D. 750, when one Theodore is described as the metropolitan bishop of Miṣr.

If this explanation is adopted, all difficulty arising from the distinction between the katholikos and Al Mukaukūs vanishes: they were two different persons, and no one has ever contended that the bishop of Miṣr was Al Mukaukūs. And the difficulty about the name Abū Maryām also vanishes. I would no longer say that the name is impossible—an erroneous assertion in which Dr. Lane-Poole follows me: all I would say is that it is doubtful in this context. I would point out—what has not been noticed before, I think—that the same name is given to the Christian pervert at Balṭib in Tabarī’s own story of the surrender of Alexandria—Abdallah ‘Abd ar Raḥmān Abū Maryām, where the forenames are clearly the Islamic additions. The name therefore is possible: but the fact that we have Abū Maryām the metropolitan, Abū Maryām the bishop, and again Abū Maryām the pervert, unquestionably establishes a confusion which renders the whole of this nomenclature very uncertain. But if it was the metropolitan of Miṣr and another bishop who met ‘Amr, there is nothing inconsistent with my theory in Tabarī’s statement that they were sent by Al Mukaukūs and returned to him: indeed the story then fits together admirably.

1 Al Birūnī, speaking of the melkite Syrian Christians, defines katholikos thus: Arabic jāṭalik. The residence of the katholikos of the Melkites in Muslim countries is Baghdad. He is under the patriarch of Antioch (ed. C. E. Sachau, London, 1879, pp. 233–4). So the katholikos of the Armenian Church was appointed originally from Caesarea, and had not even the specific rank of metropolitan. To-day there are four katholikoi in Armenia.

2 See for example, Abū Sa‘īd, pp. 92, 121, 138.

3 Arab Conquest, p. 173.

4 See Trad. B., p. 10, supra.


Before quitting Ṭabarī, however, I must point out a discrepancy in his evidence. For whereas in the one tradition he says that when ‘Amr, reinforced by Zubair, met Abū Maryam and Abī Maryam, they fought with him;¹ in the other he says ‘When ‘Amr and Al Mūkūkis met at ‘Ain Shams, their armies began to fight’² That these two statements refer to one and the same incident, does not in my opinion admit of reasonable doubt. It is one more illustration of the necessity of considering the various traditions in Ṭabarī in their isolation as well as in their union. But if the incident is the same, and if one tradition alleges that it was the katholikos of Miṣr, while another alleges that it was Al Mūkūkis, whose meeting with ‘Amr was followed by the battle at ‘Ain Shams, or the battle of Helíopolis, then it follows that the Mūkūkis may be identified with the katholikos of Miṣr, and the katholikos of Miṣr may be the metropolitan of Egypt, or in other words the Patriarch Cyrus. In that case, however, the tradition which separates Cyrus from Al Mūkūkis must be so far mistaken. And it must be remembered that equal authority cannot attach to inconsistent traditions. One must choose between them on a balance of evidence.

The name Abū Maryam which I gave in the Arab Conquest (p. 515). It cannot be identified with the name Benjamin. Historically it is certain that Benjamin was in retreat in the desert till after the Muslim power was established in Egypt; and philologically I accept Catani’s objection that the names Ibn Yāmin and Maryam were both so well known to the Arabs that confusion between them is very improbable. I may add that the very name Abū Maryam is found, in the Aphrodite papyri (MS. 1448, Brit. Mus. Catalogue), dating from about A.D. 700.

¹ p. 2584. ² p. 2592.

Ṭabarī’s testimony, however, rightly interpreted, not only harmonizes rather than clashes with my theory, but actually supports it. I may add that there is not a word in his whole story suggesting or justifying the identification of Al Mūkūkis with any subordinate officer of the empire whatever.

Let us now see whether other Arabic historians bear out Dr. Lane-Poole’s contention. There is an important passage in Ibn Abd al Ḥakam (c. A.D. 850) which, so far as I know, has not been noticed in this connexion:

فوجئه هرقل ملك الروم كما دتى شيخ من اهل مصر المغوس أميراً على مصر وجعل إليه حربها وحياها خراجها ودول الاستكبتاره.

Which means that Heraclius, the Roman emperor, deputed Al Mūkūkis as viceroy over Egypt with full military power and with control of the revenue or taxes. What can such a position mean but one of supreme authority? In naming Al Mūkūkis as controller of the revenue Ibn Abd al Ḥakam is not only supported by Eutychius ² (A.D. 876–939) among Arabic writers, but he is in most remarkable agreement with the seventh-century Coptic document,³ which in recounting the visit of 

¹ This is in the part published by Karle, p. 55 of the Arabic text (Göttingen, 1856, 410).
² For quotation and reference see below, p. 86.
³ MSS. Copi, Clar. Press, p. 5, published in Amélineau’s Vie de Samuel de Kolamim. See Arab Conquest, p. 518; but I did not know of the passage in Ibn Abd al Ḥakam when that page was written.
between Ibn 'Abd al Hakam and another quite independent authority. The Arabic historian makes two statements about Al Mukaukis, the one emphasizing his military, the other his fiscal authority. On the fiscal side, we have clear confirmation from Coptic documents; on the military side I now give a curious confirmation from a seventh-century Syriac document which has not very long come to light. The Chronicon Anonymum, translated and edited by Guidi and published among the Chronica Minora, was written in the seventh century shortly after the subjugation of Egypt, and it declares that the Arabs were deterred at first from the invasion because the frontiers of Egypt were defended with a large and powerful army by the patriarch of Alexandria. Such a statement would sound almost incredible, if it stood alone: how could an archbishop control these purely military measures? But if the patriarch at this time was Cyrus, as is not denied, and if Cyrus was Al Mukaukis, then the assertion of the very early Syriac document exactly tallies with Ibn 'Abd al Hakam's description of the viceroy as clothed with full military power.

So much, then, for Ibn 'Abd al Hakam. It is obviously impossible to deny that he represents Al Mukaukis as sent to Egypt by Heraclius with
full civil and military power; that such a description cannot conceivably apply to any subordinate official; and that the evidence of this Arabic writer is most remarkably confirmed by independent Coptic and Syriac documents almost or actually contemporary with the conquest.

Al Baladhuri (A.D. 806–93) is not very definite about Al Mukaukis. But he represents him as having concluded peace with 'Amr under a treaty which Heraclius repudiated—presumably the treaty of Misr; as subsequently in command at Alexandria during the siege; and as again negotiating with 'Amr for the surrender of that city. There is no word in this writer to support the assumption that the Mukaukis was a subordinate official; indeed Baladhuri's account is in close agreement with John of Nikiou's account of Cyrus.

Al Ya'qubi (died A.D. 873), who was not an Egyptian, makes the Mukaukis conclude peace with 'Amr—a peace which Heraclius repudiated.

Ibn al Athir (A.D. 1160–1232) seems to follow Tabari; but he describes Abu Maryam, who was sent by Al Mukaukis to meet 'Amr, as katholikos of Memphis, clearly showing that he understood the expression katholikos of Misr as referring to the bishop of the city of Misr and not to the patriarch of Alexandria. There is therefore nothing inconsistent in Ibn al Athir's evidence with the theory identifying Al Mukaukis with Cyrus. I may add that bishop and archbishop were not very clearly distinguished by Arab writers. Thus Abu l'Mahasin, who speaks of Abu Maryam as katholikos of Misr, also speaks of Benjamin as bishop of
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Alexandria. So the phrase bishop of Rome is not unknown in history. But Ibn al Athir represents the Mukaukis as ordering battle to be given at 'Ain Shams on the advice of the military tribune; as negotiating later at Alexandria; and as making peace with the Arabs. This Arabic historian then in no way countenances the theory that the Mukaukis could be a subordinate officer.

Ya'qubi (A.D. 1178–1229) makes the Mukaukis the author of the peace on behalf of Copts and Romans and subject to the emperor's approval—evidence that he was in the writer's opinion viceroy of Egypt.

Al Makin (A.D. 1205–73) says that Al Mukaukis was 'governor of Egypt in the name of Heraclius', i.e. viceroy.

Ibn Dukmak (c. A.D. 1350–1406) cites Ibn Wahb as quoting Al Layth ibn S'd as follows: 'Al Mukaukis, the Roman, who was viceroy (khalif) of Egypt, made terms of peace with 'Amr.'

Makrizi (A.D. 1355–1442) quotes Yazid ibn Abi Habib as saying that 'Al Mukaukis, the Roman, being governor of Egypt, made peace with 'Amr'; and the fort', i.e. Babylon, 'was commanded by Al U'airig under the authority of the Mukaukis'; and of the Mukaukis again 'he governed the country for the emperor Heraclius'. He also made the Treaty of Misr, which the emperor repudiated, 'reproaching his representative with imitating the cowardice and meanness of the Egyptians,' &c. There is no shadow of doubt that Al Makrizi regarded Al Mukaukis as viceroy of Egypt.

Abu l'Mahasin (A.D. 1411–69) says that 'the
commander of Kašr ash Sham'a (i.e. fortress of Babylon) was ‘Ughairig, who was subordinate to Al Muğkūkís’.

Then began the siege of the fortress, which was commanded by Al Mandafûr on behalf of Al Muğkūkís, Ibn Kašrak al Yunănt. Again he speaks of ‘the principal Egyptians with their governor Al Muğkūkís’. There was no question of an inferior official in the judgement of Abu ’l Maḥāsīn.

With him As Suyūṭī (A.D. 1445-1505) is in general agreement: ‘The emperor Heraclius repudiated the agreement made by Al Muğkūkís with the Arabs,’ and so forth.

In order to meet Dr. Lane-Poole’s statement that, so far as the Arabic evidence goes, Al Muğkūkís might be ‘sub-governor’ or some official under the governor-general of Egypt, I have reviewed the evidence and selected definitions of his authority and position from the principal Arabic historians from Ibn ‘Abd al Ḥakam down to As Suyūṭī. And what is the result? They one and all either describe him as ʿālm king or viceroy, and ʿālī, prince or governor-general, or else they describe his office in terms which cannot possibly apply to any but the supreme authority in Egypt. The Arabic historians, therefore, can only be taken to prove that the Muğkūkís was Heraclius’ viceroy in Egypt; and they totally fail to support any theory which would assign to him any subordinate position. He was ruler of the country, deputed by the emperor, exactly as Ibn ‘Abd al Ḥakam alleges.

So much seems fairly established. But if Dr. Lane-Poole was driven to the theory that Al Muğkūkís held a subordinate position as the only way of avoiding the identification of Al Muğkūkís with Cyrus, and if that theory has been proved totally irreconcilable with the evidence of the Arabic historians on which he relied, then Dr. Lane-Poole’s position has become altogether untenable.

But his argument had two divisions—one, that the Arabic evidence told against the identification of Cyrus with the Muğkūkís, the other that the Coptic evidence was unworthy of credit. On the first I have rebutted his contention: I now will deal with his attempt to discredit the Coptic authorities. It is quite true that I said in the Arab Conquest of Egypt that the historical value of certain Coptic documents which I named is not very great; but the saying is quoted somewhat unfairly against me. The reason I gave was that the writers, ‘where they might have told us so much, furnish only a few scanty and incidental allusions to contemporary history’; but it is obviously most unjust to reject the historical material which Coptic authorities do afford on the ground that they do not afford more. In these documents the allusions to matters of history are clearly unstudied, and when they relate to contemporary events, they are of unquestionable value. I have already dwelt on the Bodleian seventh-century Coptic MS. recounting the visit of

1 Two MSS. give the name of the Muğkūkís as ʼeṣṣr or ʼeṣṣr ibn Minā. Clearly the name has been transferred from the commander of the fortress to the Muğkūkís by error.

2 Probably مکابن, as I have shown. See Arab Conquest, p. 513.

3 Pref. p. x.
the melkite archbishop to the monastery of Kalamün, and I have shown how it agrees with the story of the same event (in which the visitor is called Al Mašaur) in the Arabic Synaxarium. Is this evidence to be rejected? On the contrary, I have shown that the identification of Cyrus as military ruler of Egypt is further confirmed by the seventh-century Syriac document, and I may now add that there is a distinct precedent for the union of the supreme secular and ecclesiastical power in a single person to be found in the sixth century. For Justinian offered the patriarchate of Alexandria coupled with the viceroyalty to Theodosius, if only he would accept the tome of Leo; and, this being so, there is clearly nothing remarkable in the fact that Heraclius united both offices in the person of Cyrus. Both these statements are made by, or at least occur in, Severus: whose history with its later additions is a compilation the value of which is now admitted by scholars. I spoke somewhat slightly of it, no doubt; but I spoke on imperfect acquaintance with the work, which then existed only in MS., but has since been in large part published. Mr. Evetts, who is editing the text with a translation, thus speaks of the work:

'L'Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie est le Liber Pontificalis de l'Église Copte. La première partie est une compilation faite . . . par Sévere, évêque d'El Eshmuènein dans la Haute-Égypte, d'après des documents grecs et coptes qu'il a trouvés dans les monastères de son pays et qu'il a traduits

1 Hist. Pat., p. 462.
2 Arab Conquest, Pref., p. xiv.

avec l'aide de quelques clercs . . . Dès le septième siècle et surtout dès l'époque de la conquête arabe, l'histori des patriarches devient beaucoup plus complète et plus intéressante. Nous avons ici une série de vraies biographies écrites par des auteurs contemporains.' With this verdict no one who has carefully studied the work of Severus can fail to agree; but as I have not seen any reasoned discussion of the question, I may venture to give some of the grounds which justify a high estimate of Severus' authority as a historian.1

From the earliest times the records of the Coptic Church seem to have been written mainly in the form of biographies, and to have been preserved in the library of the well-known monastery of Macarius at Wadi Naṭrūn. No better place of security could have been found than within the walls of this remote convent fortress in the desert; and here were stored the MSS. on which Severus founded his history. A note dated June 1, A.D. 1081, and added to the text runs as follows2: 'Here ends the sixteenth chapter wherein the history of the fathers is completed as far as Abba Simon, the forty-second patriarch. . . . Hereafter will follow that which we have translated from the documents in the monastery of St. Macarius, viz., the history of the patriarchs from Michael the Last to Sinuthius the First. We

1 Renaudot in his preface has some remarks on the value of Severus, and gives reasons for not publishing the whole text; but he does not deal with the internal evidence which the text affords for its historic authenticity (Histria Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum, Paris, 1713, 4to).
2 Hist. Pat. Alex. in Patr. Orient., t. v, fasc. 1, p. 47.
also translated in this monastery the lives of nine other patriarchs in the year 796 of the Martyrs (A.D. 1080). This is written by Apacyrus the deacon and Michael, son of Apater, of Damascus, through the grace of God which enabled us to find the histories in the monastery of St. Macarius, with the help of the brother Theodore, the steward, son of Paul, on Sunday the 6th of Bā‘īnah in the year 797 of the righteous martyrs. We have compared the MSS. one with another and found them corresponding to our copies, and so we assured ourselves of their authenticity.

This is a record of the careful and conscientious study of original sources, and the same process can be traced nearly four centuries earlier. For we learn from another passage that events up to the time of Chalcedon and Dioscorus (c. A.D. 450) were 'written down in the twelfth part of the histories of the Church'. Next, for the chronicle from Cyril down to Alexander 'we may consult the teacher and scribe George, archdeacon and secretary to the patriarch Simon' (A.D. 689–701), who also wrote his history at the monastery of St. Macarius; and the writer adds, 'Therefore I, the vile sinner, beg you to pray the Lord Christ for me that he may loose the bond of my feeble tongue and open my darkened heart and give me knowledge of words, so that I may be able to show forth what you, my brethren and my father, ask of me, not as a teacher and guide above you but as a scholar, since I saw that of which I have written with mine own eyes and its importance imposes an obligation upon me, besides what I heard from friends older than myself such as I could trust and believe.'... Indeed the Lord Christ knows that we have added nothing to the facts, having related what took place down to the death of the blessed father Theodore, patriarch of Alexandria, and the affairs of state in his days to the end of the seventeenth chapter of the history, completed above,' i.e. to A.D. 743. 'Now... we will write the eighteenth chapter of the history of the Church,' the historian proceeds, while to an assertion which he makes a few lines lower he adds, 'as we witnessed with our own eyes many times'; and again, 'They set up a king called Kyriakos (in Nubia) who has remained king to the day on which I write this history.' Here is clear proof of a contemporary writer in the eighth century of our era. The writer was the secretary to Mūsā, bishop of Wasim, near Gizah, who constantly writes in the first person—e.g. 'we attended at the palace', 'there was with us Abba Theodore, bishop of Miṣr,' &c.—and he gives textually an extract of the patriarch Michael's memorandum (on the subject of the monastery of Minā by Mariūt) which was presented to 'Abd al Malik's secretary.' On the other hand he defends an omission of certain incidents by saying, 'I have related these matters

---


3 Id., p. 122.
in the book of his (Michael's) biography apart from this history.' But he again records historical events—the death of Marwân: 'they impaled Marwân head downwards, having taken him prisoner: and we were witnesses of this event.'

In the seventh century the biographer of John III (A.D. 677-86), in recounting the story of John's last journey to Alexandria says, 'the writer of this history was with him, for he was his spiritual son,' and he gives many graphic details such as a contemporary writer alone could furnish.

Further, many historical allusions which occur in Severus and can be controlled, are obviously correct. Thus in the account of Simon I we read, 'On a Sunday news came to the Amir that the army of the Romans had risen against the prince Justinian and deposed him, and had appointed Leonitus in his stead,' Simon's patriarchate is dated A.D. 689-701 or rather 700, and Justinian II was deposed in A.D. 695. Again, 'Meanwhile the Roman monarchy was like a children's game.' For when the Romans had deposed Justinian their prince, they made Leo (or Leonitus) their ruler in his place. But Leo was put to death before he had completed the third year of his reign, and after him reigned Apeimarus (called Tiberius)...After him reigned Philippicus. Then after two years Anastasius was made prince of the Romans and is still reigning. [By saying still the writer means at the time of composing the history.]

---

1 Hist. Pat., p. 111. 2 Id., p. 187. 3 Id., p. 35.
4 Such as that known as King of the Castle.
5 Hist. Pat., p. 57. The words in square brackets are a note by

---

One other instance must suffice. When the tyrant Kūrrah was governor of Egypt, we are told that he exercised the most violent extortion, seizing and confiscating private property, estates, revenues, and endowments, till the people were reduced to abject poverty, 'and men began to flee from place to place, but no place would harbour them.' For Kūrrah sent his agent, 'who collected the fugitives from every place, and brought them back, and bound them and punished them.' These events are recorded as happening in the patriarchate of Alexander II (A.D. 705-30). Now this account has been absolutely confirmed by the recently discovered Aphrodisio papyri, where precisely the same story of the fugitives may be gathered from the Greek documents, which are dated A.D. 708-10. This coincidence of the two versions is exceedingly strong evidence for the historical accuracy of the History of the Patriarchs.

It is no doubt difficult at times to distinguish the real author of any particular story in this work, for the reason that the biographies and other documents embodied in the history were written by several hands during the life or just after the death of the successive patriarchs; and the ego of the writer is constantly changing: Thus the compiler who says, at the end of the life of Michael I, 'he the translator or editor of the original Greek or Coptic record. Mr. Evett ascribes the note to Mauhāb.

1 Hist. Pat., p. 64.
2 See two articles by Mr. H. I. Bell, (1) The Aphrodisio Papyri in Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xxviii, p. 98 (1908), and (2) Translations of the Greek Aphrodisio Papyri in the British Museum in Der Islam, Bd. ii, Heft 2/3, p. 270 (Strassburg, 1911).
remained on the evangelical throne, according to the statement which we found in the library of the monastery of St. Macarius, twenty-three years and a half \(^1\) to A.D. 768, cannot be the same as the writer who speaks of Anastasius as Roman emperor still reigning, though he is doubtless the author of the comment on the word still. But the fact that the various MSS. found in the library were copied verbatim et litteratim, and that they go back to the earliest times and are contemporary for the most part with the events recorded, gives a very high value to the work. Of course, miraculous and fabulous elements as well as mistakes are found, just as they are found in all the Arab historians; but there would be little early history of any sort left, if every record tainted with legendary matter or error were rejected. And on the whole I say without fear that the general credibility of the patriarchal chronicles on matters of history is established beyond question.

This has been a rather long digression; but it was necessary to rebut Dr. Lane-Poole's assertion impugning Severus' authority. He makes a great point of the apparent admission by Severus that he did not know Greek or Coptic. This confession of ignorance is certainly made by the writer of the third preface to the history; but there is strong evidence that Severus' name was attached by the error of a copyist to that preface, which Severus cannot have written.\(^2\) There proves therefore on examination to

\(^1\) Hist. Pat., p. 215.

\(^2\) The share of Severus in the editorship of these histories is difficult to determine. If the third preface were written by him, it

be little or no warrant for the belief that Severus was ignorant of Greek and Coptic, and every warrant for the belief that his history was a careful compilation founded upon authentic documents. It is accordingly wrong to discredit his evidence; indeed, I am not aware of a single Arab historian whose work can be shown to be based in the same way upon a continuous series of written records, and records, for the most part, of contemporary writers. The Arab historians recount a great many traditions of early times, but they very seldom cite or even mention original documents.\(^1\) In other words, Coptic history is based on a much more scientific and solid foundation of MS. authority.

These considerations justify such an estimate of the historical value of Severus' work, that its evidence on the question of Al Mu'awwiya's identity cannot be

would mean that his collection went down to his own times, i.e. at least to A.D. 977, and that it included some biographies, composed by himself, of patriarchs his contemporaries. But the author or compiler of the ten biographies from Michael III (A.D. 881) to Simeon II (died A.D. 1047) was Michael, bishop of Timnas; and in these Severus had no hand. It seems probable, according to the best opinion, that Severus' own work was the collection and compilation of the lives of the first forty-two patriarchs from St. Mark to Simon I, and that this is the work referred to as the Book of Biographies in the list of Severus' works given in the Life of Philotheus (A.D. 981-1095); and also the work which about a hundred years later was discovered at the monastery of the Lady at Nahāy by Mauhīb, as he relates in his preface to the twenty-sixth chapter of the History of the Patriarchs, a chapter not yet published (Paris MS. 302, p. 135).

\(^1\) Of course, it is common enough for one Arab writer to quote another, e.g. Makrizi cites Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam and others. But Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam does not enlighten us with regard to his original MS. sources.
lightly set aside. Let us see then what Severus says—or rather the biographer of the patriarch Benjamin.

‘Heracleius appointed Cyrus, governor of Egypt, to be both patriarch and governor together.’ When Cyrus came to Alexandria Benjamin was warned and fled to a desert monastery in Upper Egypt, where he remained in hiding for ten years, and ‘these were the years’, he says, ‘during which Heracleius and Al Mukaukis reigned over Egypt.’ He again speaks of Al Mukaukis as having driven him away, and speaks of Cyrus as ‘the misbelieving governor of Alexandria, who was both governor and patriarch under the Romans’. This language establishes the identity of Cyrus and Al Mukaukis very clearly, and, as I have shown, it completely agrees with the language of the Arabic Synaxarium.—Al Mukaukis was head of the faith of Chalcedon, and had been made governor and patriarch over Egypt,—and with the Ethiopic Synaxarium, ‘Al Mukaukis, i.e. the governor and archbishop of the city of Alexandria and all the land of Egypt.’ I have also shown the exact correspondence of the language with that of the contemporary Bodleian MS., which makes the Mukaukis hold the two offices of archbishop (or patriarch) and controller of finance in Egypt; and I have shown how a nearly contempo-orary Syriac MS., the Chronicon Anonymum, makes the patriarch of Alexandria responsible for the military defences of Egypt against the Arabs; while on the other hand the Arab historian Ibn ‘Abd al Hakam describes the viceroy of Heracleius in Egypt as possessing full military power and as controller of finance, and calls him Al Mukaukis.

The Greek historians also use language tending to the same conclusion. Nicephorus says that Heracleius sent Marianus to Alexandria to act in concert with Cyrus, the patriarch of Alexandria, and to settle together some arrangement with regard to the Arabs; and again he speaks of Cyrus as bishop of Alexandria.

Theophanes is more explicit. He says, ‘on the death of George (melkite or Chalcedonian patriarch) Cyrus was sent as bishop to Alexandria,’ and speaking of the Arabs he says: ‘They invaded Egypt. Now Cyrus was charged before the emperor with having made over the gold of Egypt to the Arabs, and the emperor sent an angry message for his recall.’

The facts to which these Greek writers testify are as follows. Both agree that Cyrus was patriarch of

1 H. Ph., pp. 490, 491, 495.
2 Arab. Chron., p. 541.
3 The fact that the story of Benjamin at Kalamin and the visit of Al Mukaukis is confirmed by the contemporary Bodleian MS., is good evidence for the authority of the Synaxarium on this question.
In Tabari

But how closely this evidence of the Greek historians tallies with that of the Arab writers in all but this one point—that the Arabs use the term Al Mukaiks where the Greeks write Cyrus! For the Arab writers agree generally that the treaty with 'Amr was made by Al Mukaiks, that it had to be submitted by him for approval to Heraclius, and that Heraclius repudiated it with anger; and though they do not mention the recall of Al Mukaiks, the recall of Cyrus is confirmed by the contemporary writer John of Nikiou.

It remains briefly to notice the testimony of two Christian Arabic historians—Abu Salih, and Sa'id ibn al Bahriq or Eutychius. Abu Salih, while agreeing that Al Mukaiks was made governor of Egypt by Heraclius, also says that the ten years of banishment suffered by the patriarch Benjamin were the ten years during which Al Mukaiks was ruling in Egypt. I do not blink the fact that Abu Salih makes the Mukaiks bear the name of George, son of Minâ, and that other writers give mission to Egypt after Heraclius' death proves that he was not regarded as a traitor. It merely proves that the surrender advocated by Cyrus was no longer thought impossible. One more point. Yakût expressly says that though the Mukaiks generally resided at Alexandria, yet that he was at Babylon at the time of the siege, as Caetani (p. 254) records: how then can Caetani justify the assertion that he was perhaps at Alexandria?

1 Caetani, p. 51.
2 Caetani, p. 51.
3 Id., p. 230.
other names; but it is sufficient to say that no name whatever is attached to the title in any early authority, and that a name first occurring five or six centuries after the death of Al Mukaukish cannot stand for a moment against the cumulative force of the arguments identifying Al Mukaukish with Cyrus. Abū Šāliḥ the Armenian then agrees with the Coptic and Greek and with the Egyptian historians as to the office which Al Mukaukish held, and he agrees with Severus that Al Mukaukish was the Chalcedonian persecutor of the Copts who drove Benjamin into exile.

Eutychius (A.D. 876-939) wrote about three centuries before Abū Šāliḥ, and it must be remembered that he was not merely a Chalcedonian himself, but actually melkite patriarch in Egypt. He says, 'After the flight of George, Cyrus became patriarch of Alexandria. He was a Maronite, of the same creed as Heraclius'; but in another place he says:

و كان العامل على الخراج بمصر المتوفى من قبل هرقن الملك

The controller of the revenue in Egypt on behalf of the emperor Heraclius was Al Mukaukish, 'who was', he adds, 'a Jacobite (or Copt) hating the Romans, but not daring to betray his Jacobite opinions, lest he should be put to death by the Romans'.

Of course Eutychius as melkite patriarch was anxious to remove from the memory of Cyrus the

odium of the surrender of Egypt to the Arabs; but he is driven to strange shifts. Thus having declared that Cyrus came as patriarch on Heraclius' appointment to Alexandria, he avers on the same page that there was no melkite patriarch of Alexandria for ninety-seven years after the flight of George—a very daring perversion of history. Apparently, therefore, Eutychius at once refuses to recognize Cyrus as melkite patriarch and at the same time charges Al Mukaukish with being a Copt at heart. The very charge is an admission that Al Mukaukish was professedly a melkite; and though Eutychius does not say that Cyrus and Al Mukaukish were one, this coincidence is very significant; while his further statement that Al Mukaukish was made controller of the revenue by Heraclius brings him into line with Ibn 'Abd al Ḥakam and with the Bodleian Coptic MS. Like the Arab writers too Eutychius represents Al Mukaukish as present in the fortress of Babylon at the siege, as retiring to Raudah, as negotiating with 'Amr, and as concluding peace by the Treaty of Miṣr. But I attribute Eutychius' failure to identify Cyrus with Al Mukaukish in terms rather to ignorance than to disingenuousness—an ignorance which leads him to speak of Al Mukaukish as alive at the time of Manuel's rebellion.¹

¹ Ibn 'Abd al Ḥakam has been quoted as supporting this statement; but the fact is that there was no one alive at the date of Manuel's rebellion (A.D. 645) to whom the name could apply, and Arab writers persistently confuse the peaceful surrender of Alexandria by the Mukaukish with its subsequent recapture from the rebel Manuel.
I have now shown what an extraordinary concurrence and convergence of evidence there is from original and sometimes contemporary documents—Greek, Coptic, Syriac, and Arabic—establishing the identity of Al Muqauquis with Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, Controller of the Revenues, and Governor-General of Egypt at the time of the conquest. It is no answer to say that the title Al Muqauquis is sometimes given by Arab historians to this or that person who cannot have been Cyrus. I admit the fact, but totally deny the conclusion that, because the term is misapplied in particular cases and bestowed on different persons, therefore it does not properly belong to any single person. That seems to be Caetani’s argument. But the truth rather is that while the Arab historians for the most part wrote with only a vague notion of the Muqauquis as

1 p. 342. ‘Nella narrazione della resa di Babilonia presso le fonti Arabi noi crediamo perciò possibile che sotto il nome di Al Muqawqis siano da intendersi due persone distinte e diverse, le quali nello hanno che fare con Ciro ossia il comandante militare greco che consegnò la rocca di Babilonia, e un qualche vescovo cotto che ottenne un accordo provvisorio per la protezione degli Copti sino alla fine della campagna contro i Greci. Siccome Ciro infine riappare sicuramente nei cronisti musulmani come Al Muqawqis alla resa di Alessandria, è evidente che sotto un solo nome si ascondono per lo meno tre persone diverse.’ Again on pp. 244–5 he speaks of my ‘erroneous theory that Al Muqauquis is always Cyrus’. That of course is an unfair presentation of the case. I admit fully that actions and situations are ascribed by Arab historians to an Al Muqauquis who cannot always be Cyrus; but their erroneous application of the name does not render my theory erroneous. But I hope it is not presumptuous to say, in differing from Caetani, that I have the profoundest respect and admiration for his monumental *Annales dell’Islam* and the amazing amount of scholarly labour and research which it contains.
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Questa biografia di Amr ibn al-‘As, il conquistatore arabo dell’Egitto (594-664), è apparsa nel 1957 al Cairo (collana ‘Al‘am al-‘Arab, della casa editrice Dar al-Ma‘arif). L’autore, ‘Abd al-Salam al-‘Aṣarī, ex funzionario del Ministero dell’educazione e dell’ insegnamento, è scrittore di talento che si distingue sia per visione poetica che per indagine storica (1). L’operetta nel delineare la carriera del grande generale spazia con scorcio efficace dall’ultimo periodo del paganesimo in Arabia, attraverso le lotte fra musulmani e idolatri, le grandi conquiste, la rivolta e i torbidi sotto il califfo di ‘Uthmān e di ‘Alī, fino all’avvento degli Ōmayyad. Animata d’entusiasmo etnico-religioso, trabocca d’ammirazione per il miracolo compiuto dall’Islām; una gente fino allora nomade e solo avvezza alla pastorizia, al commercio, alla guerriglia, si è trasformata in una truppa di credenti che sbaragliò gli eserciti dei più potenti imperi in nome dei sublimi ideali di eguaglianza e libertà. Il ‘ihād con i suoi martiri (‘shihād = testimone della fede, come greco μάρτυς).

Suggestiva e vivida è la rievocazione iniziale della vita alla Mecca durante la Ḥajāliyya con le sue rivalità gentilizie e commerciali. Suggestivi sono pure certi cenni descrittivi come quello che apre il cap. III con gli idoli della Ka‘ba illuminati da quella aurora fatale; quello alla terra che germina fecondata dal Nilo (cap. XIX); quello che allude all’imminenza del primo albeggiare, quando i tre imām escono per la preghiera, con l’espressione di origine coranica (al-baqara, 186):

“il filo bianco stava per distinguersi dal filo nero” (cap. XX).

La lingua è classicamente pura. Lo stile, pur modernamente sobrio, abbona in procedimenti retorici, in immagini cariche tradizionali. Alcuni motivi sono ripetuti con predilezione come la vita rude e frugale dei primi musulmani e il loro principio d’uguaglianza descritti da un messo che ne ha visitato il campo;

---

1) Altra sua opera scritta in collaborazione con Muhammad ‘Abd al-‘Amin al-Hasan, è la vita di ‘Āmina bint Wāhab, la madre del profeta, racconto agiografico pervaso da tenero e fresco sentimento religioso (‘Al‘am al-Mas‘ūda, Cairo).
الصحراء، أما النهر فإنه يقام على مسافة قليلة، تصلون إليه بالقصر.
والقين، وبينكم ما شروهم من هذا الحدود.
وفي شهر فذاعف الحصن تناثر في حدوده، والروم يجميعون
الصوم السيف للسلاطين المتينة، ثم يفرعون إلى حسمهم، حتى خارج
قواهم، ونجد ألا مطر من السلم.
وأشق ضوء الصباح القادم على أبواب الحصن وقد تفتحت مستمرة،
فاندفع فيها جيش الإسلام بلغ الكبيرة والبدرة والحمض، فوضع السلاح
القدر، وسرد السماح، وباشا الرسول، ورجل أعمده ليائلاً
جسور، يقى الغرام ويفر بالنصر القريب، حتى بلغوا بلبس،
وكان الأربعين قد استعد فيها للقاء المسلمين متحماً، جنباً جنباً،
فلتن السلاح حوله واضتفروا على الحباق، وأذافاً من حيره منه طعم
الموت، حتى بهم المحاربون وفتحوا أبواب يطنون الآمن.
وشد السلاح على مقاوض سيفهم، وعبوا في عاصفة من التكبير
والتكلم إلى تلك الأبواب المستمرة، وأصمهم موعود مرفوع السيف باسم
النهر، يغلب دخول بلبس في أحضان الإسلام، ويفرش المسلمين
بالفتح المبين، فقد أصبحوا على سرية يوم واحد من رأس الدنا، حيث
تنشب المعركة الفاصلة بين قوة الحق وعهد الباطل.
بين فكي الأسد
يوم واحد من رأس الدنا، يوم واحد من النيل! النصر للحق،
واخذлан الباطل!
كانت هذه الانتفاضات تدوى في حمض الصحراء، يشهد الله على ما قُل
لب الميمنين من الإخلاص لbaoe، والعمل لإخلاص كله، وخرج
من أواه المسلمين قوة حارة، فلقيت بسيطات السفر المنهوجة في أشعة
السمس قفزت بدراً وروفاً. حتى بلغوا مكاناً على مسيرة من النيل في
حدود الصحراء بسما، عين شمس، فانهاءه عروق قاعدته. له
وكأن الروم يقلّون أكنهم عجبًا من هذا الجيش والقائد: وقد أجمعوا
vo scivolato via dal Nilo attraverso il deserto? Quanto al fiume, esso è un'acqua vasta, impetuosa, incantevole, alla quale giungerete con tenacia e fiducia e vi sarà d'aiuto quello che avrete bevuto da questo rivo.

Passò un mese e i proiettili della fortezza si spargiavano intorno ai suoi lati. I Rûm uscivano, assaggiavano le sciabole svampanti dei musulmani, poi fuggivano nella fortezza, e ciò finché si spossarono le loro forze e caddero ch'era inevitabile la resa.

Spuntò sulle porte della fortezza la luce del quieto mattino in cui si aprirono per la resa. Si riversarono per esse i soldati dell'Islâm avvolti dalle grida di lode alla grandezza d'Allâh, all'Unico Dio. I musulmani accorsero al rivo a sorbire di quella acqua e mescolarla con la loro fede. Allora, lasciata al-Parma, ripresero il cammino mentre le loro lingue ripetevano i versi del Corano e l'annuncio del profeta, e 'Amr andava innanzi a loro, ardito leone, rinvigorendo la tenacia, annunciando la vittoria vicina. Andarono finché giunsero a Bilbîs. Là si teneva pronto Artabuno ad affrontare i musulmani, trincerato nella munita fortezza. I musulmani accercherono questa, le strinsero sopra il laccio che soffoca e a quanti ne uscirono fecero gustare il gusto della morte, finché gli assediati dispersero e aprirono le porte chiedendo di aver la vita salva.

I musulmani strinsero le impugnature delle sciabole e s'avventarono, vento d'une tempesta di lodi alla grandezza d'Allâh, all'Unico Dio, verso quelle porte anerte, con 'Amr innanzi a loro, la sciabola levata, il labbro sorridente, che proclamava l'entrata di Bilbîs nel seno dell'Islâm. Già erano giunti a una sola giornata di marcia dal vertice del delta, dove si sarebbe impegnata la battaglia decisiva fra la forza della verità e le armi della menzogna.

XV Tra le mandibole del leone

A una sola giornata dal vertice del delta, a una sola giornata dal Nilo! Vittoria alla verità! Disfatta alla menzogna!

Queste esclamationi rintronanti in mezzo al deserto, testimoniando ad Allâh quanta pia devozione alla sua religione era nei cuori dei credenti e quanta energia per esaltare la sua parola, uscivano forti e colorose dalle bocche dei musulmani e si incontravano con le lame delle sciabole fiammeggianti ai raggi del sole, le quali avevano più intenso lo sfogolar dei lampi. Essi giumsero così ad un luogo nei pressi del Nilo, ai confini del deserto, che si chiamava 'Ayn Şams. (56) 'Amr lo scelse per suo quartiere.

