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HAGGAI MAZUZ

Abstract
In his Kitāb al-Mawāʿız waʾl-ʿIbār fī Ǧikr al-Ḥiṭat waʾl-ʿĀṯār, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī (1364–1442 CE) includes several chapters that draw on post-Biblical Jewish texts, inter alia. The academic literature has very little to say about the presentation that al-Maqrīzī thus creates. To correct this lacuna, this article illuminates al-Maqrīzī’s exposure to and use of Rabbinic and Midrashic sources by offering examples of remarks in his writings that appear to have come from such sources—directly, through the mediation of Muslim scholarship, or in an in-between manner. Several conjectures about the origins of his knowledge are offered.
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Introduction
The Egyptian historian Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī (1364–1442 CE),1 devoted several chapters to Jewish history and Judaism in his monumental topographical history of Cairo, Kitāb al-Mawāʿız waʾl-ʿIbār fī Ǧikr al-Ḥiṭat waʾl-ʿĀṯār, often known as al-Ḥiṭat. One of these chapters deals with the Jewish Oral Law and its foundational post-Biblical texts, the Mishnah and the Talmud.2 This chapter has received very terse treatment in the academic literature. Those who treat it do so descriptively and without offering insights. Simḥah Pinsker translated some of al-Maqrīzī’s remarks on the Mishnah and the Talmud into Hebrew and suggested that al-Maqrīzī had indeed consulted them on a Karaite source.3 Eliyahu Ashtor, summarizing much of al-Maqrīzī’s writings on the Jews and Judaism, claimed on the basis of their content that Pinsker was right: al-Maqrīzī had indeed consulted with the Karaites. Yet he does bring two cases of what seems to him possible Midrashic influence.4 Daniel Boušek translated most of al-Maqrīzī’s writings about Jewish texts into English and

3 PINSKER 1860: 7-9.
4 ASHTOR 1944, 1: 373-375.
discussed them briefly, noting that al-Maqrīzī’s passage about the Mishnah and the Talmud is the longest in medieval Islamic literature that he encountered. He, too, argues that the Karaites were al-Maqrīzī’s source of information. Another scholar who suggests Jewish sources of influence on al-Maqrīzī’s descriptions of Jews and Judaism is Ayman Fu’ād Sayyid, who, in his critical edition of al-Ḥiṭat, refers mainly to Biblical verses.

While the above-mentioned scholars pointed Karaite and Biblical influence on al-Maqrīzī’s account, al-Maqrīzī’s knowledge of the Jewish Oral Law, however, was more extensive than that alleged by scholars. Perusal of al-Maqrīzī’s account of Jews and Judaism in al-Ḥiṭat demonstrates an aspect of his work that has not been researched to date: his exposure to Rabbinic and Midrashic sources and his intertwining of this material at least nine times in his Jewish history, twice in his description of the Jewish calendar, and twice in his account of the Jewish Oral Law. This article discusses such contents and elements that al-Maqrīzī may have used (sometimes in part), suggests what his sources may have been, and considers what one may learn from this demonstration of knowledge.

(1) Moses’ birthday

One of the topics that al-Maqrīzī describes in length is Moses’ life. Describing the events of the Exodus, he writes that Moses was born on the seventh of Adar, a statement that demonstrates familiarity with a Midrashic idea. After all, the date of Moses’ birth (and death) is mentioned not in the Bible but in the Talmud as well as in Seder ʿŌlam Rabbā, a second-century CE Jewish chronology ascribed to R. Jose son of Ḥalaftā.

(2) Prophecy about Moses’ birth

Pharaoh’s priests, al-Maqrīzī writes, saw in the stars that the Egyptian king’s death would come about at the hands of someone born of the Israelites within a time frame of three years. Therefore, Pharaoh forbade the Israelites to have intercourse during these years. After he saw in the stars that this child had been born, he ordered the males to be massacred. The account of having seen this in the stars is absent in the Bible. It is reminiscent of Exodus Rabbah, a work of Aggadic Midrash, redacted around the tenth century CE and apparently compiled by a copyist in the eleventh or twelfth century CE. In Exodus Rabbah 1:18, according to which Pharaoh’s sorcerers saw that Israel’s savior would be sentenced on account of water, for which reason Pharaoh ordered all male babies

