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Abstract
The present article discusses how such influential and renowned Arab historians as Ibn Ḫaldūn (d. 808/1406) and al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) described the reigns of the Christian kings of Iberia that were their contemporaries (or near-contemporaries), and particularly, how they depicted the reign of Pedro I of Castile (r. 1350-1366 and 1367-1369). The article offers a thorough survey of the fragments devoted to Pedro I, whom Ibn Ḫaldūn met in person, and shows that his death at the hands of his half-brother Enrique II (r. 1366-1367 and 1369-1379) received much attention in Ibn Ḫaldūn’s Kitāb al-ʿIbar and al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda. Moreover, it shows, on the one hand, that the information on the kingdom of Castile offered by them, though altered and distorted, was related to contemporary Spanish sources, and, on the other hand, that part of that information on the dār al-ḥarb at the other end of the Mediterranean found its way to Mamluk Egypt, where it was incorporated by Ibn Ḫaldūn and al-Maqrīzī (and by their contemporary al-Qalqašandī via Ibn Ḫaldūn) into their respective works.
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Resumen
Este artículo estudia cómo los historiadores árabes tan influyentes y renombrados como Ibn Ḫaldūn (m. 808/1406) y al-Maqrīzī (m. 845/1442) describieron los reinos de los reyes cristianos de Iberia que fueron contemporáneos suyos, y, especialmente, cómo describieron el reinado de Pedro I de Castilla (g. 1350-1366 y 1367-1369). El artículo ofrece un análisis en profundidad de los fragmentos dedicados a Pedro I, al que Ibn Ḫaldūn conoció personalmente, y muestra que su muerte a manos de su medio hermano Enrique II (g. 1366-1367 y 1369-1379) recibió gran atención en Kitāb al-ʿIbar de Ibn Ḫaldūn y Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda de al-Maqrīzī. Pone de relieve asimismo que la información sobre el reino de Castilla que proporcionan ambos autores, aunque alterada, guarda relación con fuentes castellanas contemporáneas, y que parte de esa información relativa a la dār al-ḥarb en el otro extremo del Mediterráneo llegó de alguna manera al Egipto mameluco, donde Ibn Ḫaldūn y al-Maqrīzī (y su coetáneo al-Qalqašandī a través de Ibn Ḫaldūn) la incorporaron a sus respectivas obras.
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1. Introduction

Almost twenty years ago now, Justin Stearns published an article in this journal in which he discussed the account of the Christian kings of Iberia in Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s (d. 776/1374) Aʾmāl al-aʿlām. At the beginning of the article, Stearns pointed out that this section is of interest to studies dealing with “the way in which Christians were described by Muslim historians”, and yet, it has aroused little scholarly attention. He observed, furthermore, that Arab historians such as Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406), al-Qalqašandī (d. 821/1418), al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), and al-Maqqarī (d. 869/1462), did not “refer to this part of Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s work in any way”, even though Ibn Ḥaldūn and Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb were friends. The present article discusses how Ibn Ḥaldūn, al-Qalqašandī, and al-Maqrīzī described the reigns of the Christian kings of Iberia that were their contemporaries (or near-contemporaries), and specially, how they depicted the reign of Pedro I (r. 1350-1366 and 1367-1369) — whom Ibn Ḥaldūn met in person —, showing that the information offered by them, though altered and distorted, was related to contemporary Spanish sources.

Clara Estow, in her monograph on Pedro I published in the mid-1990s, stated that few medieval monarchs “have captured the popular and creative imagination as has Pedro ‘the Cruel’”. His death at the hands of his half-brother Enrique, Count of Trastámara, who reigned as Enrique II (r. 1366-1369), has indeed received much attention in historical and literary works. As will be seen, the figure of Pedro I, known to posterity as ‘the Cruel’, but also as ‘the Just’, was likewise given much attention by Ibn Ḥaldūn and al-Maqrīzī.

