

The Historiographical Works of Barhebraeus on the Mongol Period

Historical writing in Syriac conforms to the model of the universal histories, among which the history of Eusebius of Caesarea is a key link in a chain of compositions. Conversion to Christianity meant discovering a history that began with Adam and Eve and continued right up to contemporary events. History is therefore written with connection to salvation. The Syriac historiographers shared this way of thinking.¹ In the Syriac language, chronicles are referred to by the periphrasis “*makt^ebonout zabnē*,” meaning writing, recording of the times, chronography.² This way of seeing events gave rise to a historiographical tradition in which each author presents his work as the latest installment of a work in progress, in line with the scheme of divine providence.

We must acknowledge that at the time of Barhebraeus, Syriac literature was in a phase of decline. In the thirteenth century, its scientific and cultural models were those that had been established by Muslim authors, rather than by Christians as it had been the case in the early centuries of Islam. In the preface to his *Candelabra of the sanctuaries*, Barhebraeus draws a gloomy picture of his times:

When our age, in just such a way, creates madmen, I am obliged to compare it to animals, and to poetically call it by their names, saying, “O age, thou art blind as a mole and prickly as a hedgehog; thy sage resembles an ass and thy architect is an owl [...]” I considered it indispensable to bring together the necessary questions in an encyclopaedic work, therein to philosophically consider and develop the theological disciplines along with those devoted to nature.³

1 On Eusebius of Caesarea and Syriac historiography, see Muriel Debié, “L’héritage de la chronique d’Eusèbe dans l’historiographie syriaque,” *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 6 (2006): 18–28.

2 On the concept of time in the Syriac chronicles, see Muriel Debié, “Temps linéaire, temps circulaire: chronologie et histoire dans les chroniques syriaques,” in *Proche-Orient ancien. Temps vécu, temps pensé*, eds. F. Briquel-Chatonnet and H. Lozachmeur (Paris, 1998), 177–196.

3 Grégoire Aboulfaradj dit Barhebraeus, *Le Candélabre des sanctuaires*, ed. and trans. J. Bakoš, *Patrologia orientalis*, t. XXII, fasc. 4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1930), 512–513.

This pessimistic view of his age was his reason for seeking to preserve Syriac literary production. He combined all aspects thereof in a series of works which constitute a veritable compendium of the knowledge of his day. Barhebraeus observes that the Syriac Christians, who, during the “golden age of Islam,” had brought knowledge and wisdom to the Arabs through the translation of ancient works, now sought knowledge and wisdom from Muslim scholars. Given the cultural situation of his time, it is not surprising that in the field of philosophy and the sciences, Barhebraeus turned to Muslim scholars. Thus, he completed a Syriac translation of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*, a text that was studied in the philosophical circles of Marāgha in Azerbaijan, with the commentaries of the Ismāʿīlī scholar Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, and a translation of the medical treatise, *Qānūn al-ṭibb*.⁴ Barhebraeus' familiarity with Islamic sources and Islamic culture, insofar as we can assess it by analyzing his works, is remarkable for a Christian writer. He displays a great openness to the thought of the Muslim scholars; as Herman Teule has shown, he was greatly influenced by Islamic mysticism, especially al-Ghazālī's (d. 1111) famous work *Ihyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn*,⁵ but also by other writers such as Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, a large part of whose *Akhlāq-i Nāṣirī* he integrated into his monumental *Cream of Science* (*Ḥewāt ḥekmtā*).⁶

Barhebraeus is a prolific author in many domains. What are the elements of originality in his works? His historical works mark the end point of Syriac historiography: the last great texts drawn up before his are those of Michael the Syrian (d. 1199)⁷ and the anonymous chronicle of 1234.⁸ My aim here is to

4 Hermann Teule, “The Transmission of Islamic Culture to the World of Syriac Christianity: Barhebraeus' Translation of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*. First Soundings,” in *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East Since the Rise of Islam*, eds. J.J. Van Ginkel, H.L. Murre-Van Den Berg and T.M. Van Lint (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 167–184.

5 Hermann Teule, “Al-Ghazali et Bar ʿEbroyo. Spiritualités comparées,” in *Actes du colloque VII* (CEROI: Antélias, 2001), 213–226.

6 M. Zonta, “Structure and Sources of Bar-Hebraeus' Practical Philosophy in *Cream of Science*,” in *Symposium syriacum III, Orientalia Christina Analecta* (1998): 279–292.

7 *Chronique de Michel le Syrien. Patriarche jacobite d'Antioche* (1166–1199), ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, 4 vols. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1899–1910). On this text, see Dorothea Weltecke, “The World Chronicle by Patriarch Michael the Great (1126–1199): Some Reflections,” *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/2 (1997): 6–30; “Originality and Function of Formal Structures in the Chronicle of Michael the Great,” *Hugoye Journal of Syriac Studies* 3/2 (2000). Available on-line at: <http://syrocom.cua.edu/Hugoye/index.html>; *Die “Beschreibung der Zeiten” von Mōr Michael dem Grossen* (1126–1199). *Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographiegeschichtlichen Kontext* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

8 *Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, Part. 1, ed. J.-B. Chabot, (Paris, 1920, CSCO. Scriptores Syri. Series tertia, tomus 14); *Anonymi Auctoris Chronicon ad annum*

concentrate on his historiographical works in Syriac and Arabic, with regard to the information that can be derived from these for the history of the Mongols, and, above all, since he was a direct witness, on the Ilkhans, as well as on the Christian communities of the time. To what extent does he provide new information beyond what is found in the Eastern Christian and the Islamic sources? Or to put the question differently, who are the Christian and Muslim writers on whom he relied? The question is not easy to answer for the period under consideration. For the period of the Crusades, by contrast, he is no innovator in his Arabic chronicle: he merely copies, almost verbatim, from the Arabic sources, in particular Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Kāmil fī l-ta'rikh*.⁹

Barhebraeus and his Historical Works

Barhebraeus is the author of two chronicles of dissimilar length. The first of these is a Syriac universal history in two parts. Barhebraeus wrote a secular history, *Makt'bonout zabnē*,¹⁰ known as the *Chronicon Syriacum*,¹¹ the last two chapters of which were published in Arabic translation with the title *Ta'rikh al-zamān* on the occasion of the 700th anniversary of his death.¹² This was in fact the publication in book form of a translation that Fr. Ishāq Armaleh had published in the review *al-Machriq* between 1949 and 1956. The second part of this chronicle is an ecclesiastical history (*Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*);¹³ an abridged Arabic version of this, too, was published in 1923–24.¹⁴ These translations, carried out in the first half of the twentieth century, attest to the fame of Barhebraeus' historical works which were vectors of intercultural transmis-

Christi 1234 pertinens, Part. II, trans. in Latin by A. Abouna with notes by J.-M. Fiey (Leuven: Peeters, 1974, CSCO. Scriptores Syri, tomus 154).