5 BOUŠEK 2012: 286-290.
7 Ibid.: 923.
8 BT, Megilla 13b; BT, Nazir 14a.
9 Seder ʿŌlam, 2, ch. 10: 249.
10 See BT, Niddah 46b; ROSENTHAL 2007.
12 See HERR 2007a.
to be thrown into the Nile.\textsuperscript{13} Exodus Rabbah 1:24 clarifies the meaning of “on account of water”: Moses would be sentenced for his conduct in the \textit{mei meribah} incident (where, instead talking to the rock, he struck it. Num. 20:7–13)—information of which the Egyptian sorcerers were oblivious.

\textbf{(3) Moses’ stuttering}

After he mentions Moses’ death, al-Maqrīzī writes that some Israelites claimed that Moses had been a stutterer (\textit{alṭaʿ}). Some, al-Maqrīzī continues, traced this disability to a congenital defect; others said that it was the aftermath of an intervention by Pharaoh’s wife, who urged him not to kill a child who could distinguish between coals (\textit{jamr}) and dates (\textit{tamr}). When Moses was instructed to eat coals, he placed his hand in his mouth, causing burns that made him stutter.\textsuperscript{14} Exod. 4:10 only alludes to the outcome and says nothing about its cause: “And Moses said unto the Lord, O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore nor since you have spoken unto your servant, for I am slow of speech (\textit{kəḇad peh}) and slow of tongue (\textit{kəḇad lasōn}).”\textsuperscript{15} These defects may not necessarily be a stutter, possibly explaining why al-Maqrīzī reports that only some Israelites identified Moses as a stutterer. (Those who failed to make this identification were in all likelihood Karaites, who follow only the literal biblical text).

Al-Maqrīzī’s words evoke Exodus Rabbah 1:26, according to which it was Pharaoh’s daughter (not his wife) who raised Moses in his palace. As Pharaoh played with him one day, Moses lifted the crown from his head and placed it on his own. This caused the sorcerers to suspect that it was he whom they had seen in their visions as the usurper of Pharaoh’s kingdom; hence they proposed that Moses be burned. Jethro, present at the scene, told them that Moses was just a child and therefore lacked judgment. He suggested that a platter with gold and coals be placed before the boy as a test. If Moses extends his hand to the gold, Jethro said, it means that he has the capacity of judgment; in that case, Pharaoh should indeed kill him. If Moses reaches out for the coals, he lacks such a capacity and is not dangerous. Moses reached for the gold but the angel Gabriel intervened and pushed his hand onto the coals. The boy, in pain, placed his hand in his mouth, causing internal burns that turned him into a stutterer. In this account of al-Maqrīzī’s, Pharaoh’s wife is mentioned instead of Jethro and the sorcerers and Gabriel do not appear at all.

Example no. 2 also appears in the first chapter of Exodus Rabbah, only a few sections after the example cited above. The occurrence of both examples in al-Maqrīzī’s remarks suggests that he, or more likely his source, showed much interest in these passages; after all, the elements are not consecutive. Ostensibly this is not the case because al-Maqrīzī’s words are almost identical to those of Abū ‘Uṯmān ‘Amr b. Baḥr al-Kinānī al-Ǧaṣrī (776–

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. BT, \textit{Sanhedrin} 101b.
\textsuperscript{14} al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Ḫiṭat}, 4/2: 935.
\textsuperscript{15} Translation taken from \textit{The King James Version of the English Bible}. In certain cases, the translation is slightly modified to reflect (in my opinion) the Hebrew text more accurately.
ca. 868 CE), known as al-Ǧāḥiẓ, in Kitāb al-Bayān waʾl-Tabyīn. Al-Maqrīzī, however, adds that there are several opinions about the reason for Moses’ stuttering. This raises the possibility of an in-between option: He learned about this Midrashic idea from al-Ǧāḥiẓ but approached Rabbanite and Karaite Jews in his milieu in an attempt to obtain more details about it.