I Rûm agitavano le mani dallo stupore per quell'esercito e
أمرهم على أن يضربوه الضربة القاصمة إذا تقدم إلى النيل، وكانت كبيرة حاميةهم في جسم من جسم، على النيل يسعى حصن بابل ببمس، قرروا أن يقفوا لهم في مكان حصن النيل قبل بابل بمسه أم دين، وهو مكان يحمي الجيش من البحر، وتحييه السفني من النيل، ورب قائد الروم دفاعه، ونظر إلى جبيه في البحر وفي الام، وفتحه قهقه عالياً، وليى عنقه في كبر، بسم صالح:

- عرمو! أين عرمو؟! أيظن أن كل لقاء حرب! هندا سيدن! في هذا الماء ستنق جثث رجاله! سوف نسجل أم دين ما لم نسجل أجانب من بابل.

ثم علت قهقه وردد مرة أخرى:

- عرمو! أين هذا العمر؟!

وبعد أن أطمأن القائد العرمو إلى قاعدته في عين شمس، استنف:

مسبه حتى بلغ أم دين، ونظر إلى حصنها وقلاعها ثم خاطب نفسه:

- يا الله! حصنها منيعة وأسوارها مشككة! والسفين تحور جنوب النيل كيف العمل؟! ولم يطل الوقوف بعرمو، وقعد عليه بشعرو، وتحرك سيفه العد يرتفع إلى قلب أعوانها وهماهن، حتى أحس الروم بخرجتها، وذكر أنها ما سدده عن معونة النهاء لها، فولوا الأدوار واحتموا بالحصن، ثم عادوا النهر مرة بعد مرة فأحس عرمو بضرورة المدد.

فكتب إلى الخليفة بصدده ليتم الفتح.

والآن في اليوم الثامن وفترة أشهر أثر السحر، وعرمو يصد هجمات الروم، ويرحب الطريق لبري طلائع المدد الذي يبعثه الخليفة فل يرى مداً ولا من بشر بعدد، ونظر إلى قوة الروم الكبيرة وأعدادهم الكثيرة و겐سه القليل، ولكن مع نيب يضعه، واصطدم مع عزته مداً، ومن روح جبیه عرمو، وأل أن يقتتح حصن أم دين، وتفتح من وجه في قلوب أطفاله، وقدم أمامهم فانطلق منهم بسرعة ورقاب الروم، وواصلت الاقتلاع روهم وهزيلة حتى ترقوا منهم وعدتهم، وأمرعوا إلى آخر حصن من حضورهم. تركزين أم دين للمسلمين ينخلونها ما كآريل، فرحبين بما آتاه الله من فصله، بين تدعون لانتقام اللذاذ الكبير.
per il suo capitano. Avevano preso il consiglio di infliggergli il colpo che doveva stroncarlo, quando sarebbe avanzato fino al Nilo. Il grosso delle loro forze di difesa era stanziato nella munita fortezza del Nilo chiamata Forte di Babilonia, ma decisi- sero di tener testa ad Amr nella piazzaforte sul Nilo che pre-cedeva Babilonia (57) e si chiamava Umm Danîn, che difendevano gli eserciti dalla terra e le navi appoggiavano dal Nilo.

Il comandante Rûm mise in assetto la sua difesa. Guardò i suoi eserciti di terra e d'acqua, diede in una sonora sghignazzata, girò il collo con superbia e gridò:

- 'Amr! Dov'è 'Amr? Crede che ogni scontro sia una guerra?

Qui sarò sepolto! In quest'acqua saranno scaraventati i cadave-
ri dei suoi uomini! Umm Danîn farà quello che non fecero Aqna-
dayn e Rîlbîs!

Sghignazzò più forte e ripeté:

- 'Amr! Dov'è questo 'Amr?

Il capitano arabo dopo che si fu assicurato del suo quartiere ad Ayn Sams, riprese il cammino finché giunse ad Umm Danîn. Guardò alle fortezze e cittadelle che c'erano e disse fra sé:

- Allâh, le loro fortezze sono ben munite, hanno mura massicce, le navi proteggono il lato sul Nilo. Come si ha da fare? Ma 'Amr non stette fermo a lungo che le truppe dei Rûm avanzarono contro di lui. Vibrarono le sciabole degli arabi e conobbero la via loro ai cuori e alle teste dei nemici, tanto che i Rûm al prorvarne l'ardore, si rammaricarono di quello che avevano udito, che il cielo le soccorreva. Volsero le spalle e si trincerarono nella fortezza. Poi ritornarono alla carica, una volta dopo l'altra, e 'Amr sentì la necessità di rinforzi. Scrisse al califfo chiedendogli ausili per portare a termine la conquista.

Passarono i giorni uno dopo l'altro e i mesi, mentre Amr stornava gli assalti dei nemici. Egli osserva la via, se mai ve-
da spuntare la staffetta dei rinforzi che il califfo gli ha mandati, ma non vede rinforzi né alcuno che li annunci. Guarda la forza ingente dei Rûm, le loro caterve numerose; guarda il pro-
curò piccolo esercito ma non gene, non si fissa. Alla sua fer-
mezza chiese rinforzi, al suo animo milizia sterminata e giurò
d'espugnare il forte d' Umm Danîn. Il suo animo egli insufflò nei cuori dei compagni e, primo d'essi, avanzò.

Le sciabole dei musulmani avvolsero i colli dei Rûm, conti-
nuarono per un giorno e una notte a troncare le teste loro finché, abbandonate le navi e le armi, essi corsero all'ultima fortezza delle loro, lasciando Umm Danîn ai musulmani.

Vi entrarono questi chiamando grande, chiamando unico Allâh, lieti del favore concesso da Allâh, pronti ad espugnare l'ulti-
ma rocca.
وكان حصناً، بابليون، منبج البناء يخيط به خندق واسع، فقويوضع
الرومان فيه أشاكاكا من الحديد كانليك ينشب في كل رجل أو حاقره.
بقي عليه، ونظر عصره إلى ماء النبيك فرزة ماتلا إلى الحمرة، ووجدت بزيد
كل يوم وحمره تشتد يوم بعد يوم، فقل إن مصر مقنة على الفيتنان،
وخف أني بلما الماء ينخدق لبعون اقتحام الحصن، وأني ينشد في الروم،
وإن الحらいج في حرصهم في وسط مصر، وسيصبح قوة المسلمين مبعثة في هذه
البلاد الواسعة. وقد لى هيبه لاتهام هذا الحصن قبل بلوغ الفيتنان
أقصاء، وكان الروم قد دخلوا الحصن ومعهم أكبر القبائل ورؤايهم.
والمثقفين علتهم، وتحك أحمر الخصار، وينشد قضمه على أيه.
معقل من معاقل الروم، ثم أخذ يفكر فيها يضع حتى يبتغي هذا الماء.
ولم يظل التفكير بعمرو، فقد خلبه إلى قائد الروم أن يباغت العرب
ويقضي عليهم فجمع عشرين ألفا من الجنود المدينين، ولحكم الخطة
تكون هذه المدفعية نهاية عمرو وحل عمرو، وتأكد الجنود أن درة الناج
معقلاً على هذه الوقعة، فإنما كسبوها، وإنما طارت من أبينهم وألقوا
بعيداً عن مصر وليلها إذا هب هم البقاء، وانتظر القائد أن يباغت العرب
في قاعدتهم بعين يساس.
كانت صورة مصر البديعة وخبراتها الصعبة تتراشي أمام جنود الروم،
ثم ب tako أن العرب قد انتزعوا من أبينهم ثور حنضهم ويتغدوهم،
وأتت هذه الصورة الجبلية تتراهي أمام المسلمين، ويتغدوهم، وأهنم ينتزعوا
من أيدي الفيتنان، وان تأبوا لله سيفاغ عليهم جرارة إيقاها ونجدها;
فتشد عزازتهم وثور حنضهم كذلك، وسار الروم إلى الجبهة العري في
عين يساس والأمال تضحك في قلبهم، موقرن بالنصر على هذه الناقة
القائمة التي لن تذه ولولا حرسها الشياطين هذا الجيش الذي بد الآقت.
وكان عمرو قد علم ما بينه الروم، ونظر إلى جبهة الصغر ثم أطرق،
فبتكر في خطة تطهيرها ذلك الجبهة الصغر، لم يعد بزيد المدد.
ولا سلاح ينسه إلى السلاح، ولا شيء إلا عون الله ولخيلة الحكيمة التي
تكمل فلم تلبس الآلاف أن نحزم عشرين ألفا، وأروعت الخطة تمامًا فوز عمرو.
Il forte di Babilonia era di massiccia costruzione e lo circondava un vasto fossato nel quale i Rûm avevano disposto fili di ferro spinato perché si conficassero in qualsivoglia pie de d'uomo o zoccolo d'animale che vi cadesse sopra. 'Amr guardò l'acqua del Nilo e la vide che tendeva al rosso (58). Osservò che cresceva ogni giorno di più, che s'intensificava il suo rosso di giorno in giorno. Capi che l'Egitto andava verso la piena e temette che l'acqua riempisse il fossato e impedisse l'assalto della fortezza, che straripasse dai canali e dai rivi ed essi fossero bloccati nel mezzo dell'Egitto, la forza dei musulmani imprigionata in quelle vaste contrade. Volle tentare se gli riuscisse d'espugnare la fortezza prima che la piena giungesse al massimo. I Rûm erano entrati nella fortezza e con loro i capi dei Copti ed il Muqawqas, il loro principe. 'Amr pose l'assedio e premette con la sua stretta sulla fortezza più poderosa dei Rûm. Intanto pensò che cosa doveva fare finché le acque si fossero ritirate. Ma non stette a lungo a pensare, perché il comandante dei Rûm ritenne di cogliere gli arabi di sorpresa e di finirla ed assemsi perciò ventimila uomini di truppa esercitata, assedando il suo piano perché quel combattimento segnessi la fine di 'Amr e dei suoi stratagemmi. Le truppe sapevano bene che la perla della corona era in gioco nella pugna: o l'avrebbero guadagnata, o sarebbe volata via dalle loro mani ed essi sarebbero stati sbalzati fuori dall'Egitto e dal suo Nilo, se pur fossero sopravvissuti, il comandante risolse d'attaccare gli arabi al loro quartier generale di 'Ayn Šams.

L'immagine meravigliosa dell'Egitto e dei suoi beni universali appariva davanti ai soldati Rûm: si raffiguravano che gli arabi già l'avessero stravolto dalle loro mani e s'eccitava il loro ardore, si moltiplicava la loro fermezza. Dell'immagine bella appariva davanti ai musulmani: si raffiguravano di strapparlo dalle mani degli oppressori, che il premio d'Allâh sarebbe profuso su di essi a ricompensarli d'avérlo salvato e soccorso, e altrettanto si moltiplicava la loro fermezza, s'eccitava il loro ardore. I Rûm marciavano contro l'esercito degli arabi con la speranza che rideva nei cuori, convinti che avrebbero vinto quella scarsa schiera che non poteva resistere, nemmeno se i diavoli la presidiassero, a quella armata che ostruiva l'orizzonte.

'Amr seppe quello che i Rûm gli avevano preparato, guardò il suo piccolo esercito e stette silenzioso a meditare un piano con il quale affrontare quell'immensa armata. Nessun rinforzo che aumenti il numero, nessun'arma da aggiungere all'arma, nulla che l'aiuto di Dio e un piano sapiente che assicuri a poche migliaia la possibilità di sconfiggerne venti. Il piano ebbe tosto
فقدنا أصحابنا وأسر بنا إليهم، ثم أسرعوا خناقاً إلى خيولهم على شفاهم.

سلافة مشروعة تبشير بالتصرف للفئة القليلة المرنة على الريف الكثيرة الباغية.

والذي الجيشان في نصف المسافة بين عين شمس وبابلون، وأثنا

الروم بكل قرية في وجه المسلمين. فتشهد المسلمون قبليا وتفقد الرومان قليلًا. وتباهى القائد كما يقینه الوصية الذي يذر من الفرصة. وشتد به الزهر، وفر رؤية المسلمين قارب الرومان زداد انحدارهم على جيش العرب.

يزرون ويعمرون النصر، ولكن صبرًا عاليًا واستغفارة حزينة أخذت تبتث من ميسيب الروم. وانتقل القائد إلى هذا الجناح فجده يحتضر وسجد له. فانقضوا عليه من الشرق كان يجمل قد اشتد عصف فانحنىوا صادقة ماحتة. تنقضت نظام الجيش وأشاعت فيه اضطراباً شديداً. وكر عبر من أمامهم فلم يجدوا إلا الغرب ي📝 حوراً نحو مدن. ولكن

الأرض قد انتقلت عن قوى أخرى من المسلمين أ􏰇نثت عليهم من الغرب، وأصبحوا بين ماضي الأسد. فرصة سانحةتطمعها أثاباه ويلبيكها لسالاً كما يفطر. ومكتبها إلا قبل كانوا في المورة، فأتنفس بها نفسهم في النيل ساقيين لا يذرون أي يذهبون، ونود ليجندهم في الأجل فاستطاع أن

يفر إلى حصن بابل، ويعنف عليه الأقوام ويتبعس ماغلبها.

والجزء يدب من قبله إلى قلب من قبل الحرب. فرضاعون إطعام الأقوام.

حتى لا تتفتحن تلك الشياطين.

وكان عمر قد بني خطته على أن يقابل الروم ببعض جيشه، ويفرع

كيفية قوية في الجيل من الشرق. وكتب آخر عند أم دين من القرب حتى

يندع الروم فتبط على كاشته القوية، وسبق الروم إلى فتحه. وأعان

الله الفئة القليلة فهزمتهم الفئة الكثيرة بذاته. وتفقد عمر جيشه فلم يجد

قد نقص إلا القليل، ونظر إلى ما سبقه خينعة من السلاح والعدة. ثم

رفع يده إلى السماء. وتعلت أصوات المسلمين بحمد الله ورحبته أن

يعيهم على انتظام الحصن المتبوع. حتى يظهرها مصر من الروم وأدرك

الروم. ثم استماتوا المسابى إلى حصن بابل.
riempito l'animo di 'Amr. Chiamò i suoi compagni e lo rivolse loro. Allora corsero leste ai cavalli con sulle labbra un sorriso radioso che prediceva per la piccola schiera dei credenti la vittoria sul grande stuolo degli iniqui.

I due eserciti si scontrarono a mezza distanza fra 'Ayn Sams e Babilonia. I Rûm si gettarono con ogni forza addosso ai musulmani. I musulmani ripiegarono alquanto, i Rûm avanzarono alquanto. Il loro comandante sghignazzò come sghignazza la belva sicura della preda e si gonfiò di nuovo orgoglio. Il retrocedere dei musulmani confortò i cuori dei Rûm che premettero le truppe arabe con impeto maggiore, ruggendo impazienti di vincere.

Ma un gridare alto, un doloroso invocare aiuto si levò dall'alba estrema dei Rûm. Il comandante si volse a quell'alba e vide che veniva infranta. Vide che gli arabi vi erano piombati da oriente, quasi che la montagna fendendosi li avesse eruttati e fossero calati, folgore distruttrice che ha spezzato lo schieramento, ha spinto le truppe atroce sgomento.

'Amr era il primo alla carica e non rimase ai Rûm che ripararono ad occidente, fuggendo verso Umm Danîn. Ma la terra si spaccò vomitando altre forze musulmane che li investirono da occidente. Si trovarono fra le due mandibole del leone, facile preda da maciullare con le zanne, da triturare nelle fauci a sua voglia. Non ne scamparono che pochi che erano nella retroguardia: si gettarono nel Nilo, nuotando senza sapere dove. Certuni ebbero differito il loro fato e poterono rifugiarsi nel forte di Babilonia e sprangare le porte dietro a sé, sincerandosi dei catenacci. Lo spavento si insinuò dai loro cuori ai cuori di quelli che erano nella forterezza cosicché raddoppiarono le precauzioni alle porte, perché quei diavoli non le schiantassero.

Aveva 'Amr escogitato il suo piano con l'idea di affrontare i Rûm con una parte delle truppe, mentre appostava una forte imboscata sul monte ad oriente e un'altra imboscata ad occidente presso Umm Danîn, perché i Rûm fossero respinti e li serrasse quella sua potente tenaglia. I Rûm furono tratti nella sua trappola e Dio aiutò la piccola schiera sicché col suo permesso sconfisse il grande stuolo. 'Amr contò le perdite del suo esercito e trovò che ben poco esso aveva perduto. Guardò invece la preda che gli era toccata, d'armi e d'arnese, e alzò le mani al cielo. Le voci dei musulmani si levarono lodando Dio e pregando Lo di aiutarli ad espugnare il forte ben munito, per purificare l'Egitto dai Rûm e dalla loro sozzura. Quindi essi ripresero il cammino verso il Forte di Babilonia.
المفاوضة

التهدل المسلمون مرة أخرى حول الحصن المنبع، واتقاضي شهر بعد شهر. وجاء المدد يضيف إلى جيش عرب أربعة آلاف من صناديد المسلمين. فيهم أربعة كل منهم يثنى. ورأى المفوق عثمان النبط ما سيأتي إليه ذلك الحصار بعد هزيمة الروم، فخرج من باب الحصن الغربي واقم بالجزيرة مع كثير من الشهيرين، وسرى على أن يبقى مع المسلمين إلى شيء قبل فوات النصرة، وأرسل رسالة بكتاب إلى عموه:

هذا! وإذا تصرف نوافر الروم بكل ما يمكن! وإذا يعثنا
من النبل فيضانه! كنا نعمل ذلك النفسان أسوأ من يهديه! كنا
يذهدون الدروع! لا بد من اليوم سيصف هذه السنة القبلية! إنه لم
يقبل هنا حتى تتحدث إليه بما تحدثت لهغة!

والم يجب عرب على العشاء، ولم أذن للرسيل بالعودة، فظلوا بيوتين
بين العرب، ثم دعاهم المسلمون ردهم وأذن لهم. وكان المفوق قد قلقاً لإبطائهم
قد حذرت نفسه بأن عراً قبلهم رداً على هجدهم، وحاز في جمع إن كان
عرف قد فعل ذلك، ولكن الرسال قد عادت إليه عزيمة كرمته، وقدمت
إليه رد عموه ففشيته ونلاء مرة بعد مرة وأخذ يقول لما فيه:

٣- ثلاث خيالات نحتاتن إحداها: الدخل في الإسلام فكونون إخواناً
للمسلمين لكم ما لم وعليكم ما عليهم، ولا فالحريزة عن ربي! وأنتم صاغرون;
وعلى المسلمين حمايتكم والذوق عنكم. وتزكيم أهالكم وأهلاءكم.
وأرضكم وأعمالكم، ولا فالحرب والجهاد حتى يحكم الله وهو خير الحاكمين.

ثم ينت المفوق إلى رجل واسمه:

٢- كيف وليت هؤلاء المسلمين؟

٣- رأينا يوماً الموت أحدهم من الحياة والتواضع أحب إليهم من الرغبة.
ليس لأحمدهم في الدنيا وثوب، جلوسهم على التراب واعتكالهم على ركيزتهم.
وأرضهم كواحد منهم. ما يعرف يعيبهم من وضعهم ولا السيد لهم من المجد.
غريب شأن هؤلاء القوم! لو استقبل هؤلاء الجبال لأرملوا!
ولا بدون صاحبهم من مثوبرون بالفيفان ولا فل تطبعاً بعدد، ارجعوا
إلى عمو ليشتب من باشانا فرما وصلى إلى حن.
I musulmani circondarono di nuovo il forte ben munito. Passò un mese dopo l'altro. Arrivarono i rinforzi ad aggiungere allo esercito di 'Amr quattromila prodi musulmani, quattro di fra i quali contavano per mille ognuno. Il muqawwas, capo dei Copti, capì come sarebbe finito quell'assedio dopo le sconfitte dei Rûm. Usò dalla porta occidentale del forte e si tenne sull'isola con un drappello d'egiziani. Decise di addivenire ad un accordo con i musulmani prima che l'occasione gli sfuggisse. Mandò ad 'Amr i suoi nunzi con un messaggio.

- Che è questo? O che ci nuocerebbe, se venissero avanti i Rûm con tutto ciò che possiedono? Che c'importa del Mîlo e della sua piena? O che questa piena ci vuò dare prigionieri in mano sua, come egli dice? Ci intimorisce forse il muqawwas? Non ha fino ad oggi conosciuto le sciabole di questa piccola schiera? Ma invero egli non s'è trovato di fronte ad essa, perché gli parlasse il linguaggio che ha parlato ad altri!

E 'Amr non rispose al messaggio. E non permise ai messi che se ne tornassero, così rimasero due giorni fra gli arabi. Quindi li chiamò, consegnò loro la sua risposta e li congedò. Il muqawwas era inquieto per il loro ritardo; il cuore già gli diceva che 'Amr li aveva uccisi per tutta risposta alla sua diffida. Era perplesso sul da farsi se 'Amr avesse veramente fatto ciò. Ma i nunzi, trattati con tutto onore, tornarono a lui e gli presentarono la risposta di 'Amr. Egli la dissigillò, la lesse più volte, si mise a mormorarne il contenuto fra sè:

Di tre soluzioni sceglierete una. Entrate nell'Islâm! Sarete fratelli dei musulmani: per voi quello ch'è per loro; contro voi quello ch'è contro loro. Altrimenti, vi sottometterete al tributo e sarete minori e i musulmani vi obbligano a tutelarvi e a proteggervi e lasciarvi fra i beni, i figli, la terra, i lavoro vetri. Altrimenti, sarà la guerra e la lotta fino a che giudichi l'iddio, ed Egli è il giudice migliore.

Allora il muqawwas si volse ai suoi messi e li interrogò:

- Come avete trovato cuoi musulmani?
- Abbiamo trovato una stirpe d'uomini cui la morte è più cara della vita, l'umiltà dell'esaltazione; fra i quali alcuno non pone il suo desiderio nel mondo. Si siedono sulla terra e mangiano sulle ginocchia. Il loro principe è come uno di loro. Non si riconosce fra loro l'elevato dall'umile, non il signore dal servo.
- Strani questi arabi! Costoro, se movessero contro le montagne, saprebbero annientarle! Bisogna proporre loro la pace, ora che sono strettì dalla piena, altrimenti, quando sarà cessata, non vi assentiranno! Ritornate presto da 'Amr perché deleghi
دخل على الموقف جماعة من المسلمين الذين اتفقوا عقري وليفافهم
كذا أراد، يتقام إظهار شديد السؤال، طويل فارع الظل، أقدامهم
ثابتة، وقاماتهم مستقيمة، وعبورهم مثابة بالخضر، فأرتفع صوت المفquoise
في الاضطراب:

- نحن هنا على الأسود الطويل، وقمت،ونبشر.
- ولكنا أخبرنا، والبضعة علينا!
- أما وجدهم غير هذا ليكون أوبا، عليكم؟
- هذا الأسود أفضلهنا وأبا وعلما، وهو سيدينا، وخيرنا، ونحن جميعاً
 رجع إلى رأيه!

- لن أستطيع الحديث معها فاختاروا غيره!
- وازنعت أصحاب المسلمين حتى كادت بثعب قلب المفروع.
- ولكن الأمير عمر هو الذي اختاره، وجعل له الأمر دوننا، وأمننا
- إلا نحتاله!

- كيف رضيت أن يكون هذا السوء، أفضلهنا، وكان ينبغي أن
يكون دونكم؟ إنه يخفٍ! إنه يخفٍ! أنصهرنا نحن صنع عمر وذن، فإنه
- الإسلام لا ينكر بين الأسد والأبيض أيه المفروع، كل الناس
- أمام الإسلام سواه، لا فضل إلا بالتقرب، فإنا قلنا أن تحدثه، وإنا
- عدنا من حيث أمينا!

ولم يحدث المفروع بدأ من الحديث إلى عبادة بن الصامت، وأشار إليه
لبدا، قابض عبادة إنسامه خليفة قلب المفروع وأصحابه ثم قال ساخرًا:
- أخفص سرادي أيها المفروع؟! أنا أستخدم إنما استنثبت بجيش
المسلمين، وفيهم أنت في مثل سرادي وأشهد! إن هم في شباب ونوة.
أما أننا فقد نفرقت الشباب، وسهم أيها المفروع، إننا لم نقصد مصر
ولا غيرا إلا لرضوان الله ونشر دينه، ولا حاجة لنا بالذين رفعهم الزائل
إلا أن كان الله قد أحل لنا ما يعني: لا ينادي أحدنا أن تكون له عادلاً
من ذهب أم كان لا يملك إلا فها، لأن غابه من الدنيا أكمل أكله بسجعه
جوعه، وسعته بالجحاف. وإن كان له قنطار من الذهب ألقه في سبيل الله.
chi venga a conferire con noi, per giungere a una soluzione.

Al muqawqas si presentò un gruppo di uomini che ‘Amr aveva
deleogado a conferire con lui, come aveva voluto. Primo veniva
un uomo nero e alto, d’un nero intenso, di bella statura. Que-
gli uomini avevano le gambe ben piantate, i corpi eretti, gli
occhi pieni di circospezione. La voce del muqawqas si levò tur-
bata:
- Togliete via da me questo nero alto! Fatene avanzare un
altro.
- Ma egli è il nostro capo, quegli che ci è stato preposto.
- Non ne avete trovato un altro perché sia il vostro capo?
- Questo nero è superiore a noi per consiglio e sapienza. E’
il signore e il migliore di noi e tutti ci rimettiamo al suo
avviso.
- Non potrò trattare con lui! Sceglietene un altro! Le voci
dei musulmani si levarono tanto che rischiarono di schiantare
il cuore del muqawqas:
- E’ l’emiro ‘Amr che l’ha scelto e gli ha affidato la dire-
zione della faccenda al di sopra di noi e ci ha ordinato di non
contraddirlo.
- E come avete acconsentito a che questo nero vi fosse supe-
riore, quando invece si confaceva che vi stesse al di sotto?
Costui invero mi fa spavento. Forse per farmi uno spregio ‘Amr
ha fatto ciò?
- L’Islām, o muqawqas, non fa distinzione fra il nero e il
bianco. Tutti sono uguali davanti all’Islām senza precllenza
se non in quanto alla devozione a Dio. O accetti di conferire
con lui, o ce ne torniamo donde siamo venuti.
Il muqawqas non poté far altro che conferire con ‘Abādah ibn
as-Sāmit e gli fece cenno che cominciasse. ‘Abādah sorrisse in
modo tale da schiantare il cuore del muqawqas e dei suoi compa-
gni e disse con scherzo:
- Temi la mia nerezza, muqawqas? E che farai, se ti incontri
con l’esercito dei musulmani, quando fra essi ve ne sono mille
altrettanto e più neri di me? Anzi quelli sono nel fiore degli
anni, mentre io ho già lasciato indietro la giovinezza. Ascol-
ta, muqawqas! Noi non per altro abbiamo te so all’Esito o ad
altro paese, che per complicare a Dio e diffondere la Sua luce
Il mondo e i suoi effimeri beni non fanno d’uopo a noi, pur se
Allāh ci lasciò per lieto quello che guadagniamo di bottino.
Niuno di noi si cura d’aver quintali d’oro o di non possedere
che un solo denaro, perché gli è sommo limite del mondo quel
poco cibo di che contenere la fame, e un mantello di che avvol-
gere le membra. Ma se pur abbia un quintale d’oro, lo spende sul-
la via d’Allāh.
وتم الموقوف خديج عفادة، ثم زار زفارة حياة، وتكرف في ابتسماء
باهتة ثم قال:
- إننا نعرف نفوذكم ونصركم عن الدنيا، وإن صالحكم نذ أغلبكم
على ما يفتتح، ولكنكم لا تعلمون ما يجني لكم الفضول في بلادنا!
- خيراً وبركة إلى إن شاء الله، أطميت العقبة أبا الموقوف وعرفت
ما يأتي به الفضول؟
- بل أنف علكم قدر أعلم، ولا أريد لأعمالكم من الصالحين.
أن يفزوا فرصة شهيدة في أيدي الروم؟
- الروم؟ ومن الذين هزمنهم في كل موقيفة حتى اليوم؟
- أي دينك أن الله بعين الفلمين وبناء الصالحين!
- لكما أعدوا لكم ما لا يضيء من الصناديد الذين لا يبكون
بالمت، إلى خائف عليكم وأنت في قنله. عدكم أن تنفعوا في بلد من بلد.
- خائف عليكم من الروم، أو خائف على الروم منا؟
- خائف أن تنطبع لكم تلك الحجاح فتصبحكم في ساحة من نار،
وIService لكم الصير فإن مشتقكم سنتنها. لا أعلم ما أتمن فيه من ضبق.
- وشد، ولدى حج بريفيكم، الصالح يا عفادة!
- على الأولى أم على الثانية؟
- لا على واحدة منهما.
- إذن فلا نتحدث، ليس لدينا إلا واحدة منهما أو الثالثة،
أوفيتنها جميع؟ الإسلام، أو الجزية أو الحرب!
- ولكن واحدة أخرى خير من هذه الثلاثة.
- لا شي، خير من هذه الثلاثة، فكاري نعود إلى عمرو.
- واحدة ترضيكم، وإن واقتنا من فضلكم قدر عمرأ!
وعم عفادة بالعدو، فأخذ الموقوف بوجه أن يسمع له حتى يعرف
هذه الوحدة فجعلها تكون الثانية، فوق عفادة وقال تعالى لما أراه وجهه:
- تحدث وإن كنت لا أقبل إلا واحدة من الثلاثة.
- نتصالح يا عفادة، نتصالح على أن نفرض لكل رجل منكم دينارين
- ثم أبا الموقوف؟
- ثم نفرض لأميركم مقابلة دينار!
- ثم؟
- ثم نفرض خليفتكم أيت دينار!
Il mughawasudi il discorso di 'Abâdah e, tratto un profondo sospiro, tentò uno smorto sorriso. Disse:
- Ben conosciamo la vostra pietà e il vostro distacco dal mondo e che proprio costesta virtù vi ha assistito nel conseguir successo. Tuttavia non potete sapere che vi riservi il destino nel nostro paese!
- Bene e benedizione, se Dio vuole! O forse, mughawas, tu hai penetrato l'arcano e appreso che cosa rechi il destino?
- No, ma temo per voi d'una sventura che già conosco. Non auguro a uomini probi, quali voi siete, di cadere facile preda nelle mani dei Rûm!
- E chi mai sconfiggemmo in ogni incontro fino ad oggi? E' forse della tua religione che Dio venga in aiuto agli oppressori e dia sconfitta ai giusti?
- Ma essi hanno apprestato contro di voi tanti prodi quanti non si contano, che non si curano della morte. Temo per voi, poiché siete in numero esiguo, che non cadiate nelle mani di chi non avrà pietà.
- Temi dei Rûm per noi? Non piuttosto di noi per i Rûm?
- Temo che s'incontrino con voi quelle armate innumerevoli e spazzino via in un'ora della giornata. Che, se anche la vostra tenacia la spunta, è certo che le vostre provviste verranno meno, poiché so in quali ristrettezze e angustie vi trovate. Ma io ho una soluzione che vi soddisferà. La pace, 'Abâdah!
- Alla prima condizione o alla seconda?
- A nessuna delle due.
- Se è così, non discorriamo, perché altro non v'è da parte nostra che una delle due oppure la terza. Non le hai apprese tutte? L'Isâm o il tributo o la guerra!
- Tuttavia un'altra è migliore di quelle tre.
- Non v'è nulla di migliore di queste tre. Pensaci, affinché ritorniamo da 'Amr.
- Una che vi soddisferà. Sono convinto che essa vi allieverà e allieuterà 'Amr!
- Ma 'Abâdah si mosse per far ritorno. Il mughawas lo pregò che lo ascoltasse per conoscere questa soluzione, se mai potesse essere quella buona. 'Abâdah si fermò e disse, il volto colmo di collera:
- Parla, anche se io non accetto che una delle tre.
- Concludiamo la pace, 'Abâdah. Concludiamola al patto che assegnieremo ad ogni vostro uomo due denari.
- E poi, mughawas?
- E poi che assegnieremo al vostro emiro cento denari!
- E poi?
- E poi che assegnieremo al vostro califfo mille denari!
مم! 
مم تهيبون هذا المال كله مرة واحدة، ونصرفون إلى بلادكم قبل أن يحشك من الروم ما لا فوّه لكم به، فخسروا المال وخشرا الأنس! 
وست عبادة بروة مم صح حصة خذا، ما كني كيبر في صدرك.

وجدر قائلًا: 
- أطمعنا بأبي الرجل أم تخضع نفسك؟! لقد نسيت! أم أحدثك عن المسلمين وزهدت في الدنيا؟! أنا أعلم أن الشهادة أول مطلب لنا من هذه الحياة؟! أين هذه الجموع التي تخوننا بها؟! فليتنا كأرض زعت تحتي إلى الله، ما من رجل فينا إلا وهو يبشر بره صاحبه، وسأ أن يروه الشهادة، وألا يرده إلى أرضه ولا إلى بلده، ولا إلى أهل بلده، ولا لست في ضيق أبي المقرب، وإن ما نحن فيه ليس راحة، فلا تخضع نفسك، فيست أصالك إلا واحده من الثلاث؛ فأنظر أبا أصالح لك، ولا تركب السطح، فالتلوب العابرة بالإيمان لا تخضع.

الفتح المبين

استناد عبادة بن الصامت، واسناد أصقاله خلقه وتركوا المقرب.
ومن معي في ذهول، ولم يكن غيرني في حائجة لأن يقص على عبادة ما دار.
بئين وبين المقرب نفسه أدرك ما أراده، وأدرك ما سيأتي إليه أمره.
أما المقرب فنبذخ من ذهول وجعل ينسخ بصيح المسلمين على الخريجة.
إذا القاطن لم يصبر، وجزاهم، ثم خاتمه العبرة فأطلق جذبه، وأسكل قليلاً، ثم عاد بذكر أصقاله بالرومان وصف الرومان، وعذر عليهم تلك
الصور الثالثة لأيامهم السوداء.
تلك الأيام البائسة التي سُلبت فيها الآثار وأزيت الدماء وقين الأبرياء.
فرحكت كلماته أوان القايب
المثير، وبيدت أهام أعينهم صور التنين وجريج والتراب.
وصور الأغراض التي كشك بها أولاد الطامعون، فوافقوا على الصنح.
وأسرع المقرب إلى عمرو وعقد معه صلحًا عهن وحن المحرم.
وأجحد فالمرومان العزة، والإم، فأشاروا على ما أبدوه المقرب، وفقوا
الإذعان، وتنادوا بالنشوة والزنات حتى يأتي المدد فتلقى عمرو وجيشه.
- E poi?
- E poi che vi pigliate tutto questo denaro in una volta sola e partiate per i vostri paesi, prima che vi capiti addosso da parte dei Rûm tanto a cuì non vi basta la forza e perdiate e il denaro e la vita!
- 'Abâdah tacque un attimo, poi esplode in un grido al quale sobbalzò il cuore del muqawwâs. Disse ruggendo:
- Vuoi ingannar noi, muqawwâs, o vuoi ingannar te stesso? Hai già dimenticato! Non t'ho forse parlato dei musulmani e del loro disprezzo del mondo? Non sai che il martirio è la prima cosa che chiediamo a questa vita? Dove sono questi stuoli coi quali vuoi spaventarci? Deh! Possero come tu dici, si che ne andassimo solleciti ad Allâh! Non v'è uomo fra noi che non preghi mattina e sera il suo Signore di accordargli il martirio, di non restituirlo alla sua terra, al suo paese, alla sua gente, a suo figlio. Noi versiamo in ristrettezze, muqawwâs, ma inverno lo stato in cui siamo è l'agio più abbondante! Non ingannar te stesso, dunque, perché non ti sta davanti che una delle tre soluzioni. Vedì quale ti convenga meglio e non commettere ingiustizia, che i cuori ove alberga la fede non si lasciano ingannare.

XVII La chiara conquista

'Abâdah ibn aṣ-Ṣâmit si girò e si girarono dietro a lui i suoi compagni e lasciarono il muqawwâs e chi era con lui nello sbigottimento. Ad 'Amr non occorreva che 'Abâdah gli raccontasse che cosa era intercorso fra lui e il muqawwâs, poiché già aveva capito che cosa quegli volesse e a quale partito avrebbe finito per appigliarsi. Quanto al muqawwâs stesso, si riscosse dal suo stupore e si avvisò di far la pace con i musulmani alla condizione del tributo, attesoché nulla potevano i suoi contro la tenacia e la combattività di quella gente. Allora lo soffocò il pianto, abbassò le palpebre e tacque per un po'. Poi riprese a rammentare ai suoi compagni che cosa fossero i Rûm e la loro tirannia. Rievocò loro le tette immagini dei loro giorni neri, quei loro giorni sventurati in cui si videro predare le derrate, spargere il sangue, trucidare gli innocenti. Le sue parole mossero le fibre di quei cuori feriti. Apparvero davanti ai loro occhi i simulacrî degli uccisi, dei feriti, degli arsi, e quanti oltraggi all'onore cui tiranni avevano inflitto. Acconsentirono alla pace. Il muqawwâs corse da 'Amr e strinse con lui un patto di pace per sé e per gli egiziani.