- 9 Hermann Teule, "Bar Hebraeus' Syriac & Arabic Seculars Chronicles," in *East & West in the Crusader States*, eds. K.N. Ciggaar, A. Davids and H. Teule (Leuven: Peeters, 1966), 38–49; Françoise Micheau, "Le *Kāmil* d'Ibn al-Athīr, source principale de l'Histoire des Arabes dans le *Mukhtasar* de Bar Hebraeus," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 68 (2005): 425–439.
- 10 *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. P. Bedjan (Paris-Leipzig, 1890).
- 11 Ernest A. Wallis Budge, *The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l-Faraj (1225–1286)*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Apa-Philo Press, 1976), I: XIV–XXXVI.
- 12 Abū al-Faraj Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-'Ibrī [Barhebraeus], *Ta'rikh al-zamān* (Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq, 1986).
- 13 *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. and trans. in Latin J.B. Abbeloos and Th. Lamy, 3 vols. (Paris-Leuven, 1872–1877).
- 14 *Al-Machriq* 21 (1923): 494–507, 660–671; 22 (1924): 182–192, 272–281, 364–372, 417–427, 519–527, 604–614.

sion. They are also a sign that the largely Arabized Christians were no longer able to read the Syriac original. Nevertheless, these works relating the history of their community had left their mark in the collective social memory. As one may observe, Barhebraeus, although a successor to Michael the Syrian, clearly follows the model of Eusebius of Caesarea. He divides “secular history” and “ecclesiastical history” into two separate volumes. He is also the author of an Arabic chronicle entitled *Mukhtaṣar ta’rīkh al-duwal*, which became known in the West at a very early date thanks to the extracts published by Edward Pocke in Oxford in 1650.¹⁵

It was long considered that the *Mukhtaṣar* was a summary of *Maktēbonout zabnē*.¹⁶ This claim is based on the evidence of Bar Ṣawma, the brother of Barhebraeus, in the long obituary that he dedicates to the latter in the ecclesiastical history, describing his final moments in Marāgha.¹⁷ But Bar Ṣawma does not say that his brother summarized it:

The most respected among the Arabs appealed to him to translate the chronicle that he had written in Syriac into the Saracen tongue that they might read it and have the benefit thereof [...]. In one month, he all but completed it, leaving only three folios.¹⁸

If this Arabic chronicle was indeed composed on the motion of his Muslim friends, it was probably begun before the last year that he spent in Marāgha prior to his death in 1286. The hagiographic nature of Bar Ṣawma’s obituary could explain why he claims that his brother composed the *Mukhtaṣar* within just one month. The account of Barhebraeus’ last days is entirely in line with the model of hagiographic literature. The death of a holy man is always a special moment for the hagiographer. It marks the coming to fruition of a holy life. In Christianity, the day a saint dies is the most important day of his life, for it is the day he is born in heaven (*dies natalis*): he enjoys immediate beatitude.¹⁹ At the moment of death, all founders choose to leave this world calmly and in the

15 *Specimen historiae Arabum*, reprint by J. White in 1806. Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Ta’rīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, ed. A. Ṣāliḥānī (Beirut: Imprimerie catholique, 1890). On the title, see Samir Khalil, “Trois manuscrits de la chronique arabe de Bar Hébraeus à Istanbul,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 46 (1980): 213–217.

16 On this question, see Denise Aigle, “Bar Hebraeus et son public,” *Le Muséon* 118/1–2 (2005): 90–92.

17 After his brother’s death, Bar Ṣawma continued writing both parts of the Syriac chronicle.

18 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* 111:469 (Syriac); 470 (Latin).

19 Marc Van Uytanghe, “L’essor du culte des saints et la question de l’eschatologie,” in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (III^e–XIII^e s.)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1991), 91–107.

cenobitic mode in order to perpetuate their work. Ill and aware that his final hour was approaching, Barhebraeus offered his advice “without fear of death, contrary to all men.”²⁰ He began to make his recommendations to his disciples, saying, “Remain in my love²¹ [...] every time that you are gathered together in love, I will be among you.”²² The disciples tore their clothes and threw dust on their heads.²³

When Barhebraeus set about composing *Makt^ebonout zabnē*, in 1276, he clearly wanted to follow in the footsteps of Michael the Syrian and add his own contribution to Syriac historiography by writing a universal history on a large scale.²⁴ But he displays a different goal in the preface to the *Mukhtaṣar*. There he sets out his principle of “selection” from the actions of rulers and wise men, and from good things and bad:²⁵ he selects certain stories to turn them into a different book. This selective approach towards the facts may explain the title of the book. In his introduction to *Makt^ebonout zabnē*, Barhebraeus says that he has made use of the resources of the Ilkhans’ library at Marāgha, where, he says, he found Syriac, Arabic and Persian manuscripts, as well as the archival documents that were kept there. For contemporary events, he claims to have relied on his own testimony. In addition, in the biographical entry dedicated to Shams al-Dīn al-Juwaynī, executed on 4 Sha‘bān 683/16 October 1284, he writes that the *Ta’rīkh-i jahāngushā* of the latter’s brother, ‘Aṭā’ Malik al-Juwaynī, was his main source.

Both the Syriac and the Arabic chronicles provide information concerning the Muslims in their penultimate chapters on “The Kings of the Arabs” (Syr. *ṭayāyē*) and their final chapters on “The Kings of the Mongols.”²⁶ In both chron-

20 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* III:471 (Syriac); 472 (Latin).

21 Jn 15, 9.

22 Matthew 18, 20, with a small variation: “Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, I am there amongst you.” Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* III:473 (Syriac); 474 (Latin).

23 On death of founders in Christianity, see for example Jacques Dalarun, “La mort des saints fondateurs. De Martin à François,” in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (III^e–XIII^e)*, 193–215, and in Islam Denise Aigle, “Sainteté et miracles. Deux saints fondateurs en Iran méridional (XI^e et XIV^e s.),” *Oriente moderno* 93 (2013): 79–100.

24 His presentation, however, departs from this model, as unlike Michael the Syrian, he does not combine secular and ecclesiastical history in one volume.

25 [Barhebraeus =] Ibn al-‘Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 1.