As Stearns already observed with regard to the account on the Christian kings of Iberia in general, the information on Pedro I and his successors offered by Ibn Ḥaldūn, al-Qalqašandī, and al-Maqrīzī — the three of whom were active in Mamluk Cairo — is not related whatsoever to Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s account (as Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb died in 1374, Enrique II was the last Castilian king known to him). Most of that information stems from sources used by Ibn Ḥaldūn, to which he would have had access before arriving in Egypt. From Ibn Ḥaldūn’s Kitāb al-ʿIbar, his contemporary al-Qalqašandī drew the history of the Iberian Christian kingdoms included in Ṣubḥ al-aʾṣās. As regards al-Maqrīzī, his authority for most of the history of the kings of Christian al-Andalus found in his Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda was also Ibn Ḥaldūn, his teacher. However, the three works contain information on events that took place after Ibn Ḥaldūn’s arrival in Egypt, and al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿuqūd records events occurred after Ibn Ḥaldūn’s death, which evidences that those events were known to them (specifically, to either Ibn Ḥaldūn or al-Maqrīzī) via written or oral sources that somehow found their way to Egypt.

Regardless of how these Muslim historians received the information on Christian Iberia, their interest in its history provides a good example against the view that Arabic historiography despised European societies and showed little or no concern for their history and culture.

2. Overview of Ibn Ḥaldūn’s, al-Qalqašandī’s, and al-Maqrīzī’s Accounts of the Christian Kingdoms of Iberia

Before turning to Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s account, Stearns devotes some space to the section on the Iberian Christian kings in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s Kitāb al-ʿIbar, of which he selects — and presents briefly — a few episodes relevant to his article; furthermore, he offers as an appendix a table with the chronology of the Christian kings as found in both Aʾmāl al-aʾlām and al-ʿIbar.

In his universal history entitled Kitāb al-ʿIbar wa-dīwān al-mubtada’ wa-l-ḥabar fī ayyām al-ʿarab wa-l-ʾaḡām wa-l-barbar wa-man ʾāṣarahum min ḏawī l-sulṭān al-ʾakbar, shortened as Kitāb al-ʿIbar, Ibn Ḥaldūn (Tunis, 732/1332 – Cairo, 1406), Aziz al-Azmeh, Bettina Münzel, and Maribel Fierro.

1 “Two Passages in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Account of the Kings of Christian Iberia”.
2 He particularly discusses the works of Bernard Lewis, Aziz al-Azmeh, Bettina Münzel, and Maribel Fierro.
3 “Two Passages in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Account of the Kings of Christian Iberia”, pp. 157-159.
4 Estow, Pedro the Cruel of Castile, p. xiii.
5 Among the numerous literary works inspired by Pedro I of Castile’s life, I will mention here as a sample three authors chronologically very distant from each other (other references are given throughout the article): Chaucer (d. 1400), The Canterbury Tales; “The Monk’s Tale”, De Petro Rege Ispannie; Voltaire (d. 1778), Don Pèdre, roi de Castille; Daniel Cortezón (d. 2009), Crónica del rey don Pedro.
6 For further development, see below, sect. 5.
7 On the influence of Ibn Ḥaldūn on al-Maqrīzī and the relationship between them, described by Nasser Rabbat as mutually beneficial, see Rabbat, “Was al-Maqrīzī’s Khiṭāṣ a Khaldūnian History?”.
8 This view, held by Bernard Lewis and others, has been criticized and challenged in recent years by scholars like Marco Di Branco, Nizar Hermes, and Daniel König.
9 One of the episodes mentioned by him is the conflict between Pedro I of Castile and his brother Enrique. Stearns, “Two Passages in Ibn al-Khaṭīb’s Account of the Kings of Christian Iberia”, pp. 170-171.
808/1406) devotes a fragment to al-Andalus, covering more than 200 pages of the seventh volume of the critical edition made under the direction of Ibrāhīm Šabbūh10 (vol. 7, pp. 369-580). For the most part, it deals with the history of Islamic al-Andalus from the conquest to the Nasrids (vol. 7, pp. 369-561), but the fragment on al-Andalus — as a synonym for the Iberian Peninsula — also comprises the history of the Christian kingdoms of Northern Iberia.