I Rûm furono afferrati da una furia scellerata e insorsero sdegnati contro ciò che il muqawwâs aveva compiuto, ricusando di sottostarvi. Proclamarono che avrebbero resistito e tenuto
أدى وادي القناة. وطال الزمن وقع الشهر الشهر الآخر، والتغلب للكف المسلح
على الحصن، وأمل الحامية بدأ يذوب مع ما تغلب من جوع
فائف ومرض حاد. حتى انسقت سبعة أشهر، وانحرس ماء النيل
وجف فوق قدر المسلمين، بيدعون عن أمانهم إلى قلوب الرومان. وجلس
عمرٌ وأصحابه يقبلون الرأى. وهمدون أنهم إلى الحصن لم يبعدونه باشرة من
اقتحامه، ويبثرون ما شهدوه من أهواء الحصار ليجدونها عاجزة عن أن
تناول بنهم، وما زالوا ينقلون الأفكار حتى ريق الأمل في عين القائد وصاحبهم.
لا فائدة من هذه الصدمة. لا بد أن ننضم القلوب لتنفس الطريق.
ولا بد أن نطعع بعضنا وبهب نفسه الله.
والتثبت جميع الأصوات في حماة دافئة:
- كنا قد وجهنا أنفسنا الله.
ولكن صوتها من أراد أن يسقى إلى الحملة، فهم صاحبه الزورقين العوام
يرجى القدوم أن يدعوا له هذا الاستفادة، لأنه على شرق إلى شجرة الله، وإن
كان الأمل علاج فادحة بأن الله سيستقبل الحصن على يده.
ووضع الحجة على أن يسمح هذا الحالة الحصر في سلم إلى رأس
الحصن حتى ينبع منه فيك. فإذا جمعه المسلمون كبروا تكبيرة عقدة تهور
الأرجاء، ونزول هذه الحامية، وصعد الفدائي وبلغ رأس الحصن وكبر
فعلت تكبيرات المسلمين، وفانت الحامية أعما صادرة من فج الحصن.
وأن المسلمين قد اقتربوا غرفت إلى عنايب تاركة الأبواب.
واستيق المسلمين السلم وانقسموا إلى الزبر، ثم هبطوا إلى الأبواب
إلى غادروا حراسا الخالقين، وفتحوها، فانغاض المسلمون إلى داخل
الحصن بما بحثوه عن روس الروم، ولم يجدهم الروم أمام هذا الهول
الذي هبط عليه إلا أن يمدد إلى هدوه لبرد الموت مما يكن من جهته.
فانبعث صوت قائد المسلمين بأمر بالكشف مدرداً قول الله تعالى: و إن
جنيحوا للسلم فاجمع يا ولوك عل الله، ويأمر قائده الروم أن ينفر من
الرجل الحصن في ثلاثة أيام.
فرغ الروم في يومين، ولم يتركوا الحصن، لأنهم أعدوا اليوم الثالث
duro, finché sarebbero giunti i rinforzi che annienterebbero  
‘Amr e i suoi uomini. Passò lungo tempo, al mese seguì il mese,  
mentre il Milo tratteneva i musulmani dal forte. La speranza  
traeva i difensori a tener testa, per quanto provati dalla fame  
feroce e dalla malattia che li falcava. Passarono così sette  
mesi. L’acqua del Milo si ritirò e il fossato si prosciugò. I  
musulmani si aggirarono cercando la via per penetrare fino ai  
cuori dei Rûm. ‘Amr e i suoi compagni sedettero per prendere  
consiglio. Volgevano gli occhi verso il forte, poi li distoglie-  
vano disperando di poterlo espugnare. Esaminavano le macchine  
d’assedio che avevano toltò come bottino, ma le trovavano impo-  
tenti a conquistarli. Continuarono a rivolgere i pensieri fin-  
ché la speranza balenò negli occhi del capitano ed egli gridò  
loro:  
- Non giovano questi apparecchi. È necessario che i cuori  
vadano innanzi per aprire la via. È necessario che uno di noi  
si offra e faccia dono di se stesso!  
Tutte le voci si levarono traboccanti d’ardore:  
- Noi tutti ci siamo donati ad Allâh!  
Ma una di quelle voci volle giungere prima in paradiso, e  
az-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awâm, l’uomo a cui essa apparteneva, si mos-  
se e pregò la moltitudine che a lui si lasciasse questo martirio,  
ché egli era bramoso d’incontrare Allâh, pur se la speme gli em-  
piva il cuore che Allâh per mano sua avrebbe aperto le porte del-  
la fortezza.  
Fu deciso che questo volontario ardimentoso salisse per una  
scala alla sommità del forte e, giuntovi, gridasse: "Allâh è più  
grande!" I musulmani, uditalo, griderebbero allora: "Allâh è più  
grande!" con un grido solo da scuoter la terra, da squassare i  
petti agli assediatì. Quegli salì e giunse alla sommità e gridò  
e rintronò alto il grido dei musulmani. I difensori lo credette-  
ro venire dall’interno del forte, credettero che i musulmani  
già l’avessero preso e fuggirono ai loro ripari abbandonando le  
porte. I musulmani si slanciarono verso la scala e si riunirono  
a Zubayr. Quindi calarono sulle porte che i difensori terri-  
ficati avevano abbandonato e le aprirono. I musulmani si preci-  
pitarono dentro il forte cercando le teste dei Rûm. Non rimase  
al comandante dei Rûm, davanti a quella calamità che era piomba-  
ta su lui, che stendere la sua mano verso ‘Amr per stornare la  
morte da ciò che rimaneva del suo esercito. Allora si levò la  
voce del capitano dei musulmani a ingiungere che si fermassero,  
ripetendo la parola di Dio l’Altissimo: "E se vogliono la pace,  
accordala e abbi fiducia in Dio", e impose al comandante dei  
Rûm che sgomberassero il forte entro tre giorni.  
I Rûm furono pronti ad andarsene in due giorni ma non abban-
لبقت قتالية أ’ilد الأقباط الذين كانوا معهم في الخصى، وتبغروا أرحلهم، ويشوهوا ويجوعهم، حتى يركهم في حالة لا يشتمل فيها أعدامهم الذين آذاهم الاعتداء مرات السين، ولكن غرنا نقدم ليكبد الأبدى القلعة ويدفعها خارج الخصى، ثم استعد ليتم الفتح بالاستيلاء على عاصمة البلاد الواقعة على بحر الروم في شمال مصر.

الخلاء

ليس هذا أحداً يا عمرو! ليس هذا إلا إبدها تهتنست بينها! هذه هي جارية الذين بها بن سمحين، قاتركوا آمنة حتى

نعود من الإسكندرية!

ووقفت الأحذى إلا تغطية القائد التي تركها بجوارهم، وسار الجيش يشق شمال مصر إلى العاصمة اختصة من البحر وبحيرة، ولم يستطع حسن من الحصين في الشرقين أن يثبت له، ولم يستطع جيش الرومان أن يقف للعب إلا ريثما يدمر للدثار، حتى لاحظ أسوار الإسكندرية بعد الثين وعشرين يوماً. دفع العرب بعداً عن مري فقنتات الحصن، ووقف القائد يكبس الأبداد، ويدبر الخطة، ووقف قائد الرومن بين جنبه يحملهم قائلًا: هذه المعركة الأخيرة أبداً الرومان، فانتروا وعلموا علماً ذلك النصر الذي لم يستطع غيورهم أن يعدهم إليه.

وحركت كلمات قائد الرومان قلبه حامية، ففتحوا الأدبار وفتحوها بالمسلمين، ولكنهم أحسوا بعد قليل بروسهم تنذر وأرسلوا تسنف فتكرموا على أطفالهم، وفتحوا عليهم أبواب الخصى، حتى إذا ذهب عمهم الروم واظتنا خلف الأسور خليلهم اتهم قادرون على أخذ العرب، فأقدروا ليدقروا البلاد ثم بعيوا الأدبار.

وضم أربع أسراء أشخ المسلمين والروم في شهد وجند، ولحسن يقت بين سواف المسلمين وربقة الروم إذا جد أبناء فاستنال عروه هذه المدة، وعزمن على اقتحام الخصى، وضرب مع أحميه خطة الهجوم، واندفع أفراد من المسلمين ذات صباح إلى ذلك الحصن تحت وليل من القذائف النارية، واندفع آخرون في البحر ساجرين بين السفن الرابضة حول المدينة، وأطقوا على الروم من البحر والبحر، وأخذت كاشة
donarono il forte, perché avevano destinato il terzo giorno a mozzare le mani dei Copti che erano con loro, a mutilare i loro piedi e a sfregiare i loro volti, in modo da lasciarli sfigati che non avessero a godere della sventura dei loro nemici i quali avevano inflitto loro una secolare tortura. Ma ‘Amr s’avanzò e trattenne le mani scellerate e li scacciò fuori dal forte. Quindi si preparò a completare la conquista, assoggettando la capitale del paese situata sul mar dei Rûm nell’Egitto settentrionale.

**XVIII L’evacuazione**

- Non v’è qui alcuno, ‘Amr! Non v’è qui che una colomba che cova le sue uova.
- Questa è la mia protetta che è venuta a rifugiarsi alla mia tenda (59). Lasciatela al sicuro finché siamo ritornati da Alessandria!

Si tolsero le tende, fuorché quella del capitano ch’egli lasciò là per la sua protetta, e l’esercito marciò attraverso il settentrione dell’Egitto verso la capitale ch’era fortificata per terra e per mare. Non vi fu fortezza sul suo cammino che gli potesse tener testa, né l’esercito dei Rûm poté fargli fronte, se non per assicurarsi la fuga. In capo a venticinque giorni spuntarono le mura d’Alessandria e gli arabi posero il campo lontano dal tiro dei proiettili della fortezza. Il capitano si fermò a misurare le distanze, a stabilire il piano. Il comandante dei Rûm si tenne fra le sue truppe, incitandole col dire: "Questa, o Rûm, è l’ultima battaglia. Tenete duro e date a questo ‘Amr la lezione che gli altri non poterono dargli!"

Le parole del comandante dei Rûm mossero i cuori dei difensori. Essi aprirono le porte e si scontrarono coi musulmani, ma tosto si accorsero che le proprie teste volavano e che i cuori si fendevano. Perciò ritornarono sui loro passi e spiantarono le porte della fortezza dietro di sé. Ma quando il terrore li lasciò e si furono riconfortati dietro le mura, sembrò loro di avere la possa di superare gli arabi. Uscirono all’attacco ma fu solo per far subire al malanno e volgere le spalle.

Passarono quattro mesi e fu un tiramolla fra musulmani e Rûm mentre fra le sciabole dei primi e i colli dei secondi si metteva la fortezza quando l’ora era più grave. Ad ‘Amr quel tempo parve lungo e decise di render d’assalto la fortezza. Coi suoi compagni dispose il piano dell’attacco.

Un certo mattino frotte di musulmani si precipitarono contro quella fortezza sotto una pioggia di proiettili pesanti, mentre altri di loro si precipitarono nel mare nuotando fra le navi ancorate intorno alla città premendo i Rûm per terra e per mare
المسلمين تعصّر قلوب هؤلاء الجماعات الصغرى في أرض مصر. فخرجت قواها.

وأرسل قادةها إلى مصر بسبيل صاحب:

سيحملوا دفراً. توفّر الباب، وفرص ما شأنه?

وتأمل عدو سور المسلمين، فهي تقضي من مداهم الرومان. وفرص بر يرقبهم. وحر.

أنّ يتهمهم أحد عشر شيراً يقدرون فإنّ آخر خيمه يرمّلون بمصر.

ومعفر كل خائر يرغموه بالعودة إليها.

وتنحرك سفن الروم، بعد قليل تجلو بهم سبيبة بعد سفينة. حتى

ندرت الأخيرة أسرتها. ثمّ توقفت قنبل. ونظر من فيها إلى مئات السفن التي طنّت حملتها فيها مدن الروم خيوات مصر. ونفّذها أحست.

بعض العرب، نظر إليها في قوة فاعتلت. ثمّ توارت عن الأنظار.

ومن النزج الناجح العرب، عن شاطئ البحر الأبيض، عبر الضاحية، ود.

نظرت إلى الأمواج المليئة بهدوءة. بلاحق بعضاً، ويركّز بعضها.

بعض قناع وحید، سحب في تفكير عقلي، ثمّ انتهى دااماً:

حزمها الروم، وصيحها العرب! رسالة لا بد أن يقوم بها

الإسلام، ولكن يعد أن يتمّ إخالها!

أبعد ما أطلع البحر، جيش الروم، جلاء يا عزراً

كونت أبيع ما أطلع البحر إلى الغريب يا عدنان.

حتى النوب الحلي الأسمى يا عزراً?

ثبت يا عدنان! لا بد من إجهاد الروم عن حدود مصر. حتى

تأمر الغرب كما أمرت الشرق. ثمّ داخل مصر يا عدنان! أما أن توقع أن يكون في البلاد جيب للروم؟ إن الفاصليين يشكّلون الأحلاف من أبناء البلاد كما بئستهم. وميكّتنهم من أموال غافهم ليفنّوا الشعب بأيديهم. أنّ أن هؤلاء الذين كانوا يحملون ظلّ الروم إلى قوهم سينقذون إلينا سبولة؟ إنّ أمامنا جهاد في الداخل وجهاد في الخارج.

قبل جهاد العدو والعدوان!

وأصبحت جيشه المسلمين ساعة في جزء مصر. وأصبح عزر

بيسه منها ينترق القصص. حتى بلغ برقة على حدود مصر من الغرب.

فدارتها له، ثمّ استناد السير حتى إلى طرابلس.

وشهد العام الثاني وال심ور للهجرة جيشه المسلمين مئات حول حصون.
e la tenaglia serrò i difensori rimasti in terra d'Egitto. Questi ebbero le forze prostrate. Il loro comandante corse da 'Amr e lo scongiurò gridando:
- Ce ne andremo, 'Amr! Solo arresta la strage e imponi le condizioni che vuoi!

'Amr arrestò le sciabole dei musulmani grondanti del sangue dei Rûm e acconsentì ad accordare loro undici mesi, (60) entro i quali troncarsero l'ultimo filo che li legava all'Egitto e dessero di taglio a qualsiasi velleità di ritornarvi.

Non passò molto che le navi dei Rûm si mossero a sgomberare trasportandoli via, una di seguito all'altra finché tutte ebbero spiegato le vele. Allora si fermarono un poco e quanti erano a bordo guardarono al lungo volgere di centinaia d'anni, durante i quali le loro navi erano partite cariche dei beni dell'Egitto. Ma le navi sentirono gli occhi degli arabi che le fissavano, sicché si allontanarono e scomparvero alla vista.

Il conquistatore arabo sedette sulla riva del Mar Mediteranneo col suo compagno. Protese lo sguardo sulle onde vaganti in balia del destino, che si susseguivano e si accavallavano le une sulle altre, ora sollevandosi, ora abbassandosi, e si perse in pensieri profondi. Poi si riscosse e mormorò:
- I Rûm le infransero, gli arabi le risaneranno! Missione che deve intraprendere l'Islâm ma non prima che sia completata l'evacuazione!

- Che evacuazione ormai, 'Amr, quando il mare ha inghiottito l'esercito dei Rûm?
- Stavo inseguendo l'acqua del mare verso occidente, 'Adnân.
- Fino all'oceano Atlantico, 'Amr?
- Piacere a Dio, 'Adnân! E' indispensabile che i Rûm evacuino dai confini dell'Egitto, perché abbia sicurezza da occidente come l'ha da oriente. Poi l'interno dell'Egitto, 'Adnân! Ti aspetti forse che nel paese non vi siano braccia aperte ai Rûm? Gli oppressori fazzonano ben a loro voglia quanti sono traditori fra gli uomini del paese, e danno loro il potere sopra i capi della loro gente, per opprimere i popoli tramite le mani di costoro. Credi tu che quelli che tolleravano la tirannia dei Rûm sulla loro gente si ridurranno facilmente ad obbedire a noi? Invero davanti a noi sta una lotta all'interno e una lotta all'esterno, prima di lottare per la prosperità, 'Adnân!

Gli eserciti dei musulmani si sparsero per le parti dell'Egitto (61) mentre 'Amr con uno di essi attraversò il deserto, finché giunse a Barca, sui confini occidentali dell'Egitto, e questa gli si sottomise. Quindi riprese il cammino e si fermò a Tripoli.

L'anno ventesimo secondo dell'Egira vide i soldati musulmani
طرابلس شيرا كاملاً حتى فتحته كما فتحت غيره من الخصوص المشيدة.
ثم عاد عمرو إلى مصر لبدأ جهاد العمران. وiben الحياة في مصر التي تركها الرومان شبحاً محتماً يسبح في البقاء.

جهاد العمران

تنحت عيون المصريين على جمال بادهم بعدما خشي عليها ظلم الرومان، فألو الشمس مشقة والتلميذات والنجوم لامعة، وأخوا بعيور الأزهار يعثر جواب الوادى. وأخذوا يتحدثون ويشتكون هذا البعير في هذه الزيتونة وجهتها. ومع ذلك لا تسع به ذرة ولا تهباء تهجة.
وينحدر أبناؤهم في الطريق ثم يعبرون إذا أشرق النهر وإذا أظلم النيل.
وبتلمع أعينهم من حزنهم ونهاجمهم. ويرفعون أصواتهم بدعواتهم وصواطهم.
مغطسين في جناح الإسلام الرحم من الجحيم الجمهود وينسي مولاه.
نرسل النيل أنوار المسلمين. فلا تفتح هو مقتضى وبغيض الأرض.
ويقصر ما هو بين القرية فلا بينهم إلا في خناف القوارب وصراع المراكب. ثم ينشد فيضانه حتى يتكامل. ثم يأخذ في الانخفاض حتى يعود كما بدأ. فخرج المصريين ليحرروا أغلب الأرض وساقلاها بينن الحب.
ويرجون البار من الربيع. حتى إذا ظهر النبات سقاء الندى من فوقه.
رغذاه الري من تحته. فيبنا مصر مرة ببناء إذا هي عينه سوداء. ثم إذا.
هي زبرجة خضراء.

هذى الأرض الطيبة الطائعة فيها صنات من صنات العرب. وكلما أكملت ردا دو لكي كراكلت شاقة وزاردت. وكذلما تحلت غضبت عليك. وأخذت عناك درها ومنعت خيما. عيندها إذا عانتها، متقاتلة إذا أحسنت إليها. وقد واجه الله أمها. يجعل بنيك حياة أهلها. يعهد إلك الخليفة بها. فأصبحت في عهلك أمانة مستحقب عليها أمام الله. فأسأك هذه الأرض ومنع أهلها بها. وسيتقمب إلك بيدها ما فاض عنها راضية باسمها.
cingere d'assedio per un mese intero i forti di Tripoli, finché
la conquistarono come avevano conquistato gli altri forti ben
muniti. Allora 'Amr ritornò in Egitto a cominciare la lotta per
la prosperità, a risuscitare la vita in quell'Egitto che i Rûm
avevano lasciato a guisa di sagoma infranta degnà di funebre
lamento.

XIX La lotta per la prosperità

Si apersero gli occhi degli Egiziani sulla bellezza del loro
paese, dopo che la tirannia dei Rûm li aveva bendati loro. Vide-
ro il sole rifulgere, la luna rilucere, le stelle scintillare.
Sentirono la fragranza dei fiori profumare per ogni contrada la
valle del Nilo, e cominciarono ad aspirare quella fragranza in
pace, una bocca dopo l'altra, non colti da paure, non turbati
dai sospiri, mentre movevano il piede per le strade e le vico-
revano, se il giorno splendeva o se la notte nereggiva, e si
riempivano gli occhi dei loro campi e mercanzie. Essi levarono
le voci in preghiere e orazioni, sicuri sotto l'ala dell'Islâm
misericorde, che rispetta le promesse, che serba la santità dei
patti.

Il Nilo occupò gli sguardi dei musulmani. Lo mirarono ed era
in piena e sommergeva la terra e la sua acqua separava i villag-
gi, così che non communicavano fra loro se non per mezzo di bar-
che leggeri e piccoli battelli. Poi la sua piena cresceva fin-
ché giungeva al colmo. Poi prendeva a decrescere, finché il fi-
ume tornava come era stato. Allora uscivano gli Egiziani ad ara-
re le terre, le alte e le basse, a sovvergere il seme, a sperare
il frutto del Signore. Ed ecco spuntare la pianta, che l'umidità
abbeverò da sopra, che l'uno nutri da sotto, e così l'Egitto,
mentre era stato una bianca verla, eccolo farsi ambra nera, ecc-
colo ancora di crisolito verde.

Questa terra buona, obbediente, in lei sono qualità di quel-
le degli arabi: se la onori, ti rende l'onore ringraziando e in
sovrappiù, ma se la spragi, s'adira e ti riduce la sua larghez-
za, trattiene la sua grazia. Ostinata, se la contrari; se la be-
nefici, docile! Già t'investì Iddio del suo governo e rimise
in mano tua la vita del suo popolo e il califfo te la affidò,
sicché sul tuo collo è pervenuto un deposito di cui risponderai
dio d'innanzi. Vivifica questa terra, fa che la sua gente ne
goda. Essa di sua mano ti porgerà la profusione dei suoi doni,
lieta e sorridente!

Così parlò 'Amr a se stesso e così pose il suo disegno. Curò
la spesa per i canali e i ponti, e destinò gran parte delle im-
poste alle opere di riforma. Installò un milometro che determi-
Introduction

This biography of 'Arabic conquering Amr of Egypt (594-664), and appeared in 1957 to the Cairo (necklace of the publishing house) author 'Abd as-Salam al- 'Asari, high civil employee of the Ministry of the education and the instruction and writer of talent that it distinguishes as for poetic vision that for historical surveying (1). Operetta in delineating the career of the great general spaces with effective end from the last period of the paganism in Arabia, through the fight between Muslims and idolaters, the great conquests, the revolt and the torrid ones under the caliphate of 'Uthman and 'Wings, until the advent of the Umayyad. Animated of ethnic-religious enthusiasm, traduccia of admiration for the miracle completed from the Islam: nomadic and then single people until it accustom to the pastoralist, to the commerce, all guerrilla, and transformed in a troop of believers whom sbaraglia the armies of piu the powerful empires in name of the sublime ideals of equality and liberty. The jihad with its martyrdoms... (page 1)

The Talk (XVI)

The Muslims encircled of new the fort very fortified. Step a month after the other. They arrived reinforces to add to the army of four thousand Amr prodi Muslim, four of between which counted for thousands everyone. The Muqawqis, apo of the Coptic, heads as it would be ended that I besiege after the defeats of the Rome. Uscì from the western door of the fort and was kept on the island with a squad of Egyptians. Determined to reach before to an agreement with the Muslims that the occasion escaped to it. I send to 'Amr its nunzi with a message.

-Mincerebbe to us, if they came the Rum ahead with all ciò that posseggono? That there ti imports of the Nile and its flood? Or that these floods captive us più dura in hand its, as it says? Us intimorisce perhaps the Muqawqis? It has not till now known the sabres of this small formation? But in truth not found it s'è of forehead to it, because spoke the language to it that has spoken to others?

And 'Amr did not answer to the message. And it did not allow the puttinges that were returned some, così remained two days between the Arabs. Therefore I call, I deliver them to they it its answer and them dismissal. The Muqawqis was restless for their delay; the heart gia said to it that 'Amr had killed them for all answer all its injunction. It was perplexed on from makes if 'Amr really had made cio. But the nunzi, it deals to you with all in, they returned to he and the reply introduced it of 'Amr. It dissigliillo, read più times to it, put itself to mormorarne the content between if:

Of three Entered solutions sceglietene one in the Islam! You will be siblings of the Muslims; for you that one ch'èper they; against you that one ch'e against they. Otherwise, you will submit yourselves to I pay and you will be ninori and the Muslims oblige
themselves tutelarvi and to proteggervi and leaving you between the assets, the sons, the earth, the jobs yours. Otherwise, sarà la guerra and the fight until that it judges Iadío, and He and the better judge.

Then the Muqawqis was turned to its puttinges and I interrogate them:
- As you have found those Muslims?
- We have found one stirpe of men which the dead women and piu carra of the life, the umita of the exaltation; between which some does not place its desire in the world. They are based on the earth and they eat on the ginocchia. Their prince and like one of they. The lofty one from the humble one does not acknowledge between they, not the gentleman from the servant.

Strange these Arabs! Costoro, if they moved against mountains, would know to destroy them! Peace must propose they it, hora who are tightened (of the? dalla) full, otherwise, when sara stopped, they do not consent to you! Returned soon from 'Amr so delegates (end Page 91)

to one solution. To the Muqawqis I introduce a group of men who 'Amr had delegated to confer with he, as it had vouto. First a black and high man came, of black an intense one, beautiful stature. Those men had the legs very planted, the erected bodies, the full eyes of circospezione. The upsetten voice of the Muqawqis levo:

-You remove via from high black cestesto me! It makes some you to advance an other.
- But he and our head, those that us and be preplace.
- Of it you have not found an other perche is your CAP?
- This black and advanced to we for council and wisdom. E'il gentleman and the best one than we and all recover to its warning.

-Potro not to deal with he! Sceglietene an other! The voices of the Muslims levarono a lot who risked to break the heart of the Muqawqis:
- E' emiro 'the Amr that have it chosen and has entrusted it the direction of the matter above we and it has ordered to us not to contradict it.
- And cmn you have consented to that this black one was advanced, when instead confaceva that same you to of under? Onvero Costui makes fright me. Porse in order makes spregio 'a Amr me has made cio?
- L'Islam, or Muqawqas, not ago distinction between black and the white man. All are equal in front of the Islam without precellenza if not in as far as the devozione to God. Or chip axes to confer with he, or we return some to us donde we have come.

The Muqawqis poe not to make other that to confer with 'Abadah ibn as-San'it and it made signal it that began. 'Abadah sorrise in such way to break the heart of the Muqawqis and its compagni and said with scherno:

- Topics my nerezza, Muqawqis? And that you will make, if you meet to you with the army of the Muslims, when between they you of they are thousand and piu equally black ones of me? Indeed those are in the flower of the years, while I gia have left behind the
The Muqawqis udi the speech of 'Abadah and, drawn a deep sigh, I try one smorto smile. It said:

- Very we know yours pieta and your separation from the world and that just cestata virtu it has assisted in succeeded achieving. However you cannot know that you reservoirs the destiny in our country!

- Well and blessing, if God wants! Or perhaps, Muqawqis, you have penetrated the mysterious one and learned that what brings the destiny?

- Not, but I fear for you of a sventura who gia I know. I do not augur men probi, which you you are, of falling easy preda in the hands of the Rum!

- The Rum? And who never we defeated in every encounter till now? E' perhaps of your religion that God comes in aid to the oppressori and gives defeat the just ones?

- But they have prepared against of you many prodi how many are not available, than they are not cured of the dead women. I fear for you, poiche you are in meager number, than you do not fall in the hands of who not avra pieta.

- Topics of the Rum for we? Not rather than we for the Rum?

- I fear that s'incontrino with you those innumerevoli armys and you street sweeper via in an hour of the day. That, if also your tenacity dulls it, and sure that your supplies will come less, piche I know in which ristrettezze and found distresses. But I have one solution that you soddisfera. The peace, 'Abadah!

- To the first condition or the second one?
- To nobody of the two.
- If and cosi, we do not talk, perche other not v'e for our part that one of the two that is third. You have not learned them all? The Islam or I pay or the war!

- However an other and better than those three.
- Not v'e null of better than these three. It thinks to us, affincche we return from 'Amr.
- One that you soddisfera. They are convinced that it you allittera allittera 'Amr! But 'Abadah movements in order to make return. The Muqawqis I pray it that it listened to it in order to know queta solution, if never could be that good one. 'Firm Abadah and was said, the face temper overflow:
- He speaks, even if I do not accept chenna of the three.
- We conclude the peace, 'Abadah. We conclude it to the pact that we will assign to every your man two money.

- And then, Muqawqis?
- And then that we will assign to yours emiro one hundred money!
- And then?
- And then that we will assign to your caliph thousand money!

(end page 95)

- And then?
- And then that you pigliate all this money in once single and you leave for your countries, before that understood to you I lean from part of the Rum a lot to which you enough the force and you do not lose and the money and the life!
- 'Abadah tacque a moment, then eploese in a outcry to which hard jolt the heart of the Muqawqis. It said ruggendo:

- You want to trick we, Muqawqis, or want to trick same you? Forgotten Hai gia! T'ho perhaps not spoken about the Muslims and their depreciation of the world? You do not know that the martyrdom and the first caso that we ask this life? Where they are these coiquali stuoli you want to scare to us? Deh! They were like you you say, that we went some you speed up to Allah! Not v'e man between we that not reghimattina and evening its Gentlemen of accordargli the martyrdom, not resistuorlo to its earth, its country, its people to its son. We pour in ristretteze, Muqawqis, but in truth the state in which we are and the abundant comfort piu! Not to trick you same, therefore, perche you is not that one of the three solutions. You see to which it convene you better and not to commit ingiustizia, than the hearts where it lodges the faith do not let to trick.

XVII The Clear Conquest

'Abadah ib a-Samit turn and turned behind he its companies left the Muqawqis and who was with he in the sbigottimento. To 'Amr it was not necessary that 'Abadah told to it that what was elapsed between he and the Muqawqis, poiche giaaveva understood that what those wanted and which left would have ended in order to get hold of. As far as the same Muqawqis, collected from its astonishment and warning to make the peace with the Muslims the condition of I pay, attesche null the tenacity and the combatitiva one of that people could succincontro. Then sofocco the plant, I lower the eyelids and tacque for little. Then riprese a to remind to its companions who what were the Rum and their tyranny. I recall they them物件 immagii of their black giori those they days scenturati in which they were looked at to pregire the commodities to scatter the blood, to slaughter the innocents. Its words moved fibers of those wounded hearts. You appeared in front of their eyes the simulacri of the victims of a murder, the wounded, of the burned ones, and how many insults to the honor those tyrants had inferto. They consented to the peace. The Muqawqis run from 'Amr and tightend with he a pact of peace for if and the Egyptians.
The Rum was seized to you from a scellerate fury and rebelled segnati against cia that the Mughawis had completed. ricasando submitting to you. Proclamaronono that would have resistiito and held (end page 97)

hard, finche they would be joints reinforces that they would destroy 'Amr and its men. (long ace time, to the month you follow the month while the Nilo withheld the Muslims from the fort. The hope drew the defenders to hold head, for how much it tries to you from the ferocious hunger and the disease that cut with a scythe them. Seven months passed cosi. The water of the Nilo withdrawal and the ditch proscriuto. The Muslims went around themselves trying the way in order to penetrate until acinti of the Rum. 'Amr and its companions seated in order to take council. They turned the eyes towards the fort. then distoglievano depriving of hope them of being able to storm it. They examined blots some to them of I besiege that they had removed like booty, but they found to them impotent to conquer it. They continued to turn the penseri finche the hope lightning in ovchi of the caption and he outcry they:

Not giovano these apparatuses. Necessary E' that the hearts go innanzi in order to open the way. Necessary E' that one of we offers and makes gift of if same! All the trabocanti voices levarono of order: - We all are we donate to you to Allah! But one of those voices wanted to reach before in paradise, and az-Zubayry ibn al- 'Awam, the man to which it it belonged, movements and prays the multitude that to he let this martyrdom, than he was bramoso to meet Allah, also if speme the heart filled up it that Allah for hand its would have opened the doors of the fortress.

It was decided that this daring volunteer salted for one scale to the sommita one of the fort and, ginnovi, gridasse: “Large Allah and piu!” The Muslims, hearing it, griderebbero then: “Large Allah and piu!” with a outcry solo to shake the earth, to squassare the chestos to he besieges to you. Those know them and reached sommita and the high outcry and rintro the outcry of the Muslims. The defenders will believe it to come from the inside of the fort, will believe that the Muslims gia had taken it and escaped to their shelters abandoning the doors. The Muslims slanciarono towards the scale and gathered to Zubayr. Therefore they decreased on the doors that the defenders frighten to you had abandoned and they opened to them. The Muslims precipitell within the fort trying the witness of the Rum, in front of that magnet that was sealed with lead on he, than to spread its hand towards 'Amr in order to avert the dead women from cia that he remained of its army. Then levo the voice of the captain of the Muslims to ingiungere that they were stopped repeating the word of God the Highest one: “And if they want the peace, it comes to an agreement and has confidence in God”, and imposed the commander of the Rum who cleared the fort within three days.

The Rum was ready to go itself some in two days but they did not abandon (end page 99)

the fort, perche had destined the third day to stump the hands of the Copti that were with they, to mutilare their feet and sfregiare their faces. so as to to leave them such whom they did not have to enjoy the scentura of their enemies s'avanzo and withheld the
scellerate hands and I drive away them outside from the fort. Therefore I prepare for completerela conquest, subjecting the understood one them of the country situated on the mar of the Run in northern Egypt.
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FUNERARY STELE OF APICL. Limestone. From Tereonthis. Late third or early fourth century A.D. Kelsey Museum. K.M. 21188.
The project which I undertook as an ARCE Fellow during the summer of 1979 is part of a larger study of Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests. The appearance of the second edition of Alfred J. Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of Roman Domination (edited with additional bibliography by F. M. Fraser) in 1978 revealed how much and yet how relatively little progress had been made in understanding the end of Byzantine Egypt. In addition to visiting as many sites as possible, I reexamined the extant literary sources in Greek, Latin, and Arabic in the light of recent researches in Late Roman and Byzantine military and nonmilitary history. Byzantinists have generally ignored untranslated Arabic texts, even Torrey's edition of Ibn 'Abd el-Hakam, Futūḥ Mīgr. My detailed conclusions will be part of a large monograph on the collapse of the Byzantine defenses of Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, and the Byzantine intellectual reactions to those events.

Some basic conclusions: the Muslim conquest of Egypt did not happen in isolation; it was inextricably involved with events in Byzantine Palestine and Syria and Mesopotamia. The initial Muslim invasions, starting in 634, made great difficulty for the Byzantines by striking southern Palestine, including the vicinity of Gaza as well as the Ḍirāb. Palestine was at the end, indeed the awkward end, of one long line of communications for the Byzantines; it was remote from the principal Byzantine bases in northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia (in the provinces of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene). The initial Muslim victories near Gaza and in the Ḍirāb may not have resulted in the surrender of many towns and their occupation at first, but they did threaten, almost from the beginning of clashes, overland communication, transportation, and coordination of Byzantine forces in Egypt with those in Palestine, Syria, and beyond. This was a critical pressure point that exposed and soon resulted in the shredding of the entire structure of Byzantine defenses. Egypt was virtually isolated by land, except for supplies coming by sea or from distant areas of Byzantine Cyrenaica and North Africa. The need to maintain maritime contact with Egypt may have inhibited the diversion of Byzantine ships for the supply and relief of coastal towns in Syria and Palestine.
The Greek sources give no coherent explanation of the Byzantine defense and the Muslim invasion of Egypt. The Arabic sources, as well as the contemporary, John, Bishop of Nikiu, describe events in Egypt in isolation from the rest of events. Modern historians have followed that approach, without giving sufficient consideration to the larger historical context. The compartmentalization of the study of the Islamic conquests has tended to obscure the close interrelationship, not only the sequential order, of events and decisions in Palestine and Egypt. With the important exception of a tradition from Sayf b. Umar concerning the withdrawal of an Arṭabūn and his soldiers from Palestine to Egypt, there is no explicit information about movement of Byzantine troops and commanders between Palestine and Egypt. The identity of Arṭabūn is uncertain: Tribunus, Arizion, and Wardūn (Armenian Wardan) are possible alternative explanations. Arṭabūn may or may not have been a commander at Jerusalem, at the earlier important battle of Ajnadayn. Equally unclear are his activities and location after any withdrawal to Byzantine Egypt, which contrasted with the withdrawal of most Byzantine commanders, soldiers, and prominent civilians to the north or to the Mediterranean ports. In any case, there is no evidence that Byzantine soldiers from Egypt contributed seriously to the defense of Byzantine Palestine. This is not surprising, because the best Byzantine soldiers had not been traditionally assigned to Egypt. There was no major precedent or experience for using troops from Egypt for the military emergencies in Palestine or Syria or vice-versa.

There are a number of plausible stories about ʿAmr b. ʿAmr al-ʿAs and his interest in Egypt and his efforts to persuade ʿUmar to allow him to lead an expedition to Egypt. Whatever the truth of ʿAmr’s earlier experience with travelling to Egypt, it is certain that ʿAmr had engaged in repeated military operations in southern Palestine where he was in a convenient position to gain detailed information about the state of defense and general conditions in Byzantine Egypt. This has not been sufficiently noted by historians of the conquests. In addition to ʿAmr’s operations near Gaza and in the Ḍarbāḥ, most authorities accept that he participated in some way in the siege or blockade of Caesarea Maritima. All of this chronology is controversial. An important Latin source has been ignored by Orientalists and Islamic historians in endeavors to sort out the chronology: the Passio LX martyrum, which is a hagiographic text on the sixty soldier-martyrs of Gaza, first edited by Hippolyte Delehaye (Analecta Bollandiana 23 [1904]: 280-307), and carefully analyzed and amended by J. Pargolle (“Les LX soldats martyrs de Gaza”, Échos d’Orient 8 [1905]: 40-43). The information in this martyrology is so specific and so fits the historical circumstances of the third decade of the seventh century that its authenticity is beyond serious doubt. The text not only provides a precise date for the final capture of Gaza (June-July 637) but, equally important for
clarifying some of the background to the Islamic conquest of Egypt, it identifies the Muslim commander who captured Gaza as QAmr b. al-Qāṣ ("Ambrus"), who also controlled Eleutheropolis (Bayt Jibrīn), to where he moved the Byzantine prisoners before sending them to Jerusalem for interrogation. The details of the execution of the small garrison from Gaza, sixty soldiers, is not of direct concern here. What is significant is that QAmr controlled Eleutheropolis and Gaza after he captured it in 637. Both towns were excellent points for marshalling supplies and troops for an invasion of Egypt, and for gathering information about the strengths and weaknesses of the defenses of Egypt, condition of the roads, factional strife in Egypt, and details of necessary supplies and potential allies for such an expedition. A glance at the map demonstrates the importance of Gaza and Eleutheropolis as listening posts and staging points. Whether or not QAmr participated in the siege of Caesarea before departing for Egypt, he had conquered the Palestinian towns closest to Egypt: Aila, Eleutheropolis, Gaza, and Raphia, and was in a position to know more about the opportunities and hazards of invading Egypt than any other Muslim commander.