26 It must be underlined that Barhebraeus does not use the same term for the Mongols in his two chronicles. In Arabic he uses the term *mughūl*, whereas in the Syriac version he terms them Huns (*hunāniyē*), in line with the Christian view that these conquerors who had emerged from the steppe were the peoples of Gog and Magog of biblical eschatology.

icles, the part devoted to the “Kings of the Arabs” ends with the account of Hülegü’s conquest of Baghdad, an event which in the historian’s mind marked the transition to a new era, that of the advent of the Mongols. Barhebraeus’ proximity to the Ilkhans and the Persian staff of the bureaucracy confers a particular interest on his historiographical work, being both a witness to history as it unfolds and an actor therein given his position as Maphrien, prelate of the Syriac Orthodox Church.²⁷

The Selection of Events

The historian’s task is to collect accounts and integrate them chronologically into a linear ensemble. He thus makes choices among the written and oral sources that he uses and among the events that he himself has witnessed. A comparison of the succession of events related in the last chapter of the Syriac and Arabic versions of the secular chronicle is enlightening in this regard.²⁸

The first observation that occurs to one when comparing the events given in the two texts is that they are not always related in the same order. The Arabic version is much closer to chronological order, but, for greater clarity, I have classed them in the table in the order of the Syriac chronicle since the latter contains much information absent from the *Mukhtaṣar*. All information about the Christians has disappeared completely from the Arabic version of the chronicle, not just that concerning the internal affairs of the various Christian communities, but also information on what is in store for them when cities are besieged and captured.

Barhebraeus’ personal commentaries on certain events are omitted from the *Mukhtaṣar*. A case in point is the death of Baybars. In the Arabic text, he gives a very straightforward account of this,²⁹ while in the Syriac version, he comments on the event as follows:

27 On Ilkhans and Barhebraeus, see George Lane, “An Account of Gregory Bar Hebraeus Abu al-Faraj and His Relations with the Mongols of Persia,” *Hugoye Journal of Syriac Studies* 2/2 (1999). Available on-line at <http://syrocom.cua.edu/Hugoye/index.html>.

28 See Appendix 1, which gives only a selection of the events included in the two chronicles. Neither is the part of the Syriac chronicle composed by Barhebraeus’ brother after his death included.

29 Some hold that the cause of his death was an arrow that wounded him during combat against the Tatars and remained for long stuck in his thigh, while others say that he was poisoned, see [Barhebraeus =] Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 288.

The divine decree struck him and he ended his days on the 28th Muḥarram 676/1st July 1277. His plans, so laden with menace, were reduced to naught. He boasted and said like Pharaoh of old, “The Nile is mine, it is I who made it.”³⁰

He illustrates his commentary with a biblical quotation, taken from Ezechiel.³¹ The comparison between Pharaoh and Baybars, then sultan of Egypt, enables Barhebraeus to explain to the Christian communities that God had thus taken vengeance on the Egyptian armies that had inflicted heavy losses upon them, especially during their raids against the Franks and Cilicia, but also against certain native Christian of Syria. Barhebraeus uses the parallel between the Egyptian Pharaoh and Baybars in the form of an *exemplum*. What happens in the present has justification in the past. This *exemplum* seeks to teach the historical causality that strikes Christian communities, but which is compensated for by divine providence in their favor. Present history is thus seen as an extension of sacred history.

The *Mukhtaṣar* contains supplementary details on a number of iconic political events. It also gives various exchanges of diplomatic correspondence, including a letter addressed by Hülegü to the last Ayyubid prince of Aleppo and Damascus, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsuf, which, although it is a “copy,” is the closest document we have to the original. Barhebraeus probably copied it in the library of Marāgha.³² He also preserves two letters exchanged between Tegüder Aḥmad (r. 680–83/1282–84), the first Ilkhan to have converted to Islam,³³ and the Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Sayf al-Dīn Qalāwūn (r. 679–89/1280–90).³⁴ These copies of diplomatic letters included in the *Mukhtaṣar* are the oldest documents relating this correspondence. Tegüder Aḥmad’s stated aim was to make peace with the rival power that the Mamluk sultanate represented. In reality, this peace proposal was an implicit demand for submission. Barhebraeus, in his Syriac chronicle, gives a short summary of the end of the Ilkhan’s letter:

30 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 538.

31 Ez 29, 3: “Speak, and say: Thus say the Lord God: Behold, I come against thee, Pharaoh king of Egypt,” Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 538.

32 On this letter, see chapter 9.

33 Reuven Amitai, “The Conversion of Tegüder Ilkhan to Islam,” *JSAI* 25 (2001): 15–43.

34 [Barhebraeus =] Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 289–292: Tegüder Aḥmad’s letter; 292–296: reply al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn.

In line with God's commandment and with the law that our father Genghis Khan laid down, destiny³⁵ has entrusted me with kingship over the Mongols [...]. I desire that fighting, warfare and pillage cease [...]. If you are of like mind, support the cause of peace and submission. If you persist in your rebellion, God will hold you to account for the blood that will then be spilled by the oppressed.³⁶

In this summary of the Arabic version of the letter, Barhebraeus has suppressed the Qur'ānic quotes that were intended to illustrate and justify on religious terms this implicit demand for submission. It may be that he judged it useful to convey the end of this letter in his Syriac chronicle so as to inform the Syriac communities that, although converted to Islam, Tegüder Aḥmad had retained the traditional Mongol political line, albeit in an Islamic cloak.

In *Maktebonout zabnē*, the biographical entries reflect the author's judgement concerning the person in question, and are less stereotypical than in the *Mukhtaṣar*. I will give but one very indicative example. In his Arabic chronicle, Barhebraeus mentions in a mere three lines the death of Hülegü and his wife Doquz Khatun. He describes Hülegü as a magnanimous ruler who surrounded himself with wise men (*al-ḥukamā'*) and scholars of the religious sciences (*al-ʿulamā'*).³⁷ He then writes that after the death of the Ilkhan, his wife too died. He describes her as a woman endowed with great knowledge (*al-khibra*) and fine judgement (*al-rāy*).³⁸ This short biographical notice is, indeed, positive, but Barhebraeus does not give any very personal opinion. The entry follows the Islamic model. By contrast, in his Syriac chronicle, he dedicates a longer entry to Hülegü and his wife, in which we find the author's positive judgement, but with additions that reflect the view that the eastern Christians had of the royal couple. He comments thus on their deaths:

In the Greek year 1576, the year 1256 of our era, in early June, the King of Kings Hulaku [Hülegü] departed this world. He had no equal for wisdom, magnanimity, or the excellence of his rule. In the summer, Tokuz Khatun

35 Here destiny is an allusion to the mandate of Eternal Heaven.

36 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 548.