The title of the section dealing with the Christian kings is “On the kings of the Banū Udūnš, who belong to the ġalālīqa, kings of al-Andalus after the Goths during the Muslims’ times, along with reports on their neighbours — the Franks, the Vascones, and the Portuguese — and a brief survey of several of their reports”. This section covers almost twenty pages of the Tunisian edition of al-ʿIbar (vol. 7, pp. 562-580).11

The section on the Banū Udūnš, i.e., ‘Children of Alfonso’ — denoting Alfonso I of Asturias (r. 739-757) —12 begins by mentioning the four kingdoms (mamlaka, pl. mamālīk) of Christian Iberia at that time: Castile, Portugal, Navarre, and Barcelona.13 Ibn Ḫaldūn states that this section deals with these nations since the time of the conquest in

---

10 This edition of Kitāb al-ʿIbar, published in Tunis between 2006 and 2013, is based on copies containing annotations in Ibn Ḫaldūn’s handwriting. It is the best edition so far, beyond compare. Unlike the seven-volume division of the previous editions — all of which (at least those I have consulted) derive from the editio princeps published in Būlāq in 1867 — this Tunisian edition is divided into fourteen volumes. The edition of volume 7 was prepared by Ibrāhīm Šabbūh and Šalāḥ Gārrār on the basis of the following manuscripts: Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi, MS Ahmet III 2924 (al-Ẓāhirī); Istanbul, Süleimaniye, MS Dāmād Ibrāhīm Bāšā (the Ṣāḥibiyya copy); and London, British Library, MS Add 232,72. See Šabbūh, introd. to Ibn Ḫaldūn, al-ʿIbar (vol. 7, pp. 562-580).

11 French translation in Dozy, Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne, vol. 1, pp. 98-126, Šihāda and Zakkār’s edition of this fragment (vol. 4, pp. 229-236) is rather deficient. In a 2004 article, Julio Escalona discusses how, through “subtle, systematic manipulation of the historical and narrative material”, the chronicles written during the reign of Alfonso III (r. 866-910) moulded the figure of Alfonso I, as a prestigious ancestor, to serve the legitimization needs of Alfonso III. As a result, Alfonso I “became the main figure in mid-eighth-century Asturian history”. See Escalona, “Family Memories: Inventing Alfonso I of Asturias”, esp. p. 257.

12 In a 2004 article, Julio Escalona discusses how, through “subtle, systematic manipulation of the historical and narrative material”, the chronicles written during the reign of Alfonso III (r. 866-910) moulded the figure of Alfonso I, as a prestigious ancestor, to serve the legitimization needs of Alfonso III. As a result, Alfonso I “became the main figure in mid-eighth-century Asturian history”. See Escalona, “Family Memories: Inventing Alfonso I of Asturias”, esp. p. 257.


90 H (711 CE) and the Muslims’ killing of Roderic (Luḏrīq), the last Visigothic king (r. 710-711). The Christians are reported to have become frightened in the face of the Muslims and to have fled to the North, where they appointed Pelayo son of Fāvīla (Balāyuh b. Qāquluh/Fāfuluh) as king. With few omissions and reasonably accurate information in general, after Pelayo — the alleged founder of the kingdom of Asturias — Ibn Ḫaldūn lists the names of 37 kings up to Enrique III of Castile.14

I offer as an appendix the names of the Christian kings, the duration of their reigns, and their dates of death from Pelayo (r. 718-737) to Enrique III (r. 1390-1406) as found in the Tunisian edition of al-ʿIbar. This edition contains some important differences with regard to the chronology included in Stearns’s article, which is based on the 1956 edition and Dozy’s translation.15

It is worth noting, for example, that only the Tunisian edition mentions Bermudo I (r. 789-791) and the kings between Ramiro I (r. 842-850) and Ramiro II (r. 931-951), on the basis of notes written by Ibn Ḫaldūn himself in the margins of a late fourteenth-century manuscript — now preserved at the British Library, number Add 232,72 —16 when he realized that some kings were missing. These additions are missing not only from previous editions of al-ʿIbar and Dozy’s edition and translation of the fragment, but also from al-Qalqašandī’s Subḥ al-aʾṣā (vol. 5, p. 264).17 We shall return to this question below.

The only direct authority mentioned by name throughout the section is Ibn Ḥayyān (Córdoba, 377-469/987-1076).18 The first quotation is particularly interesting. Ibn Ḫaldūn voices his disagreement with Ibn Ḥayyān’s assertion that the Children of Alfonso were descendants of the Goths, arguing that this nation had already disappeared “and power rarely returns once it has slipped away, so sovereignty (mulk) must have started over in another nation” (al-ʿIbar, vol. 7, p. 564). Here Ibn Ḥayyān is echoing the discourse of the late ninth-century chronicles of Alfonso III’s cycle, which presented the Asturian kings as heirs and continuators of the