(4) “Like an inverted tub”

When the Israelites encamped at Mount Sinai in the third month of the Exodus (i.e., Sīvan), al-Maqrīzī writes, Allāh ordered Moses to have his nation purify and prepare themselves to hear His words. The Israelites purified themselves for three days and on the third day, the sixth of Sīvan, Allāh lifted the mountain (rafaʿa Allāh al-Ṭūr), basked it in His light, and shadowed His surroundings with clouds. Amid thunder and lightning on the horizon, He issued the Ten Commandments (ʿashr al-kalimāt), which al-Maqrīzī then lists. This account is reminiscent of Exod. 19 in most of its details. The Biblical account of the revelation at Sinai, however, does not state that God lifted the mountain. This information appears only in BT Ṣabbat 88a: “[…] And they stood at the nether part of the mount’ [Exod. 19:17]. R. Abdīmī b. Ḥammā b. Ḥassā said: “This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, overturned the mountain upon them like an inverted tub and told them: ‘If you accept the Torah, very well; if not, there shall be your burial.’”

Two Qurʾānic verses report the lifting of the mountain: “We raised over you the Mount” (wa-rafaʿnā fawqakum al-Ṭūr. Q. 2:93); “And We raised above them the Mount” (wa-rafaʿnā fawquhum al-Ṭūr. Q. 4:154). Therefore, one may claim that al-Maqrīzī was inspired by these verses. Yet this is not the case. Perusal of al-Maqrīzī’s account of Jews and Judaism in al-Ḫiṭaṭ reveals that he copied entire paragraphs from Chapter 4 of Kitāb al-Taʾrīḫ, a brief chronicle written in Judeo-Arabic and featuring Rabbinical characters, attributed by some scholars to R. Saʿadya Gaon (882–942 CE). This Midrashic content is one of them.

(5) Copies of the Torah

Al-Maqrīzī writes that Moses, before he died, ordered the Israelites to write copies (nusakh) of the Torah along with its commentary (qirāʿa) and to observe both the precepts that they had witnessed from his transmissions and those that they had acquired from him in jurisprudence (fiqh). Deut. 31:9 reads: “And Moses wrote this Torah and delivered it
unto the priests the sons of Levi, who bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel.” According to some Midrashim, e.g., Deuteronomy Rabbah, 9:9, Moses wrote on the last day of his life not one Torah scroll, as stated in Deut. 31:9, but thirteen scrolls—one for each of the twelve tribes and one to be deposited in the ark for consultation in the event that a member of the nation seeks to falsify something.\textsuperscript{23} The content of this source is definitely Rabbinic; no Karaites would claim that Moses transmitted \textit{fiqh}, which probably refers to the Talmud. Even this, however, does not suggest that al-Maqrīzī drew his inspiration from a Midrashic source, since here too he copied from \textit{Kitāb al-Taʾrīḥ}, which is, as mentioned, features Rabbinical characters.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{(6) Clouds of glory}

The Jews, says al-Maqrīzī, tell that dwelling in booths (as the Torah instructs them to do on the festival of Sukkōt) reminds them of the shade that Allāh provided their ancestors in the desert by means of “the clouds.”\textsuperscript{25} This is probably a reference to \textit{ʾamūd he-ʿanan}, the pillar of cloud, also known in the Jewish sources as \textit{ʾananei ha-kaḥōd}, clouds of glory,\textsuperscript{26} one of the manifestations of God’s presence.\textsuperscript{27} BT \textit{Sukkah} 11b reports a disagreement about the meaning of Lev. 23:42: “I made the Children of Israel to dwell in booths.” R. Eliʿezer claims that these booths were \textit{ʾananei ha-kaḥōd}; R. ʿAkiba defines them literally as booths.