37 In Islamic sources, Hülegü is also described as surrounded by wise men. Rashīd al-Dīn wrote: "His court [of Hülegü] was adorned by the presence of scholars and wise men (*ʿulamā' wa ḥukamā'*)," see Rashīd al-Dīn/Alizade, 111:91. See Reuven Amitai, "Hülegü and his Wise men: topos or Reality," in *Politics, Patronage and the Transmission of Knowledge in 13th–15th Century Tabriz*, 15–34.

38 [Barhebraeus =] Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 284–285.

[Doquz Khatun] too, the most faithful queen, departed. The death of these two stars that had brought triumph to the religion of the Messiah caused great affliction among the Christians.³⁹

After the trauma provoked by the Mongol conquests in Anatolia, Armenia and northern Syria, the Armenian and Georgian principalities submitted to the Mongols and became their allies. The Armenian elite made numerous attempts to promote an image of Mongol rulers as friends of the Christians.⁴⁰ Identical opinions to those of Barhebraeus can be found in the Armenian historians. Vardan Arevelc'i (1200–71) writes:

Houlagou [Hülegü]'s wife, named Dôkhous-Khathoun [Doquz Khatun], was in fact a Christian [...]. She held the Christians in sincere affection and in particular regard [...]. The same went for Houlagou [...]. The Tartars carried with them a canvas tent in the shape of a church. The *jamahar* (rattle) would call the faithful to prayer.⁴¹

An emblematic text for the tendency to reappraise the Mongols in positive terms at the end of the 13th century is the *History of the Region of Sisakan* by Step'anos Örbëlean (1260?–1304).⁴² We also have many accounts indicating that the Christians considered Hülegü and Doquz Khatun as the “Constantine and Helen” of the age. He writes:

The great and pious sovereign, master of the world, hope and providence of the Christians, Houlavou-Ghan [Hülegü] died [...] along with his most blessed wife Toghouz-Khatun [Doquz Khatun], poisoned by the guileful Khoja-Sahib [Shams al-Dīn al-Juwaynī]. God alone knows if they were inferior in piety to Constantine and Helen.⁴³

39 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 521.

40 See Alexander Osipian, “Baptised Mongol Rulers, Prester John and the Magi: Armenian Image of the Mongols Produced for the Westerns Readers in the Mid-Thirteenth–Early Fourteenth Centuries,” in *Caucasus During the Mongol Period—Der Kaukasus in der Mongolenzeit*, eds. Jügen Tubach, Sophia G. Vashalomidze and Manfred Zimmer (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2012), 153–167. See also Zaroui Pogossian, “Armenians, Mongols and the End of Times: An Overview of 13th Century Sources,” in *Caucasus During the Mongol Period*, 169–198.

41 Vardan Arevelc'i, “Les Mongols d'après les historiens arméniens,” *JA* (1860): 290.

42 He personally knew three Ilkhans: Arghun, Geikhetü, and Gazan Khan.

43 [Step'anos Örbëlean], *Histoire de la Siounie*, trans. M. Brosset (Saint-Petersbourg, 1864), 234–235.

Barhebraeus' account matches that of Armenian historian Vardan Arevelc'i in whom he may have found inspiration. But did he understand Armenian? Dioscorus of Gazarta wrote a biography in which he claimed that this great scholar had some knowledge of Armenian.⁴⁴ However, when he was ordained in Sīs, the capital of Cilicia, his sermon had to be translated into Armenian.⁴⁵ Barhebraeus often, in speaking of the authorities on which he relies, uses imprecise terms, such as *malfōnō* or indeed "one of my brothers."⁴⁶ The hypothesis may therefore be put forward that he may in some cases have used Armenian oral accounts that were transmitted to him through Syriac. In his *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, he writes that certain monks (*dayrōyē*) of the monastery of Mār Mattai understood Armenian.⁴⁷ Thus, in choosing and selecting the accounts that he considered worthy to engage the interest of his readers, Barhebraeus composed two different chronicles, even if most of the chronological and political information remains fundamentally identical in the Syriac and Arabic texts.

Barhebraeus and the Use of Sources

The main information on the Mongols, appearing in the second-last chapter of both texts, concerns their geographical origins, their situation before Genghis Khan, the coming to power of the latter on the steppe, an account of their various conquests, a description of Mongol law,⁴⁸ their cultural relations with other tribes, and, finally, an account of the Great Khan's death. All this information is scattered throughout the narrative of events that occurred in Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt, which have themselves no direct relation with the Mongols. Barhebraeus, as we have seen above, asserts in *Makt^ebonout zabnē* that his main source is al-Juwaynī's chronicle, composed between 1252 and 1260. That chronicle recounts the conquests and reign of Genghis Khan and the Great Khans who succeeded him up to Möngke, as well as Hülegü's progress in the lands of Islam. But, although the text was completed after the capture of Baghdad, al-Juwaynī makes no mention of its fall. Having studied the Persian chronicle and Barhebraeus' Syriac text, I can ascertain that the latter

44 Hermann Teule, "Gregory Barhebraeus and his Time: The Syrian Renaissance," *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 3 (2003): 22.

45 Hermann Teule, "Gregory Barhebraeus and his Time," 38, n. 16.

46 Hermann Teule, "Gregory Barhebraeus and his Time," 21.

47 Hermann Teule, "Gregory Barhebraeus and his Time," 38–39, n. 16.

48 On the Mongol law, see chapter 7.

had direct access to the Persian text and translated fragments of it into Syriac for use in the second-last chapter of his chronicle's secular history.

Pier Giorgio Borbone has very clearly shown that in *Makte^ebonout zabnē*, Barhebraeus relies on al-Juwaynī for events to which he was not a direct witness.⁴⁹ But I thought it of interest to study how he used this source and to ask whether he also used al-Juwaynī in composing his Arabic chronicle. As a first step, I compared the organization of information in *Ta'riḫ-i jahāngushā* and in *Makte^ebonout zabnē*. I was thus able to see that he delves into al-Juwaynī, taking much information from him, sometimes with mistakes as to the names of tribes and of places. But an interesting fact, not noted by Pier Giorgio Borbone, is that he provides new information. I have also observed that al-Juwaynī is probably one of the sources used by Barhebraeus for a great deal of the information on the Mongols included in the second-last chapter of *Mukhtaṣar*. I have selected a number of relevant examples of the way Barhebraeus uses *Ta'riḫ-i jahāngushā*.⁵⁰

His account of the history of the Mongols before Genghis Khan is certainly based on the oral sources collected by al-Juwaynī during his stay in Qaraqorum, which was long before Hülegü's arrival in Persian territory.⁵¹ The second account retraces Genghis Khan's rise to power on the steppe. In *Makte^ebonout zabnē*, Barhebraeus writes that: "Ong Khan, who was John, king of the Christians, reigned over a tribe of barbarian Huns who were called Krīt."⁵² Ong Khan thus appears, correctly, as king of the Kerait. I will not enter into the detail of the complicated events surrounding the elimination of the king of the Kerait. But, departing on this occasion from al-Juwaynī and relying probably on an account circulating on the steppe which had acquired the status of legend, Barhebraeus confuses Ong Khan with Küchlüg, the son of the Naiman' leader, who had indeed married the daughter of the Buddhist king of the Qara Khitai of Transoxiana.⁵³ This passage concerning Ong Khan is absent from al-Juwaynī, who for his part does not confuse Ong Khan with Küchlüg. Barhebraeus has inserted this into his account of the rise to power of Genghis Khan probably on the basis of oral sources of Nestorian origin.