---

14 Around five monarchs are missing.


18 Īsā b. Ahmad al-Rāzī (d. 379/989) is also quoted, as al-Rāzī (al-ʿIbar, vol. 7, p. 564), but indirectly, via Ibn Ḥayyān.
Visigoths,19 whilst Ibn Ḥaldūn’s argument is based on his political theory of dynastic cycles and shift of power from one nation to another.20

Ibn Ḥayyān is also quoted as the authority for the report on Ramiro II, including mention of the Battle of al-Ḥandaq (Alhandega), fought in 327/939 between him and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III near Simancas (al-ʿIbar, vol. 7, pp. 565-566). The fragment on the kings between Ramiro I and Ramiro II added by Ibn Ḥaldūn in the margin of the London manuscript is inserted just before the quotation from Ibn Ḥayyān on Ramiro II. In fact, Ibn Ḥaldūn gifts two different years of death for this king, one of them (339/950-1) taken from Ibn Ḥayyān, the other one (329/940-1) from an unknown source (that from which he probably took the whole marginal addition). The reports on Ramiro II are included in volume 5 of Ibn Ḥayyān’s al-Muqtabis.21 The historian from Córdoba is also quoted with regard to the conflict between Ordoño III and Sancho I, from Córdoba is also quoted with regard to the involvement of Count Fernán González (conflict between Ordoño III and Sancho I, with Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s (d. 749/1349) Masālik al-ḥisārī fī mamālik al-ʾamṣār, “Harūšiyūs, historian of the rūm”,22 and Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar. From this last work on al-Qalqašandī drew most of his passage on the Visigothic kings of Iberia (Šubh al-aʿṣā, vol. 5, pp. 238-241) — except for a few details borrowed from al-Ḥimyarī’s al-Rawḍ —25 and his passage on the Christian kingdoms of Iberia in Islamic times (Šubh al-aʿṣā, vol. 5, pp. 263-271). Al-Qalqašandī lists the kings from Pelayo to Enrique III as they appear in al-ʿIbar rather faithfully — omitting a few of them — but he does not offer all the information his authority does. It is important to note that Šubh al-aʿṣā lacks the fragments added by Ibn Ḥaldūn in the margins of the ʿIbar copy preserved at the British Library.

As regards al-Maqrīzī (Cairo, 766-845/1364-1442), in the aforementioned Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda — a work containing the biographies of nearly 1,500 prominent individuals who were contemporaneous or almost contemporary with al-Maqrīzī — he provides a great deal of information on al-Andalus, particularly in the biographies devoted to Pedro I of Castile (r. 1350-1369),26 Pedro IV of Aragon (r. 1336-1387),27 and the Nasrid Yūsuf II (r. 793-794/1391-1392).28

The entry on Pedro I of Castile contains information on the Castilian kings from Alfonso VIII to Enrique III, whereas that on Pedro IV of

---

19 On this see e.g. Escalona, “Family Memories: Inventing Alfonso I of Asturias”.
23 We know from quotations in later works that Ibn Ḥayyān mentioned Alfonso V of León (r. 999-1028) in his Maṭīn (a lost book containing an account of the author’s own times), using a spelling for the king’s name identical to that in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar (vol. 7, p. 570): Uḏfūnš b. Burmund. See Ibn Bassām, al-Daḥīra, vol. 7, p. 84; see also Gamāl al-Dīn, Min nussā kitāb al-Maṭīn, p. 181. In al-Maṭīn, Ibn Ḥayyān even mentioned Alfonso VI of León, who began to reign in 1065, that is, eleven years before Ibn Ḥayyān’s death. See Ibn Bassām, al-Daḥīra, vol. 4, p. 650.