One may claim that al-Maqrīzī was inspired by these sources or learned about this Midrashic idea from Egyptian Rabbanites, who apparently favored R. Eliʿezer’s opinion. (The text itself does not identify them as Rabbanite but one presumes that they were such because al-Maqrīzī cites a Midrash.) Al-Maqrīzī’s words, however, are almost identical to those of Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (1272–1332 CE) in \textit{Nihāyat al-Arab fi Funūn al-Adab},\textsuperscript{28} who probably based himself on \textsc{Mabāhij al-Fikar wa-Manāhij al-ʾIbar} by Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Yahyā al-Kutubi, known as al-Watwāt (1235–1318 CE).\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{(7) Pharaoh’s appearance}

In his references to the Israelites in Egypt, al-Maqrīzī describes the Pharaoh of Moses’ time. He cites several opinions about the monarch, each beginning with the expression “and it was told” (\textit{wa-qālā}), without specifying the source. One such source reports that Pharaoh was short and lame and had a long beard, black-blue eyes, a small left eye, and a mole on...
his forehead.\textsuperscript{30} BT \textit{Mō'ed Qatan} 18a also refers to Pharaoh’s beard and height, in addition to the size of his genitals. These details are mentioned \textit{en passant} in a discussion about the rules of mourning. They were transmitted by R. Pappa: “The Pharaoh who lived in Moses’ lifetime [height] was one cubit (\textit{amah}), his beard [length] was one cubit, and his genital [length] was one cubit and a pinky.” As far as I can ascertain, this is the only Jewish source that addresses itself to Pharaoh’s physical dimensions. Thus, despite the differences, the origin is Talmudic. Al-Maqrīzī or his source added more details about Pharaoh’s looks, perhaps to add spice and interest to the story. It is noteworthy that physical descriptions of Pharaoh appear in earlier Islamic sources.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, it is not necessarily the case that al-Maqrīzī’s source in this instance was Jewish.

\section*{(8) Elijah as Phinehas}

When he discusses Ilyās, the Qur’ānic name of Elijah,\textsuperscript{32} al-Maqrīzī identifies this figure as Phinehas son of El'azar.\textsuperscript{33} The Biblical account places Elijah and Phinehas in eras far apart. Such an identification, however, exists in post-Talmudic Midrashic texts such as \textit{Pirqe de-Rabbi Eli’ezr} (henceforth: \textit{PRE}), an eighth-century CE pseudepigraphic collection ascribed to R. Eli’ezr son of Hyrcanus (late first century–early second century CE).\textsuperscript{34} \textit{PRE} 46, for example, states in R. El’ezr’s name that Phinehas is Elijah. In \textit{Midraš Aggadah}, a Midrashic compilation on the Pentateuch edited in the twelfth/thirteenth-century CE,\textsuperscript{35} it is stated at Num. 25 that Reish Laqish subscribes to this identification.\textsuperscript{36}

\section*{(9) Phinehas’ miracles}

After identifying Phinehas as Elijah, al-Maqrīzī writes that some Israelites fornicated with Amorite (instead of Midianite) and Moabite women; thus they invoked the wrath of Allāh, who brought upon them a plague (\textit{wabā’}) that killed 24,000 until Phinehas charged into a tent where a man and a woman (Zimri son of Sali’ and Cozbi daughter of Sūr—see Num. 25:14), whom he does not mention by name) were fornicating, and impaled both of them with his spear. Exiting the tent, he hoisted them (on his spear) and showed them to the congregation.\textsuperscript{37} This description seems like a variation of a fragment of a passage in BT \textit{Sanhedrin} 82b that describes six miracles wrought for Phinehas when he killed Zimri and Cozbi. The fourth and fifth of these miracles, as described by R. Yōhanan, were that “[Zimri and Cozbi] did not slip off the spear and an angel came and lifted up the lintel.”

\begin{footnotes}
\item 30 \textit{al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḫiṭat}, 4/2: 926.
\item 31 E.g., \textit{Ibn Ḥazm, al-Fiṣal}, 1:322.
\item 32 \textit{WENSINCK & VAIDA} 1971.
\item 33 \textit{al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḫiṭat}, 4/2: 936.
\item 34 See \textit{HERR} 2007c.
\item 35 See id. 2007b: 188.
\item 36 \textit{BUBER} (ed.) 1894, 2: 148 (Num. 25).
\item 37 \textit{al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḫiṭat}, 4/2: 936.
\end{footnotes}
Some of the miracles performed for Phinehas when he killed Zimri and Cozbi also appear in earlier Islamic sources,\(^\text{38}\) thus again raising the possibility that al-Maqrızî’s source was not Jewish.