49 For a comparison between the Syriac version of the chronicle and these of 'Aṭā' Malik al-Juwaynī, see Pier Giorgio Borbone, "Barhebraeus e Juwaynī: Un cronista siro et la sua fonte Persiana," *Evo* 27 (2004): 121–144.

50 See Appendix 2.

51 Similar accounts were produced by John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruc, both of whom also stayed in the Mongol capital.

52 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 409.

53 On this passage concerning Ong Khan and King John in Barhebraeus, see chapter 2.

This legend was still in circulation at the time of Barhebraeus, who was in contact not only with Jacobite Christians, but also with Nestorians, the latter being many and influential at the Ilkhanid court. In other words, Barhebraeus “reworks” al-Juwaynī’s material. It is of particular interest that he includes the King John episode in *Mukhtaṣar*, while omitting all the Biblical quotes justifying Genghis Khan’s victory. This is a clue that may support the theory that the Arabic text was intended for a Muslim readership, as Barhebraeus’ brother asserts.

Another passage that is useful in demonstrating how Barhebraeus makes use of al-Juwaynī, by contrast, follows the latter’s Persian text closely. It is the episode concerning the role played by Teb Tenggeri in Genghis Khan’s election. As reported by al-Juwaynī, this account reflects the ideology of his successors who claimed a mandate from Heaven to conquer the world. It is transmitted, almost verbatim, by Barhebraeus in his Syriac and Arabic chronicles,⁵⁴ providing further evidence that Barhebraeus has adopted the *Ta’rīkh-i jahāngushā* of al-Juwaynī, along with oral sources, as his main source for everything concerning Genghis Khan.

It is relatively easy to understand how Barhebraeus “worked” on the facts supplied by al-Juwaynī: he makes selections and reorganizes the information by summarizing it and adding the oral accounts that were in circulation in Christian circles. The question of the sources used by Barhebraeus in drafting the final chapter of his chronicles is somewhat more difficult to answer. Has he used Christian or Islamic oral sources? Does he scrupulously follow one or more Arabic sources, as he does for the periods of which he was not a personal witness?

I have consulted a number of the Arabic sources in which Barhebraeus could have acquired his information. Abū Shamā (d. 655/1268) is the author of a history of some importance, in particular for the Ayyubids, *Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn fī akhbār al-dawlatayn al-Ṣalāḥiyya wa-l-Nūrīyya*, which he completed in 659/1261. This text pays no heed to the Mongols, but Barhebraeus could have made use of its sequel (*Dhayl ‘alā l-rawḍatayn*), also the work of Abū Shamā who continued working on it until his death. As Nikita Éliséeff points out, from 625/1228 on he uses his personal notes.⁵⁵ His information on Bilād al-Shām is first-hand. He was witness to Hülegü’s attacks on Syria, but once again we do not find any passages copied word for word. The chronicle of al-Makīn b. al-‘Amīd (d. 672/1273), a Coptic author born in Egypt but living in Damascus,

54 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Syriacum*, 409; [Barhebraeus =] Ibn al-‘Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 226–227.

55 Nikita Elisséeff, *Nūr al-Dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades (511–569H/1118–1174)*, 2 vols. (Damascus: Institut français de Damas, 1967) 1:53.

then raised my expectations.⁵⁶ This author appears to have met Barhebraeus in 652/1254.⁵⁷ A witness to the Mongol conquest of Syria, Ibn al-ʿAmīd negotiated with Hūlegū, which earned him a long period of imprisonment.⁵⁸ He is the author of a universal history, *Nahj al-sadīd wa-l-durr al-farīd*.⁵⁹ I compared *Mukhtaṣar* to the part of this chronicle edited by Claude Cahen, but unfortunately, this path led to nowhere. For example, as with Barhebraeus we find accounts of the Mongol invasion of Anatolia, of the capture of Baghdad, and of the capture of Mayyāfāriqīn and Aleppo. But while they have the same tone as those in *Mukhtaṣar*, they are not identical in their formulations, whereas when Barhebraeus uses Ibn al-Athīr's *Kāmil fī l-taʾrīkh*, he copies it almost word for word.

For the moment, we do not know which Arabic sources Barhebraeus used. But having observed the way Barhebraeus used ʿAṭāʾ Malik al-Juwaynī, it is possible that he delved into various Arabic sources and “reworked” their text, which would explain why it has been difficult to find one basic source. He may have used a source that has disappeared, one that is preserved in a later text, or simply one that has not yet been published. For the last chapter of his chronicles, it is difficult to say in which Arabic sources he may have found his information, but for many of the events that he relates, he relies on his own experience and on information that he was able to collect orally.

What Value Should be Attached to Barhebraeus' Chronicles for the Mongol Period?

Several Muslim authors have relied on his Arabic chronicle, as Claude Cahen has shown in the case of Ibn Shaddād's history of the Jazīra.⁶⁰ Mamluk and Persian historians who have passed on the diplomatic correspondence used the *Mukhtaṣar*. These letters confer a high degree of importance on the chronicle, as Barhebraeus gives us their oldest versions. He seems to have had access

56 The part of the chronicle corresponding to the period under consideration in this article has been published by Claude Cahen, “La ‘Chronique des Ayyoubides’ d'al-Makīn b. al-ʿAmīd,” *BEO* 15 (1955–57): 127–184.

57 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* III:719 (Syriac text); 720 (Latin).

58 Claude Cahen, “La Chronique des Ayyoubides,” 112.

59 On this author, see Nikita Éliasséff, *Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades*, 55, and Claude Cahen, “La Chronique des Ayyoubides,” 109–115.