Jean Maspero's L'Organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine remains the classic study of Byzantine military institutions in Egypt, although many fine specialized studies have since appeared. What one must remember is that although Heraclius was the first reigning Byzantine emperor to visit Jerusalem, no reigning Byzantine emperor, to my knowledge, visited Egypt. Heraclius had some familiarity with the terrain of Palestine and Syria (and he directed many operations from such cities as Emesa/Hims, Antioch, Edessa, and Samosata), but his communications with Egypt necessarily were more complex, the situation was less clear, and presumably much news came via the sea.

The surrender of various Byzantine ports on the Palestinian and Syrian coast, such as Gaza and presumably Askalon in 637, Caesarea in 640 (or even 641), made contact between Constantinople and Egypt more hazardous, although not impossible. The gradual loss of such ports probably dampened Byzantine morale in Egypt; troops—and some officials and civilians—probably feared being cut off.

Another contemporary problem that complicated the defense of Egypt was, after the Byzantine evacuation of Antioch and Chalcis (Qinnasrin) and Barrheoa (Aleppo), the threat to and subsequent invasion of Byzantine Mesopotamia (cf. my unpublished paper, "Heraclius and Byzantine Mesopotamia", to be included in my book on Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests), and the commencement of Muslim raids into Anatolia. It is increasingly clear that after the Byzantine debacle at the Battle of the Yarmūk, Heraclius was desperately involved in trying to develop a viable southeastern defensive line to
prevent a threat to Constantinople and to his native Armenia and fellow Armenians. Constantinople, Anatolia, and Armenia were priorities for Heraclius, because they were respectively capital, heartland, and key source for military recruits for his empire. It was uncertain at that time whether any defensive line would hold. Heraclius' attention was riveted on Melitene, the Cilician approaches to the Taurus passes, and the upper Euphrates and Tigris. Egypt was not insignificant, but it was extremely difficult to devise a coherent defensive strategy for such widely scattered fronts as upper Mesopotamia and Egypt—at a moment when total military collapse threatened. Under these circumstances, the defense of Egypt became even more difficult to coordinate with the military operations in defense of Anatolia.

The lack of a coordinated Byzantine defense for Egypt was underscored by another major failing, the unwillingness or unreadiness of at least some of the few Byzantine units to the west of Egypt to move east to participate in the defense of Egypt. A contemporary seventh-century source reports that Peter, the Byzantine commander in Numidia, refused to obey orders from the emperor to take his army to the assistance of beleaguered Egypt; but Peter refused to do so on the negative advice of the Chalcedonian leader Maximus the Confessor, who told him "do not do this, because God does not wish to assist the Roman state during the reign of Heraclius and his offspring" (Migne, Patrologia Graeca 90: 112). The source is an unusual example of how at least some officials of the reigning Heraclian dynasty sought to use the issue of the cause for the Muslim conquest of Egypt against the Chalcedonians/Catholics, in order to justify the dynasty's Monothelite religious policies. It shows, furthermore, that the loss of Egypt was sufficiently serious in the eyes of seventh-century contemporaries that it was the subject of political controversy and that it required identifying a religious scapegoat, the Chalcedonians/Catholics. Egypt was sufficiently important that its loss was not quickly forgotten or easily explained away in Constantinople.

The accumulating evidence from different scholarly publications, and from scraps of information in a number of primary sources concerning Egypt as well as other regions of the Byzantine Empire, indicates conclusively that the institutional structure of Heraclius' empire at the moment of the Islamic conquests was still basically a Late Roman one, not, of course, an unchanged version of Constantinian and Justinianic structures. There is no evidence for any drastic or comprehensive transformation of Byzantine military institutions in Egypt, Palestine, or Anatolia, although experiences in the recent conflict with the Persians had shown Byzantine military institutions and finances to be strained to their limit.

By the time 'Amr invaded Byzantine Egypt, the decisive battles against the Byzantines had already taken place, culminating in the battle of the Yarmūk. Despite some modern
scholars' conclusions to the contrary, there is no evidence that Christian sectarian strife was responsible for the failure of the Byzantines to develop an effective defense of Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia; in fact, the predominant Christian group in Heraclius' armies in Palestine and Syria probably were Monophysite Armenians and Arabs. The role of Monophysites had been perhaps passive in the towns, but that is not surprising, because townspeople and countryfolk had seldom resisted the Persians fiercely in the sixth century, in Syria. In fact, as the Late Roman historian E. A. Thompson has noted in his newly published book on Romans and Barbarians (Madison, Wisconsin 1982), civilians such as townspeople and countryfolk rarely offered violent resistance to "barbarians" in other regions of the Roman Empire in the Late Roman period. There is, therefore, no justification for ascribing any passivity necessarily to Monophysite or other Christian religious strife— it was rather typical behavior for civilians who lacked training in warfare. Nevertheless, the issue of religious politics in the particular case of Egypt and its surrender to 'Amr does deserve closer scholarly investigation. But the controversial case of Patriarch Cyrus involves personal rivalries as well as Monophysite-Monothelite strife.

Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam significantly identified Emperor Heraclius as the backbone of Byzantine resistance in Egypt (Futūh Misr, ed. C. Torrey, New Haven 1922, 76). This is an important recognition of the role of Heraclius in making strategy and in directing military operations; contrary to the supposition of some modern Byzantinists, the Arabic sources do not depict Heraclius as senile or incompetent at the moment of the Islamic conquest of Egypt. There is an implicit admission in Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's statement that is astute: the fate of Byzantine Egypt was not decided in Egypt, but at Constantinople and on the battlefields of Palestine and Syria.

My grant from the American Research Center in Egypt gave me the inestimable opportunity to pursue these researches in Egypt, to use various local facilities and to consult with scholars in Egypt, among whom I specifically wish to mention Marsden Jones, Jean Gascoin of the French Institute, and Leslie MacCuU of the Society for Coptic Archaeology. I am incorporating much more detailed conclusions in my larger manuscript on Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests.
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ENTIRE TEXT
Egypt on the eve of the Muslim conquest

WALTER E. KAEGI

Egypt's population in the early seventh century AD cannot be determined with any certainty, but it probably numbered less than the five million persons frequently attributed to the province at the height of the Roman Empire in the Early Principate. By the year 600, the population may have declined to three million; mortality resulting from plagues erupting during Justinian's reign in the sixth century cannot be accurately estimated. Many Egyptians were designated “Chalcedonians” or “Monophysites,” but this distinction did not represent a genuine cleavage of ethnic identity in Egyptian society. An assumption that “Chalcedonian” referred exclusively to Greeks rather than to native Egyptians is erroneous. Greek remained an important spoken and written language in Egypt, although by the early seventh century Coptic was used increasingly in written records. Subliterary texts in Coptic date back to the early third century.

Many other aspects of Egypt's economy, social structure and spiritual outlook during Late Antiquity persisted into the early seventh century. But the privatization of public functions by owners of great estates intensified from the fourth century, a process that significantly altered institutional structures during the remaining periods of Byzantine administration.

Members of the social elite still could acquire some familiarity with the repertory of Greek authors of antiquity, as testified by the writings of the poet Dioskoros of Aphrodito in the sixth century or the historian Theophylact Simocatta in the early seventh. Theatrical performances in Alexandria during the early seventh century continued to entertain audiences that included high officials.

The general population was probably quite young, its numbers restricted by plague epidemics and widespread infant mortality. Agriculture continued as the foundation of the economy.

The Patriarch of Alexandria, Egypt's largest city, controlled extensive properties and functioned as a prominent communal leader as well as head of the Church. The ecclesiastical institution itself changed over the period from the fourth to the seventh centuries. The Patriarchate, monasteries and religious foundations continued to mature, developing their institutional sophistication and acquiring more landed wealth through bequests and gifts.

By the year 600, the ecclesiastic establishment was more elaborate than it had been in the fourth century. Forbidden to alienate its properties, the Church rarely lost its landed holdings. Many papyrological, hagiographic or historical narrative sources refer to the accumulation of vast wealth by ecclesiastical institutions in Egypt. The Patriarchate of Alexandria was the prime beneficiary, but several monasteries amassed large estates as well.

Many civilian and military officials envied this growth in ecclesiastic wealth, and disputed its propriety.

Among religious minorities, the Jewish community was prominent. However, Jews do not appear to have figured significantly in either the Persian or Islamic conquests. If they had, Byzantine apologists would probably have attempted to attribute the loss of Egypt to them. In contrast

7 C. Hans, Alexandria in Late Antiquity, Topography and Social Class (Ramatayone, 1997), 46-7.
9 See the bibliographic addenda of P. M. Fraser to A. J. Butler, Arab Conquest of Egypt (Oxford, 1970), xiv-xxii.
with ascriptions of blame in Palestine-Syria, there were no allegations of Jewish complicity or incidents of anti-Jewish hostility mentioned as causes for the failure of Byzantine forces to bar the Muslims from Egypt.

Although the intellectual horizons of its rural population may have been narrow, Egypt had maintained extensive ties with the external world long before the seventh century.10 Egypt possessed renowned pilgrimage sites. Its Mediterranean ports of Alexandria and Pelusium were flourishing. Inhabitants of its coastal towns and river ports had access to news from around the empire, if on a delayed basis because of slow communications. Egypt possessed significant transportation hubs, even though the majority of its inhabitants were rustics who lived by agriculture and, to a lesser extent, pastoralism.11 The remaining pagan elements on its periphery had probably been converted to Christianity by the late sixth century, and its cities no longer harbored pagans who were willing to declare their allegiance openly. Egypt's coasts and river shores provided opportunities for contact with travelers and merchants from other shores of the Mediterranean. Egyptians were still making pilgrimages in the early seventh century to venerate relics and religious sites in Palestine. Their visits contributed to a sense of cosmopolitanism to the province. Those regions were still part of a larger late antique cultural world. Some rough and non-Christianized tribes still occasionally raided and terrorized communities such as Sceite on the western edge of the desert as late as the 630s.13

While Egypt was not the catalyst for the seminal political and military events of the early seventh century,14 it did assume an important role in the broader Byzantine imperial economy in terms of agriculture, commerce and artisanal production. Egypt may have contributed as much as 30 percent of total imperial tax revenues from the Prefecture of the East.15 Egypt was an integral part of the broader Byzantine and Mediterranean economy, and its financial contributions were essential to Byzantine fiscal integrity at the start of the seventh century; its grain contributions were crucial to feeding Constantinople until about 617. During that year Emperor Heraclius

10 P. Oxy. LV1 1972 is an unusual documentary example of travel between Alexandria, Babylon (Old Cairo) and Constantinople; see J. G. Kogan, "A Constantinian Loan, AD 541," Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists 29 (1993), 175–82.
Conquest of Egypt, about which Butler and Leone Caetani had only imperfect knowledge — and newer critical methodologies in approaching the texts and their traditions have been developed.17

Egypt's Byzantine defense forces in the early seventh century, including irregulars, may have numbered 25-30,000 — roughly the same size as earlier Roman contingents stationed there. These were not elite troops; most were probably of Egyptian origin. Maritime communications were the principal means by which Egypt and Constantinople remained in contact. Byzantium controlled the Mediterranean and had the capacity to shift elite troops by sea to Egypt from districts surrounding Constantinople. Other strong forces might be sent from Numidia overland or from Syria-Palestine, either by land (the Via Maris) or by sea, in ships that skirted the Mediterranean coast.18

One may wonder how easily troops from the Balkans or Thrace could have adjusted to unfamiliar military service conditions in Egypt (climate, health, terrain, diet, availability and quality of water). Byzantine military forces garisoned in Egypt had never been the empire's best troops, who were not recruited from or stationed there. Egypt was not a major center of Byzantine military unrest, which mostly occurred on its eastern frontier with Persia or in the Balkans.19

Echoes of spirituality in Egypt on the eve of the conquest appear in some writings of the hagiographer John Moschus, and in the biographies of Patriarchs John the Almsgiver (610–19) and the Copt Patriarch of Alexandria, Benjamin (636–65). Scattered remarks by them indicate the founding of new churches and dedications in Egypt, and the appeal of Christian saints, festivals and bishops. At the end of Byzantine rule, Christian values still caused a banker to drop his career for an ecclesiastic calling.20

The Heraclian dynasty (610–71), or some of its members, hoped for assistance from north Africa, just as Heraclians had previously resisted the usurper Emperor Phokas (602–10) and had stood firm against the Persians who had overthrown Egypt (617–25). In Egypt it is possible that some might


have regarded north Africa as a possible bulwark against invasion, because the Persians had not overthrown that region. The Heraclian dynasty had, after all, emerged from north Africa to seize imperial power, and this last fact might have encouraged some observers to look west, however unrealistically, for military rescue.

With due regard for lacunae in the primary sources on the Islamic conquest, many scholars would argue that they are superior to those for the conquest of Syria or Mesopotamia. In some respects historians of the Arab conquest of Egypt are better informed because of more diverse primary sources than for Syria and Palestine; some papyri have survived, as have contemporary Christian sources such as John of Nikiu.21 On the other hand, the Muslim-Iraqi tradents did not pay as much attention to Egypt as to Iraq.

Similar problems emerge in evaluating Muslim traditions concerning Egypt as in other early Islamic traditions. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (d. 871) is a relatively early compiler, and his account depends on an Egyptian school of traditions. As we learn from Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s History, Ibn Lahia (715–790) preserved early traditions of this school for the final moments of Byzantine Egypt.22

Christian historians in Egypt were writing long after these events. John of Nikiu, a contemporary, was an exception, but his text has survived only in a faulty Ethiopic transmission. Byzantine chroniclers such as Nikophoros and Theophanes24 do not draw directly on Egyptian sources, but instead use materials such as the work of Theophylact of Edessa that were probably compiled in northern Syria or Constantinople. These sources transmit traditions that tend to represent events in terms of personalities. Latin sources are of little assistance. However important they are for other aspects of seventh-century history, Armenian sources, such as Sebeos, barely mention Egypt. Greek hagiography provides broader information, but does not clarify aspects of the context of the Islamic conquests. Archaeology and its ancillary disciplines — epigraphy, sigillography, and numismatics — illuminate some of this context but do not clarify complex questions of chronology or historical interpretation. The result is an impressionistic picture. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam provides traditions that correlate with those of Theophanes (so-called Theophanes, or George the Syncellus). Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam claims that Heraclius stiffened Byzantine resistance in Egypt, while Theophanes reports that Heraclius had replaced civilian leaders such as John Kates in Osrhoene with Procopios and Patriarch Kyros with Manuel. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam provides names of traditionists who preserved that memory. His traditions from the Egyptian school provide a powerful group tradition, although the numbers of its practitioners do not necessarily secure its accuracy. These include Yahya ibn Ayyub, who died in 784, and Khaled ibn Humayd, who died in 786. These last two are early and well regarded. The tradition that Heraclius sought to forbid civil officials from making separate peace terms with the Muslims without previous explicit approval from him is plausible. Such traditions, of course, also help to preserve the prestige of the Heraclean dynasty, foisting blame on

others for the military reverses and disasters — and the loss of territory, human or financial resources, but Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam was not a tool of a Heraclean propaganda machine. Nevertheless, there may be some relevance of this tradition to later juridical claims that the Muslims acquired Egypt by conquest, making those territories subject to higher taxes.

The sources warrant caution. They do not give reliable statistics and are frequently vague. No direct archival material survives in Egypt, Constantinople or Cyprus that treats the critical communications between the Byzantine imperial government and its leaders in Egypt on the eve of the conquests. Nor are there archival materials that indicate policy decisions of ‘Amr ibn al-‘As, commander of the Muslim victors. Instead we have late compilations of traditions which often reflect the traditions’ other agenda or their sources. These traditions are often overly simplistic and tend to attribute too much responsibility to personalities. There is also a tendency for Muslim sources to report, at a later date, events in a scheme of classification that makes sense only in terms of later juridical interpretations or disputes that were historically inappropriate for Egypt in the 630s and 640s. Nor is it plausible that ‘Amr invaded Egypt on his own initiative, nor on the authorization of Caliph ‘Umar.23

Surviving Byzantine sources at Constantinople probably owe some of their information to Arab Christian traditions and transmission. They are so fragmentary in their coverage that it would be impossible to understand the Muslim conquests of Egypt by relying exclusively on them.26 Nor do collections of Greek epistolography, sermons, speeches, or other literature fill in the gap. Muslim sources, for their part, do not rely on credible Christian or Byzantine sources. Coptic Christian sources reveal their own biases. John of Nikiu provides the most reliable account, which may be supplemented with the histories of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam and al-Tabari, saints’ lives or papyri. The Christian Arab historian Euthychius (So’id ibn Barzin) provides a late and confused version of the conquest. Although some hagiographic traditions exist, they do not celebrate any Christian martyrs who fought to the death defending Egypt against the Muslims. The only such traditions are from Gaza and they provide no new insights. In contrast to the Martyrs of Gaza, there is no record of Christian martyrs of the initial Muslim invasion of Egypt.27

The Emperor Heraclius did not visit Egypt, nor had any of his recent predecessors. How did that fact affect Egypt’s fate? Heraclius’s family was of Armenian extraction, with some familiarity with conditions of service in northern Syria, Mesopotamia, the upper Euphrates and Africa Proconsularis, but not Egypt. Presumably, Heraclius’s impression of Egypt would have relied in part on information from his cousin Niketas, who had reconquered it in 608–10, taking it from partisans of the usurper Phokas. Niketas presumably also reported to Heraclius his observations about the positive and negative features of Egypt with respect to war against an opponent from the east who occupied Syria–Palestine. Niketas’s opinions derived from his recent experiences in winning a civil war against Bonosus, Phokas’s general, and his own abandonment of Egypt to the Persian invaders. Whether the historian Theophylact Simocatta, who hailed from Egypt and wrote at the court, spoke with Heraclius and his entourage about Egypt cannot be ascertained. But there were probably other Egyptians in Heraclius’s entourage. Heraclius probably acquired better information from Niketas about Egypt than had his predecessors, who did not benefit from a trusted cousin’s recent service there. Toward the end of his life, Heraclius was probably exercising his authority as emperor only intermittently: a worsening medical condition impeded his efforts to make rational decisions.

Egypt remained a vital source of revenues to Constantinople, despite the loss of grain for the city, but one pondered the accuracy of information to the government in Constantinople about Egypt’s situation, political, military or ecclesiastical. How much the Byzantine leadership knew about the Muslim invaders and their leadership in Medina is speculative, and the predominant perceptions of the Byzantine leaders probably derived from rumors, fear and confused reports from refugees. The Senate emerged as an important institution at Constantinople during this era, but the nature of its members’ knowledge about Egypt is a mystery.

The consequences of the Persian occupation are complex. The initial invasion inflicted little physical damage. The Persians’ evacuation of Egypt was peaceful, following the July 639 agreement at Arabissos (southeast Anatolia) between Heraclius and Shahhurâzîd, the Persian general who had conquered Egypt but who then nurtured other ambitions in Persia. The Persians seem to have departed swiftly, perhaps within two months of the

29 I owe much to the 1993 University of Chicago seminar paper of T. M. Hickey, “Observations on the Sasanian Invasion and Occupation of Egypt,” now being revised for publication.

629 agreement. The dearth of primary sources prohibits a more precise date, and the size of the Persian military occupation force also defies estimation. The best Persian troops had probably left Egypt by July 639 to accompany Shahhurâzîd to the Cilician Gates and the vicinity of Alexandria. No more than a skeletal occupation force of Persians remained in Egypt, even at the time of Shahhurâzîd’s meeting with Heraclius at distant Arabissos in that month. Impending friction between Shahhurâzîd and the Sasanian monarch Khusrav II probably imperiled shipment of supplies to the Persian forces in Egypt, who feared reprisals or being cut off there, when their situation would have become untenable. Egyptians did not participate in any known effort to cast off Persian rule, and no fear of them caused Shahhurâzîd to evacuate Egypt. His decision was part of his larger plan to seize control of Persia for himself and his partisans.

The Persian occupation was disruptive politically, interrupting the continuity of Roman–Byzantine rule, and causing some deterioration of the infrastructure. We have few details on the precise organization of the Byzantine army in Egypt after the Byzantines reoccupied the province. If the situation in Egypt parallels that in Palestine, there may have been an effort to restore the situation to what it was immediately before the Persian invasion, but not to reestablish any radical reorganization or reform. Unlike their presence in Syria or upper Mesopotamia, there are no reports of Persian troops remaining in Egypt, even as renegades. Egypt was physically more remote from Persia, and Persian soldiers would have been more vulnerable there if they had wished to remain.

No question persists over Shahhurâzîd’s conquest of Egypt, although many specifics are unclear. The chronology of his dispute with Khusrav II is poorly understood: in all likelihood tensions grew unbearable for Shahhurâzîd after the end of the 626 siege of Constantinople by Avars and the Persians. It is also uncertain how Shahhurâzîd’s overtures to Heraclius and alienation from Khusrav II affected Egypt and its population, but they probably resulted in a reduction of violence on the part of Persian troops. This cannot be documented, however. While Shahhurâzîd’s actions probably aroused both Melkite and Coptic hopes, his eyes were on Heraclius and a return on his part to triumph in Persia rather than on local improvements in relations with Egyptians. No one claims that Egyptian geopolitical issues motivated Shahhurâzîd’s dispute with Khusrav II or his decision to cooperate with Heraclius. Heraclius could not easily ignore Shahhurâzîd’s overtures, although it is plausible that he remained skeptical of Shahhurâzîd’s sincerity or future decisions. Shahhurâzîd shifted his tactics in the Byzantine–Persian

conflict when he departed Egypt and drew near to the war's centers. Egypt remained important, but its strategic significance did not equal that of northern Syria or Upper Mesopotamia for expeditionary armies of the two protagonists. The news of Shahrbarz's assassination in Persia (633) probably evoked no reaction in Egypt, where he no longer wielded any power.

Egypt remained relatively prosperous after the Persian departure. The resumption of coastal trading and the end of the Persian occupation helped to revive the economy of Alexandria and other coastal towns, and trade also facilitated the spread of news both true and false. Egyptians had not considered the Persians to be welcome masters. One can speculate that various Arabs, some of whom may have served as scribes and interpreters, had learned much about the Persian occupation and evacuation of Egypt. The Persian troops under Shahrbarz who had formerly served in Egypt but subsequently moved to northern Syria and Mesopotamia, probably disseminated information, exposing vulnerabilities and opportunities. Arab communities which lay astride the lines of Persian communications between Egypt and Mesopotamia probably learned about conditions in Egypt and passed on some of that information. It is uncertain whether tentative Byzantine efforts to open gold mines in the Eastern Desert (most notably, the Umm Fawakhir) in Justinian's reign had continued into Heraclius's. The abortive efforts of the sixth century may have left some expectation of great mineral wealth in Egypt even after the mining ceased. Rumors about it could have added to the material temptations for a Muslim invasion.

The leading church officials in Egypt were Cyrus/Kyros, the Monothelete Patriarch of Alexandria, who arrived from Phasis in 630/31 – the Mu'taqis of Arabic traditions – and Benjamin, the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria after 626. The two intensely disliked each other. Because he is remembered as an oppressor, it is difficult to assess Kyros accurately. There is no way to evaluate the veracity of later reports that the Prophet had summoned Kyros, among other political leaders, to Islam. However, it is plausible that Kyros, as Byzantine governor and patriarch, paid tribute to the Muslims to forestall invasion. It is also plausible that 'Amr ibn al-'As, who led the Muslim conquest, accepted such funds. Kyros's efforts to make peace with 'Amr necessitated commercial taxes. The fact that Kyros could contemplate raising so much money through these taxes is an indication of the vitality and volume of commerce in the 630s. Furthermore, the dozen or so years of Sasanian occupation had not irrevocably damaged such trade. Stories that 'Amr first saw Egypt while on a trading visit underscore the commercial importance of Egypt and the familiarity of some Arabs with it. Trade had revived sufficiently by the end of the 630s that Kyros believed he could garner substantial funds from it. In his own mind, raising taxes would not do undue damage to life, stability, or values in Egypt. The later Christian Arab historians Agapius and Severus also claim that Kyros secured a truce for three years in return for tribute payments. Their sources presumably derived from the work of Theophanes/George Syncellus. An earlier tradition, Ḥarith ibn Yazid ad-Ḫadrāmī (d. ca. 700), reports via Ḫan ibn Labītah, according to Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, that Aḥā Bakr made a peace arrangement with Kyros for Egypt immediately before the conquests of Syria. This would not be inconsistent with other reports in the histories of Nikephoros, Theophanes, Michael the Syrian, and Agapius, who draw on Theophilius of Edessa.

It is significant that the Persian evacuation of Egypt did not result from any Byzantine campaign from north Africa or from any Byzantine naval actions against its coasts, let alone any naval landings. Instead it resulted from actions at the center of gravity – in upper Mesopotamia and northern Syria and the Caucasus – and a political revolution that brought the Emperor Heraclius and the Persian general Shahrbarz together. So other than offering troops, supplies, and other resources from the defense of Palestine and Syria against the Persians, earlier historical precedents did not offer any clear indication as to how Egypt might defeat the new Muslim conquerors of Syria. There was no easy formula to grasp.

The role of religious strife in Byzantine Egypt deserves attention, especially given Kyros's prominence in it. Coptic memory of the end of Byzantine rule is filled with recollections of persecution during Benjamin's long patriarchate. Coptic literature contains hostile references to Arabs, before and after the conquest, indicating that not every Copt welcomed Arabs as deliverers. And some who originally did soon changed their opinions. It is risky to assume that later Coptic attitudes were also those of the time of the original conquest. Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam includes a tradition in his history that the dissident Patriarch, Benjamin, made separate arrangements with 'Amr ibn al-'As. We know from him and from the Byzantine historians Theophanes and Nikephoros that Heraclius rejected the terms Kyros had made and deposed him, probably early in 640. The inclusion of this tradition in Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's history does not guarantee its truth, but merely that it was deemed worthy of reporting in light of the late ninth-century situation. Some Copts of this later period may have interpreted events in the same
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way, as the contemporary testimony by John of Nikini suggests. Respective transmissions of traditions may have distorted what really happened.

As the Muslim conquest of Palestine progressed between 634 and 637, the separation of Egypt by land from the core of Byzantine territory in western Asia only made it more difficult to devise a solid land defense. Such a task had not worked when the Persians overran Palestine and Syria in the early 600s, and while the Byzantines did not learn from this experience, the Muslims had. 'Amr had conquered Gaza in 637, if we believe the account of the Sixty Martyrs of Gaza. While in southern Palestine 'Amr had time to learn about Egypt and was strategically placed to take advantage of Persian vulnerabilities there. He could also prevent any other Muslim commanders from exploiting the situation. It is conceivable that 'Amr had had a similar arrangement with Kyros of Alexandria, and that in return for monetary payments he held off from invading or raiding Egypt. The logistical problems of maintaining communications and supplies for troops operating in Egypt were not insuperable when the Muslims controlled Gaza and its environs. Outposts such as Nessauna on the edge of the Negev may no longer have been manned. Some of their occupants were of partial Arab background, if one can trust their known names. Possession of Palestine gave the potential initiative and a range of options to the Muslims.

Some Byzantine troops from Palestine fled into Egypt after the Byzantine defeat there at the hands of the Muslims between 634 and 637, but we neither know their precise numbers nor can identify their units. Given their defeat by the Muslims, those Byzantine troops and their leaders were too demoralized to repel the Muslim army from Egypt, nor had they learned from their debacles in Syria and Palestine to make any significant contribution to their forces defending the province. Their behavior when they retreated into Egypt is unclear. The Muslim invasion itself followed the Byzantine loss of most of Palestine and Syria,96 only a few coastal points were still holding out against the Muslims on the Syro-Palestinian coast at its inception. The invasion of Egypt made their retention even more perilous and ultimately irrelevant, and a dynamic of Muslim military success was already evident.

The Byzantine government faced another challenge. There was no great general whom it could trust to devise a successful defense. No officer emerged from the disarray of Byzantine forces to win renown or to show leadership potential. Admittedly, conditions in Egypt contrasted with those in Syria, nor were the soldiers similar. Armenians had served prominently in Syria and Mesopotamia, and friendly Arab tribesmen constituted a large portion of the Byzantine forces there. In Egypt, the ethnic mix seems to have differed. Many local levies were of dubious quality. Some troops from

adjacent parts of North Africa served in Egypt, although not as many as the government had wished. Some forces were transported by sea from Thrace, but their adjustment to local conditions may have been difficult.

The overall effect of the Muslim successes in Palestine and Syria, especially the fall of Jerusalem and other holy places, cannot have been positive, especially after Heraclius had restored the presumed fragments of the Cross to their rightful places. Problems of morale were probably created within Egypt for both the army and civilians.77

Byzantine military commanders were at odds personally, and disagreed over whether to make terms with the Muslims or to persist in violent resistance. Dometianus, brother-in-law to Kyros, concurred with him about the advisability of trying to reach an accommodation with the Muslims, but these commanders were occasionally inconsistent, or at least opportunistic. Dometianus was later inclined to honor General Valentinos and the advisors surrounding the eleven-year-old Emperor Constantine II at Constantinople, who took a hard line. John of Barra, Marinos and others also favored resistance, as did Manuel when he was dispatched to Egypt.38

The rationale within the military for Egypt's defense is not well understood. The existence of cleavage is clearly important because it drained support and strength for a coherent resistance, and also convinced Muslims that theirs was the winning side.

Disputes among civilian, ecclesiastical and military leaders did not account for all internal Byzantine divisions. Serious problems had emerged at the imperial capital, Constantinople. The death of Heraclius at the beginning of 641 paralyzed Byzantine resistance.78 Even the Muslim tracts of Yabde ibn Ayyub (d. 784) and Khaldun ibn Humayd reported such tradition. The regency of Heraclius's widow, Martina, preferred a more moderate stance toward the Muslims than did some other factions at the court. No confidential memoranda or archival materials survive from Constantinople or Egypt concerning this important policy issue. The position taken by Martina's faction can be explained by a fear that her regency was vulnerable to deposition at the hands of a soldier-emperor if fighting intensified or if the government suffered further defeats on the battlefield. Martina, her sons and partisans could ill afford another Yarmouk, yet there was a real danger of another occurring. The regency, in that dangerous period when there were minor children of a controversial union, needed an interval in which stability could be gained and consolidated. In addition the government did not want to be in the position of having to assume responsibility for the further loss of important territory. The personal
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opinions about Egypt on the part of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Pyrrhos, Empress Martina or her sons are unknown. Martial's attitudes were probably formed in the circles of Heraclius's family. She had personal knowledge of Syria, but not of Egypt.

Philagrios, the powerful Koukoukoularios (imperial palace chamberlain) and Sakellarios (treasurer), urged support for Heraclius's son, Heraclius Constantine III, and grandson, Constans II (descending from his first marriage to the late Fabia Eudokia). He used his financial influence to win support of critical military elements with the help of his aide, the ambitious Armenian officer Valentinos. This individual was based at Constantinople in the service of Heraclius Constantine and Constans. The treasury of the sacellum was in the ascendant in the seventh century, following the disintegration of the old praetorian prefecture and its financial structure. The struggle for succession was acrimonious, and distracted the imperial government from any coherent effort to save Egypt.

It is unclear whether Philagrios ever managed to enforce a new census for the entire empire ordered by Heraclius just before his death, or whether he even implemented it in Egypt. Its likely date, 640, happens to coincide approximately with the recall of Kyros and his ensuing exile. The issue at hand was not simply the loss of revenues to the Muslims, but also a powerful internal bureaucratic quarrel about the effort to initiate a new census. Kyros claimed that he would impose a new commercial tax to compensate for the loss of revenues to the Muslims. However, any expedition would have weakened the bureaucratic controls of Philagrios in Constantinople, and so met resistance. There thus was a complex set of fiscal factors involved.

Heraclius's wrath against Kyros may have been intensified by Philagrios pressing him, for his own reasons, to reject any initiatives devised by Kyros, since they would enable local officials in Egypt to gain more autonomy. If true, this perspective was myopic. But Kyros and other local officials might well have resented Philagrios's efforts to extend such an unfamiliar measure as a census to Egypt. The creation of a new census would have offered many opportunities for the central bureaucracy in Constantinople to consolidate its control over Egypt, and would have threatened many constiuencies that extended beyond Kyros's circle. No Egyptian source mentions this measure. Philagrios and Kyros were opponents for reasons probably connected to rivalries over control of revenues and spheres of influence. There is no reason to doubt John of Nikioti's information about this antagonism. Philagrios supported members of the Heraclian family whose support depended on military leaders who found it in their interest to advocate strong military resistance to the Muslims, especially in Asia Minor. These disputes in Constantinople distracted the government, and contributed to the failure of a sound defense strategy for Egypt.

Egypt's size and remoteness from Constantinople also complicated its defense. One may reasonably ask whether any strategy would have succeeded once the loss of Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia blocked contact by land between Egypt and Anatolia and Constantinople. That loss also deprived Byzantium of contact with friendly Arab Christian tribes who in the past had served as a shield against hostile Arabs. If Egypt was to be protected from Muslim Arab invaders, it would be necessary to find the right troops and devise effective strategies. Judging from the Mauricius Strategikon of ca. 600, the extant military manuals provided no easy formulae.

The Blue and Green circus factions of Constantinople also existed in late Byzantine Egypt, as literary texts and inscriptions attest. Some scholars have emphasized religious sectarianism and the role of these factions, identifying the Greens with resistance to Islam and the Blues with readiness to avoid a military confrontation. These interpretations are simplistic and unpersuasive. An argument that those previous partisans of the Circus Factions explain the fall of Egypt is unconvincing. It is incorrect to attribute to the factions any significant role; they may not have made any positive contribution to Egypt's defense, but they were not the cause of its failure.

It is incorrect to assume that all Monophysite Egyptians supported the Muslims against the Byzantines. The situation was more complex. Some Egyptians did collaborate and rapidly converted, but Muslim victories cannot be simply ascribed to help from Egyptian collaborators. The Muslims possessed excellent military commanders and a coherent purpose, while everyone agrees that the Byzantine political, ecclesiastical and military authorities in Egypt and Constantinople were mired in bitter rivalries that proved ruinous to their chances. Previous massacres of Christians by the Persians, and the rapid surrender of many Palestinian towns to Muslims in
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the 630s probably induced the Byzantines to reach a peaceful settlement with the Muslims in Egypt. Rumors about possible atrocities may have intensified this propensity.

There was no coherent plan to arm the Egyptian population, or for rapid training in the use of arms so that the populace could resist. Acquiring sufficient wood for fashioning weapons itself posed problems. Civilians were most-likely to participate in local defense by helping to repair canals or man walls against invaders. There were precedents in Palestine, Syria and Upper Mesopotamia of local authorities making separate peace during the Persian invasions of the sixth and early seventh centuries, as well as during the Muslim invasions of the 630s. It is not surprising that Egyptians behaved similarly. There was no desire among the local population for fighting to the death to save their town or district from occupation. One cannot trust later traditions about terms of surrender, which may involve post-hoc juristic reasoning rather than historical realities.

Their long-held conviction that the Arabs were unable to besiege walled towns may have blinded the Byzantines to their own vulnerabilities during the Muslim invasion. In Egypt, as in Syria, some walled towns held out longer against the invaders than did regions. The early fall of the fortress of Babylon (Old Cairo) to the Muslims placed them in a strong strategic position; they were able to cut off Upper Egypt from the Delta. Again by a process of “blinding,” they made it virtually impossible for any defense of Upper Egypt to be conducted coherently, since those who might resist in the south could learn only with difficulty about the central government’s efforts in Constantinople. Egypt had to attempt its defense in the absence of good communications with other Byzantine forces, except by land and sea with Numidia or other parts of north Africa.

Egypt had provided financial support for military operations in Syria and many earlier campaigns. The imposition of a heavy tribute on the province temporarily forestalled a Muslim invasion. But the payment of such a huge tribute deprived Byzantine Syria of the means previously available to aid its defense. In this way, the fortunes of Egypt and Syria were intertwined during the early Islamic conquests. Whether this was a conscious plan on the Muslims’ part or not, its consequences were serious.

In May 635, the Monothelite government of Emperor Constans II (641-65) accused the ailing Chalcedonian monk Maximus the Confessor, exiled in Africa since 633, of discouraging a Byzantine commander, Peter, from moving Numidian troops to rescue Egypt. He was held responsible for the loss of that great province to the Muslims.44 Such scapegoating is in不忘of how important was Egypt’s loss. It is plausible that the government of Heraclius had attempted to move troops from Numidia against the Muslim invaders of Egypt in response to the first reports of restiveness among Arabs in nearby regions of the Arabian peninsula, on the eve of the more powerful Muslim penetrations into Palestine and Syria. This indicates that there was some perceived Arab threat to Egypt as early as 633, even though there was no substantial invasion until 639. This threat further reinforces the veracity of reports that Patriarch Kyros purchased some temporary relief from Muslim invasions.

The defeat and death of General John Burkainos (Barka was one Byzantine term for al-Marri, in Cynaeica) early in the Muslim invasion may provide another indication that some troops from areas west of Egypt participated in its defense at the end of Heraclius’s reign. John Burkainos died at the battle of ‘Ayn Sham (Heliopolis), near modern Cairo, probably in July 640. The reported site of both Muslim and Byzantine armies are suspect. Some scholars doubt that John Burkainos came from Barka or that his presence indicated any participation of troops from Byzantine-controlled regions west of Egypt. But given the earlier Heraclian conquest of Egypt from coastal areas in Libya and Carthage, and given accusations that efforts to send relief forces from the west (with which Maximus the Confessor allegedly interfered) were sabotaged, that skepticism seems excessive.