(10) **Covenant of peace**

After Phinehas killed the fornicating man and woman, al-Maqrızî writes, Allah promised him in the Torah “eternal peace” (dawâm al-salâm).\(^\text{39}\) This is a paraphrase of Num. 25:12: “And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Phinehas son of El'azar son of Aaron the priest deflected my wrath from the Children of Israel in his zeal for my sake among them, and I did not consume the Children of Israel in my jealousy. Therefore I say, Behold, I give him my covenant of peace” (laken 'emor hinen lô 'et berôš šalôm. Num. 25:10–12). Al-Maqrızî adds that some Jews interpreted this verse as instructing that Phinehas would not die and that he lived until the time of Jehoshaphat.\(^\text{40}\) According to the Biblical account, Phinehas did not live until the time of Elijah. The story speaks of Ahab, king of Israel and the contemporary of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (see e.g., I Kgs. 22:2). Furthermore, the Biblical account states not that Elijah died but that he ascended to heaven in a whirlwind (II Kgs. 2:1–11). The idea of Elijah’s eternal life appears in second version of Aḥōt de-Rabbi Nathan, 38 (šenayim 'amdû), a post-Talmudic commentary on, and an elaboration of, the Mishnäic tractate Aḥōt, attributed to Rabbi Nathan (late second-century CE), the redaction of which is assumed to have taken place in the Geonic period (late sixth–eleventh century CE):\(^\text{41}\) “Elijah will live and exist until the Messiah comes.”\(^\text{42}\)

(11) **Ma’aseh Ḥanûkkah**

Describing the festival of Hanukkah, al-Maqrızî writes that it is celebrated due to the overthrow of a tyrant who had taken over the Temple, killed those who were there, and demanded the *ius primae noctis* privilege. The sons of priests attacked the monarch and the youngest of them killed him. They searched for oil for the Temple but found only a small quantity, and declared the anniversary of those days a festival that they called Hanukkah.\(^\text{43}\) Hanukkah is not mentioned in the Bible; Rabbanites are important sources of information about it because Karaites do not recognize it. The *ius primae noctis* motif appears in several sources. JT Ketubōt 5b (1:5) states that the Greeks “decreed that the governor [shall] first have intercourse [with women who marry].” In BT Šabbat 23a, R. Joshua says that women are obliged to light a Hanukkah candle—an unusual demand because normally women are exempt from time-bounded obligations—because they also

---

38  E.g., Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal*, 1: 322.
40  Ibid.: 936-937.
41  See KISTER, M. 2007.
42  SCHECHETER (ed.) 1887: 52 (on 38:26).
participated in the miracle: The Greeks ruled that every virgin bride must have intercourse with the ruler first and the miracle of Hanukkah, he adds, was brought about by a woman. This is probably a reference to the story of Mattathias’ daughter.

One would assume that al-Maqrīzī was inspired by Midrash Ma’aseh Ḥanōkkah, which reports that Mattathias’ daughter, Hanna, tore her clothing on her wedding day in front of the guests. When her brothers spoke of wishing to kill her for this reason, she asked them why they should be angered by what she had done even as she was about to be given to the Greek governor. You should learn from Simon and Levi, she then told them; they were only two and yet successfully overcame the people of Nablus, whereas you are more than 200. Her brothers learned indeed: They escorted her to the governor, who thought they had come to surrender her to him, and when they entered his house they killed him in their zealotry. Yet al-Maqrīzī’s words, as in Example no. 6, are taken from al-Nuwayrī, who relied on al-Waṭwāṭ. 44

The allegation that Moses wrote the Mishnah evokes the beginning of a dictum by Joshua b. Levi in JT, Pe’ah 13a (2:4): “Scripture, Mishnah, Talmud and Aggadah, even anything that a longstanding student will teach in the presence of his mentor, were already told to Moses at Sinai.” Another possible source of inspiration for al-Maqrīzī in this context is BT, Berakhot 5a (especially given the proximity of the terms Torah and Mishnah in this source as in that previously mentioned), which states that Scripture, Mishnah, the Prophets, the Hagiographa, and the Talmud were given to Moses in Sinai. (Al-Maqrīzī makes such a claim only in regard to the Mishnah and not in reference to the Talmud.)