60 Claude Cahen, “La Djazira au milieu du treizième siècle d'après ʿIzz-ad din ibn Chaddad,” *Revue des études islamiques* 1 (1934): 116–128.

to originals, or at least to copies of the originals held by the Ilkhanid chancellery. These letters have come down to us with numerous variations.

The Syriac chronicle includes information on the internal political affairs of the Ilkhans and on the Christian communities which is not to be found in *Mukhtaṣar*, making it a source of indisputable interest. These two texts complete each other perfectly. For the second-last chapter, however, one cannot say that he provides any new information compared to al-Juwaynī, other than oral legendary sources which are of interest for the history of representations and for a study of how Barhebraeus used on his sources.

In addition to the value of the chronicles for the history of the Mongols, *Makt^ebonout zabnē* is of interest for the history of the Christian communities, in particular the Syriacs, Armenians and Nestorians, who are, with few exceptions, conspicuously absent from Islamic sources. The way Barhebraeus composes his Syriac chronicle shows that this text is intended to teach the lessons of history to the Jacobite Christian community. As can be seen from the tables comparing *Makt^ebonout zabnē* and *Mukhtaṣar*, Barhebraeus, a direct witness to the events he catalogues in the last chapter of his Syriac chronicle, has composed, or so it appears to me, a community history. He details what happened in the bishoprics of which he had charge, and in the towns and villages where important Jacobite Christian communities lived. He details the eventful history of the monasteries and describes Christian festivals and the difficulties encountered in trying to celebrate them in peace. Everything that relates directly to the history of the Christians is part of a symbolic language. Barhebraeus seeks to demonstrate that, in the end, it is God who decides their fate. By offering new accounts of divine grace in worldly affairs, the historian is in fact extending sacred history.

One may also hypothesize that this Syriac chronicle, of which only two full manuscripts exist,⁶¹ held in the Bodleian library in Oxford, one of them being a very large folio written in a bold hand in four columns,⁶² may have been intended for a pedagogical purpose: the reading in church, or to the congregation, of the passages concerning the Christian communities. It was, indeed, as a history of their community that the Jacobite religious leaders perceived the *Makt^ebonout zabnē*, which they continued up to 1493.⁶³

61 Hunt n° 1 and Hunt n° 52, Barhebraeus/Budge, viii.

62 This is manuscript Hunt 1. It was copied in 1498 by a monk named Joseph. Manuscript Hunt 52 is older, and was probably copied in the fourteenth century, see Barhebraeus/Budge, viii.

63 Jean-Marie Fiey, "Esquisse d'une biographie de Bar Hébraeus (m. 1286)," *Parole de l'Orient* 13 (1986): 299.

Barhebraeus adapts his method of historical narrative to the cultural references of his intended readers. The Syriac chronicle is written in the tradition of Michael the Syrian, but with an emphasis, for the period whose events the writer himself witnessed, on their edifying, exemplary and didactic aspect, halfway between historiography and hagiography.⁶⁴ *Mukhtaṣar*, on the other hand, is inspired more by the Islamic model. It follows the chronological order of events more closely, the author makes no personal commentary, the obituaries are grouped together at the end of each year, and the biographical entries correspond more or less to the stereotyped model of Arabic biographical dictionaries.

How reliable is Barhebraeus for the history of the Mongols? In the end, the more thought I give to the use of medieval sources, the more cautious I become in using them. Now, when writing a history book or an article, I make choices when selecting the information I use from my sources, knowing at the same time that the historians I am using made choices themselves. Writing history means making choices, and we must therefore be conscious that we are creating an image of the society we attempt to reconstruct, in the image of the reconstruction previously carried out by the historiographers on whom we rely. It is also necessary to be aware that the historiographer adapts to the public for which he writes his texts. Chronicles are also destined to serve as works of propaganda on behalf of rulers, great families or a particular community. They are intended to preserve a “collective memory,” an “image” that one wishes to leave to future generations. Certainly, Barhebraeus like other medieval historians is reliable, as long as we pay heed to the way he uses his sources and decode the message that he wants to deliver.

Appendix 1

Maktʿbonout zabnē

Mukhtaṣar taʾriḫ al-duwal

After the death of the caliph, Hülegü appoints a governor in Baghdad: ‘Alī Bahādur [al-Khʿārizmī].

Long passage on the situation of the Christians and the fate awaiting them after an Arab slanders them to Hülegü.

After the death of the caliph, Hülegü appoints a *shihna* and *wulāt* in Baghdad (*they are not named*).

Omitted from the Arabic text.

64 Denise Aigle, “Bar Hebraeus et son public,” 98–102.

*Maktʿbonout zabnē**Mukhtaṣar taʾriḫ al-duwal*

Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ sends his son to Hülegü; he then comes to him in person. Siege of Mayyāfāriqīn (*some additional details*).

Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ sends his son to Hülegü; he then comes to him in person. Siege of Mayyāfāriqīn.

Hülegü asks al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ to pledge allegiance to him; he sends his son; several embassies asking him to come in person are mentioned.

Hülegü asks al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ to pledge allegiance to him; he sends his son.

Omitted from the Syriac text.

Text of a letter Hülegü addressed to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ dated 657; the letter is carried by Mongol envoys.

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ sends his son; Hülegü is angered; Hülegü is referred to by the Persian title *Shāhānshāh*.

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ sends his son; Hülegü is angered; Hülegü is referred to by the Arabic title *Malik al-arḍ*.

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ comes before Hülegü and swears allegiance to him.

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ comes before Hülegü and swears allegiance to him.

Hülegü asks the Rūm Saljuq sultans, ʿIzz al-Dīn and his brother Rukn al-Dīn, to pledge allegiance to him; he then divides Anatolia between the two.

Hülegü asks the Rūm Saljuq sultans, ʿIzz al-Dīn and his brother Rukn al-Dīn, to vow allegiance to him; he then divides Anatolia between the two.

Additional information on the visit of one of the sultans to a Christian monastery.

Omitted from the Arabic version

Siege and capture of Aleppo by Hülegü (*many details as to the fate of the Christians, who are also massacred*).

Siege and capture of Aleppo by Hülegü (*all information concerning the Christians is omitted*).

News of the fall of Mayyāfāriqīn (*many details as to the fate of the Christians*).

News of the fall of Mayyāfāriqīn (*all information concerning the Christians is omitted*).

Capture of Mārdīn due to the refusal of the lord of the town to submit.

Capture of Mārdīn due to the refusal of the lord of the town to submit.

Rabban Simeon places himself at Hülegü's service: the Christians prosper.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Mongol defeat at ʿAyn Jālūt.

Mongol defeat at ʿAyn Jālūt.

Mongol reprisals against al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ: he is killed along with his entourage.