Niketas had already quarreled with John the Almsgiver, Patriarch of Alexandria, about taking control of church funds to help the beleaguered empire and its government.47 The quarrels between Kyros and Heraclius, or Kyros and Philegres, seem to have been similar. Tensions were inherent between a wealthy church and a military with an unquenchable thirst for funds. Thus the tensons of 641 paralleled those during the Persian invasion. Niketas had directed the earlier defense of Egypt against the Persians. That had involved a battle at Caearea, resulting in a truce (613). He had also fought the Persians in northern Syria, near Antioch. Such clashes were part of Syria’s defense, but also outer skirmishes to protect Egypt. It was presumably after the failure of those actions that Niketas withdrew into Egypt and then fled by ship from Alexandria in the face of the Persian invasion. It is unclear what military lessons he learned from his experience.

The loss of Egypt to the Constantineople government had twice negatively affected Syria’s defense earlier in the seventh century, by diverting the attention of its protectors and by removing Egypt’s financial resources from its support in 610 during Heraclius’s revolt against Phokas. The occupation by Shahrbaraz and the Arab conquest soon followed. However, in neither case did the loss of Egypt permanently impair the defense of
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Anatolia. The Arab menace with respect to Egypt was always seen as a problem emanating from the Sinai Peninsula, and in addition there was the threat of nomadic incursions from Nubians in the south. Those who had imperiled travel, overland commerce and agriculture in certain important regions, but they did not endanger the control of Egypt by the central government, except in the direst moments of the third-century crisis of the Roman Empire when the aggression of Palmyra was at its zenith. Egypt had long maintained contact with Arabs, including those from Sinai. Literary references to Arabs in religious texts do not reveal any new trend culminating in the late sixth or early seventh centuries. Such references are often stereotypic and should be regarded with caution.

Control of the sea and of Egypt's waterways was always essential to the administration of Byzantine Egypt. The sea was the medium for dominating the church in Egypt, for recalling and communicating with patriarchs, for sending troops and supplies, and for extracting funds from Egypt to Constantinople. Egypt was navigationally linked to Cyprus, which remained in Byzantine hands even after Syria fell. That link progressed from Egypt through Cyprus to Rhodes, and from Rhodes to Constantinople. Control of the littoral and such ports as Alexandria/Alexandretta in Syria or western Asia were also of importance, permitting the Byzantines to strike at coastal areas in Egypt occupied by hostile forces. This control did not, however, secure the Egyptian interior very well, especially if a distress were distant from Egypt's waterways, since the Byzantines do not appear to have developed techniques of large-scale warfare away from them.

Jean Maspero once observed that the Byzantines lacked unity of command in trying to devise a defense of Egypt. Modern scholars' doubts about Maspero's thesis are unwarranted. There were poor coordination of relief forces, disagreements between their leaders and local defense levies. Maspero noted that the Byzantine forces in Egypt were sufficient for their normal military duties, but that they were inadequate for the task of securing it against the Muslims in the early seventh century. The fortresses and fortifications in themselves were satisfactory.

Modern historians have praised Heraclius for not risking the loss of his remaining armies by trying to retain Egypt. The emperor thus implicitly conceded that the loss of Palestine and Syria doomed the province. The perspective of those who give such praise is, of course, that of Constantinople — not that of Alexandria or Cairo. The Byzantine Empire's strategic needs caused it to concentrate its better troops in northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia rather than in Egypt. Ordinarily, few elite expeditionary troops of maneuver were stationed there. We know little about events along the Egyptian Red Sea coast in this period, and their significance for broader developments. It is unlikely, for example, that the early negotiation terms with the Muslims at the northern Red Sea port of Ayla (‘Aqaba) by its bishop would have escaped notice by some Egyptians, but there is no recorded evidence of this. Nor is there evidence about the movement of Byzantine troops or vessels along the Red Sea coast in response to the movement of Muslims in the northern Hijaz. Likewise, although the Red Sea could have been a conduit for valuable information about events in Arabia to reach Byzantine officials in Egypt, no record has survived that they received such reports and revised their policies accordingly.

Most material in Byzantine military manuals concerning maneuvers and battle formations was inappropriate for conditions in Egypt, especially the Delta. But it was equally so for other parts of the province, in particular the harsh, dry regions away from the Nile. We have no manuals on the use of canals, waterways, marshes or grid districts to deter invaders. On the other hand, the Muslims benefited from knowing more about the Byzantines than their opponents knew about them. Given their control of Palestine, the Muslims were able to keep the Byzantines guessing about their intentions, and whether they planned to strike against Egypt or against Byzantine outposts on the edge of northern Syria, or the route to Anatolia. Byzantium thus faced a strategic dilemma: where does one concentrate the limited supply of remaining troops that requires time and expense to deploy? In Syria-Palestine there is marginal evidence, some epigraphic or parenthetical anecdotes in literary sources, that local elites repaired walls or patrolled districts, activities continuing from the sixth century, but there is no similar evidence for Egypt. Egypt lacked raw materials, especially iron and wood, for manufacturing weapons and military machinery. Supplies of wood probably came from forested areas of the empire, such as southwest Anatolia, the Adriatic coasts, or the Black Sea littoral and its interior.

Urban unrest certainly contributed to the fall of Egypt to the Muslims. Yet what could such unrest have accomplished against them? There were Muslim traditions that the population of Alexandria had twice risen against
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the Arabs after the signing of peace terms. Some have imputed the settlement with the Muslims to fatigue on the part of Egypt's leadership stemming from the volatilities of local public opinion and exasperation over shifting imperial policies. These views may be credible.

One may guess that, as in Syria, few in Egypt at the beginning believed that the Muslim conquest was irrevocable. But unlike in Syria, the possibility of flight by civilians was not easy. The swift Muslim conquest of the Pentapolis by 643 effectively eliminated the opportunity for overland flight west to Byzantine Africa. It was possible by sea but there was a limit to the number of those ready to take the risk. The earliest attitudes towards Arab Muslims took shape at all levels of Byzantine society in Palestine-Syria, not in Egypt, in the light of the initial contacts between Christians and Muslims. Wherever their accuracy, these attitudes would circulate rapidly in Egypt as well.

The Muslims' invasion of Egypt came at a propitious time for them, when the imperial government found itself rent by internal strife over the succession. Although unintended, the timing was perfect for the Muslims to apply maximum pressure with minimal troops. The conflict between the Treasurer Philagrius and Patriarch Kyros also worked to their advantage. While not causing the political crisis, they profited from it. The imperial postal system was still partially operative in Anatolia early in the seventh century, but whether it still linked Egypt with Constantinople is unclear.53 There is no evidence for the creation of a new Byzantine "theme" system in Egypt during Heraclius's reign, even though the appointment of Manuel to replace Kyros signified a stronger Byzantine commitment to a military response during the crisis.54

The sequence of events throughout the Muslim conquest poses some problems but is less ambiguous than that of the conquest of Syria. 'Amr led his troops past Pelusium (al-Farama), which he took after a siege of one month, and then through Wādi Tamīlīt to the eastern side of the Delta. He sought to capture the strategically vital fortress of Babylon so that he could isolate the Delta. Copies reportedly aided him in his capture of Pelusium. After taking Bilbeis and Tendunias, he requested reinforcements from Caliph 'Umar, who sent him another 4,000 troops. (One should suspect reports of round numbers such as 4,000 in Arab historical traditions.) When they arrived, his forces totaled perhaps 15,000. 'Amr triumphed at the battle of 'Ayn Shams north of Tendunias and then besieged Babylon from August

September 640 until its surrender in April 641. The Patriarch Kyros made a provisional treaty with the Muslims that Heraclius rejected. 'Amr's initial raids into the Delta encountered problems, so he returned to the siege of Babylon. He then proceeded north along the western edge of the Delta, capturing Terenuthis, Nikaia, Kom Sharif and Suhays before reaching the suburbs of Alexandria at Hulwa. The city was placed under siege.

Meanwhile, Kyros returned from temporary exile to Babylon, via Rhodes. Kyros negotiated a general peace in return for payment of tribute and two dinars per unconverted male. He was granted an armistice period of eleven months to evacuate all Byzantine troops. 'Amr then extended his control over upper Egypt as far as the Thebaid. Kyros died in March 642. Four years later, Manuel returned with troops to restore Byzantine authority in Alexandria, but he was slain. After their defeat, his troops were again evacuated, leaving the Muslims in permanent control.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the civilian or military casualties on either side during the operations resulting from the conquest. Massacres of civilians on a large scale are unlikely, but smaller ones surely spread terror. There were scattered reports of individuals accepting Islam.

It would be equally futile to attempt to estimate financial and economic consequences. Intercity trade was surely affected negatively, as was the movement of agricultural products from region to region. No immediate health disaster ensued from refugees crowding into a few densely packed towns.

The Byzantines probably retained their best military units at Constantinople to protect the capital and confront the threat of civil war posed by the ambitious General Valentinus.55 Other troops would have been concentrated in Anatolia, to stave off a Muslim invasion through the Taurus Mountains. Anatolia was more important to the Byzantine government than Egypt, and the retention of Anatolic and Armenian forces was essential for its defense, so that there could be no option of sending them to Egypt's rescue. Thus the Muslim push on to the Anatolian plateau in 644 may have deterred any serious effort to recover Egypt.

Internal strife in Egypt on the eve of the conquest cannot be ascribed to a single factor. Several sources testify to disagreements between the Melkite Patriarchate and military officials such as Niketas or General Isakios, on the eve of the Persian invasion several decades previously. These conditions had worsened by the 630s and early 640s. Patriarch John the Almsgiver sought to negotiate a peace between the Persians and the imperial government, but encountered popular and military opposition. Laonikos of Neapolis's Life of John was composed on Cyprus in 641/2 under Archbishop Arkadios, an ally of the embattled Patriarch Kyros.

The *Vita* and its epitomes' information regarding events in 619 may contain not accurate reports but distortions that reflect the perspectives of Kyros and Arkadios in the early 620s. Then, as in 619 and the 620s, controversy flared over responsibility for the loss of Egypt. In both instances, the Patriarch of Alexandria was the object of hostility to at least one important military commander. John fled Egypt for Cyprus. He may have been accompanied by Niketas or Isaiakios, who allegedly betrayed Alexandria to the Persians.46 Kyros's abortive attempt to negotiate peace with the Arabs paralleled John's earlier approach to the Persians. One other epitome of the *Life of John* reports that Saracens (Arabs) fled to Alexandria when the Persians invaded.47 One wonders whether they were Sinaí Arabs or arrivals from Palestine. John also ransomed some families from Madianites who appear to have been Arabs from Trans-Jordan or somewhere east of the Dead Sea. Use of a Septuagint term like Madianites implies that they were Bedouin from the Dead Sea region. They were probably pursuing opportunities for enrichment in the aftermath of the chaos following the Persian defeat of the Byzantines.48

Those negotiating the return of captives from the Bedouin raids in 619 were the Bishop of Rhinocolura (al-Arish), the Archbishop of Constantinople in Cyprus and the Abbot of St. Anthony's Monastery. Involvement of the Cypriot Archibishop on behalf of Patriarch John may indicate a coastal location for a meeting and return of ransomed captives. All of these texts depict friction between the Patriarch of Alexandria and its military leadership over money or willingness to negotiate peace. John is represented as accompanied by Niketas, Heraclius's cousin. In both cases, it seems that some inhabitants of Alexandria opposed their Patriarch's settlement with the respective invader. The "Saracens" who had fled to Alexandria before the Persian advance were a source of information about the city to the Muslim Arabs two decades later. The inclusion of a reference to them may indicate that in the past their presence in Alexandria was unusual and thus worthy of mention in the *Vita* epitome composed by Sophronios. The presence of Saracens in Alexandria created a pool of personnel from whom some spoke Arabic and could serve as translators familiar with Arab negotiating techniques.49


Finger-pointing over responsibility for the loss of Alexandria thus occurred at least twice in the seventh century. The accusations against Maximus the Confessor were another aspect of that controversy and its repercussions. A. J. Butler writes his *Arab Conquest of Egypt* prior to the publication of either epitome of John's *Life*. He therefore could not assess its information in his otherwise competent history.

It is essential to consider the role of controversies about Kyros and Arkadios, Philagrios and Martina, and the imperial succession crisis in the composition of Leontius's *Vita* in its present form. These controversies also reinforce the need to contemplate events in Cyprus and their relationship to Alexandria and Constantinople. The earlier controversies about Patriarch John and the surrender of Alexandria belonged to recent memory. This memory probably inclined Patriarch Kyros to caution in his negotiations with 'Amr ibn al-As. The need to shield himself from allegations of treachery and betrayal may have complicated Kyros's role even further at the end of the 620s and early 630s.

An atmosphere of mistrust arose from more than differences about Chrtology. An earlier Patriarch was believed to have been the object of conspiracy and even murder by the military commander Isaiakios. These controversies hampered decision-making. They also contributed to the breakdown of confidentiality. Heraclius's reaction to Kyros's unauthorized treaty with the Muslims was consistent with his deposition of John Kates, curator of Othohe, for negotiating a similar truce with the Muslims after the battle of Yarmuk. There is a logic in Heraclius's policies of restraint over administrators attempting to make separate terms, whether in northern Syria, upper Mesopotamia or Egypt.50

Patriarch John the Almsgiver played a crucial role in negotiating an obscure peace settlement between the naval commander Aspragus and the Cypriot port of Constantinople in 619. It is possible that dissident and disgruntled Byzantine military forces on Cyprus had considered the rejection of imperial authority in the wake of Persian victories and Byzantine defeats. That strife in 619 had further complicated Byzantine efforts to defend Egypt from the Persians.51

The controversial stance of Archbishop Arkadios of Constantinople towards the imperial succession crisis at the death of Heraclius could have made Egypt's lines of communication at the difficult moment of 632/3 even more tenuous. It probably discouraged the leadership in Egypt from taking further risks. It jeopardized communications and logistics at the worst possible moment for Egypt's security. Those who sailed between Constantinople and

Egypt via Cyprus could not have been ignorant of these frictions. They adversely affected the Byzantine army’s morale. The murky case of Asparagius thus underscores strife in Cyprus in the second decade of the seventh century, a prelude to difficulties stemming from Heraclius’s death and the resultant succession crisis in the early 640s that compromised Egypt’s security.

Three ecclesiastical leaders – Patriarchs John and Kyros of Alexandria, and Archbishop Arkadios of Constantinople – died in the midst of the events of 639 and 641 respectively. General Isakios, involved like John in the earlier controversy, also died in Cyprus during the course of events. Their deaths exacerbated the rapid turnover of imperial leadership at Constantinople and prohibited a continuity of leadership.

The precedent of negotiations with Arabs about captives does not in itself confirm the veracity of other reports about negotiations to forestall a Muslim invasion. But there is testimony that Patriarch John had planned to turn away the Persians by negotiation, and that General Isakios, after betraying Alexandria to them, sought to murder John when he was fleeing to Cyprus. These events foreshadowed Kyros’s actions. Butler doubted whether the Muslims would have accepted money in return for some temporary respite of three years. Yet the payment of a substantial sum to them would have denied it to the Byzantines for their defense of Syria and Anatolia. Thus a decision by the Muslims to accept it would be perceptive. It would reinforce their position while denying vital resources to their opponents at a critical moment. The strategic situations on these different fronts were interrelated.

The interest of Niketas, according to the Vita of John the Almsgiver, in associating John with Heraclius is noteworthy, if the account is accurate. By inference, Patriarch John may have sought to avoid implying his support of Heraclius in those desperate moments of the emperor’s reign that were clouded by questions over his imperial legitimacy and doubts over divine protection for the empire. Echoes of civil–ecclesiastical strife are discernable even in the story of Niketas and John. This story had odd resonances at the end of Heraclius’s reign. The Vita’s author emphasizes the close relationship between Niketas and John, and subsequently between him and the dynasty. The author may have worried about new efforts by the government to secure still more ecclesiastical wealth. He accordingly invoked the prestigious names of both John and Niketas to discourage more expropriations of forced loans in the early 640s, even if they were to finance the restoration of Byzantine control over Egypt. Hagiographic memory reflected genuine ecclesiastical fears of further confiscations after 641.

As Nikephoros mentions in his Short History, the relationship between Niketas and his daughter, Gregoria, is significant. She married the Emperor Heraclius Constantine (III). Niketas was celebrated for victories over Persians in Constantinopolitan statuary and one inscription, but there is no evidence that he defeated the Persians in Egypt. Presumably, he was long deceased. Whatever the genetic consequences of these ties, the nature of illnesses suffered by Fabia/Eudocia and Heraclius are unclear. The role of Empress Gregoria, who had strong ties with the neighboring Cyrenaican peninsula, is uncertain. She may have exerted influence at the imperial court in support of hardline policies that would protect Africa by seeking to prevent the Muslim conquest of Egypt (such as moving more troops to Egypt from other parts of Africa) or she may have reluctantly accepted the terms negotiated by Kyros in the hopes that peace in Egypt would protect Africa.

Heraclius’s northern heritage may have reinforced the already strong connection of Constans II to the remaining members of the Heraclean dynasty. The connection may also have reinforced his commitment to retain north Africa. Despite his limited resources, this relationship could have influenced Constans to travel west to Italy and Sicily. He murdered his brother some time after the loss of Egypt, but this act reflected the larger context of internal strife that had plagued the imperial house since Heraclius’s later years.

Severus’s late account of the patriarchs of Alexandria contains material on the seventh century that is compatible with Theophanes’ and Nikephoros’ versions. It also accords with the Christian Arab History of Agapius of Melfi, despite religious differences. Severus also repeats the story that Egypt paid three years’ tribute to stave off the Muslim invasion, an assertion made by Nikephoros and Theophanes. So even a Coptic tradition, or one passed down by a Monophysite tradent, accepts the tradition of an arrangement to buy off the Muslims from their invasion. It may have derived from what Theophillus of Edessa passed on to Nikephoros and Theophanes. These accounts were consistent with the activities of Patriarchs like John the Almsgiver, who also sought to make arrangements in lieu of warfare and the consequent loss of life and property.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Byzantines could have fashioned a better defense of Egypt than they did. The fall of Egypt was not inevitable, although at some point reversal of the process became difficult. Internal Byzantine strife was worse during the empire’s attempts to defend Egypt than during its unsuccessful efforts to hold Syria. The initial capture of Alexandria in 641 marked a threshold, if that had not already been crossed when Babylon surrendered to the Muslims. The caliber of the generals sent to direct the resistance was low. The accession in late 641 of a leadership in Constantinople that favored resistance to the end did not substantially alter Egypt’s position. That new leadership needed to consolidate its grip on power, and while seeking to deflect criticism, it could not afford to take big risks. It did send Manuel the Augustalis with a large force in a last attempt to retrieve the deteriorating situation. But that expedition
ended in ignominious failure, although there was no naval disaster comparable to that of 468 when the Byzantine fleet failed to recover Africa from the Vandals. The Byzantines suffered no serious losses from their Egyptian operations. Recriminations about the defeat reverberated for decades in many literary genres, but these charges did not illuminate the complex context of decisions and actions. There does not appear to have been any great longing for a return to Byzantine rule among Egyptians, and unlike in northern Syria, that was not an option since Byzantine power rapidly receded westward across north Africa.

From the perspective of the Byzantine regime, it was a success simply to have extricated its elite forces by sea after the likelihood of Muslim victory was obvious. Accordingly, there was little hope for a reversal of conditions that would allow a Byzantine recovery. In the early 640s, the government could afford the loss of no more elite troops to the Muslims. How much equipment they did abandon in the evacuation is unknown. Byzantine forces in Egypt suffered no battle of annihilation, nor were they trapped under siege and destroyed. Thus in conclusion, the Byzantines won no victory, but avoided a disaster that would have weakened their defenses in Anatolia and the Balkans. On balance, the Byzantines lamented the Muslim conquest as "the Egyptian destruction." For Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam and his sources, it was the Emperor Heraclius who was the backbone of Byzantine resistance and with him perished Byzantine power in Egypt.62

A tentative chronology of important events during the Muslim conquest

December 639

'Amr ibn al-'Aṣ commences his invasion of Egypt from southern Palestine.

End of January
640

Pelusium falls to the Muslims after a one-month siege.

July 640

The Muslims win an important victory at Heliopolis or 'Ayn Shams.

640

The Emperor Heraclius summons Patriarch Kyros to Constantinople and criticizes his negotiations with the Muslims.

Late 640 or early 641

Miṣr or the town of Babylon (Old Cairo) falls to the Muslims. The Muslims begin to invade the upper delta of the Nile.

February 11, 641

The death of the Emperor Heraclius.

April 9, 641

The citadel of Babylon or Old Cairo falls to the Muslims. Nikiu falls to the Muslims.

May 13, 641

The death of Emperor Heraclius Constantine III, when power temporarily devolves to the regency of Empress Martina and Patriarch Pyrrhos of Constantinople; Philagrius is exiled to North Africa.

May 24, 641

The coronation of Constans II after the deposition of Martina and her sons; Philagrius is recalled from exile. Kyros returns to Alexandria.

September 641

Muslim troops enter Alexandria.

September 14, 641

November 28, 641

The Byzantine treaty, signed at Babylon, surrenders Egypt.

December 10, 641

The first payment of tribute from Egypt to the Muslims after this treaty.

March 21, 642

The death of Patriarch Kyros.

September 17, 642

Byzantine troops under the command of Theodorus evacuate Alexandria, but leave a prefect, John, to coordinate the transition to Muslim rule.

644/45

There is an abortive effort by the eunuch Manuel to recover Egypt with the assistance of a Byzantine fleet. Manuel is slain.
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1. The Source Material

The wealth of written sources for the medieval history of Egypt is certainly exceptional in the Islamic world. Local histories and chronicles, various encyclopaedias, collections of biographies and other scholarly treatises, especially in the later Middle Ages, shed abundant light on practically every aspect of human activity. Most of these works produced by the Muslim scholars reflect historical reality as viewed by a more enlightened stratum of Egyptian Islamic society, but at the same time they give us material which was common knowledge at that time, as well as inside and official information.

Other versions of the facts and events, different points of view and separate historical material are presented by the works that came from the non-Islamic Egyptian milieu, and particularly from Christian sources. These additional historical sources provide a valuable means for checking and supplementing more current traditions. To these must be added substantial sections in most of the important works on history and geography produced in other countries, in which Egypt is treated in considerable detail, as befitted a country which played such a prominent role in the economic and political life of the Islamic world. The authors of these “external” works normally view Egyptian affairs from a different perspective and often represent other spheres of interest. They may also have used sources other than those found in Egyptian works, and this allows us to verify some details.

The standard narrative sources for the medieval period in Egypt are supplemented by a unique group of historical documents which were practically unknown in other Islamic countries—that is, rich collections of papyri and documents on paper.

Documents

Collections of original records, both official and private, are estimated to contain about sixty thousand documents, many of them extremely valuable, especially for economic and social history. Of this number about sixteen thousand are on papyrus, most of them in Arabic, but a number of early ones also in Greek or Coptic, or bilingual. About ten thousand belong to the famous group of Arab-Jewish manuscripts called the Geniza Documents. These, however, postdate the period we are interested in by at least two centuries and as such can only be used
as ancillary material. Much of this source material on Egyptian history mentions al-Fustat. However, as far as the city itself is concerned—its development, quarters, buildings (particularly non-religious ones), streets and public services—the information is disappointingly meagre, imprecise and unreliable, especially for the early period with which we are concerned. Therefore, for our study, the body of documents is smaller than one would expect, although it provides occasional information not to be found elsewhere. Unfortunately, there are at present almost insurmountable difficulties in using this material, difficulties which will continue certainly for many years to come. The greater part of these documents have not been published or even catalogued, and those which have are dispersed over hundreds of volumes of periodicals and rare publications, most of which are unindexed.

Narrative Sources

Of about a dozen medieval works which are of real significance for our study, Kitab Futuh Misr wa-l-Maghrib (Book of the Conquest of Egypt and the Maghreb) by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (born c. A.D. 805 died A.D. 871) is the oldest and certainly the most important for the earliest period of the town. Its chapters on the foundation of al-Fustat and its topography and history appear to have served as the model for a whole series of subsequent treatises of this kind. Unfortunately, all these works prior to the well known fifteenth century compendia of Ibn Duqmaz and al-Maqrizi, Kitab al-Khitai of al-Kindi (+A.D. 961), Kitab al-Mukhtar of al-Qudai (+1062 or A.D. 1065), Kitab al-Qasit fi'l-Khitai of al-Djawwani (written after A.D. 1174/75) and Kitab Iqaz al-Mutaghafil by Ibn Mutawwadd (A.D. 1330) are lost, and are known to us only from later quotations and excerpts.

'Abd ar-Rahman ibn 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd al-Hakam came from an important family of al-Fustat, and his father was a distinguished scholar-theologian of the Malikite rite, also learned in history. He was held in high esteem throughout the Middle Ages as the true father of Egyptian-Arab history, though his importance in modern times suffered somewhat from the severe criticism of Charles C. Torrey, a twentieth-century editor of his work. However, from the excursus on Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's career included in the Introduction to a later edition of the text, it appears that during the twenty odd years which separate Torrey's two publications, he learned to appreciate the value of the work, and in the later one he only formally maintains his unfavourable earlier criticism. In recent years a group of Egyptian historians did justice to Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam by publishing a volume of studies devoted to various aspects of his work, but the unnecessarily apologetic tone of some parts of this collection interferes with its historical criticism and objectivity.

The exceptional value of the Futuh Misr is undeniable and needs no apology, although the modern historian must bear in mind the shortcomings which were common in this period. He must also keep in mind that its primary intention was not to transmit knowledge of bygone facts and events to posterity or to apotheosize the warriors of the first generation of the Islamic conquerors, but to give a plausible historical explanation for a number of obscure juridico-religious traditions concerning the conquest of Egypt and North Africa.

An interesting problem is raised by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's sources. For most of his historical or juridico-religious information he indicates his source in the form of an isnad, (list or 'chain' of successive transmitters), which was the normal usage of the time. This form implies an oral tradition, but we should assume that at least a part of his material came to him in written form, although there is no definite proof of it. There is however strong indirect evidence that there existed in Egypt from the first half of the eighth century a strong written historical tradition. The authors of some of these alleged historical works, whose names we often encounter in the isnads of the Futuh Misr, are Yazid ibn Abi Habib (died A.D. 745), 'Ubayd Allah ibn Abi Dja'far (died A.D. 752), Ibn Lahi'a (died A.D. 790), al-Laith ibn Sa'd (died A.D. 791), Yahya ibn Ayyub al-Ghafiqi (died A.D. 780), and Yahya ibn 'Abd Allah ibn Bukair (died A.D. 846). But it should be noted that with the exception of the last whom our author probably encountered personally and could draw from directly, only Yahya ibn Ayyub is named as a direct source, which could indicate the use of his written collection of traditions. Information from the others mentioned above is normally received through such authorities as 'Uthman ibn Salih 'Abd al-Malik ibn Mamlama, Abu al-Awsad ar-Nadr, Yahya ibn 'Abd Allah ibn Bukair and others, who were direct informants (rawis) of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam. Al-Laith ibn Sa'd and Ibn Lahi'a appear only a few times as direct informants and Yazid ibn Abi Habib or 'Ubayd Allah ibn Abi Dja'far never do, though they appear very often in the chains of isnads. But there is also a difficulty with Yahya ibn Ayyub: most of the information coming from him is cited with double authority, his own and that of Khalid ibn Humayd (died A.D. 786), whom we do not know as a historical writer. Since we do not know of any instance of a written historical work with a double authorship, we should assume that the information from both was transmitted orally or in writing by a later rawi whose name was omitted; that is, unless we take for granted the existence of a written account by Khalid ibn Humayd, which was to a large degree similar to the alleged work of Yahya ibn Ayyub.

All these observations make the theory of an extensive use of the written material by our author rather difficult to accept. But on the other hand, there is no reason to doubt a well founded hypothesis of the existence of historiography in Egypt before Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, and if such works existed, the author of the Futuh Misr must have been acquainted with them. However, according to the usage of the time, he probably relied on oral tradition whenever it was possible. During this period there was no sharp distinction between the historical tradition and the religious; the usage of the latter could be accepted, and an oral tradition with a complete isnad of rawis was considered more sound (sahih) than a written one, which could be incomplete and easily falsified. In any case, out of the more than forty rawis from whom Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam drew his information directly
knowledge, which may very well have been the case. We can be fairly confident that about the middle of the ninth century, when Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam committed his information to writing, local memory concerning primitive khittas (areas for settlement allotted to various groups—generally tribal groups—in the early days of al-Fustat; later simply ‘quarter’) buildings and the like was still alive and reasonably accurate. At that time some of the old buildings in a more or less modified form were certainly still standing, most thoroughfares followed their early courses and the town quarters had basically the same names and borders. Also, many descendants of the original settlers were still in the town and must have been aware of their history. Possibly Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam’s family itself was descended from original inhabitants of al-Fustat and was especially well versed in its history and traditions.  

As for the Futuh Misr’s text, there are several partial editions. The best complete edition is doubtless that of C. C. Torrey, which appeared in 1920 and was based on the British Museum twelfth-century manuscript and three others from European collections. Very carefully prepared and including an introduction, index and very useful dictionary, it provides an excellent working instrument.

In 1961 another edition appeared by ‘Abd al-Mun‘im ‘Amir, based on a manuscript from the Istanbul Fatih Collection dated A.D. 1136/37 (A.H. 531) and unknown to Torrey. The edition, although carelessly printed and without an index, gives us access to the earliest manuscript known so far.

Before we discuss the topographical works of Ibn Duqmaz and al-Maqrizi, which will be of major importance to this study, a brief discussion of the secondary sources is in order. Of the long list of historical and geographical works written between the ninth and fourteenth centuries, in which al-Fustat and matters related to its history have been referred to in a more or less detailed way, only very few deserve our attention here. Most of the others either repeat the information known to us from better—that is to say, more reliable or older—works, or do not refer to the period we are interested in at all.

A small amount of original information is found in two other ninth-century works. One of them is a well known account of the Arab conquests by al-Baladhuri; the other, equally popular and reliable, is the geography of al-Ya‘qubi. Although the latter was written in Egypt, both accounts refer to the country from a more detached viewpoint, treating it as a part of the Caliphate and not as the centre of attention as Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam does. This partly explains why there are few details, topographical or otherwise, in their works. Nevertheless, their general remarks still provide useful information on the early town and its people.

For al-Baladhuri’s work the edition of al-Munajjid was used. It is slightly better and is based on a collection of manuscript material larger than the well known standard edition by de Goeje. Existing translations of this work, by P. Hitti and F. Murugotten, and by O. Rescher, were inaccessible to this author. For al-Ya‘qubi’s Geography the edition of de Goeje and G. Wiet’s translation were used.
The work of al-Baladhuri (written about A.D. 869) follows the use of hadith, well established in his time, in the presentation of the historical material. For each piece of information he gives a chain of informants with which we are able to check the sources or compare the data with parallel material transmitted by other authors, especially by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam and, to a lesser degree, al-Kindi. On the whole, the three authors draw largely from the same sources, the Egyptian historical tradition. This fact, while perfectly understandable for the two Egyptian writers, is somewhat strange with al-Baladhuri, who composed his works in Baghdad and belonged to the Iraqi school of history. It is not known whether he even visited Egypt. His study might easily have been written while he was staying in Damascus. It is more likely, however, that he had durable links with the country, as his grandfather had been employed in the administration there.

It is interesting to note that his main sources of information for the Egyptian campaign and related matters were either Ibn Lahba or al-Laith ibn Sa'd, both reputed authors of early historical works. Since al-Baladhuri could not possibly have known Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's Futuh Misr, which he never mentions, it is possible that he somehow had access to written material by these other authors.

Al-Ya'qubi's presentation of his material differs from that of al-Baladhuri in every respect. In both his works, the Geography and the History (of which the latter is of less value for our study), he discarded the insads and presented his material as a narrative without naming his sources. Since Egypt was the country in which he spent much of his life and wrote his works, he certainly drew from the local written tradition as well, supplementing it with oral information and personal observation.

Next on our list are two important historical works of al-Kindi: Kitab Tasniya Wulat Misr, often called Kitab al-Wulat or Kitab al-Umara for short, which is a history of the governors of Egypt from the Arab conquest up to the decline of al-Ikhshid rule (c. A.D. 640-961), and Kitab al-Qudat, which is a history of the judges of Egypt up to the year A.D. 860. Both works were published in one volume by Rhuun Guest, the text of al-Qudat being supplemented with appendices which bring the text up to the beginning of the eleventh century.

The author of these works, Abu 'Umar Muhammed ibn Yusuf ibn Ya'qub al-Kindi al-Tudjibi al-Misri (A.D. 897-961), was a native Egyptian, as is evident from his nisas (surnames), and belonged to the South Arab tribe of Tadbib which had been prominent at al-Fustat since its foundation. His many-sided historical activity (unfortunately the majority of his books are lost) makes him the outstanding figure in Islamic Egyptian historiography of his time, especially since all his attention was focused on his native country.

The nature of the historical information that we can draw from both works is manifold. Although they were intended as chronicles for the chiefs of political and judiciary authorities, and the author was very careful to keep closely to his subject, the works naturally also referred to various facts of a military, administrative, social and economic nature. There is not much direct information on the physical aspect of the city of al-Fustat: our author evidently kept it for his specialized treatise on the khilaf. Luckily for us, al-Fustat is often the main theatre of the events he is describing; therefore, incidental references valuable for the study of its toponography are also included. Perhaps more important are numerous allusions revealing various aspects of the social structure of the early city as well as the main subject of the work, which gives detailed information on its political background.

The next early medieval historical work composed in Egypt is the History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church. Though mistakenly ascribed to a single author, Savirus (Severus) ibn al-Muqaffa', the bishop of al-Ashmunein, in reality it was composed by various scribes whose names and dates are in many cases known to us. As for the bishop Savirus, it is assumed that about the middle of the tenth century he translated earlier biographies written usually in Coptic, but sometimes in Greek, into Arabic and edited them. From the note by the copyist Yuhanna ibn Sa'id ibn Yahya ibn Mina, known as Ibn al-Quzum, which was inserted at the end of the biography of Cyril II, it would rather appear that it was he who edited (probably shortly after A.D. 1128) the earlier part of the History up to the eleventh century. Of course this does not exclude the role of Savirus, although Yuhanna's statement indicates that the problem of the authorship of this document should be reexamined.

The primary concern of the biographies is, of course, ecclesiastical history, but at the same time they give abundant information on the social, political and economic situation of the country. Some parts of the History are less valuable than others, which is understandable in a composite work which is dependent on the varying abilities of its multiple authors. For the early Islamic period it is uniquely valuable, as the biographies are quite often eyewitness accounts, an advantage which the contemporary Muslim sources do not possess.

For the study of al-Fustat, the History gives us considerable important information often not found elsewhere. The biographies for the first centuries of Islam, however, give relatively more information about Alexandria, as this city was the Patriarchal See. But the growing influence of the Arab capital, the interference of the central authorities in the affairs of the Christian community, and the simultaneous involvement of an influential Coptic secretarial class in the central administration of the province, changed this situation long before the See had been transferred to the capital. Closer relations of the Alexandrian Patriarchate with the seat of government could not but be reflected in the History, where, especially from the last decades of the seventh century, al-Fustat is frequently mentioned.

The first part of the text, up to the year A.D. 849, was edited and published with an English translation by B. Evetts in Patr. Or. A better edition of the text up to the year A.D. 767, based on the older manuscript from Hamburg, was published by C. F. Seybold. Evetts's edition has been supplemented by the Société d'Archéologie Copte in Cairo, which published other parts of the text based on various manuscripts, together with an English translation. So far, the biographies of the patriarchs have been published only up to the thirteenth century.
Another author belonging to the Egyptian Christian milieu was a certain Abu Salih, the author of an interesting book on the churches and monasteries of Egypt (Kitab Kan’ah wa-Adhira Misl), edited from a unique copy in Paris by B. T. A. Evetts and translated by the same scholar. The author was an Armenian who settled in Egypt and somehow became associated with the Coptic creed, but of whose life nothing more is known except that he completed his work in the beginning of the thirteenth century (the last date mentioned in his work is A.D. 1208), when he must have already reached a considerable age.38

The most valuable information in this work is probably based on the author’s personal observations, which, however, chronologically exceed the scope of the present study. Of significance for us, therefore, are only those parts where the author draws from older sources. These are not very numerous and most of them have survived in a more or less complete form elsewhere. But there are a few quotations from a very important and lost work of al-Kindi entitled Kitab al-Khitat, which bear directly on our subject. They give us interesting details about some of the city’s quarters, its original settlers and so on, which are not recorded elsewhere.

In most cases, when referring to events which were not contemporary, Abu Salih names his sources. Sometimes, however, his information remains unattributed. In such cases, especially when we cannot find parallels in the known texts, we can infer that they also come from al-Kindi, unless our author used older books of whose existence or contents we are still ignorant. Some local oral tradition may also have been used, but it is, of course, always remain untraceable. Examples of facts which cannot be paralleled elsewhere are the information he gives about the zariba built by the Arabs at the time of the siege of Babylon, or about the red banner which gave its name to the later quarter of al-Hamra, or al-Qaraa.

Important, although practically never used by students of the Egyptian capital’s historical topography, is the famous geographical dictionary by Yaqut al-Hamawi. The work, completed and published in Halab in March A.D. 1224,39 contains abundant material from Egypt, which at least in part was collected during the author’s visit there in A.D. 1215. The material relevant to our study is contained in two large articles, “al-Fustat” and “Misl,” and in a number of small entries devoted to the better-known topographical units in the town.40 But on the whole, the author of this work provides little information which is unknown to us from other sources, especially from al-Maqrizi. However, since Yaqut’s work is more than two centuries earlier than al-Khitat, it gives us a valuable means of checking the latter. For topographical details he used the works of al-Quda‘i extensively and to a lesser degree that of al-Djawwani. For the early period and details of the conquest he used the works of Abu ‘Umar al-Kindi (possibly including his Kitab al-Khitat and Kitab Mawali Ahl Misl) and the Futuh Misr of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, although he does not mention this work by name. Most likely the quotations referred to as coming from such authorities as Ibn Lah‘a, al-Laith ibn Sa‘d, and Yazid ibn Abi Habib, were taken from Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam and not directly from their works.41 However, certain details, such as the names of four high-ranking officers of ‘Amr’s army who were appointed to supervise the distribution of lands at the foundation of al-Fustat, which are given by Yaqut42 but do not occur in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, would indicate that the former had at his disposal a fuller account of events, probably that of al-Quda‘i. But on the whole, in his relation of the conquest and the foundation of al-Fustat, Yaqut follows Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s narrative, though presenting it in a more systematic manner (which is characteristic of his work).