Yohanan b. Zakkai—the “smallest” of Hillel’s disciples

In his account of the Jewish Oral Law, al-Maqrīzī writes about Shammai (50 BCE–30 CE) and Hillel (late first century BCE–early first century CE). After noting their contribution to the Mishnah, he notes: “Hillel had eighty students, of whom the smallest (asgharahum)

44 EISENSTEIN (ed.) 1915: 190.
45 al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-Arab, 1: 197; al-Waṭwāṭ, Mabāhij al-Fikar, 1: 218
was Yōḥanan b. Zakkai.” This is based on the end of a statement in BT, Sukkah 28a: “Hillel the Elder had eighty disciples, thirty of whom were worthy of having the Divine Spirit rest upon them, as [it did upon] Moses our Teacher, thirty of whom were worthy of having the sun stand still for them [as it did for] Joshua b. Nun, [and the other] twenty were ordinary. The greatest of them was Jonathan b. ‘Uzzîel, the smallest of them (qâṭan she-be-kîllan) was R. Yōḥanan b. Zakkai.”

Conclusion

Many Midrashic contents and elements entered Islamic sources through the mediation of Jewish converts and of Muslim authorities who had learned them from Jews. Midrashic material has been used in Islamic literature from early times for different purposes: Qur’ān interpretation, folklore, and polemics, sometimes to allege that Jewish sources are fabricated and in other cases to argue that they foreshadow the advent of Muhammad. Al-Maqrīzī’s case is different. He uses Midrashic ideas to describe episodes in the Jewish historical narrative. This aspect of his historiography squares with the Rabbanite, not the Karaite, treatment of the Jewish sources. This study of al-Maqrīzī’s writings on Jews and Judaism demonstrates that he was familiar with ideas from post-Biblical Jewish compendia such as the Talmud (both BT and JT), Exodus Rabbah, PRE, Aḥôt de-Rabbi Nathan, and Kitâb al-Ta’rîf (and possibly Seder ʿOlam Rabbâ and Midraṣ Aǧgadah). In the case of Kitâb al-Ta’rîf, he simply copied the contents en passant.

One may speculate that al-Maqrīzī was familiar with, and made use of, additional Jewish materials that had been absorbed into, and/or rewritten in, early Islamic literature, as in Examples 3, 6, and 11 (and, theoretically, in Examples 9 and 7). This, however, is highly improbable in some cases for several reasons. First, in two instances he clearly copied them from Kitâb al-Ta’rîf, and in one instance he may have used a late Midrashic source (Midraṣ Aǧgadah); thus, the likelihood of contents from this source having been absorbed into the Islamic literature is lower. Second, most of the materials relate to two Biblical figures: Moses and Phinehas. Al-Maqrīzī speaks of Moses when he discusses Dammûh synagogue and of Phinehas when discusses Jawjar synagogue. The description of the synagogues is very short compared with that of these personalities, whose stories al-Maqrīzī tells as part of these synagogues’ history and whom al-Maqrīzī discusses at length for an unknown reason. It is very likely that he absorbed information on synagogues and

---

48 See MAZUZ 2016b.
51 See MAZUZ 2016c.
their history from Jewish informants. Only one of the examples in this article relating to Moses’ life was taken from an earlier Muslim sage (Example 3), suggesting that here his sources should be sought outside Islamic literature. If so, al-Maqrṣīṭī was an eclectic who conflated information that he absorbed and compiled from varied sources, Jewish and non-Jewish. In addition, previous studies show that al-Maqrṣīṭī used additional Jewish sources without citing them by name. Al-Maqrṣīṭī’s knowledge implies one or several of the following possibilities as to its origin: (1) He had some access to Midrashic sources because someone had either told him about them or translated them for him orally—giving him information more characteristic of Rabbinic Jews than of Karaites. The possibility that he learned about this material from Karaites does exist, since some Rabbinic excerpts were found in medieval Karaite literature. Yet, judging by the contents of the excerpts that were found so far, and on their small extent in the medieval Karaite literature, the chances for that are not high. Future research and findings may change the picture. (2) These sources may have been translated into Arabic and/or Judaico-Arabic in his milieu and, perhaps, in or before his lifetime. The translations may have strayed somewhat from their origin, possibly explaining the minor differences between his version and the Midrashic ones. If so, who translated them and when? How widely were they disseminated? These questions remain unanswered. (3) Al-Maqrṣīṭī was able to read the Hebrew language or the Hebrew alphabet, at least to some extent. As mentioned above, he copied extensive parts of Kitāb al-Taʿrīf into his account. Possibilities 1 and 3 are proved.