As already noted, Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar was used as a source on the kingdoms of Christian Iberia by both his peer al-Qalqašandī, and their younger contemporary al-Maqrīzī. In his manual for secretaries entitled Šubh al-aʿṣā, the Egyptian scholar al-Qalqašandī (756-821/1355-1418) offers some geographical and historical information on al-Andalus drawn from various sources (Šubh al-aʿṣā, vol. 5, pp. 211-272). Among these are Abū l-Fadl Fīdaʾ’s (d. 732/1331) Taqwīm al-buldān, Ibn Ḥaldūn’s Abd al-Mun’in al-Ḥimyarī’s (d. after 726/1325-6) al-Rawḍ al-miʿār fī ḫabar al-aqṭār, Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-Umarī’s (d. 749/1349) Masālik al-ḥisārī fī mamālik al-ʾamṣār, “Harūšiyūs, historian of the rūm”, and Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar. From this last work on al-Qalqašandī drew most of his passage on the Visigothic kings of Iberia (Šubh al-aʿṣā, vol. 5, pp. 238-241) — except for a few details borrowed from al-Ḥimyarī’s al-Rawḍ — and his passage on the Christian kingdoms of Iberia in Islamic times (Šubh al-aʿṣā, vol. 5, pp. 263-271). Al-Qalqašandī lists the kings from Pelayo to Enrique III as they appear in al-ʿIbar rather faithfully — omitting a few of them — but he does not offer all the information his authority does. It is important to note that Šubh al-aʿṣā lacks the fragments added by Ibn Ḥaldūn in the margins of the ʿIbar copy preserved at the British Library.

As regards al-Maqrīzī (Cairo, 766-845/1364-1442), in the aforementioned Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda — a work containing the biographies of nearly 1,500 prominent individuals who were contemporary or almost contemporary with al-Maqrīzī — he provides a great deal of information on al-Andalus, particularly in the biographies devoted to Pedro I of Castile (r. 1350-1369), Pedro IV of Aragon (r. 1336-1387), and the Nasrid Yūsuf II (r. 793-794/1391-1392).

The entry on Pedro I of Castile contains information on the Castilian kings from Alfonso VIII to Enrique III, whereas that on Pedro IV of
Aragon contains information on the counts of Barcelona and the kings of Aragon from Borrell II to Alfonso V (r. 1416-1458). The source for most of the material in both biographies is Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-ʿIbar*; for most but not all, as some of the events mentioned in *Durar al-ʿuqūd* occurred after the death of Ibn Ḥaldūn in 1406, including the mention of Alfonso V of Aragon, who acceded to the throne in 1416, by which time Ibn Ḥaldūn had been dead for ten years.

Following the general introduction on the four Christian kingdoms of Iberia, the history of the period between the Islamic conquest of the Peninsula and the arrival of the Almohads — with mention of the killing of the last Visigothic king and the wars between the Christian kings and the Muslims — is summarized in three lines of al-Ǧalīlī’s edition of al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar al-ʿuqūd*. Then, there is a jump in the narrative to the time of the Almohad al-Ǧaabweya Yaʿqūb b. Yusuf (r. 580-595/1184-1199), during whose rule the Iberian Christians are said to have been governed by Alfonso VIII of Castile (r. 1158-1214), Alfonso IX of León (r. 1188-1230), and Sancho I of Portugal (r. 1185-1211).29 It is at this point where the *Durar* narrative converges with that in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-ʿIbar* and al-Qalašandī’s *Ṣubḥ al-ʿašā*. All the preceding information on the Iberian Christian kings is missing from al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar al-ʿuqūd*.

3. Pedro I of Castile and his successors in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-ʿIbar*  

3.1. Pedro I of Castile in *al-ʿIbar*

One of the Christian kings of Iberia who receives the most attention in *al-ʿIbar* is Pedro I of Castile,30 whom Ibn Ḥaldūn met in person. The focus of the fragment devoted to this Castilian king is on the conflict with his half-brother Enrique, Count of Trastámara, future king Enrique II of Castile. The news on Pedro I’s death, whom Ibn Ḥaldūn had met when he was to Granada, possibly produced a deep impression on him, and he recounts the episode in two additional places of his *al-ʿIbar*, specifically, in the sections on the Nasrids and on the reign of Algeciras by the Nasrid sultan Muḥammad V (r. 755-760/1354-1359 and 763-793/1362-1391).

Both al-Qalašandī and al-Maqrīzī relied on *al-ʿIbar* for the reports on Pedro I’s reign included in *Ṣubḥ al-ʿašā* and *Durar al-ʿuqūd*, respectively, although this statement requires further qualification in the case of al-Maqrīzī, as we will see.