With the exception of the Futuh Misr of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, whose significance for our study far outweighs that of all other written works, the largest amount of information is provided by the latest group of historical sources. As a rule, the information is fuller and more detailed here than in earlier authors and covers a wider range; at the same time, it is more methodically and logically arranged. This fact is seemingly paradoxical, since the historical material for this period available to later authors could not have been better or more extensive than that which their predecessors had at their disposal. On the contrary, time effaced a good deal of it. This paradox can be resolved in light of the extraordinary development of Islamic historiography and the encyclopaedic sciences in the later Middle Ages. The methods of collecting material and subsequently presenting it in a written form were perfected, the fields and scope of interest of particular scholars multiplied and expanded, and their scientific horizons widened. But these processes, advantageous as they doubtless were, often contained implicit dangers, especially in cases where a scholar dealt with facts and situations distant in time or space. Since there was a marked tendency to rationalize obscure points within the particular subjects covered, even though the supporting data lacked consistency, were insufficient or even unavailable, scholars were introducing their own theories and speculations. Occasionally they were right, as in the famous sociological generalisations of Ibn Khaldun, but more often the speculations were baseless, irrational, dictated by prejudice, or simply lacked a scientific basis. Of course, these deficiencies were not restricted to late medieval works. They characterized the medieval mind in general, but in this later period they seem more pronounced.43

In the historical material useful for our study—i.e., that concerning the early city’s physical form and in particular its topography—these drawbacks are not easily noticed. Non-controversial facts are usually presented with apparent objectivity, conforming to the best judgment of authors, and only with rigorous criticism and minute examination and comparison against other available sources does their inconsistency appear. Examples of such cases, which unfortunately have been accepted at face value by modern scholarship, are discussed in subsequent pages; and such cases are fairly common, even among our best authorities.

Of the numerous historical and encyclopaedic works composed in the late medieval period in Egypt (and almost every one gives a more or less detailed account of al-Fustat), two have a very special place in our source material. These are al-Inisar of Ibn Duqmna and al-Khitat of al-Maqrizi. None of the others deserves close attention, except perhaps al Qulqashandi’s Subh al-Asha', which
gives some new and significant information. For the early period these later sources contain either abridged repetitions of such sources as at-Tabari, al-Baladuri, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, al-Kindi, et al. (as in the case of the famous chronicles of Ibn Dawadar, Ibn Taghiri Birdi, and Ibn Iyas), or, as in Huw al-Muhtadara or as-Suyuti, utilize material already collected by al-Maqrizi. There is also practically nothing of value, except for some marginal notes, in the voluminous work of Ibn Sa‘id, though it is a useful source of information on later periods and on literary history.

Sarim ad-Din Ibrahim Ibn Muhammad Ibn Aydumur Al-Alisi Ibn Duqmaz, an author of several historical works on Egypt, was also known as a jurist (a subject on which he also wrote). But for posterity and especially for modern scholarship, his fame was primarily established by his historical and topographical study entitled al-Intisar li Wasiat ‘Iqd al-Amsar. Of the entire work of ten volumes only the fourth and fifth parts are still extant.

The whole of the fourth part is devoted to al-Fustat, its topography and monuments. The single preserved manuscript is evidently the author’s autograph. (a view opposed by Casanova). The handwriting supports this opinion, but more conclusive is the evidence that the manuscript is incomplete. On many pages of the text, places have been left blank, evidently with the intention of filling them with details, dates, etc., which were not available to the author as he was writing. Since one would not expect an unfinished work to be given to a copyist, we can be reasonably certain that it is indeed the autograph, or at least a working copy. This may also explain why al-Maqrizi did not quote it among his sources, rather than, as Casanova suggests, that it was because Ibn Duqmaz literally copied large parts of Ibn Mutawwad’s work which al-Maqrizi had in the original. The work being unfinished and unpublished at the time of the author’s death in the year A.D. 1400 (A.H. 809), it was simply not available to al-Maqrizi when he composed his chief opus (in spite of his being for a time Ibn Duqmaz’s pupil). This question is important because it directly concerns the material essential for our study. However, we will leave it for the moment and discuss it together with al-Khitat.

Since only a part of the whole study has been preserved, we cannot evaluate it as a whole. Apparent gaps and deficiencies in historical interpretation were perhaps made up for in other volumes, but there is no way of knowing. From the volume that we have, the study appears to be a rather dry, unimaginative enumeration of facts and reminds one more of a concise topographical dictionary than a vivid historical narrative (such as that of al-Maqrizi). This is perhaps due to the juristic mind of an author trained in legal traditions. But this characteristic, although somewhat dull, inspires confidence in the work in spite of its lack of references to the sources used—and these are few indeed. For information concerning the early period, al-Quda’i, al-Kindi, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam are practically the only authorities mentioned. For later facts Ibn al-Mutawwad is most frequently quoted. A few other authors, such as Ibn Sa‘id al-Maghribi, Ibn Yunus, and ‘Abd ad-Din Ibn Nabulusi, are also occasionally named, but the amount of information ascribed directly to them is negligible.

The bulk of the material is related without any indication of authority. Some of it can, nevertheless, be traced to earlier sources which either have been preserved in their original form or are known to us from quotations in later works. In all such cases where it is possible to compare texts, the reliability of Ibn Duqmaz is apparent, which makes his negligence in naming the sources even more inexplicable. Since the most important topographical works on al-Fustat, (namely al-Khitat of al-Kindi, al-Khitat of al-Quda’i) and an-Naqat (al-Kindi, Mutawwad), are lost, we do not know to what extent the fourth part of al-Intisar depended on them—probably even more than al-Maqrizi’s al-Khitat, which focused on al-Qahira rather than on al-Fustat. The context proves, however, that Ibn Duqmaz did not copy them slavishly, as Casanova suggests. He theorizes that al-Intisar depended almost totally on Ibn al-Mutawwad, and whenever possible tried to improve a piece of information. Evidently, with a preconceived form of the study in mind, Ibn Duqmaz cut out unnecessary, inconsistent or untrustworthy details, supplemented his work with vital facts, dates, etc., and through his personal research made efforts to bring the history of the elements of the town’s topography up to his own times.

Material useful for the study of the earliest period of al-Fustat is mostly contained in two early sections, that is to say, in the introduction relating the foundation of the town, and in the chapter on famous houses. Unfortunately, two cards of the manuscript are missing from the latter chapter, which may account for the lack of information on some important houses mentioned by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam. But on the other hand, we have here some information not to be found in other known sources. Additional early material is scattered throughout almost all the other chapters, especially those which describe different kinds of streets, famous places, hills, lakes, mosques and baths. However, since the primary task of the author was to describe the city in his own times, he neglected to discuss, for example, the quarters which were already abandoned and monuments and places unrelated to contemporary topography, although there are exceptions to this general rule. Apart from this there is a complete lack of any precise sense of geographical orientation in his work, but this is a common defect of all medieval source material. Dimensions, distances, and directions in reference to permanent landmarks are almost never mentioned, and this makes it extremely difficult or even impossible to locate most of the topographical elements to which Ibn Duqmaz refers.

Tagi ad-Din ‘Ali al-Maqrizi is certainly the best known of all Egyptian medieval historians and one whose fame has spread far beyond the professional circles of orientalists and oriental scholars. His Kitab al-Mawla’s wa-l-Riha bi-Dhikr al-Khitat wa-l-Athar, usually referred to simply as al-Khitat, is especially renowned and serves as the main reference work for the historical topography of Cairo and other Egyptian towns as well as for the country’s institutions, social history, etc. The work is too well known to describe it in detail here. The third part of it is devoted to al-Fustat and its suburb-cities, al-‘Askar and al-Qata’. In addition to historical and topographical information it includes a summary of al-Kindi’s history of governors from the Arab conquest to the foundation of al-
In this respect his speculations and reconstructions, interesting as they might be, are often inconsistent with his own facts and are dangerous to follow without thorough checking against all available information. One of the best examples of this is his reconstruction of the course of the Nile within the town's boundaries at the time of the Arab conquest. But still, such material should not be rejected a priori since it may be based on authentic and partially trustworthy historical tradition which is not preserved elsewhere. Still, the main value of his work for the study of the early periods rests with the meticulous transmission of information from sources which are long since lost and would otherwise have been totally inaccessible to modern science. Usually he quoted from them verbatim, and this can be verified in the instances where a given work has been preserved in its original form. Occasionally, however, he abridged the original text or replaced difficult or archaic words and expressions with more current ones. Only rarely did he evaluate or discuss the cited piece of information, though sometimes according to the usage of his times, he brought up two or more opposing views on one question. The author or title of a quoted source is normally given, although now and then he neglected to do so, even for long quotations, as for instance for an abridged account on the Tulunids taken from al-Kindi. Other instances of carelessness, such as frequent citations from al-Quda'i using Ibn al-Mutawwad as an intermediary for the original work, can be found. But on the whole, as we said, we can praise his care and exactitude.

The last work we must mention is the famous manual of secretarial composition known as Subh al-A'sha fi Sind a'l-Insha by Shihab ad-Din 'Ali ibn Ahmad al-Qalqashandi (died in A.D. 1418). A description of al-Fustat is included in the second Excursus on Al-Masalik wa'l-Mamalik. Comparatively short, it nevertheless includes some original information which supplements our other sources and allows for verification, especially of citations from al-Quda'i, al-Qalqashandi's main source of information on early al-Fustat.

**Archaeological Sources**

From the standpoint of archaeological research the site of al-Fustat was perhaps luckier than most other Egyptian mediaeval towns. For a long time it was a sad rule that whenever medieval remains overlay ancient sites and stood in the way of archaeologists looking for pharaonic remains they were recklessly removed with no record at all. With al-Fustat, this was not the case. The site did not promise to yield anything ancient and consequently was left alone. But because of its proximity to the capital and its suburb, Old Cairo, it has served since the abandonment of most of its quarters in the late eleventh century as a source of valuable building material, then as an enormous dump, as the location of industrial installations which were disagreeable in an urban environment, and for squatters. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it became an inexhaustible source of sibakh, a precious agricultural fertilizer, and at the same time, with the growing interest in objects of Islamic art, the domain of treasure
hunts. In practice, the activities of treasure hunters, sabkakhin, and extractors of building materials were often combined. This large-scale exploitation not only did inestimable damage to the actual remains of the medieval city but also disturbed the stratigraphy and destroyed the archaeological context, so that much of the historical evidence is totally lost or beyond reconstruction. With this state of affairs, the large-scale systematic work commenced in 1912 by the Museum of Arab Art and directed by Ali Bahgat could not but be welcomed. He organized the sabkakhin, put them under the supervision of specially appointed guards, and through their industry unearthed an important portion of the town (about twelve hectares), and made a number of large soundings in different parts of the site. As the result of twelve years of excavation, thousands of objects, some of them of considerable value, were saved for the Museum, and a report was published. His method of excavation obviously did not allow for precise chronological differentiation of architectural remains, nor did it permit the dating of objects by archaeological methods. Therefore, for the present study, it can only be used tentatively, as a source of comparative material which must be interpreted on the basis of subsequent scientific research.

Baghhat's excavation ended around 1924. In subsequent decades many other, although much smaller, excavations were undertaken in various parts of the site, but few have been published and their results are therefore mostly unknown. In most cases, however, the unearthed portions of the town remain uncovered and are open for examination, and can serve as comparative material.

For a new large-scale scientific excavation, the site of al-Fustat had to wait another forty years. Excavation began in 1964 as a kind of emergency project to investigate areas destined by Cairo's town planners for modern construction. The work was carried out by a large scientific staff with modern equipment, trained archaeological workmen brought in from Upper Egypt, and the cooperation of various experts. So far, about three hectares (in two sectors) of the town have been uncovered.

During the 1960s and 1970s, archaeological research was also undertaken by various missions of the Egyptian Antiquities Department, in the course of which a considerable area was cleared and investigated by means of soundings.

One of the archaeological characteristics of the eastern part of al-Fustat, at least in the sections so far investigated, is that, wherever possible, foundation walls were laid directly on bedrock. This applies both to the earliest buildings as well as to others which were subsequently built in the same place. This practice, in addition to the disturbance of the archaeological stratification and context by generations of diggers mentioned above, accounts for the scarcity of remains datable to the first century of the Islamic era. Nevertheless, meticulous investigation of the rare undisturbed and stratified portions of the preserved fills, particularly of streets and under pavements within houses, led to the discovery of layers datable to the early period of the town's existence. Also, certain fragments of the sewage system and even some remains of actual houses could be dated back to Umayyad times. The results of this scientifically conducted excavation are derived from only a small part of the site, but given their similarity to other portions of the town previously excavated, they can safely be applied to all of them; that is to say, to almost twenty hectares of urban area. Such a considerable portion of the town certainly allows for valid generalizations.

Archaeological material from the western part of the town inclusive of its pre-Islamic nucleus, the fortress of Babylon or Qasr ash-Sham, has a different character. Here the occupation was practically uninterrupted throughout the medieval period and modern times, and this has made any systematic archaeological research impracticable. The only extensive works conducted so far were recent excavations undertaken within and around the Mosque of 'Amr on the occasion of its last reconstruction. These results, of utmost importance for Islamic archaeology, are unfortunately unpublished and the material inaccessible. The same applies to other occasional works within this quarter or to random excavations. Thus, the only archaeological information for Old Cairo comes from the author's own observations.

The material on Qasr ash-Sham is a little better. Although no scientific archaeological excavations were ever conducted in this quarter, some random work has been done and described, and, what is more important, the preserved architectural monuments have been investigated and recorded.
2. The Geography of the Site

The area of old al-Fustat has undergone considerable transformation in the more than thirteen centuries since the town’s establishment. The changes differed in character and so did their causes and their chronology. Not all of them can be scientifically defined and proven today. However, a reconstruction of the main physiological features of the area from the period of the Arab conquest is desirable, because the relief and physical conditions of the area in which the town was founded influenced its subsequent development in a fundamental way (as is the case with every urban agglomeration). Obviously, in studies of this kind the present state of the site in question must be accepted as the starting point. In general, the historical sources only rarely provide information which is applicable for topographical purposes. This is also true in our case and therefore these sources are of secondary value. The more useful archaeological data are unfortunately very fragmentary; moreover, in the majority of cases they are chronologically uncertain. In addition, they are restricted to a relatively small part of the whole area in which we are interested; namely, to the area which has been scientifically investigated. That is why the basic information comes from geographical works, some geological studies, and cartographic data, as well as from the author’s own observations made in the field between 1964 and 1978.

The area of the town proper is situated on the eastern bank of the Nile, just outside the Delta, whose southern border it defines. On the west bank the suburb of al-Djiza (Gizeh) with its adjoining plain and the islands in the Nile are more like a continuation of the Delta in a southerly direction.

The 31st N. latitude runs through the town. The approximate distance from the Mediterranean in a straight line is no more than 175 kilometres. It is enough, however, to intercept a considerable portion of the rain from the north. The long-term average rainfall is slightly less than thirty millimetres annually. Rain falls only during the winter months and normally there are only seven rainy days a year.

The temperature in January averages about 12° C and in July a little below 28° C. Because of the wide range of temperatures within twenty-four hours, both the night cold in winter and the heat in summer are sometimes strongly felt. But the low temperatures in winter usually do not last very long, while the summer heat is mitigated by relatively cold nights and refreshing northern winds. In the spring hot southern winds, the so-called khamsins, often turn into sand-storms and are very trying. However, on the whole the climate is fairly regular, the weather stable, and cataclysms such as hurricanes, so frequent in other regions, are exceptional. Until the High Dam was built, a more immediate source of unexpected disaster was the Nile and its annual flood. Although the fluctuation of the water level was fairly regular (with its minimum in the spring, beginning to rise about the twentieth of June, and its maximum at the end of September, with the normal fluctuation in the water level of between 6 and 7.5 metres) it departed occasionally from this norm: either the flood did not reach a level which would adequately irrigate the fields and ensure sufficient crops, or there were excessive floods, submerging the country under water and causing destruction within the town as well. However, the damage caused by these floods, no matter how destructive, cannot be compared with that resulting from a low Nile and the subsequent bad crops. The situation was particularly severe when there were two or more years of low Niles (a not uncommon phenomenon), since food reserves were soon exhausted and famine spread throughout the country. In the big cities these conditions were usually accompanied by epidemics and unrest, resulting in political and economic chaos with far-reaching, long-term effects.

Although climatic factors and the Nile, coupled with the activity of man, had the greatest influence on the environment and resulted in most of the changes in the physiography of the area, one should not disregard tectonic movements, which were of some significance as well. Earthquakes, though not as frequent in this area as in other regions of the Mediterranean Basin, took place occasionally and resulted in considerable damage. Unfortunately, we have scant information about them and not all have been noted by the sources. Information for the early Islamic period particularly is lacking. However, on the basis of later data, we can assume that earthquakes seriously affecting the town occurred at least once a century.

The area relevant to our study is enclosed between the Nile and the steep scarps of al-Muqattam overlooking the town on its eastern side. The northern boundary can be delimited by a hypothetical line drawn between the westernmost spur of al-Muqattam, which in later times was occupied by the Citadel, and the Nile somewhere near the present-day Midan Sayyida Zaynab. To the south the area of the town reached the depression of Birkat al-Habash, which is equivalent to the plain belonging today to al-Basatin village and extending up to al-Ma‘udi.

The greater part of the territory was occupied by a rocky plateau of varying height, which in the period under discussion was most probably barren and covered with loose blocks of stone, the residue of erosion. Only a relatively narrow belt close to the Nile was alluvial plain and could be used for cultivation. These two parts were clearly distinguished in medieval times, and according to their main physiographic features had different names. The one near the Nile was called ‘Amal Asfai, and the other ‘Amal Fauq, designations which can be translated approximately as “the Lowland” and “the Highland,” respectively. These two areas housed the main part of the town of al-Fustat proper. There were suburbs situated outside this area, which, although they were directly connected with al-Fustat and inseparable components of the urban agglomeration, were also geographically distinctive regions, and as such they will
be discussed later. Another reason for this distinction is that the main physical features of the suburbs underwent far less significant transformation in the course of time than the area of al-Fustat proper.

'Amal Asfal

This narrow strip of lowland directly bordering on the Nile actually constitutes part of the valley floor which continues to the south for thousands of kilometres between the barren eastern desert and the river, and gradually expands into the broad plains of the eastern Delta in the north. The valley floor within the town varied considerably in width. Generally speaking, it was much wider in the north than in the south, where the plateau forming its eastern border was higher and descended steeply to the Nile. With the exception of some higher hills in the north the plateau descended very gently towards the plain and was more distant from the river. But on the whole, some thirteen centuries ago the lowland was considerably less extensive than it is now, the Nile having receded several hundred metres to the west since that time. Also, its aspect differed from the present in many respects. First of all it was considerably lower than now and therefore far more sharply contrasted with the adjacent highland. Its rise and the resulting levelling of the town's contours was due to a twofold action of nature and man. The first is a phenomenon common to the whole floor of the Nile Valley, especially its lower sections, and results from the gradual sedimentation of alluvia. As the whole valley floor is rising, the river bed is also rising at a rate comparable with the elevation of the river banks by sedimentation and so, consequently, is the water level. According to our estimates, the valley in the neighbourhood of Cairo rose between one and one and a half metres during the last thirteen centuries. In the city itself, though, the rise in ground level through human action was much more important. This process, common to almost all ancient settlements, is the result of the accumulation of occupational layers, and these piled up especially fast in low and wet places near the Nile because of more intensive commercial and industrial activity. Observation in various places, mainly in the central part of 'Amal Asfal, indicates that the ground has risen between two and eight metres since Byzantine times, due in part to alluvial sedimentation, especially in originally lower places. The rise in ground level also resulted in the widening of the area of 'Amal Asfal as it encroached on the lower parts of the rocky edge of 'Amal Fauq. It goes without saying that the accumulation of occupational deposits and alluvia resulted in the disappearance of minor natural and artificial undulations of the ground. This process of levelling of the uneven earth surface is well-known both to archaeologists and geologists. Thus, what is nowadays almost a flat area might not have been so thirteen centuries earlier. Unfortunately, without special research, soundings, excavation and stratigraphic examination, one cannot precisely determine the original state of the area. Moreover, within 'Amal Asfal it would be almost impossible to carry out extensive archaeological research, since the area has been densely settled in modern times. Nevertheless, incidental observations and references in the medieval sources provide a number of useful indications. On the whole it appears that the area was comparatively level, although not devoid of some depressions and elevations. It was also quite low as compared with 'Amal Fauq. It has been suggested that this lowland was regularly flooded by the annual flood of the Nile, but this does not seem likely. Probably most of the area was just above the reach of the normal flood. Additionally it may have been protected by an artificially constructed embankment.

There were a number of small ponds there such as Birkat Shata, Birkat Rumaysa, and others whose names have not been preserved, that probably dried up when the elevation of the Nile was low, and one large lake at the northern outskirts of the town, known later as Birkat Qarun. During the flood some places were marshy. These muddy depressions and ponds were evidently remnants of the river's meanderings which long ago had been separated from the main current. In the course of time they tended to disappear and today there is no trace of them. Likewise, the remains of the old navigation canal known earlier under the name of Amnis Trajanus, the moat which once protected Babylon, and a canal in the southern part of 'Amal Asfal which used to drain water from Birkat Al-Habash, have all disappeared. This canal, known from later medieval sources as Khalid Bani Wali, in all probability also predated the conquest.

On the other hand, there is no written evidence of the existence of natural or artificial elevations. Three of them are indicated by archaeological observations, however incomplete and incidental they may be. The existence of some others, such as low tells which were the remains of pre- or early-historical settlements, are probable but cannot be proved, and they would have been totally absorbed in the increasing layers of river mud and town debris.

One elevation was the original site of the Mosque of 'Amr. It would certainly be logical to assume that the mosque of the principal town quarter was built on an eminence high enough to be safe from the flood. That it was really so can be inferred from observations of the mosque's environs. The elevation was based on a hump of solid bedrock, long in shape but not exceeding three hundred metres in length. It was probably a geological formation similar to Kaum Al-Djarib (Kom Al-Garib), which still exists, although much disfigured by recent earthworks. But the elevation on which the Mosque of 'Amr was built was considerably lower, not more than three or at most four metres above the surrounding plain.

Babylon was probably built on an analogous low elevation with a slight depression in the northeastern part. However, it is not known for certain if the base of this elevation is also formed of bedrock. The foundations of the powerful and heavy ramparts would be more solid and resistant if set on solid rock instead of soft alluvia impregnated with water, and such a bedding may have been the reason for the choice of this particular location for erecting the fortress. Be that as it may, it seems certain that on the eve of the Arabs' settlement in the area the ground level inside the fortress was considerably higher than that outside. Setting aside speculation about unproven geological formations, this could have
been caused by uninterrupted occupation within the enclosure for several centuries prior to the conquest, which inevitably resulted in the accumulation of several metres of occupational debris. As the area outside the fortress was subject to much less intensive occupation, the accumulation was slower there, although some extra growth must be allowed for the sedimentation of Nile deposits. The evaluation of the levels in absolute terms is very difficult; however, it seems reasonable to assume that the difference in level amounted to three metres, a very rough estimate.

Physical conditions in the region of ‘Amal Asfal (although not perfect because of soil humidity), and its location in proximity to the Nile and along the main lines of communication, made it the most favourable area for settlement. This area was certainly further improved during the early periods of the Arab occupation: many of its natural depressions were filled in and the area rapidly rose and was protected against the annual flood. This process not only increased the area available for settlement, but also resulted in a more intensive occupation; the area eventually became the most densely populated, filthy, and unhealthy quarter of al-Fustat, whose hygienic conditions were deplored even in the Middle Ages. This was, however, a later development, with which we are not concerned here.

‘Amal Fauq

This vast area includes all the rocky plateau east of the Nile valley and west of the Muqattam cliffs. In theory there should be excluded from this area some low spots located in several places between the rocky uplands. In fact, the denomination, which implies that the area was considerably more elevated in the comparison to ‘Amal Asfal, should not be taken literally, as the area includes several depressions, old wadis or natural cavities, whose level were no higher than the valley itself. The whole area can be divided into a number of sub-regions, such as: 1) the vast area bordering ‘Amal Asfal from the east and consisting of two high hills and undulating rocky ground slightly higher to the east and cut through by broad low-lying valleys; 2) the upland of al-Qaraafa as-Sughra, almost flat nowadays, stretching east of the former; and 3) the wide massif of al-Qaraafa al-Kubra immediately south of it.

The first sub-region, which in early medieval times accounted for as much as about two-thirds of the densely built-up urban area on the east bank, is today additionally divided into two parts by a modern highway known as Shari‘ Salah Salim. The road runs almost perpendicularly from the Nile, passes Kaum el-Djarah on its north, continues to the point where the wall of Salah ad-Din meets the aqueduct of Sultan an-Nasir, then proceeds in a northeastern direction along the wall towards the Citadel; which it encircles on the east side. Although the division of this area by the road is totally artificial, it is convenient for the sake of description. This sub-region was simply referred to as al-Kharab in later medieval works, a denomination which we can adopt as well in the absence of anything better.

The Northern Area of al-Kharab

The reconstruction of the original physical features of this large area, which at the time of the town’s foundation constituted its whole northeastern part (about one-fourth of the territory taken for the settlement), is a most difficult problem. It was probably never totally abandoned, because of its relative proximity to Fatimid Cairo; furthermore, parts of it (such as the so-called site of Tlili Zaunhmu) were for centuries used by inhabitants of the nearby quarters as a convenient dumping ground for waste. Accumulation of rubbish and refuse from the city resulted in the formation of huge hills comparable to the so-called Qat’ al-Mar’a situated north of the Citadel, or to the Monte Testacei in Rome.

The highest of these hills once reached the height of seventy-one metres above sea level, but recently the region underwent considerable change and levelling and was gradually occupied by public parks and modern buildings. This, of course, completely erased any possible remains of the older contours. The region extending further south underwent even more drastic transformation. Part of it, the quarter called Sayyida Nafisa, adjacent to the cemetery of the same name, had been levelled and built over as early as the first quarter of this century. Then, in the 1950s and early 1960s, a large area of some fifteen hectares, situated at the bifurcation of Shar’ Salah Salem and the Aqueduct of an-Nasir, was levelled and built over with blocks of low-cost flats. This new district is called Abu as-Su‘udd. Thus, all this area, once one of the most important and stable arteries of the medieval town (the Suq al-A’zam, connecting the Mosque of Ibn Tulun and the urban district surrounding it with the Mosque of ’Amm), is completely unavailable for systematic examination, and the details of its original contours are beyond reconstruction. Recently even the rubble heaps and ruins in the vicinity of the interesting architectural complex discovered in the 1930s, and mistakenly considered to be the remnants of al-‘Askar, which are located between the Mosque of Abu as-Su‘udd and Shar‘ Salim Zarifa, have been built over. The same has happened to the large area directly north of Shar‘ Salim Salim, east of the archaeological concession of the American Research Center in Egypt (ARCE) called Fustat B.22

One can only presume that the whole area to the north was once a big lowland bay, probably a plain slightly oriented towards the Nile and enclosing most of the area between the only two natural elevations appearing in this area—namely, the Kaum el-Djarah and Djabbal Yashkur—and from the east limited by the elevations of the northern part of the Smaller Qarafa. The eastern edge of this area, in the place where the Aqueduct meets Salah ad-Din’s wall twenty-one hundred metres from the bank of the Nile, is as much as thirty-three metres above sea level, a difference of eight metres in relation to the level of the present roads close to the Nile. On the north west, beyond Djabbal Yashkur, the area is lower and is a continuation geographically of the Delta, which lies between the Nile and the already non-existent Khalidi and extends over the region of the large lakes once called Birkat Qarun and Birkat al-Fil, which have now disappeared. The area now comprises parts of the districts of Sayyida Zainab and
activity of the population has so far seldom been successfully restrained by administrative sanctions and the protest of archaeological authorities, and now it is seconded by more official actions.

Roughly half-way between Kaum al-Djarib and the rocky plateau where the ruins of the part of the town unearthed by 'Ali Bahgat26 (the area was then called Halqum al-Djamal) are located, is a long natural valley which once probably opened onto the Nile somewhere in the vicinity of Qasr ash-Sham'. It seems probable that in the bottom of this valley the Amnis Trajanus was once dug out.27

The valley extends to the north east and ends about two and a half kilometres from the Nile in a depression at the foot of the elevation known as Tilil 'Ain as-Sira. Before the High Dam was built, the valley was for the most part of the year dry, but is now swampy; small ponds and some vegetation appear, destroying vestiges of the medieval city. It is not possible today to determine if the valley spread farther to the north east. Big quarries north of the 'Ain as-Sira hills, which were still used until recent times and which also cut Salah ad-Din's wall at this point, and the modern rubbish dump mentioned above disfigured irreversibly this part of the old town.

The outline of the borders of the valley, even where it can still be distinguished in the terrain, disappeared under the heaps of rubble which amassed there in the late Middle Ages. However, it seems that its western part took on the form of a wide sunken basin. In its lowest part, near the old Jewish cemetery, there were until recently three ponds, largely due to water seepage from the Nile. It is significant that the valley was used in the latter part of the tenth century for building an aqueduct-pipeline, which was discovered in the area of the ARCE excavation.28 Its continuation has been located, about one kilometre farther to the north east, by a team from the Egyptian Antiquities Department.29 At the same time, this discovery proves the inclination of the valley in a north easterly direction. This, of course, allows for a conclusion that the depression is natural and not the product of contemporary stone quarrying like many other depressions in the area of the old town. Simultaneously, it provides evidence that the territory of 'Amal Faqih was not a uniform rocky plateau rising towards the slopes of al-Muqattam but had very pronounced natural contours. The differences in level of up to twenty metres were by no means exceptional, adding to the variety of the town but also causing additional technical problems for the architects.

East of the lowest part of the depression discussed above is a series of elevations ranging in height from fifteen to twenty metres, the aforementioned Tilil 'Ain as-Sira. These are the highest hills in this east-central part of the town, even higher than the Smaller Qarafa situated farther to the east (today a big necropolis and a residential district named after the well known Imam ash-Shaffi's mausoleum). In their present state it is not easy to determine to what extent the hills are natural formations and to what extent they were formed by layers of the rubbish dump of a late medieval date. The fact that some of the artificial hills were of considerable height was proved by the ARCE excavations in 1971.30 A hill ten metres high was dug up and the whole of it down to the very foot was formed of layers of rubbish amassed in the period from the twelfth to the
fifteenth century. In the case of Tlul 'Ain as-Sira this seems only partly true. The solid rock visible in the lower parts of the exposed profile is quite thick and indicates that differences of ten metres in level in the bedrock was not rare in that part of town. This is even truer in the south eastern part of the hills, where, between the deserted quarry and the mausoleum of Ibn Tabataba, there is a depression in the rocky ground which is occupied by a lake and a hot mineral spring after which the whole district gets its name, 'Ain as-Sira. West of that region the hilly area and the gentle slope of Great Qarafa is now covered with excavations of old quarries. These are continued a few hundred metres farther west by analogous stone pits in Bata al-Baqara, which stretches almost to the wall of Salah ad-Din. The old quarries disturbed the original relief of the surface in the south eastern part of the area of al-Kharab considerably. The unexploited parts of the rock allow one, however, to reconstruct approximately the original appearance of the ground surface here. It was a rocky plateau dropping steeply in some places, and in others sloping gently towards the north and north west from an average height of thirty metres above sea level below the ridge of al-Qarafa al-Kubra down to about eighteen to twenty metres in the depression of 'Ain as-Sira, and in the valley north west of 'Ain as-Sira rising again to a height of forty metres above sea level on the Kaum al-Djarir summit. In general, the area was naturally rugged, both as the result of erosion and tectonic movement and from the activity of man, who drew the stone he needed from the most easily exploited places. As urban development progressed, however, the activity of man had an opposite effect and led to a levelling of the area. All the small depressions were quickly filled in with organic and inorganic sediments. Sediments do not settle as easily on elevations, especially if the basement soil is laid on bed-rock. They are constantly removed by man and wind or washed away by occasional rains, and very often such places show bare rock even after many years of sedimentation.

Kaum al-Djarir, mentioned above, was a large rocky massif dropping steeply towards the alluvial valley on the north west, while its other slopes were long and gentle. Considering the fact that the urban area situated below rose, and assuming that the top of the hill remained the same or was even slightly levelled to make it more suitable for building, we can assume that at the time of the town's foundation it dominated the neighbouring valley by as much as twenty-five metres, and was a prominent land-mark in the northern part of town. The only other nearby elevation was Djabal Yashkur, more than one and a half kilometres due north.

**Al-Qarafa al-Kubra**

The steeply sloping western part, which descends to the Nile valley south of the present day Mısır al-Qadima, is usually called Ishtab 'Antar after a huge unexplored ruin there. In the later Middle Ages it was called ar-Rasad after al-Hakim's astronomical observatory which was erected there, and still earlier it was known as ash-Shara'F or al-Djurf. On the map in the *Description de l'Egypte* it is designated "Hauteurs de St. George." The eastern part, crossed by Ibn Tulun's aqueduct, is normally called Qanatir Ibn Tulun. Finally, the central part is called Sab'a Banat because of a group of middle-Fatimid mausoleums preserved there. Some other names, derived chiefly from quarries operating until recent times and still occasionally used, have only limited local application.

The massif of al-Qarafa al-Kubra, as mentioned above, descends steeply to the flats of the Nile Valley, which it dominates by about thirty metres. Since the valley is considerably broader now than in the early Islamic period, it is evident that the slope at the time of the Arab settlement was much closer to the river. It was also steeper and more prominent, as the valley was lower at that time. The situation in the south was similar, where the slope is also steep and conspicuously dominates the depression of al-Basatin (once filled during the high Nile by the waters of Birkat al-Habash).

The situation is different in the east. The massif descends very gently in the direction of al-Muqattam, where at its lowest point Ibn Tulun built his aqueduct (the present elevation is thirty-one metres above sea level there). Farther on, the ground rises once more, to end at the al-Muqattam cliffs beyond the cemeteries of al-Tuni and the village of al-Basatin.

The parts just described, and in particular the centre of the plateau, did not undergo serious transformation during the last thirteen centuries except for some changes in elevation and a progressive levelling. The contour of these quarters was more pronounced formerly than it is now. Some ruggedness has disappeared and a large amount of debris has accumulated, especially in sunken places; but on the whole the physical aspect of the region has remained the same. The northern confines of al-Qarafa al-Kubra, in the neighbourhood of the present-day highway going from Old Cairo to al-Imam ash-Shafi'i quarter, referred to above, have been more disfigured. Today almost the whole slope for more than two kilometres between Kaum (Kom) Gharab and al-Imam al-Laith cemetery is honeycombed with the enormous cavities of disused quarries (some of them more than twenty metres deep and sharply cut), which make access from the north difficult. But observation of sections of these rocky walls and remains of the original surface, in some places still visible from the road, allow us to conclude that here again the transition from the low ground in the north to the upland of al-Qarafa al-Kubra was originally gradual and, although in some places the terrain rose quite steeply, it was everywhere fit for building.

Summing up, one can conclude that the area occupied in the early Arab period by the town and its suburban settlements was very diversified in its natural contours, soils and the level of the water table. Apart from the high rocky plateaus and hilltops, which were completely barren and dry, there was the humid alluvial plain, with rich vegetation and marshy depressions as well as cavities with natural hot springs which may have fed some halophytes. The surface of the rock was strewed with calcareous rubble and larger blocks, the effects of erosion, similar to the top of al-Muqattam today. In the depressions the soil was mostly alluvial mud and in dry wadis was probably composed of sand and gravel.
As differences in elevation only exceptionally exceeded twenty metres, there was no serious difficulty in delimiting town quarters and tracing out the street network within the town. About a quarter of the total area lies close to the Nile; namely, Amal Asfal. Mostly low and within the reach of the Nile flood, it included some valleys which were below the level of the high Nile and which were periodically filled by ground water, especially in years of high Niles. The margins of this area were marked out by a few higher elevations which dominated the neighbourhood. From the east, the natural boundary of the town was formed by elevations occupied in the course of the centuries by the vast necropolis of al-Qarafa as-Saghira. They were sparsely inhabited. Farther to the east the sheer slopes of al-Muqattam provided a natural defensive wall. Although the slopes have been exploited throughout the ages as a source of stone, which has altered their appearance, they must always have been very inhospitable and inaccessible. Only a small area on the northern side opened out onto the Delta plain, and when the lakes in this region dried up it was completely open to attack or could be used for transport. Also easily accessible was the narrow southern passage up the Nile Valley.

**East Bank Environs**

Except for the barren area of al-Muqattam, the massif to the east of the urban site (with its quasi-horizontal terraces and steps at different altitudes and a maximum height of 210 metres above sea level), the area to the north and south is flat, fertile alluvial plain.