In addition to the many insights that may be gained by studying the Midrashic elements in al-Maqrṣīṭī’s writings, this line of inquiry may be instructive of his Jewish milieu and the prevalent teachings of the Rabbinic Jews of Egypt in his day and possibly before it. This study is another piece in the puzzle relating to our knowledge of the familiarity of Rabbinic Jews in Egypt with Midrashic works. The discovery of many fragments of Halakhic and Aggadic Midrashim in the Cairo Genizah may suggest that these accounts were familiar to Jews in Egypt with Midrashic study is another piece in the puzzle relating to our knowledge of the familiarity of Rabbinic Jews of Egypt in his day and possibly before it. This research and findings may change the picture. (2) These sources may have been translated into Arabic and/or Judaico-Arabic in his milieu and, perhaps, in or before his lifetime. The translations may have strayed somewhat from their origin, possibly explaining the minor differences between his version and the Midrashic ones. If so, who translated them and when? How widely were they disseminated? These questions remain unanswered. (3) Al-Maqrṣīṭī was able to read the Hebrew language or the Hebrew alphabet, at least to some extent. As mentioned above, he copied extensive parts of Kitāb al-Taʿrīf into his account. Possibilities 1 and 3 are proved.

In addition to the many insights that may be gained by studying the Midrashic elements in al-Maqrṣīṭī’s writings, this line of inquiry may be instructive of his Jewish milieu and the prevalent teachings of the Rabbinic Jews of Egypt in his day and possibly before it. This study is another piece in the puzzle relating to our knowledge of the familiarity of Rabbinic Jews in Egypt with Midrashic works. The discovery of many fragments of Halakhic and Aggadic Midrashim in the Cairo Genizah may suggest that these accounts were familiar to Egyptians. Recently, I published an article on the use of Midrashic sources for polemical purposes by Saʿīd b. Ḥasan al-Iskandarī, a thirteenth-century CE Alexandrian Jew who converted to Islam. Further research would enhance our knowledge of familiarity with Midrashic contents among the Jews of Egypt in the Late Middle Ages and possibly even earlier.

52 Several Jewish authors who preceded and lived after al-Maqrṣīṭī—Benjamin of Tudela (1130–1173 CE), R. Joseph b. Abba Mari b. Kaspi (1279–1340 CE) and Joseph b. Isaac Sambari (1640–1703 CE)—confirm the connection between Moses and the Dammiḥ synagogue. Sambari, however, associates Elijah with the al-Šāmiyyān synagogue. See Ibn Kaspi, Ṭīrat Ḳasef, 156–157; Ibn Kaspi, Tiḥr Ḳasef, 139; Sambari, Ṣefer Diḥbei Ṭosef, 154, 158. See further, MAZUZ [2018b].
56 MAZUZ 2016c. – On Saʿīd b. Ḥasan see further, MAZUZ 2015.
References

Primary sources


SCHECHTER, Solomon (ed.). 1887. *Abot de-Rabbi Nathan (A and B)*. Vienna: [n.p.].


Secondary sources

ASHTOR, Eliyahu. 1944. *History of the Jews in Egypt and Syria under the Mamluks*, 3 vols. Rabbi Kook Institute, Jerusalem. [In Hebrew].

Haggai Mazuz

KUTSCHER, Eduard Yechezkel. 1968. “Genizah Fragments of the Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishma’el.” Leshonenu, 32: 103-116. [In Hebrew].
Post-Biblical Jewish Sources in al-Maqrīzī’s Historiography

—. [2018a, forthcoming]. “Al-Maqrīzī’s Sources on the Samaritans in al-Khiṭaṭ.” Bein ‘Eber le-‘Arab, 10. [In Hebrew].


© Haggai Mazuz, School of International Studies, Sun Yat-sen University/China

hagaimazuz@gmail.com

17 (2017): 1-13