Mongol reprisals against al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ: he is killed along with his entourage (*more detailed than the Syriac version*).

(cont.)

<i>Makt'bonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar ta'rikh al-duwal</i>
Enthronement of the Great Khan Qubilai.	Enthronement of the Great Khan Qubilai.
Baybars takes power after killing the Mamluk sultan of Egypt, al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Quṭuz.	Baybars takes power after killing the Mamluk sultan of Egypt, al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Quṭuz.
Return of the Mongols to Syria.	Return of the Mongols to Syria (<i>additional details on the role played by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūnis</i>).
Mosuli affairs: episode of the letter sent from Egypt to the city's [Christian] governor, plotting against the Mongols; reprisals of the Muslim troops against the Christians.	Mosuli affairs: episode of the letter sent from Egypt to the city's [Christian] governor, plotting against the Mongols (<i>the considerable information about the Christians in the Syriac version is omitted</i>).
Baybars sends a young black, of caliphal ancestry, to take Baghdad: he is defeated [this was the first Abbasid caliph of Cairo, placed on the throne by Baybars].	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Siege of Mosul by the Mongols.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Death of Hülegü and his wife Doquz Khatun (<i>eulogy of the two "stars"</i>).	Death of Hülegü and his wife Doquz Khatun (<i>their death is recorded without any comment as to her having been Christian</i>).
Enthronement of the Ilkhan Abaqa.	Enthronement of the Ilkhan Abaqa.
Marriage of Abaqa to the Byzantine emperor's daughter [Despina Khatun].	Marriage of Abaqa to the Byzantine emperor's daughter [Despina Khatun] (<i>Barhebraeus' personal commentary is omitted</i>).
Baybars demands that the king of Cilicia, Het'um I, submit to him and pay the poll tax; the latter asks for Mongol assistance; arrival of the Mamluk troops in Cilicia; Leon, the king's son, is taken prisoner (<i>many details on the fate of the Armenian Christian populations</i>).	Baybars demands that the king of Cilicia, Het'um I, submit to him and pay the poll tax; the latter asks for Mongol assistance; arrival of the Mamluk troops in Cilicia; Leon, the king's son, is taken prisoner (<i>omission of the destruction of churches and convents</i>).

*Makt'bonout zabnē**Mukhtaṣar ta'riḫ al-duwal*

Negotiations between Het'um I and Baybars for the release of Prince Leon in exchange for the emir Sunqur al-Ashqar [who had been taken prisoner by the Mongols]. The Mamluks invade Cilicia. Sunqur al-Ashqar is freed by Abaqa, who takes pity on King Het'um I.

Negotiations between Het'um I and Baybars for the release of Prince Leon in exchange for the emir Sunqur al-Ashqar [who had been taken prisoner by the Mongols]. The Mamluks invade Cilicia. Sunqur al-Ashqar is freed by Abaqa, who takes pity on King Het'um I (*additional details on the return of Prince Leon*).

Story of a man from Taghrīt who had converted to Islam and whom the Nestorian catholicos wished to drown in the Tigris.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Capture of Antioch by Baybars.

Capture of Antioch by Baybars.

Execution of the bishop of Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Earthquake in Cilicia.

Earthquake in Cilicia (*no reference to the destroyed churches and monasteries*).

Death of the king of Cilicia, Het'um I, and election of his son Leon.

Death of the king of Cilicia, Het'um I, and election of his son Leon.

The Ismā'īlī attack Shams al-Dīn al-Juwaynī, the head of the Baghdad *dīwān*: repression of the Christians.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Some of the great men of Cilicia betray King Leon again.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Earthquake in Azerbaijan.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Story of a Nestorian monk who has sexual relations with a Muslim woman, and renounces Islam during Lent.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Death of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī; his biography.

Death of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī; his biography (*structured differently and treated as a chapter, faṣl, in the chronicle*).

Story of the Jewish goldsmith murdered by criminals who sought to rob him and his wife.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

Story of the Arab dervishes who came to Tarṣūs on a pilgrimage; the rumour spreads that Baybars is one of them.

Omitted from the Arabic version.

(cont.)

<i>Makṭʿbonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar taʾrīkh al-duwal</i>
The Mamluk army in Cilicia; much pillaging, which affects the Christians.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
The Turkmens and Kurds of the Mosul region attack the Christians.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
A caravan of Christian merchants coming from Cilicia is attacked by Turkmens, and many are killed.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Cilicia is attacked by the Turkmens and horsemen from the Egyptian army; the constable Smbat and other Armenian leaders are killed.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Before all these events: violent winds in Mosul.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
The bishop of the Armenians is killed by a Muslim man.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Struggle between Baybars and the Mongols in Rūm; treachery of [Muʿīn al-Dīn] Parwāna [strongman of the Saljuq sultanate of Anatolia which was allied to the Mongols].	Struggle between Baybars and the Mongols in Rūm; treachery of [Muʿīn al-Dīn] Parwāna [strongman of the Saljuq sultanate of Anatolia which was allied to the Mongols] (<i>the many details on the fate of the Christians given in the Syriac chronicle are omitted</i>).
Abaqa takes revenge on [Muʿīn al-Dīn] Parwāna, putting him to death (<i>additional commentary on the traitor's behaviour</i>).	Abaqa takes revenge on [Muʿīn al-Dīn] Parwāna, putting him to death.
Death of Baybars (<i>various remarks on the reasons for his death</i>).	Death of Baybars (<i>different remarks on the reason for his death</i>).
An anecdote concerning Baybars' brother, set during the war between Baybars and the Mongols.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
The Kurds capture the monks of the Mār Mattai monastery.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Plot of a certain Bābā, a Persian, against Masʿūd, the Christian governor of Mosul.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Blessing of the water at the Epiphany.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>