Immediately south of the town site, overlooked by the heights of the present-day al-Qarafa al-Kubra, there was a large hollow depression called in the Arab sources Birkat al-Habash. Slightly sunken in the middle, its floor today is about nineteen metres above sea level and at the time of the conquest must have been about two metres lower. Being much below the highest point of the Nile flood, it was annually submerged, forming an extensive, shallow lake. In winter and early summer, when the water subsided, the area was one of the most fertile ones in the neighborhood of al-Fustat. The depression extends for about five kilometres along the Nile up to present-day al-Ma'adi and covers about a thousand hectares. The gentle slopes bordering on it on the east and north east were covered with orchards and semi-rural dwellings and there were probably other villages farther south.

South of this depression the Nile valley again narrows but with a few wider bays of agricultural land, such as the one near Tura and another near Hulwan. The latter bay, although some twenty kilometres distant, was still within easy reach of the capital and could be regarded as belonging to its orbit. Here for the first time in Islamic history a satellite residence town, Hulwan, was founded by 'Abd al-Aziz, thus starting a custom which was to be repeated countless times by later rulers in various regions of the Islamic world.

To the north of the capital, flat agricultural lands were practically unlimited. The urban territory merged there into the vast expanses of the eastern Delta without any sharp dividing line. Resort homes, orchards and fields belonging to the city dwellers, if not from the very founding, certainly from a fairly early date, were mixed with typical rural estates, and these in addition to numerous villages or small towns must have occupied the eastern border of the Delta outside the reach of the annual flood or on some natural or artificial elevations within the flood plain. One of the most important of these was Umm Dunain, identified with the Byzantine stronghold of Tandunias, a place commemorated by the battle between the armies of 'Amr and the Byzantines. It was situated about three kilometres north of al-Fustat, probably in the neighbourhood of the present-day Midan Bab al-Hadid, on the Nile, which at that time flowed some two kilometres east of its present course at this point.

Another very important agricultural region north east of al-Fustat was 'Ain Shams, ancient Heliopolis. Conveniently linked with the capital by an old canal as well as by the Khalilj Amir al-Mu'minin, which was restored in the second year of Arab domination, it certainly supplied a great proportion of the city's agricultural products.

On the whole, these regions to the north (except for obvious changes resulting from intensive occupation in the last hundred years) have not changed their physical appearance. The immense plains remained the same; only water courses were altered.

**The Nile**

Attempts to reconstruct the physiography of the area under discussion would not be complete without considering the course of the Nile within the town. The river, no doubt the most important of all natural factors influencing the life of the town and its development, also played a significant role in its geography, and all changes in the course of the river were reflected in town planning activities.

The course of the Nile within the urban area of al-Fustat has undergone considerable change since the foundation of the town. This is certain and can be proven without difficulty from the written sources. The result of these changes was a gradual withdrawal of the river to the west. Their extent and chronology, however, are somewhat obscure, as the sources often disagree on particular details; moreover, they do not always coincide with data drawn from a study of the historical geography of the area.

The main source of information for the history of the Nile in Islamic times has been al-Khitain, whose author, al-Maqrizi, is the only known historical writer who tried to give a full account of changes in the river's course. The most significant passage on the subject reads: "At the time of the conquest of Misr all lands from Manshat al-Mahrani to Birkat al-Habash, along and from the bank of the Nile at Mawrada al-Halfa, the place opposite al-Djam' al-Djadid, to Suq al-Ma'aridj and what is in this direction down to the places opposite al-Mashhad ar-
Ra’s, which is called ... today Zayn al-’Abidin—all this was the river. And nothing was between the Fortress, al-Djamī‘ and what was in front of them to al-Hamra ad-Dunya, to which belongs now Khitt Qanatir ad-Sibā‘, and between Diziarat Misr, which is known today as ar-Roda, but water of the Nile.” This statement, supplemented with a few details also mostly drawn from al-Maqrijī’s work, has been accepted by modern scholarship and is the basis of today’s views on the medieval course of the Nile within the town.  

The source of al-Maqrijī’s account was most probably fragmentary and not very reliable information taken from earlier authors, as well as a vernacular tradition evidently still very much alive in his time. Both must have been quite imprecise chronologically and topographically, and require considerable analysis to make proper use of them. Obviously the author could not resist the temptation of devising a comprehensive theory on the subject, and to achieve this objective he combined the data mentioned above with his own views, which were based among other things on the correct observation of the Nile sediments within the town. Unfortunately, when formulating his own opinions he overlooked, or even intentionally omitted, facts known to him which would contradict his theory. The same mistake was made by those modern scholars who took his words too literally. Consequently, many modern reconstructions are open to criticism and revision, especially those which were published in the form of plans. However, since we are concerned here with the earliest period of Arab domination, only a fragmentary discussion is possible.

As a starting point let us examine the evidence for the position of the river bank in the central quarter of the town. There is a generally accepted opinion that the Mosque of Amr was erected on the bank of the Nile. The source of this questionable assumption is among others al-Maqrijī’s account. However, analysis of the information provided by the earliest sources, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam and Al-Kindi, does not support this opinion. On the contrary, the early sources seem to imply that the Mosque stood a considerable distance from the river. The earliest tradition related by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam says that the mosque was surrounded with gardens and vineyards. The word hawla used in this context implies that the mosque was surrounded by them on all sides, including the Nile side, and this in turn requires a certain distance. There is also other, more convincing evidence. At the time of the land allotment to the Arab settlers, when the town was established, there was enough space between the Mosque of Amr and the river both for an old ablution place, al-Mīdat, and for a road which seems to have been the most important transport route in al-Fustat (which implies a certain width), as well as for houses. First of all there was the Dar as-Silīsila, a residence which Amr built for the Banu Sahm when they came to al-Fustat. Also in the direction of the Nile Khāridja ibn Hudhafa built a house for himself, most probably facing onto the road mentioned above. He was an official of high rank, the deputy governor of Egypt for military affairs and security, and we can easily imagine that as such he was allotted a considerably larger portion of land. This is also supported by the fact that his son received a substantial amount of money (ten thousand dinars) for his house from the later governor of Egypt ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Marwān.

The house of Kharidja was probably included in the famous palace called Dar al-Mudhahhaba (the Glided House), which ‘Abd al-‘Azīz built there in the year A.D. 686/87 (A.H. 67). It stood at the Suq al-Hammam west of the Mosque of Amr. The palace became an official residence of the Marwanid branch of the Umayyads in Egypt and must have been an important architectural complex. Its popular name, al-Madīna (The City), by which it was known in contemporary sources, gives certain indications as to its size. But even the palace complex did not take all the ground between the mosque and the Nile. Enough was left over for the same ruler to enlarge the mosque on all sides.

A comparable picture results from a study of the topography of the area around the mosque. As this will be discussed in detail later, let us only mention here that at the time of the conquest the Nile flowed close to the western side of Babylon, whose walls and huge drum towers protected the harbour and boat bridge located at the River Gate. Another fixed point farther north is provided by the monastic complex known today as Abu as-Sayfayn. The first reference to one of the churches belonging now to the monastery, the church of Saint Mary, comes only from about the year A.D. 786/87 (A.H. 170), when it was destroyed by the order of the governor, ‘Ali ibn Sulayman al-‘Abbasī, but the context of the reference gives the impression that this church had been built in the first or second generation after the Prophet, that is to say not later than the end of the seventh century. Therefore we can ascribe with all confidence the foundation of the adjoining church of Abu Shenuda and probably also that of Saint Mercurius to the pre-Islamic period. They stood then on the bank of the Nile, which later receded from them.

If we accept this as the state of affairs at the time of the foundation of al-Fustat, we can draw a straight line between these two pre-Islamic structures and the line would give us the hypothetical eastern bank of the river. If this reasoning is correct, the original mosque would have been erected not less than 350 metres from the river bank. This distance, compared with that of about one kilometre in al-Maqrijī’s time, may account for his insistence on the proximity (relative, one can say) of the Mosque of Amr to the Nile at the time of the conquest.

The church of Abu Mina provides another fixed point which allows one to trace the eastern bank of the Nile farther north; that is, in the area of the later quarter of al-Hamra al-Wusta. This church was rebuilt several times and its foundations were still preserved in the nineteenth century and served as a basis for its reconstruction; therefore, we can fix its position within the town’s topography with precision.

The first mention of the church of Abu Mina dates from the year A.D. 735 (A.H. 117), when the governor al-Walid ar-Rifa‘a gave the Christians permission to build it. This resulted in serious disturbances in the city and the fighting, allegedly under a Yamani immigrant, al-Wuhayb, took quite a violent turn. This contradicts to some degree Abu Salih’s and al-Maqrijī’s assertion that the church was restored (shudithi), since normally only the building of entirely new churches caused violent protests by the Muslim public, while restorations were
usually tolerated. This, however, is of little consequence for our purpose here, since even if the church did not date to pre-Islamic times it fixes the course of the Nile for the very early period. Incidentally, there was an ancient tomb in the territory of the shrine in Abu Salih’s times, in the place where the eucharistic bread was baked. If in this context the word ‘ancient’ means pre-Islamic, we can push the dates back a few hundred years. Anyway, there is no reason to draw the line of the river bank in this region as far east as the shrine of Zain al-Abidin, which is precisely what al-Maqrizi and his modern followers did. Zain al-Abidin, built in the ninth century, is situated roughly three hundred metres east of Abu Mina, and admitting for the sake of argument that al-Maqrizi was right, it would mean that this land was exposed by the receding river in less than a hundred years. This does not tally with at least three facts. First, the area of al-Hamra was well settled before this church was built (or rebuilt) in A.D. 735, which would hardly be possible if this area were freshly reclaimed. Second, we know from another example from roughly the same period that the new land exposed by the receding river was regarded as state property and was at the disposal of the Caliph. Third, it is hardly possible that not only the permission but also the land to build the church would be given to the Christians at the same time. The only known instance of such an occurrence concerns ‘Amr’s order and land outside the urban area.

The distance between Abu as-Sayfayn and Abu Mina is about one and a half kilometres. Unfortunately, there is no landmark which would allow us to fix precisely the shoreline in between; but since no natural obstacles are present, we can be reasonably certain that it was a roughly straight line. Today’s street of Abu as-Sayfayn and its continuation to the north, called Shar’ ad-Diyur, in all probability mark approximately the Nile bank in the first century of the Hijra.

The changes in the course of the Nile north of Abu Mina were much more important, but they are also more difficult to establish. Two points only can be fixed with a reasonable degree of precision. These are the position of al-Maks-Umm Dunayn, a settlement on the river bank, which can be located in the neighbourhood of the present-day Midan Bab al-Hadid thanks to Salah ad-Din’s wall and some information from written sources, and al-Qantara of ‘Abd al-Aziz on the Canal. Al-Qantara was certainly not far from the mouth of the Canal, near the late thirteenth century Qanatir as-Sibṭa, nor was it far west of the present-day Mosque of Sayyida Zaynab. Taking into account the location of these two points, we can establish the most likely conjectural eastern shoreline of the Nile. It would have to run north-north-east from Abu Mina to the point where Shar’i an-Nasriyya once reached the Canal, and then along this street and almost northward by al-Luk, roughly along the modern street of Muhammad Bey Farid and ‘Imad ad-Din to Bab al-Hadid. Of course, in the flat, low terrain beyond Djabal Yashkur, where no natural elevations were present, even considerable deviations in the allegedly straight shoreline were possible, and local changes over the centuries are likely.

The course of the Nile underwent relatively fewer changes south of Babylon. In most places the border of the area was composed of natural escarpments up to thirty metres above the floor of the valley, which were an efficient barrier against the flood waters and prevented them from interfering drastically with the shoreline. The tendency of the river to recede in a westerly direction, predominant in the early Middle Ages, could be observed already in the time of ‘Abd al-Aziz, but in the southern quarters of the urban area it was restricted to a gain of only about three hundred, exceptionally four hundred, metres of new land. The Nile receded this much in the region of al-Wail, west of the plateau of al-Qarafa al-Kubra. More important modifications may have occurred in the region of Birkat al-Habash, but since the area was very low and inundated by the flood waters every year, they could hardly have been of much duration. On the whole, the river bank and generally the course of the Nile was determined here by the relief of the eastern side of the valley. The heights of Tura to the south of the Birkat al-Habash basin and ash-Sharaf north of it prevented any major deviations of the river to the east, and since the depression of Birkat al-Habash (whose north-south length is only about five kilometres) is not large enough to allow the formation of any permanent meanders, the river’s course must have been relatively stable here and approximately straight, notwithstanding ephemeral local changes.

Al-Djazira

A permanent feature in the Nile’s topography which influenced its course to a considerable degree was al-Djazira (the Island), the predecessor of the present-day ar-Roda (or ar-Rauda in classical Arabic), as it has been called since the twelfth century. It was situated in the middle of the river, roughly in the same place as today; that is, opposite Babylon and the central quarters of al-Fustat. It has been suggested, however, that at the time of the conquest it extended farther south and was shorter on its northern side. Although probable, this assumption is nevertheless unprovable since no irrefutable evidence can be found to support it. A possible indication might be sought in the history of the Nilometer which is located there. The first one was built by Usama ibn Zayd in the year A.D. 715 (A.H. 97) and was later destroyed by a flood and replaced in A.D. 861/62 by another one which still stands and functions today. The southern end of al-Djazira was the most likely place to install the first Nilometer, as was also the case with the later one, and its destruction may mean a change in the island’s length. On the other hand, the survival of the present Nilometer for eleven centuries indicates the remarkable stability of the island’s contours at the south end.

The extension of al-Djazira and its shore to the north were probably less stable. What we know about the history of al-Djazira in later times suggests this too. But the assumption advocated by Rhuvon Quest that it was much shorter at the time of the foundation of al-Fustat is contradicted by an interesting reference given by al-Maqrizi and taken from Kitab al-Mawali, the lost work of al-Kindi. It says that al-Djazira could be seen from Dar al-Fil, the residence of a certain Abu Ghanim, mawla of Maslama ibn Mukhallad and for a time wali of the said al-Djazira under ‘Abd al-Aziz. Considering the respective positions of al-Djazira...
and Birkat Qarun, on whose shore the residence was located, it is clear that it certainly could not be seen from there unless it extended northward almost as far as it does today. Since, however, the eastern bank of the Nile in the northern part of the urban area deviated from its present course by at least one kilometre, it is also likely that the northern end of al-Djazira curved considerably to the east.

The Western Channel of the Nile

According to tradition the main stream of the Nile in the early Islamic period was on the eastern side of al-Djazira, contrary to the present state, but it seems also that both branches were of roughly equal width even if the western one was shallower and tended to dry up at low Nile.64 Judging from the distance from the walls of Babylon to the Nilometer, the width of the eastern branch was about 350 metres, and such must have been the western one; today they are eighty and six hundred metres, respectively.

About the al-Djiza branch of the Nile even less information has been preserved. We can only be certain that it ran much farther to the east. Probably as much as the river-bed lost in the east, it gained in the west. We have some general information proving this process; for instance, that concerning the church of Saint Peter, which once stood on the very edge of the river with its foundations in the water, but which later disappeared, washed away together with the ground it stood on.65 But the exact shoreline is beyond reconstruction. Still more complicated was the situation to the north, where as late as the twelfth century the village of al-Bulaq (which since early Mamluk times has served as the main port for Cairo and was linked with it by road) was located on the western bank.

This shifting of the bed of the Nile westwards already appears in the early Islamic period. It is possible that such tendencies existed even earlier, and founding a large populous town such as al-Fustat in this area only aggravated these tendencies. The existence of an extremely busy port on the eastern bank not only protected the shoreline from the flow of the river, but may even have prompted the shift of the main current of the river westwards as well. Hundreds of anchored ships and boats, the building of even rudimentary embankments and quays for mooring, loading and unloading goods, and the accumulation of layers of port debris near the shore, which made the river shallower, certainly affected the river current, and consequently the sedimentation of mud. Another factor, even more important, no doubt, was the dumping into the river of the town's rubbish, both ordinary litter and all types of inorganic refuse as well as industrial byproducts in large quantities from the production of ceramics, glass, and building materials. This process of polluting the shore takes place in all periods and in all towns where the river or the sea provide a handy dump, even if it is actively opposed by efficient municipal authorities, and in al-Fustat such authorities were obviously not very active. We know that the disorder and poor sanitary conditions irritated even the contemporary authors. The accounts of al-Muqaddasi70 and Ibn Ridwan71 both deal with this matter, and the latter one expressly deplores the practice. Naturally, running water was an effective purifying agent, but only for light organic materials. All heavier inorganic particles settled at the river's edge and in the course of time rose together with the river mud and formed a new bank. This process (certainly unintentional and combined with natural forces) may be regarded as advantageous for the city, for it resulted in a significant growth of the habitable area. The process seems to have begun very early in the Islamic period, as we know that there was already construction going on west of Qasr ash-Sham' in the time of 'Abd al-'Aziz and Bishr ibn Marwan; that is, before the end of the first century of al-Hidjra.72

The first important change in the course of the river, which uncovered a vast area adjacent to al-Fustat, took place just before A.D. 725, under the rule of the governor al-Hurr ibn Yusuf. The area exposed was between the fortress and the bridge, and a covered market (al-gaysariya) was built there in A.D. 726 by order of the Caliph Hisham.73 Ground was also gained in the area south of the bridge, between the lands of the Banu Wa'il and the Nile. It was distributed among the people.74 The process continued for over two centuries and eventually resulted in the complete silting up of the eastern arm of the Nile between al-Fustat and ar-Roda in A.D. 947, so that the channel had to be cleaned in order to provide water for the inhabitants.75 But this does not concern us here.

The Western Bank

The west-bank suburb al-Djiza and its environs were located on a vast alluvial plain extending to the west for about eight kilometres to the hills of al-Mina and the borders of the desert in the neighbourhood of the Pyramids. Broad plains extend for a considerable distance in both directions, north and south, making it the largest agricultural area in the vicinity of the capital. Its geomorphology, except for changes caused by human industry and the action of the Nile, remains generally the same today as it was when the suburb was founded. The ground level, of course, has risen several metres as a result of the sedimentation of the Nile mud, and probably the network of canals for irrigation and drainage has been modified and augmented.

The whole region, since time immemorial, must have been one of the richest and most populous in the country. At the time of the conquest, Memphis situated some fifteen kilometres south of al-Djiza, must still have been a considerable town, and several smaller ones have also been recorded, as well as a number of villages. But al-Djiza soon became dominant and overshadowed the others. Abu Salih speaks of thirty churches and a large number of monasteries6 in the region, which bear witness to the density of population and its well-being.

The area of al-Djiza, thanks to its advantageous location just across the river from the main city quarters, and the ease of communication either by water or the bridge to al-Djazira and Babylon, made it the most important rural district on which the new town depended for its food supply and agricultural raw materials, and as such largely contributed to its future development. In turn, the capital provided a convenient market for the district's products.
3. The Pre-Islamic Settlements

The undeniable advantages of the site on which the Arab capital was founded were particularly significant for the new masters of Egypt, but they were also well known and appreciated by their predecessors. The whole region on the border between Upper and Lower Egypt shows evidence of intensive town settlement from ancient times, and al-Fustat was in a way a continuation of the process under altered political conditions. The ancient settlements do not concern us here, but the problem of urban centres in this area in the period directly preceding the establishment of the Arab encampment, their location, character, and territorial extent deserve more meticulous study. This is important not only for purely historical reasons, but also because the previous settlements must have had a great influence on the structure and topography of the Arab town.

This question has been examined previously by such scholars as Butler,2 Herz,3 Caetani,4 Reitemeyer5 and others,6 but because the sources do not agree on the subject, their conclusions are not unanimous. One fact is, however, unquestionable: the existence of the Byzantine fortress situated on the Nile, close to the central district of al-Fustat. This fortress was preserved more or less untouched throughout the Middle Ages and its remnants have survived to the present as a quarter in Old Cairo, sometimes obscurely called Qasr ash-Sham.7 Many attempts were made even in the Middle Ages to explain the name, which must have been used by the Arabs quite early, but a satisfactory answer has not yet been found.8 Judging from references to it in the work of al-Mas'udi, Kitab at-Tanbih, already by the middle of the tenth century the name was generally used when referring to the fortress.9 There are indications that it was also current much earlier, although evidence for this is not conclusive.10 Qasr ash-Sham11 is generally held to be identical with the Babylon often mentioned by the early Islamic historical tradition as the main stronghold which resisted the Arabs in the district of the future al-Fustat. The topography of the site and the analysis of the earlier source material leave little doubt of this.

In Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's work the fortress invested by the Arabs, and the focal point of his lengthy narrative of the siege, was usually called simply al-qasr or al-hisn (castle, fortress) without a more precise reference. Babylon is expressly mentioned only a few times,12 but it seems that in using the older tradition of the conquest the author had no doubt that Babylon, al-qasr and al-hisn were three different names for the same stronghold. In one case, after quoting al-Laith ibn Sa'd's information that the fortress called Babylon was built by the Persians, he even clearly states that it is the fortress (al-hisn) which exists in Fustat today.13 In another place the statement is almost equally explicit: "'Amr laid siege to the fortress (al-qasr) which was then called Babylon (Babilyun)."14 As the authorities for this information Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam quotes 'Ubayd Allah ibn Abi Dja'far, Ayyad ibn 'Abbas and other informants quoting 'Uthman ibn Salih on the authority of Ibn Lahif. Thus, it seems certain that at the turn of the seventh century there was a common opinion in al-Fustat that the fortified quarter existing in the town's centre, generally known as al-qasr or al-hisn, was identical with the old Babylon. The awareness of this fact can also be observed later when that district was generally called Qasr ash-Sham. The best evidence for it is the above quotation of al-Mas'udi, who calls the fortress Qasr ash-Sham' Babilun.15 That point of view was preserved throughout the Middle Ages and appears both in Abu al-Daghil's work16 and in that of the usually well informed and scrupulous Yaqtin.17 It was only al-Qudur's information which resulted in al-Maqrizi's doubts. Al-Qudur refers to the remnants of a stone castle situated outside the town of al-Fustat, on the edge of the elevation called ash-Sharaf, as Qasr Babilyun. On the strength of this statement al-Maqrizi declared that, contrary to what Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam said in his book, Qasr ash-Sham' and Qasr Bab al-Yun could not be the same thing because the former is located inside al-Fustat and the latter outside it.18

The problem of the identity of Babylon and Qasr ash-Sham' has been broadly dealt with by M. Herz.19 In discussion with P. Casanova, who denied the identity of the two strongholds,20 he convincingly proved his point. We will not go back to the arguments of Herz, since the evidence of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, based on information going back to the first generation of Arab settlers, leaves no room for doubt. Still, there is another problem to be solved, namely, whether apart from the Babylon fortress there existed any other town in the area of al-Fustat at the time of the conquest. Most scholars dealing with the problem believe that there was.21 The opinion is on one hand based on the testimony of the ancient writers, who indicate quite explicitly the existence of a large town in the neighbourhood of the later al-Fustat and, on the other hand, on the late Arab authors such as Ibn Duqmāq22 and al-Maqrizi.23 However, the ancient information is not necessarily applicable to the period of the conquest, and the references in the late medieval sources usually cannot be traced to any reliable origin. In fact, they depend on some obscure local legends.24 Of all early traditions, it is only al-Baladhi, who calls Babylon, to which he gives the name al-Yuna (without the first component, which he must have considered a common noun, bab or gate), a town.25 However, from the text it cannot be inferred that the expression "Town al-Yuna" refers to the same fortress or another settlement outside it.

The evidence of John of Nikiu26 had been considered as the strongest proof for the existence of the pre-Arab town in the area of the later al-Fustat until this hypothesis was successfully questioned by Else Reitemeyer.27 Even if we reject her proposals of the amelioration of the Ethiopic text, one cannot disagree with the supposition that the name Misr (Mesir) was introduced into the Ethiopic text by the Arab translator in the period when it was already generally used for denoting
the agglomeration of al-Fustat. Anachronisms of this type are not rare. We come across them also in the Arabic texts: for instance, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam states in one passage of his work that al-Muqquaqs, on hearing about the Arab invasion of Egypt, went to al-Fustat. What our author had in mind as al-Fustat was no doubt the place which was called this in his time—not in al-Muqquaqs’. Similarly, al-Baladhuri says that when ‘Amr arrived in Egypt accompanied by his army the inhabitants of al-Fustat entrenched themselves with a moat. In reality, there is not one mention of the existence of a town (Babylon or any other) as opposed to the fortress Babylon in the text of John of Nikiu. The same conclusion can be drawn on the basis of a careful analysis of the early Arab sources. A similar observation was made by L. Cactani, according to whom the existence of any town outside the walls of Babylon was improbable.

The information passed on by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, which is the most substantial and reliable of all, since it was taken directly from the early indigenous historical tradition, leaves no room for doubt that it concerns the fortress Babylon and some mythical town outside its walls. The same can be maintained about the two references in al-Ya’qubi and al-Baladhuri. That Babylon (Alyuna) was called a town (medina) by the latter author may mean that he wishes to stress its urban character and not that he has made a mistake through lack of information about the African part of the campaigns, as Reitemeyer implies.

Within its walls—with its numerous churches, its civilian Coptie population (mentioned by the sources), its granaries and markets, and the harbour at the River Gate—Babylon must have had a very distinct urban character. The Arabs must have been well aware of that too. Therefore we should rather seek an explanation for why the early sources, both Muslim-Arab and Christian, firmly ascribe a military function to it, which is implied by terms like al-hisn and al-qasr, and why it was referred to as a town only a few times.

In order to solve this problem we shall try to reconstruct what Babylon was like at the time of the conquest. The information on the subject in the written sources is insufficient and ambiguous. Under the circumstances we have to look to archaeological material, for its analysis may help us to reach some conclusion. It may also help us answer the basic question of whether there had existed any other town apart from the fortress Babylon in the area of al-Fustat. Unfortunately, in spite of a large number of excavations carried out within the fortress at different times, especially during the construction work, the data are generally inaccurate or simply uncertain, mainly because of the lack of reliable records. Field-work was usually carried on without any scientific archaeological supervision; no reports were published.

In fact, there are only a few works of scientific value on our subject. They are S. Toy’s 1937 analysis of the fragments of military architecture which have survived; the study undertaken a little later by U. Monneret de Villard; and most important, the pioneering research of A. Butler, which was carried out at the time when the contemporary construction and the destructive activity of man had not as yet erased the remnants of the original defences surrounding the town on the east and north. It is thanks to Butler that we possess the complete plan of the fortifications of Babylon. Completed by the studies of Toy and by the pieces of more recent information, it enables us to draw at least approximate conclusions essential for our argument.

Butler’s plan shows the extension of the defensive walls, bastions and other fortifications as it was possible to reconstruct them in the middle of the nineteenth century: it represents undoubtedly the last phase of construction. On the basis of certain wall remnants outside the enclosure, it can be presumed that at some earlier period its shape was more regular and that the walls stretched at least 180 metres farther to the north east. The latter observation is supported by Mahmud Ahmad. He states that his personal investigations, carried out in 1925, showed that the distance between the Mosque of ‘Amr and the fortress did not exceed one hundred metres. This implies that the fragments of the Roman defensive wall were found at that distance from the Mosque. Since the regular Byzantine wall enclosing the fortress from the north (which was still well preserved in Butler’s time) was about 720 metres from the mosque, it seems that the fragments observed by Butler and the remains found by Mahmud Ahmad one hundred metres from the mosque belonged to the same northern wall of a bigger fortress of an earlier date. The fortress extended farther not only in a northerly direction but presumably also almost 120 metres to the west. As there can be little doubt that the original enclosure was rectangular in shape, there must have been a right-angle corner there. Of course, it would mean that at this early date the Nile flowed more to the west, possibly not far from its present course. At some unknown date, but prior to the reign of Trajan, to whom many fragments of the existing western line of fortifications were dated, the Nile moved to the east, destroying the hypothetical western corner. If this hypothesis is correct, it would explain the peculiar shape and perhaps the orientation of the fortress as recorded by Butler.

When Trajan rebuilt the fortress and erected the new oblique western wall alongside the Nile, it was reinforced with two huge drum towers built inside the enclosure. In later times they flanked the River Gate and perhaps helped to anchor the bridge of boats which connected the fortress with al-Dazira and the other bank of the Nile. These puzzling constructions, to the best of our knowledge unique in the whole of Roman military architecture, and especially their situation and intervening distance (which exceeds fifteen metres) can only be explained by another hypothesis: that they originally defended the entrance of the Canal. It seems reasonable that Trajan, the author of the reconstruction of Babylon and the renewal of the Canal which for centuries preserved his name, combined both ventures. Claudius Ptolemy, who wrote not very long after the time of Trajan, says that the Canal crossed Babylon, which seems to support this theory. The architectural analysis of the drum towers corroborates this to a certain extent too. Their internal construction, based on the system of radial, spoke-like walls, which according to Toy made the whole construction extremely resistant, seems to have been intended to withstand water pressure rather than the attack of siegeworks, which would probably not be used on the side by the river and would hardly be expected from inside the town. Admitting that at a certain period the Canal crossed Babylon (not a mythical open city but a real and well documented
walled fortress town) one comes immediately to the question of whether it still existed at this location at the time of the Arab siege. At this point we shall not enter into lengthy arguments, because this problem will be discussed while dealing with Khalid Amir al-Mu'minin. Sufficient to state here that no written source at our disposal gives grounds for such an assumption. Evidently, in such a small town as Babylon, where land must have been very valuable, the disused and silted-up Canal would have been filled in and the area used for construction. Also the towers, completely reconstructed in the fourth or fifth century, had been adapted to other needs and the old mouth of the Canal sealed with a wall and provided with a strong gate known in later Arabic sources as the Bab al-Hadid.

The problem of the northern wall of the original larger enclosure of Babylon is more difficult. Was it, as Mahmud Ahmad seems to believe, only 100 metres from the site of the future Mosque of 'Amr at the time of the conquest? Or was it the city's northern part cut away already in pre-Islamic times? In the latter case the northern wall, with two bastions at the corners, of the secondary phase recorded by Butler would have been the one the Arabs had met at the siege. On the contrary, if Mahmud Ahmad is right, that wall would have to have been built in Arab times.

Unfortunately, conclusive archaeological material is lacking, though Butler seems to have believed that all the walls which he recorded were approximately of the same period and certainly were constructed (or rather reconstructed) by the Byzantines. But by this time this secondary northern wall was almost totally destroyed and he had little chance to study it. Pococke, two hundred years earlier, had a much better opportunity. The wall was still preserved and provided with a gate, not unlike the southern one which still exists. Pococke's description does not imply any difference between particular walls, and it appears that they all were those of Nikopolis that is, Byzantine.

All this argues against Mahmud Ahmad's assumption and tallies with the general historical situation. It is unlikely that the Arabs would have allowed the Copts to erect a new defensive wall, a major military feature, in their quarter. Repairs, even total reconstructions, were permitted, but new building of not only religious but also military constructions was strongly resented by the populace. Consequently, Butler's wall had to be Byzantine, and the other one farther north, earlier still.

Apart from this it is also improbable that the Arab camp, in particular its vital part, the headquarters of the commander-in-chief (which all early traditions concerning the conquest invariably locate in the spot where later the mosque was built), could have been situated so close to the walls of the enemy stronghold; that is, within the reach not only of missiles from heavy siege engines but also of ordinary bows and arrows.

In view of the above considerations we can be reasonably sure that the walls reconstructed by Butler, whatever their original date, were basically the same as those which protected Babylon against the Arabs during the siege, that their essential layout remained unchanged throughout the Middle Ages, and that the remains discovered one hundred metres from the mosque belonged to older defences which were already out of use by the time of the conquest.

The surrounding wall built of burned bricks was about 2.70 metres thick and twelve metres high from the ground to the walk at the top. The protecting parapet with crenellation would increase the height to about fourteen metres. The wall was strengthened by towers rectangular in shape and rounded into a semicircle at the outer end. They protruded about fourteen metres from the wall, affording considerable protection to the curtain wall in between. We see on Butler's plan ten such towers protecting al-qasr on the southern, northern, and eastern sides. There were originally at least two more on the northern side, which flanked the gate. Possibly there were others, but no traces of them survived in Butler's time. There were no protruding towers on the western side; this wall, washed by the Nile, did not require extra protection. But as we have already said, inside the wall there were two extremely strong drum towers flanking both sides of the water gate. Built of stone blocks with bands of three regularly spaced layers of brick, they presented an impressive military feature. The walls of the drum towers, like those of the curtain wall, were 2.70 metres thick at the base and about one and a half metres thick at the top. The height of the towers was over sixteen metres without parapet and crenellation. They were four metres higher than the curtain walls. Opposite the western gate there was probably a boat bridge linking the fortress with the island in the middle of the Nile and with the western bank in the area known as al-Djiza. On the eastern end the bridge was protected by the fortress of Babylon, in particular by its two drum towers, and the other end was also protected by a fort. The island in the middle was walled too, both forts belonging to the formidable system of Babylon's fortifications. On both sides of the bridge, protected by the walls of the fortress and the towers, there was a harbour. Part of it probably extended as far as the southern gate. The southern gate, designed originally as a land gate, had been subsequently adapted as a water gate. The Nile was brought directly to its sill and part of its outside walk was turned into a quay.

Another gate analogous to the southern one existed probably also in the eastern wall. The whole structure was additionally protected by a ditch. The ditch, evidently not cared for during peacetime and filled up with rubble, had been cleared on news of the Arabs' raid. It is possible that a part of an ancient bed of the Amnis Trojanus had been used for the ditch.

From the archaeological facts outlined above, it is clear that the external appearance of Babylon was that of an extremely strong fortress and its rather modest internal area (not exceeding five hectares) rather suggests the name 'fortress' or 'castle' than 'city.' In reality, however, it was a medium-size fortified town and not a purely military settlement.

Its area, and the number of religious buildings, which at this time amounted to some ten or more churches and monasteries, suggests a fairly important civil population of several thousand souls. In addition to this there certainly was a permanent garrison there, probably stationed in the rampart bastions and drum towers, the latter very likely serving at the same time as a sort of keep. Twelve bastions (or more) with an inside lodging space of about 260 square metres each,
distributed between three floors, and two drum towers with lodging space on three floors of about 850 square metres each, provided at least 4800 square metres of lodging space and could have contained a fairly large garrison, perhaps a thousand men, which in case of emergency could easily have been doubled.

Was there another town outside the walls of Babylon-Qasr ash-Sham? As we have shown above, the sources give nothing positive in this respect. On the contrary, the mention of the ditch being dug around the fortress, several times repeated by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam,66 and the total lack of information in the early sources concerning this mythical city indicate the opposite. L. Caezani, who probably examined the historical material more carefully than most of the other scholars dealing with the Arab conquest, came to the same negative conclusion.57 For us an important additional argument against the theory of an extra muros town is of an archaeological nature: the remains of a larger enclosure point to some sort of crisis in the settlement at an earlier date. Since the size of the enclosure was certainly proportional to the number of inhabitants, the need to reduce it would mean that there were not enough people to dwell in it. And this was precisely the case with Babylon. Its past reduction does not tally with a large city outside the walls during the Arab siege. The remains recorded by Butler in the nineteenth century and Mahmoud Ahmad some fifty years later have been fairly well preserved thirteen centuries earlier; that is, at the time of the conquest. If they were not rebuilt to accommodate inhabitants of an unprotected city, it is because such a city did not exist.

On the other hand, we know, however, that there were many monasteries in the open country around Babylon and we can assume that there were also some farms. The low alluvial land, especially immediately north of the fortress, was fertile and cultivated. We know this from the well-known tradition concerning the land owned by Qaysaba ibn Kultum, which he granted for the future Mosque of ‘Amr and which was occupied by gardens and vineyards.58 Another tradition puts the original site of the Mosque of ‘Amr in the garden ar-Rihan.59 If there were cultivated lands, there were probably also country houses, if not actual villages nearby. Some of them may have been destroyed during the fighting but some others very likely survived. In fact, we seem to have an indication of this. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, quoting a very ancient tradition, says that ‘Amr ibn al-‘As allotted to the Caliph ‘Umar a house (dar) near the Mosque al-Djami’.60 It is significant that the tradition does not say that it was a khitta but a house, which may mean that it was actually standing there at the time of the conquest. There are some other places in the text of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam where there are references to houses being allotted to some individuals and not khitas, as is normally the case; unless the expression is due to imprecise language and dar is substituted for khitta, which seems rather unlikely, the meaning would be just that.

Our arguments, we must stress here, concern the immediate vicinity of the fortress in the area on which the future city of al-Fustat would be built; certainly, a little farther away there were other settlements, villages or even towns. The existence of a rather important town, a main centre of a rich agricultural district, Heliopolis—'Ain Shams, is known for certain.61 It is not possible to advance any theories as to its real size but it may be supposed that its favorable geographical and economic position would account for a population equal to or greater than that of Babylon, whose position depended mostly on fiscal administration, commerce and military strength.

Somewhere not far away there was also Tandunia—a town and a castle commonly identified with the Arab Umm Dunain and al-Maks of later times62—and certainly al-Djiza across the Nile,63 not counting nearby settlements upriver.

Almost all modern historians maintain that apart from those settlements there was another large fortress on the top of the plateau to the south of Babylon, which is generally identified with the one referred to by Strabo.64 Quite naturally both fortresses were often confused. As we know,65 the confusion dates from the time of al-Quda’i and al-Maqrizi and certainly was helped by the fact that on top of the plateau there still exists a monastery called Dair Bablyyun. Furthermore, there are also ruins of a large construction known locally as Ishtab ‘Antar, the Stables of ‘Antar (undated and still unexplored), which were often taken for the remains of this upper Babylon.