<i>Makt'bonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar ta'riḫ al-duwal</i>
Story of the Baghdad executioner.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
The Egyptian armies in Rūm and Cilicia: the Christians subjected to pillage.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Sunqur al-Ashqar refuses to recognize the new sultan, Baybars' successor.	Sunqur al-Ashqar refuses to recognize the new sultan, Baybars' successor.
The Mamluks besiege Marqab; the Hospitallers, forewarned, conceal themselves outside the fortress and defeat the Mamluk troops.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Clash between Mongols and Mamlouks between Ḥamā and Ḥimṣ; Mamluk victory.	Clash between Mongols and Mamlouks between Ḥamā and Ḥimṣ; Mamluk victory. (<i>additional details</i>).
Mengü Temür, Abaqa's brother, decides to come to Syria after the defeat of the Mongols; he is poisoned in Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar.	Mengü Temür, Abaqa's brother, decides to come to Syria after the defeat of the Mongols (<i>additional details on the military campaigns</i>).
Death of Abaqa (<i>before his death he takes part in a Christian feast; additional comments compared to the Arabic version</i>).	Death of Abaqa (<i>as in the Syriac version, Barhebraeus mentions that before his death he took part in a Christian feast</i>).
Enthronement of Tegüder Aḥmad.	Enthronement of Tegüder Aḥmad.
Tegüder Aḥmad sends a letter to the Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn proposing peace (<i>the letter is heavily abridged, with only the end given</i>).	Tegüder Aḥmad sends a letter to the Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn proposing peace.
<i>Omitted from the Syriac version.</i>	Full text of the letter.
<i>Omitted from the Syriac version.</i>	Full text of the sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn's response.
Mission of the shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān to Egypt, and his eventual imprisonment by al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn (<i>many details</i>).	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Power struggle between Tegüder Aḥmad and Arghun.	Power struggle between Tegüder Aḥmad and Arghun (<i>additional details</i>).
Enthronement of Arghun.	Enthronement of Arghun.
Execution of Tegüder Aḥmad.	Execution of Tegüder Aḥmad.
Arghun appoints another Christian governor, Mas'ūd's son, to Mosul.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>

(cont.)

<i>Maktʿbonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar taʾriḫ al-duwal</i>
Killing of Shams-Dīn al-Juwaynī (<i>many personal comments</i>).	Killing of Shams-Dīn al-Juwaynī (<i>personal comments omitted</i>).
Al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn releases the shaykh ʿAbd al-Raḥmān from prison when he learns that the Ilkhan Arghun has taken power.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
<i>Yarligh</i> of the Ilkhan Arghun justifying the overthrow of Tegüder Aḥmad: he did not follow the law of his fathers but rather that of the Arabs.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
A hen lays an egg as big as a goose's.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>
Pillage of Mosul and the region by Kurds, Turkmens and Arabs, along with horsemen from the Egyptian army (<i>many details as to the fate of the Christians</i>).	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>

Appendix 2

Comparative table between ʿAṭāʾ Malik al-Juwaynī and the Chronicles of Barhebraeus

<i>Maktʿbonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar taʾriḫ al-duwal</i>	<i>Taʾriḫ-i jahāngushā</i>
<i>The Mongols before Genghis Khan</i>	<i>The Mongols before Genghis Khan</i>	<i>The Mongols before Genghis Khan</i>
Their geographical origin, then account of their misery. They [the Mongols] had clothes made out of the skins of dogs and wolves. They ate rat meat and other repugnant animals; they drank horse milk.	<i>Omitted from the Arabic version.</i>	A much more detailed account; ʿAṭāʾ Malik al-Juwaynī emphasizes the role that Genghis Khan played in relieving them from their distress.

<i>Makt'bonout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar ta'riḵh al-duwal</i>	<i>Ta'riḵh-i jahāngushā</i>
<i>Genghis Khan's rise to power: the struggle with Ong Khan, leader of the Kerait</i>	<i>Genghis Khan's rise to power: the struggle with Ong Khan, leader of the Kerait</i>	<i>Genghis Khan's rise to power: the struggle with Ong Khan, leader of the Kareit</i>
As a whole, it agrees with 'Aṭā' Malik al-Juwaynī, but Barhebraeus adds an original episode: Ong Khan is called "King John" (<i>Malik Yūḥanā</i>), a Christian leader of the Krīt (Kerait). Genghis Khan seized the power. Holy Scriptures justified Ong Khan's defeat.	As a whole, it agrees with 'Aṭā' Malik al-Juwaynī, but Barhebraeus adds an original episode: Ong Khan is called "King John" (<i>Malik Yūḥanā</i>), a Christian leader of the Krīt (Kerait). Genghis Khan seized the power. But here no Holy Scriptures justified Ong Khan's defeat.	'Aṭā' Malik al-Juwaynī begins by giving a religious legitimacy to the seizure of power by the future Great Khan: "Genghis Khan carries the name, Temüjin, according to God's decree (<i>ba-taqdīr wa ḥukm</i>) he would be master of all inhabited kingdoms." No allusion is made to the fact that Ong Khan is called "King John."
<i>The Teb Tenggeri episode</i>	<i>The Teb Tenggeri episode</i>	<i>The Teb Tenggeri episode</i>
God foretells Genghis Khan's election. At that time, there came a man who, I heard from trustworthy Mongols, used to walk naked, in the middle of winter, in the desert and the mountains. When he returned, he declared: "God spoke to me, and He sais: I gave the entire face of the Earth to Temüjin and his children and I have named him Genghis Khan. Tell him to be just." And they call him Tobot Tengri (<i>twbwt tngry</i>) [Teb Tenggeri].	God foretells Genghis Khan's election. At that time, there came a man who, I heard from trustworthy Mongols, used to walk naked, in the middle of winter, in the desert and the mountains. When he returned, he declared: "God spoke to me, and He sais: I gave the entire face of the Earth to Temüjin and his children and I have named him Genghis Khan. Tell him to be just." And they call Tubut Tinkrī [Teb Tenggeri].	God foretells Genghis Khan's election. At that time, there came a man who, I heard from trustworthy Mongols, used to walk naked, in the middle of winter, in the desert and the mountains. When he returned, he declared: "God spoke to me, and He sais: I gave the entire face of the Earth (<i>tamāmat rüy-i zamīn</i>) to Temüjin and his children and I have named him Genghis Khan. Tell him to be just." And they call Tubut Tinkrī [Teb Tenggeri].

(cont.)

<i>Makṭūb-nout zabnē</i>	<i>Mukhtaṣar taʾrīkh al-duwal</i>	<i>Taʾrīkh-i jahāngushā</i>
<i>The laws established by Genghis Khan</i>	<i>The laws established by Genghis Khan</i>	<i>The laws established by Genghis Khan</i>
Barhebraeus takes up the story of ‘Aṭā’ Malik al-Juwaynī, but he summarizes extensively and makes several small changes.	Omitted from the Arabic text.	A much more developed account, placed just after the introduction in praise of Genghis Khan.
<i>Account of Genghis Khan’s death</i>	<i>Account of Genghis Khan’s death</i>	<i>Account of Genghis Khan’s death</i>
Barhebraeus relies on ‘Aṭā’ Malik al-Juwaynī, but in a very abridged account.	Barhebraeus relies on ‘Aṭā’ Malik al-Juwaynī, but the account is substantially abridged and placed in the obituaries.	A much more detailed account.