The evidence, except for that of Strabo, is by no means conclusive and even his cannot be used to prove reality some six hundred years later. The answer should be sought for in the archaeological record. Nevertheless, it may be assumed with confidence that in some place like the Sharaf eminence, commanding a view of a very large portion of the Nile Valley, there was a military establishment; a fort or at least a fortified watchtower, one in a chain of fortifications such as the forts at al-Djiza66 and on the Nile Island,67 of which Babylon was the central point. We could expect another post like that on the top of al-Muqattam. The Arabic sources record one such ruined stronghold called al-Qusayr, the Small Castle, which was somewhere on the summit of al-Muqattam plateau.68 It should probably be distinguished from a group of Melkite monasteries situated on the top of the mountain ridge above Tura south of al-Fustat and also called al-Qusayr.69 In a strategic place such as the mountainous ridge where the Ayyubid Citadel stands today, there might have been a fort too, but it is unlikely that there was another large castrum with a numerous garrison and civilian population near Babylon. The water supply would be inadequate and what could be done with the power of Rome—to supply permanently 150 prisoners of war to operate the hydraulic machinery70—clearly could not be afforded by the Byzantines of Heraclius’ time.
part of it a sort of aristocratic resort where only a lucky few possessed property. To have real estate on the island must have been very desirable, and the Muslims soon became the majority here; but for a long time it remained an important center of Coptic population as well. In addition to being a military centre and leisure resort, the island played a significant role in the economic life of the town. Gardens produced fruits and vegetables, trees yielded timber for building and some firewood, and the Nile may have provided the livelihood of fishermen. There were also commercial establishments there, partially owned by the Caliphs, but the main industry was certainly shipbuilding with its associated crafts, not all of which was military in character. On the whole, it seems that the island, predominantly a military stronghold in Byzantine times, was developing socially and economically into a regular town district. Indirect evidence for this may be the total abandonment of the Byzantine defences. Although already partially destroyed by ‘Amr ibn al-‘As, the defences had certainly been maintained and garrisoned in the early days of Arab rule. But soon they disappeared, possibly dismantled or destroyed by the Nile, and were completely forgotten. Operation of the shipyard, the harbour for the warships and the necessary barracks for the crews must have given the island a different air as well as a special administrative status; but by the end of the Umayyad period, its basic functions were not drastically different from those of other quarters of the city.

\textit{Qair ash-Sham‘-Babylon}

Investigating the early history of various districts, one invariably comes to the amazing phenomenon of Babylon. An alien body in the city’s flesh, it retained its individuality and apparently its administrative separation for centuries, in spite of historical circumstances which should have induced if not justified opposite action by the authorities. Its high walls and bastions, surrounded by the Muslim town on three sides over which it proudly towered, inevitably must have looked like a symbol of past Christian might. It is true that at least in the earliest period there was a standing Arab garrison posted there, but certainly the Muslim population was so small that the inhabitants of Babylon were in a far better position in case of an enemy attack. How was it that almost in the middle of the Muslim central quarter, which from the very beginning had suffered from a lack of unoccupied land, a large district with an alien population who, in the eyes of the Muslim majority, were devoid of legal rights, was tolerated? Why was no attempt made by the Muslims to dislodge them? Muslims do appear there in later times, but they were probably native converts. But before the conversion of the Christians gained momentum, which did not affect a tightly knit community like Babylon before the tenth century, there was not even a single mosque there. And for a long time, we hear of no Arab property within the walls.

Thus, the population was composed predominantly of Copts, although the presence of Melkite churches and a monastery, attested by later sources, indicate there was also a Greek Orthodox minority. There was also a small Jewish community associated with a synagogue of ancient date. Numerous churches and two or three important monasteries attest to a large clergy and monastic community within the walls. But probably the most important and influential group of inhabitants was the secretarial caste, which was primarily occupied with the administration of taxes in specie and in kind and with the collection, storage and supervision of stocks, current correspondence, public works, etc. All this complicated bureaucratic machinery, which the Arabs in the beginning knew very little about and only gradually learned, was left entirely in the experienced hands of Coptic officials. And since the central administration was moved from Alexandria to al-Fustat, this group must have increased considerably. Quite soon, whether it was because Babylon became too small to house all these officials or because they were more comfortable in more spacious residences elsewhere, they began to move out into surrounding districts. There can be, however, little question that many remained, perhaps feeling safer behind its walls and in the midst of their own coherent community.

Besides the members of the central administration at all levels and its auxiliary employees, there must have been in Babylon the usual urban population engaged in various professions: handicrafts, commerce and services. They provided the surrounding Arab city with the necessary infrastructure and very soon expanded into other quarters, although these links were maintained only not with their Coptic kin but with the Arabs and their clients as well. Many of them certainly visited Babylon daily for various reasons and this contributed to the process of its integration with the rest of the town. For, in spite of its marked autonomy and the separation emphasized by its walls, it indubitably formed a part of one city.

Administratively, Babylon could not be regarded as a single unit. Each of its main communities—Coptic-Yacobite, Greek Orthodox and Jewish—were under their own jurisdictions. It is not entirely clear what was the role of the Arab official, the sahib al-Qair, appointed for the first time when the bulk of the army moved off to invest Alexandria, and probably maintained also in later times. Certainly, it was primarily a military post. The commander of the garrison had no administrative power over the civil population, so is not unlikely that the sahib al-Qair was charged with maintaining order in public places among the civilian population and that he supervised the civil guards, tasks which later were taken over by commanders of the central sharia for the whole town. They, on behalf of the governors, probably supervised the conduct of the population in public; their duties in ‘Abbasid times were taken by muhtasib. On the other hand, it is unlikely that Arab officials interfered with the economic life of alien communities unless it had a bearing on the fiscal interests of the state. Of course, conflicts with Muslims were tried by the qadi.

The equally important question of Babylon’s physical aspect is even more difficult to answer. There is virtually no evidence regarding the internal arrangement of the quarter, its plan and architecture. Perhaps a plausible reconstruction could be worked out on the basis of analogous material from other
contemporary Egyptian Coptic sites, but this would be a purely theoretical undertaking.99 We can be reasonably certain of a few points, however. Certainly in the first centuries of Arab rule, the quarter remained much the same as when it had been an independent Byzantine Coptic town: with its comparatively tall domestic architecture of two or three storeys, built of mud brick; narrow, relatively straight streets with main thoroughfares leading to the gates and crossing at right angles; and more ambitious public buildings, both religious and civil, built of baked brick or small, hewn blocks of stone but not particularly distinguishable from private residences because of their later Muslim counterparts, presenting to the street undecorated facades whose plain walls greatly contrasted with the usually rich interiors.

Besides the ordinary houses and a few more ambitious residences of local aristocrats and rich clergy, a considerable portion of the space available was covered with sacred constructions: churches and monasteries. There were also granaries, and we can also extrapolate state-owned textile factories and some administrative buildings. Baths, fairly popular since Roman times, were, because of the danger of fire, mostly built outside the walls. We know of two such establishments outside Babylon, apparently of pre-Islamic date.97

The role of this quarter within the whole urban complex, regardless of its individuality, must have been enormous as a model of the urban way of life for the half-nomad original population of al-Fustat. It provided ready examples of houses and other architectural forms. What is possibly even more important, the population of Babylon, which survived intact and was not dispersed or alienated from its traditional social milieu (as were smaller social units that settled in predominantly Muslim quarters), served as a powerful force in transmitting the local civilization and cultural tradition.

The Necropolis

Although the necropolis at this early date was not yet a proper city quarter, it was undoubtedly an important element in al-Fustat's topography and played an important part in its development. The questions of its location, extent, division, and territorial evolution, and even its name (al-Qarafa), appear to be easy ones in light of its subsequent fame and frequent mention in sources, but for the early periods information is rather obscure and uncertain.

Later sources, most of them drawing from al-Quda'i, call the necropolis al-Qarafa and derive the name from the alleged khitta of the Banu Qarafa, a clan of the important Yemenite tribe of al-Ma'afir.99 There is, however, evidence which makes it difficult to accept this statement at face value. First of all, neither Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam nor other sources, which derive their early information from al-Quda'i's work, mention this clan among the original settlers. One exception is Abu Salih, who probably quotes al-Kindi's lost work on the khittas.99 But even he does not seem certain and gives an alternate explanation of the name Qarafa.100 Also al-Maqrizi quotes a different opinion,101 and this suggests that there was no general agreement on the origin of the name.

Be that as it may, it is certainly improbable that the whole enormous area designated in later times as al-Qarafa could have been at the town's foundation the khitta of a single and certainly not very important clan, and it is even more improbable that there were two different khittas of this tribe, namely the Smaller and Greater Qarafa, as al-Maqrizi states.102

If such were indeed the origin of the name, it must at first have been applied to a much smaller area, most probably the seat of al-Ma'afir, and only gradually have been applied to the whole necropolis. At any rate, it seems most unlikely that al-Qarafa was used as a collective name for the various parts of the Muslim burial grounds of al-Fustat before the tenth century. The first authors who used it with that meaning were al-Muqaddasi103 and Ibn Haykal,104 in referring to the Djamli built there by the Fatimid princes. It is significant, in our opinion, that this name does not occur at all in the earliest Egyptian sources, including Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam's and al-Kindi's Kitab al-Wulat wa'l-Qudat.105

Later sources ascribe the name of al-Qarafa to two different areas. One of them was a vast area between the slopes of al-Muqattam and al-Fustat proper, extending from the Citadel hill south for about two and a half or three kilometres, and the second was located on the plateau east of ar-Rasad and north-east of Birkat al-Habash in the neighborhood of Ibn Tulun's aqueduct. The latter part was called al-Qarafa al-Kubra or al-Kabira, that is, Greater Qarafa; and the former part, north and south of the mausoleum of Imam ash-Shafi'i, was called al-Qarafa as Sughra or as-Saghiira, that is, Lesser Qarafa.106 Also in early times, if we are to believe the tradition transmitted by al-Maqrizi,107 there were two burial grounds for al-Fustat: one between the Mosque of al-Fath and the foot of al-Muqattam, which evidently gave rise to al-Qarafa as-Sughra; and the other between Musalla Khawan and Khitta al-Ma'afir, which formed the nucleus of al-Qarafa al-Kobra. Unfortunately, we cannot precisely locate either of these places.108

From our incomplete evidence, it appears that the Arabs in the early period were on the whole not very particular about where they buried their dead; but in al-Fustat the custom prevailed of carrying them outside the settled area,109 which was contrary to the usage in al-Kufa, for instance, where tribes had their burial grounds within their khittas.110

A long narrative related by Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam,111 which implies a belief in the very special significance of al-Muqattam in this respect, and the sanctity of this mountain, was doubtless fabricated in later times to give it the spiritual sanction of ancestral choice as a place for burials. But the tradition was not baseless, since the place had long been revered by the local populace. The tradition about numerous Christian shrines in the area of the later al-Qarafa, which were destroyed in the war of conquest,112 clearly indicates this. All this suggests that for the pious, the preferable burial place was as near the sacred mountain as possible. But ordinary tribesmen probably had their burial grounds nearer to their khittas.

Each tribe evidently had a separate cemetery. These tribal burial grounds, which are confirmed for the fourteenth/fifteenth century,113 must have originated at a time when the tribal social structure was still strong in the town; that is, before
AMR B. AL-‘ĀS (AL-‘ĀST) AL-SAHMI, who belonged to the Quraish, was a companion (Ṣahābi) of the Prophet. He embraced Islam in the year 8/629 before the conquest of Makka. His kunya or surname was Abū Abd Allah. He was also called Abū Muḥammad.¹

His mother was Nābigha bint Harmala of Banū Julān. ‘Uqba b. Nāfi‘ b. ‘Abd al-Qays (d. 63/683) and ‘Amr b. Athātha al-‘Adwī (d. circ. 66/686) were his half brothers.² He was a short man with a big head and a wide forehead. He had a big mouth, long beard and broad shoulders. A man of long hands and legs ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās was very clever in reaching decisions and was brave in action.³

‘Amr b. al-‘Ās had a firm belief in Islam and sincere love for it. After his conversion the Prophet wanted to send him to a battlefield where he would be able to render good service to Islam and at the same time would get a huge amount of booty. ‘Amr was keen to serve the cause of Islam but did not take any interest in worldly attainments. He informed the Prophet that he had accepted Islam with a genuine belief in that religion and not for any material gain. The Prophet was pleased with him for expressing such a sentiment.⁴ ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās was a traditionist or muḥaddith.⁵

He was a prudent diplomat, skilful politician and a valiant general. His military activities started during the lifetime of the Prophet.⁶ After he had participated in a few expeditions the Prophet sent him to ‘Umān, where he could induce two rulers, named Ja‘far and ‘Abbād b. Julanda, to embrace Islam.⁷

The Prophet also deputed ‘Amr to Bilād in Syria for the purpose of preaching Islam, where he was attacked by some non-believers. ‘Amr sought help from the Prophet, who sent a contingent, including Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. That battle was known as the battle of Salāsil.⁸

‘Amr won the battle. After that campaign was over the Prophet appointed him the Governor of ‘Umān, and he remained in the post till the death of the Prophet.⁹

‘Amr b. al-‘Ās also played an important role in the conquest of Palestine, where he was sent by Abū Bakr with an army. During the caliphate of ‘Umar (13/634-23/644) ‘Amr b. al-‘Ās proceeded for the first time towards al-Maghrib.¹⁰ Before him no “Ṣahābi” did dare to enter Africa.
Towards the beginning of 25/645 ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ sent ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘d b. Abi Sarh towards North Africa at the direction of Caliph ‘Uthmān. Africa was finally conquered by ‘Abd Allāh, but ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ must be credited with the bold project of planning the conquest and of carrying it into effect militarily.

‘Amr’s Interest in the Conquest of Egypt:

There were several reasons for ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ’s interest in the conquest of Egypt. He had visited the land before his conversion to Islam. Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam says that before embracing Islam ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ went to Bait al-Maqdis (Jerusalem) as a member of a group of Quraish merchants. Once as he was watching his camels graze on a nearby hill, he happened to meet a person named Shammās who belonged to Alexandria. He had come to Jerusalem to perform prayer at Bait al-Maqdis.

Shammās had reasons to be very much obliged to ‘Amr as he had saved him twice from death, once by offering him water when he was about to die of thirst and later by killing a snake when it was about to bite him.

Shammās invited ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ to visit Alexandria and promised to give him two thousand dinars as diyyat (blood money) for saving his life. In this connection ‘Amr consulted his associates and accepted the invitation. His journey to Alexandria provided him with an opportunity to see for himself the beauty and richness of Egypt. In Alexandria he saw its magnificent buildings. He was deeply impressed by the fertile land of Egypt and its grandeur. In the course of this journey ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ not only got acquainted with the roads and highways of Egypt, but also learned how one entered and made exit from it.

‘Amr’s Urge for the Conquest of Egypt:

‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ wanted earnestly to bring forward the message of Islam to the Egyptian people. But, he was waiting for permission of the caliph ‘Umar for this major campaign. Meanwhile, in 18/639 when the caliph came to Jābih ‘Amr met him and inspired him for the conquest of Egypt.

He argued that with the conquest of Egypt Muslim strength will be more and more consolidated. Thus he sought permission to proceed towards it. The caliph was convinced by the argument of ‘Amr and sanctioned dispatch of about four thousand of Yamani soldiers. ‘Umar permitted ‘Amr to undertake the campaign but at the same time cautioned him that he would soon receive a letter of the caliph and if he received any retreat order before reaching Egypt, he must return from the expedition. But if he had already crossed the border of Egypt before receiving any letter, he might continue the campaign, and in that case he should seek help from Allāh, the Almighty.

In 18/639 (or 19/640) ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ started his Egyptian campaign at dead of night without informing anybody. The caliph after giving his consent for the expedition was however greatly concerned about the fate of his
soldiers, because he thought that his army might not be a match for the well-equipped Romans. Accordingly, he wrote to ‘Amr asking him to withdraw from the campaign.

In another report it was said that after the conquest of Syria the caliph himself wrote to ‘Amr to prepare for an expedition to proceed to Egypt and this letter of the caliph was brought to ‘Amr by Sharik b. ‘Abduh. After the letter had been despatched Ḥadrat ‘Uthmān came to the caliph. The caliph informed ‘Uthmān that he had sent a letter to ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ directing him to proceed to Egypt. ‘Uthmān did not like ‘Amr, for in his opinion the latter was an ambitious and unreliable person. He thought under ‘Amr’s leadership the Muslim army had no chance of a victory.

He then advised the caliph to call him (‘Amr) back from the expedition. As a result, Caliph ‘Umar wrote another letter to ‘Amr directing him to come back from the campaign immediately. He was, however, given the option of continuing the campaign if he had already crossed the border of Egypt. According to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Balādhar ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Abdulrahmān, the letter reached ‘Amr while he was at Raḥf.

‘Amr showed his prudence and did not open the letter suspecting that it might contain an order not to proceed further. He continued his march till (in 18/639 or 19/640) he reached a village between Raḥf and al-‘Arish. Here, when he came to know that he had already reached within the border of Egypt, he demanded the letter of the caliph. The letter was opened and he found that an order of retreat had been issued by the caliph. As he had already crossed the border of Egypt before receiving any order of retreat, he could continue his expedition. Hence he continued his campaign. Had it not been for his prudence Egypt would not have been conquered so early.

As soon as Heraclius’s agent, Cyrus (Ar. Muqawqis) received the news that the armies of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ were moving towards Egypt, he asked the Governor of Egypt, U’airāj, to get ready with full arms and ammunition. And he (Cyrus) himself proceeded towards Fustāt. ‘Amr got the news of Roman preparation, but he cared little for it. He continued his march armed with the strength of Īmān (faith) in Allah, the Almighty. When he reached Jabal al-Hilāl (Mountain of Hilāl) some groups of people from Luklam tribe also joined his army. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, without any obstacle arrived at al-‘Arish on the day of ‘Id al-‘Aḍhā, and sacrificed a sheep.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam in his book “Futūḥ Misr wa Akhbaruḥū” recorded that the first battle (after the battle of ‘Ayn al-Shams in July 640/20) which took place with the Romans was at al-Faramā (Pelusium) in the middle of January 640. This battle continued for about a month. Eventually ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ won the battle. But according to Maqrizi, after the battle of ‘Ayn al-Shams ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ sent one of his co-fighters, Abraha b. Ṣabbāh to Faramā who concluded a treaty with the Faramāns. Maqrizi did not make mention of the battle that took place there.
Here, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam’s version seems to be nearer to the truth, since it was an important Roman city of northern Egypt. From a naval point of view too it was dangerous, as it is located only at three miles distance from al-Bahar Akhdar. Baladhuri also held the same view.\(^{34}\)

On receiving the news of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ’s advance towards Egypt Abu Binyamin, who was the bishop of the Copts (Qibtīs)\(^{35}\) at Alexandria, informed his followers in writing that the Romans were going to lose Egypt very soon. He also directed them to meet and co-operate with ‘Amr according to the direction of their priest (Abu Binyamin). The Copts not only made friendship with ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ but also helped him in his expedition.\(^{36}\)

From al-Farama ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ proceeded towards Alexandria.\(^{37}\) After a heavy fight of one month, Bilbays (Bibis) was conquered and then ‘Amr reached Um-Danian.\(^{38}\) Here he had to face fierce fighting. He informed Caliph ‘Umar that victory was being delayed, and that he would require help in the shape of more soldiers. Accordingly, Caliph ‘Umar sent 4000 soldiers with four leading commanding officers, Zubayr b. al-Awwām (d. 36/656), Miqdad b. ‘Amr (d. 13/653), ‘Ubādah b. Ṣāmit (d. 34/654) and Maslama b. Mukhallad\(^{39}\) (d. 62/682).

‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ continued his forward march towards Alexandria. In this direction he besieged the strong castle of Babylon (Babilūn).\(^{40}\) The Romans dug ditches around the castle. The siege continued for one month. ‘Amr appealed for additional soldiers to the caliph. The caliph sanctioned help of another 4000 soldiers. ‘Amr conquered the castle and continued his expedition.\(^{41}\) Meanwhile, Cyrus (Ar. Muqawqis) sent a delegation to ‘Amr and threatened him saying that if he (‘Amr) further continued his expedition he would face its evil consequences.

But ‘Amr turned a deaf ear to this threat. Thus Cyrus’s diplomacy proved a failure. ‘Amr placed before the Romans the following three conditions:

1. That they would be treated as friends of the Muslims if they accepted Islam.

2. In case they were not ready to accept Islam, they must pay tribute.

3. If they were not ready to accept any of those two conditions then the Muslims would have no other alternative than to fight “till Allah decides and He decides for the best”\(^{42}\)

When the delegation of Cyrus came back to him from the camp of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, he enquired about the character and conduct of the Muslim soldiers they met there. The delegation informed him that the Muslim soldiers had such self-confidence that they did not care for the enemies whatsoever their number might be. They could fight even with a handful of army.\(^{43}\) Because they fought for the pleasure of Allah, the Almighty, they took less interest in
the worldly life; rather they gave utmost importance to the life hereafter. The delegation also informed Cyrus that the Muslim soldiers were united and very punctual. They had equality and fraternity among themselves.44

On receipt of the report about the Muslim soldiers, Cyrus realized that it would not be so easy to win over the Muslims,45 and sent a message to ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, requesting him to send a delegation to him (Cyrus) so that they could talk about an amicable settlement. ‘Amr responded to the call of Cyrus and sent a delegation consisting of ten members with ‘Ubādah b. Ṣāmit as the leader.46 While talking to Cyrus, ‘Ubādah placed before him the three conditions already communicated to him earlier. The conditions were: the Romans will have to accept Islam or to pay tribute, failing which, the Muslims will have no alternative but to fight.47

Having talked to the Muslim delegation and noticed its attitude, Cyrus became nervous.48 He informed the Roman emperor, Heraclius, of the whole situation namely that Muslim soldiers were very courageous though they were less in number. Each of them could fight with more than one hundred Roman soldiers. But Heraclius did not care for it. He ordered his army to continue the war, as he thought that the fall of Alexandria was as bad as the fall of Roman empire.49

In the meantime, Caliph ‘Umar wrote a letter to ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ asking him why there was so much delay in the conquest of Egypt. He asked ‘Amr to deliver a speech to the Muslim soldiers in the light of the contents of the letter in which he advised them to purify their hearts, because Allāh does not help those whose intentions (Niyyāt) are not clear. ‘Amr carried out the order of the caliph on a Friday before sunset.50

Heraclius, on the other hand, made preparations with full strength to go to Alexandria and fight personally against the Muslims. But all of a sudden, he had an attack of epilepsy and died. This occurred in the year 19/639.51 ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ had already besieged Alexandria five months before the death of Heraclius and continued the siege up to nine months after his death. After the long siege ‘Amr contrived a new strategy. He, in consultation with Maslama b. Mukhallad, ordered ‘Ubādah b. Ṣāmit to command the Muslim army for the conquest of Alexandria. His strategy proved fruitful. He won the battle. Thus ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ became successful in his expedition, and Alexandria was finally conquered on a Friday in the month of Muḥarram in 20/640.52

Thus Alexandria became an integral part of the caliphate. With the fall of Alexandria the whole of Egypt and its frontier up to the border of Abyssinia in the south and Libya in the west became part of the Muslim dominions.60 The so-called story about the burning of Alexandrian library by ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ on the orders of Caliph ‘Umar was nothing but a fabrication. According to P.K. Hitti, it was the great Ptolemaic library of Alexandria which was burnt by Julius Caeser as early as 48 B.C., but at the time of Muslim conquest there was no such library in Alexandria.61
Historians differ about the year of the conquest of Egypt and Alexandria. According to Tabari, both Egypt and Alexandria were conquered in 20/640. Maqrizi differed about the year of the conquest of Alexandria. According to him, Alexandria was conquered in 21/641. Baladhuri and Ibn al-'Imad reported that Egypt was conquered in 20/640. Baladhuri further reported that after the conquest of Egypt, 'Amr b. al-'Ās wrote to Caliph 'Umar seeking his permission to proceed to Alexandria, which the caliph granted. Thus 'Amr proceeded towards Alexandria and conquered it in 21/641. Dhabābi also held the same view. But Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam differed. According to him Alexandria was conquered in 20/640 on a Friday in the month of Muḥarram.

Here Baladhuri's report seems to be nearer to the truth that Egypt was conquered in 20/640 and Alexandria in the following year, 21/641. Those who reported that Alexandria was conquered in 20/640 might have reported so, due to the difference of a few days or months, that the fall of Alexandria occurred at the end of 20/640 and the take-over ceremony took place a few days later, which was the beginning of 21/641. Ibn al-'Imad reported that some regions of Egypt were conquered in 20/640 but the complete expedition became successful (with the conquest of Alexandria) in 21/641. After the conquest of Alexandria 'Amr b. al-'Ās sent Mu'āwiya b. Ḥudajj (d.52/672) to Caliph 'Umar to give him the good news. On receipt of the news of the conquest of Alexandria 'Umar became very glad. He bowed down his head in "sijda" and expressed his deepest gratitude and thankfulness to Allah, the Almighty.

'Amr b. al-'Ās died in 42/662 or 43/663 on the day of 'Id al-Fitr at the age of 90. His son 'Abd Allah led the funeral prayer (Ṣalāt al-Janāza).
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637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;

637

1 at

year

mo the
to

to

Cf.

578;
286 ISLAMIC CULTURE October


(31) A Muslim is not afraid of any power except Allāh. One who fights in the path of Allāh, no matter whether he wins or loses the battle, he will get his rewards. ‘To him who fighteth in the cause of God, whether he is slain or gets victory, soon shall We give him a reward of great (value)’ al-Qurān, 4:74. (Tr. Abdullah Yūsuf ‘Ali, Libya, 1973). As far as the conquest of Egypt is concerned, there is a Ḥadith on the authority of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb that the Prophet himself gave hints that Egypt will once be conquered by his followers. According to his prophecy, Egypt, the beautiful land, was conquered by one of his Sahābas, ‘Aṣūr b. al-‘Āṣ.

و من أراد أن يذكر الفردوس أو ينظر إلى مثلها فلينظر إلى أرض مصر
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Tabari also did not mention the treaty of Abrahah b. al-Sabbah with the Faramans. According to him, after the battle of 'Ayn al-Shams 'Amr sent Abrahah to al-Farama' and 'Aww b. Malik to Alexandria. 'Amr might have sent them to collect information from those places. Tabari also mentioned that at Farama' and Alexandria are two adjacent places named after two prominent brothers, “al-Farama’” and “al-Iskandar”!

Cf. Tabari, pp. 2586-2587.

(35) Qibti or Copt, a tribe of the oldest inhabitants of Egypt. They were literate. The Qibti language was a rich living language up to eighteenth century. This language is still used in their churches for religious ceremonies. Cf. Ta'rikh Misr Qadim, (Persian, Tehran), from Intigharat Danishghah, Vol. i, 8.

وكان بالإسكندرية أسقف الفقيبط يقال له نيامين فلما بلغه قدم عمر بن العاص إلى مصر

كتب إلى الفقيبط يعلمهم أنه لا تكون للروم دولة وأضلهم قد أقطع وياسرهم بقتلك

عمرو فقال أن الفقيبط الذين كانوا يمهد بعمرو أعوانا.

(36) Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, Futah Miṣr, pp. 58-59; Tabari, op. cit., p. 2586; Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan, Ta'rikh al-Islām, p. 251; Hitti, op. cit., p. 165. The incident is similar to that of two priests, Daghatire and Ibn Natür, during the lifetime of the Prophet. They only advised their people to accept the truth but they themselves accepted Islam. We were also informed that the Roman Emperor, Heraclius, after hearing about all the Prophet indicated that his country (the Roman empire, including Egypt) would one day be conquered by the Prophet or by his followers.

(37) While proceeding towards Alexandria from al-Farama', 'Amr b. 'Åş had to face a few abstracts at al-qawāṣir. Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, Futah Miṣr, p. 59.


(39) In another report it was stated that one of the four commanding officers sent by Caliph 'Umar the fourth one was Kharija b. Ḥuḍafah (d. 40/660) (and not Maslama b. Mukhallad). For Zubair b. al-'Awān, see Zirikli, al-'Aṯām, vol. iii, p. 74. For Miqdād b. 'Amr, see ibid. Vol. viii, p. 208. For 'Ubādah b. Ṣāmit, see ibid. vol. iv, p. 30. For Maslama b. Mukhallad, see, ibid. vol. viii, p. 123. For Kharijah b. Ḥuḍafah, see, ibid. vol. ii, p. 332. As far as the strategy of war is concerned everyone of those four leading persons was equal to one thousand ordinary Roman soldiers. Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, Futah Miṣr, p. 59. When those additional 4000 soldiers arrived 'Amr b. al-'Åş throw in all 4000 soldiers for that campaign. Cf. Ibid.


(43) Cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, p. 65; Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan, op. cit., p. 353. ‘Allāma Iqbal also expressed the same sentiment while narrating the equality in Islam and the Muslims. Cf. Dr. Muḥammad Iqbāl, Shikwa wa Jauḥ Shikwa (Urdu) p. 27.

(44) Ibid.

(45) On hearing what the character of the Muslim soldiers was, Cyrus realized the same truth which was expressed by Heraclius during the life-time of the Prophet that Alexandria (Egypt) will one day be conquered by the Muslims. Cf. Bukhārī, pp. 4, 5; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, p. 65.

(46) ‘Ubādah b. Sāmīt was black and when as the leader of the Muslim delegation he appeared before Cyrus, he got frightened and the latter ordered that somebody else should appear as leader. The other members of the Muslim delegation vehemently opposed this. They informed Cyrus that in Islam there is no difference between white and black. (The most righteous were the most honoured men, as it was mentioned in the Holy Qur’ān: “Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you,” [al-Qur’ān, sura, 49: 13 tr. ‘Abd Allāh Yūsuf ‘All, The Glorious Qur’ān, Libya, 1971). They also informed Cyrus that ‘Ubādah was the most righteous of them, that was why he was made leader. And if Cyrus wanted to talk to the Muslim delegation he should talk to ‘Ubādah as leader of the delegation. Thus Cyrus was compelled to talk to ‘Ubādah as the leader of the Muslim delegation. Cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, op. cit., p. 66.


(49) Cf. Maqrizi, Kiṣṭat, p. 265; Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, p. 76.


فَلَنِ اسْتَبْرَكْ وَتَعَالَيْ لَا يَنْصُرُ قُوَّةٌ إِلَّا بِقُوَّةٍ وَسْمَاعٍ

Cf. Maqrizi, Kiṣṭat, p. 266.

Ḥaḍrat ‘Umar advised ‘Amr to deliver the said speech on a Friday before the sunset, because it was the time when Allah sends down His blessings (raḥmat) and grants the prayer of His servants. Two years had already elapsed and the conquest of Egypt was delayed. So they should pray to Allah for victory. Cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, p. 79; Maqrizi, Kiṣṭat, p. 266.

(51) Cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, p. 76. In another report it was mentioned that Heraclius died in 20/640. However, it was confirmed that he died before the conquest of Alexandria. Cf. Futūḥ Misr, p. 76.

(52) ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ rend out the letter of the caliph (‘Umar) before the Muslim soldiers, and performed with them two rak‘at of salāt and said du‘a (prayed) to Allah, the Almighty, for victory in the battle. Later on, he consulted on some points with Maslama. According to the advice of Maslama, ‘Amr gave command of the army in the hands of ‘U바dah. Perhaps he did so from a strategic point of view, which consequently led to the conquest of Alexandria. Cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, p. 79; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh al-Umam, vol. iv, p. 226; Maqrizi, Kiṣṭat, pp. 266–67.


(55) Cf. Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh al-Rusul Wal-Mulāk, p. 2580. Ṭabarī also mentioned 19/639, 20/641, 22/642, 23/645 and even 16/636 as the probable year of the conquest of Alexandria. Cf. ibid., pp. 2579–81. But in his Ta‘rīkh al-Umam he made it clear that both Egypt and Alexandria were conquered in the year 20/640.


(59) حديث يحيى بن يورد وابن مخلد بن حميد قالا حاصرونا الاسكندرية سبعه أشهر بعد موت

هرقل وخمسة قبل ذلك وفتحت يوم الجمعة لمستهل النص المنصرم سنة عشرة


(62) It was also reported that 'Amr died in 48/668 or 51/671. Cf. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Ḳātīb, vol. ii, pp. 435-36.

(63) At the time of his death 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ was seeking help and forgiveness from Allah, the Almighty, and was reciting a du'a

THE HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF EGYPT, NORTH AFRICA AND SPAIN
KNOWN AS THE FUTUH MISR OF IBN ‘ABD AL-HAKAM,, TRANS JOHN LONG.
He [the narrator] said, “Then he returned to the narrative of ‘Uthman b. Salih. He said, ‘When it was the 18th year, ‘Umar had arrived at al-Jabiya; ‘Amr b. al-‘As was alone with him; so [‘Amr] asked [‘Umar’s] permission to march to Egypt. ‘Amr had entered Egypt during the Jahiliyya and knew its roads/routes and had seen much of what was there. The occasion for ‘Amr entering it, as Yahya b. Khalid al-‘Adawiyy—who got it from Ibn Luhay’a and Yahya b. Ayyub [who themselves gotten it] from Khalid b. Yazid—informed us, was that it had come to him that ‘Amr had arrived at Jerusalem in with a group from Quraish to carry on a trading venture. Then [‘Amr] became concerned about one of the Byzantine Christian priests of the Alexandrians, who had come to pray at Jerusalem. Now [the priest] had gone out into some of [Jerusalem’s] mountains to wander about; and ‘Amr was grazing his camels and those of his companions. The camels’ consumption of pasturage was an occasion of conflict between [the Christians] and us.

‘Amr was grazing his camels when that priest passed by him. A powerful thirst had struck him on a day of intense heat, so he stopped beside ‘Amr and asked him for a drink of water. ‘Amr gave him a drink from his qurbah and he drank until his thirst was quenched; and the priest slept at [‘Amr’s] place. There was a hole beside where the priest slept and a mighty serpent came out of it. ‘Amr saw it and went toward it with an arrow and killed it. When the priest awakened, he looked at the mighty serpent from which God has saved him and said to ‘Amr, ‘What is this?’ ‘Amr told him that he had shot it and killed it. So [the priest] went to ‘Amr, kissed his head and said, ‘God has twice saved my life through you, once from the powerful thirst and once again from this serpent. So what will I offer to you is this country.’ [‘Amr] said, ‘I have come with some of my companions; we are seeking favor for our trading venture.’ The priest said to him, ‘How much do you think you hope to gain in your trading?’ [‘Amr] said, ‘My hope is to gain something by which to buy a camel, for I possess only two camels; so my hope is to gain another camel, then there will be three.’ [The priest] said, ‘Look here! Among you, how much is the blood money for one of you?’ [‘Amr] said, ‘One hundred camels.’ The priest said to him, ‘We are not owners of camels, we are owners of currency.’ [‘Amr] said, ‘It would be a thousand dinars.’

The priest said to him, ‘I am a stranger in this country, but I came to pray in the church at Jerusalem and to travel about in these mountains for a month, [since] I had made that as a vow upon myself. And I have spent that [time] and I want to return to my country. So is it not your right to follow me to my country? And is it not your right that you have a solemn promise and covenant [lit., “God’s promise and covenant”] that I will give you a double amount of blood money, because through you God, most high, twice saved my life?’ ‘Amr said, ‘Where is your country?’ [The priest] said, ‘Egypt, in city called Alexandria.’ ‘Amr said to him, ‘I don’t know it, nor have I ever entered it.’ The priest responded to him, ‘If ever you had entered it you would have known that you had never entered its like!’ ‘Amr said, ‘Will you fulfill for me what you are saying? And by virtue of that, are the promise and the covenant an obligation you are taking on?’ The priest said to him, ‘God has granted to you that I be obligated, by virtue of the promise and the covenant, to fulfill [it] for you; and that I return you to your companions.’ ‘Amr said, ‘How long will my sojourn there be?’ [The priest] said, ‘A month. You will set out
with me for ten [days], going; you will stay with us for ten [days]; and you will return for ten [days]. And I am obligated to you to protect you while going and to send someone with you who will protect you while returning,’ ‘Amr said to him, ‘Grant me some time so that I may confer with my companions about this.’

“So ‘Amr set off for his companions. He informed them about the promise the priest had made to him and he said to them, ‘Provide me with supplies [sufficient for me to go and] to return to you; and I make a promise to you that I will give you a share/half of it despite the fact that he befriended me, one of you whom he took a liking to.’ They said, ‘Yes!’ and sent with him one of their men. So ‘Amr and his companion set out for Egypt with the priest [traveling] until they reached Alexandria. So ‘Amr saw some of its buildings and the great number of its people and some of the wealth and goods there that pleased him. He said, ‘I have never seen [anything] like Egypt, and the abundance of wealth here.’ He looked at Alexandria and its structures and the good quality of its buildings, at the great number of its people and at the wealth there and he increased in wonder.

“It was fitting that ‘Amr enter Alexandria at [the time of] a great feast there, during which their kings and their nobles assembled. They had a wreathed golden ball which their kings would throw at each other and would catch in their sleeves. And what they knew from this ball was that anyone who dropped it passed from them, but that anyone into whose sleeve the ball had fallen and remained there lived to become their king.

“So when ‘Amr arrived at Alexandria the priest honored him in every way and he was covered by a silk brocade garment which he wore. ‘Amr and the priest sat with the people in that place where they were throwing the ball at each other and were catching it in their sleeves. One of the men threw it and it began to fall until it fell into the sleeve of ‘Amr and they were amazed at that. They said, ‘This time, only, has this ball ever lied to us! Do you believe this Arab will become our king? This will never be!’

“That priest went in among the people of Alexandria and told them that twice ‘Amr had saved his life and that he had guaranteed him two-thousand dinars. He asked them to collect that for him from whatever [money] there was among them. So they did, and they paid it to ‘Amr and ‘Amr and his companion set off. The priest sent with them a guide and a messenger; he provided them with supplies and honored them until he and his companion returned to their companions.

“So by that means ‘Amr knew the entrance to and the exit from Egypt; and he saw what was known about it, [namely] that it was the best country and the most abundant in wealth. When ‘Amr returned to his companions, he paid them what was [the value] among them of a thousand dinars and he kept for himself a thousand. ‘Amr said, ‘It was the first wealth that I contracted for and thereby became rich!’"