The narrative in the chapter on Christian Iberia in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *al-ʿIbar* (vol. 7, pp. 575-576) runs as follows:

His (Alfonso XI’s) son Pedro (Bitruh) succeeded to the throne, whereas his son the Count (al-qumt) fled to Barcelona, whose king (i.e., Pedro IV of Aragon) granted him protection. Pedro marched against him several times and conquered most of his territory. He besieged Valencia more than once. However, in the year 768 (1366–7 CE)11 victory was granted to the Count, who took possession of the territories of Castile. The Christians submitted to him on account of Pedro’s cruelty and poor governance. Then, Pedro reached the nations of the Franks that lie beyond Castile, in the North, in the regions of Germany and Britain as far as the shore of the Green Sea (i.e., the Ocean) and its islands — they are the people of England, who are among the nations of the Franks.32 He gave his daughter in marriage to the son of their greatest king, the Prince of Wales (al-Bins Ġālis). The Prince of Wales accompanied him with uncountable troops, until he seized Castile and the Frontera. They returned to their country after an infectious disease afflicted them and killed many of them.

The war between Pedro and his brother the Count went on until the latter defeated the former. Pedro took refuge in a fortress, to which the Count laid siege. When it was evident that the Count was going to take it, Pedro secretly asked one of the leaders for shelter. He accepted, but then denounced him to his brother the Count. The Count attacked Pedro by surprise at the tent of that leader, and killed him in the year 772 (1370-1 CE). The Count took possession of the whole realm of the Children of Alfonso. He forced the son of his brother Pedro to surrender from Carmona, where he had taken refuge upon his father’s assassination in the company of his vizier Martín López de Córdoba (Martín Lubs). The kingdom of Castile became consolidated for him.

**The Prince of Wales, king of the Franks, contended**

---

29 Part of this information is later reproduced in the entry on “Ǧaynūs b. Ǧāk” (i.e., Janus, king of Cyprus, r. 1398-1432), at the end of whose biography al-Maqrīzī recorded a great deal of information on the Franks (*Durar al-ʿuqūd*, vol. 1, pp. 588-589).  

30 For secondary literature on this king, in addition to Estow’s monograph, see, e.g., Díaz Martín, Pedro I el Cruel; Valdéon Baruque, Pedro I el Cruel y Enrique de Trastámara; Vadaliso Casanova, Pedro I de Castilla.


32 The remark in boldface is a gloss written by Ibn Ḥaldūn on the margin of the British Library manuscript. This marginal note is omitted from al-Qalašandī’s *Ṣubḥ al-ʿašā*, vol. 5, p. 269.
with the Count in behalf of the son he had by Pedro’s daughter — according to the custom of the Christians (‘ağām; lit. ‘non-Arabs’, ‘barbarians’), the son of the daughter is the one who is made king — arguing that the Count was not trueborn. War continued between them, so that this distracted him from the Muslims, who refrained from paying the tribute they had paid to his predecessors.

Although this passage has an evident historical basis, it contains a few important mistakes and inaccuracies that deserve commentary. According to Ibn Ḥaldūn, Enrique of Trastámara, who is referred to as al-qumṭ, ‘count’, took possession of Castile in the year of the Hegira 768, which covers from 7 September 1366 to 27 August 1367. Enrique was crowned king of Castile on 5 April 1366, that is, 23 raġab 767 H.³⁴

The king of England referred to as “their greatest king” (malikīhum al-‘azam) is Edward III of England (r. 1327-1377), whereas “al-Bins Ġālis”, that is, ‘the Prince of Wales’ — heir apparent to the English throne — was his eldest son: Edward of Woodstock, known to history as the Black Prince (1330-1376). When his brother Enrique proclaimed himself king of Castile, Pedro fled to the court of the Prince of Wales in Bordeaux. They met in the summer of 1366. However, the Prince of Wales did not marry Pedro’s daughter as Ibn Ḥaldūn affirms. Two of Pedro’s daughters, Constanza and Isabel, were instead married to two other sons of Edward III of England: John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and Edmund of Langley, Duke of York, respectively. Both marriages took place after Pedro’s death (in 1371 and 1372, respectively).

The forces of Pedro I, with the aid of the troops of the Black Prince, defeated Enrique at the Battle of Nájera, which took place on 3 April 1367 (2 ša‘bān 768). After the battle, the Black Prince remained in Castile (Burgos, Valladolid and Soria) for several months, waiting for the money Pedro owed him, which never arrived. Both he and many of his men fell ill, afflicted with dysentery and other diseases. They returned to Aquitaine in late August 1367.

Two years later, on 14 March 1369, the forces of Pedro — supported by Nasrid troops and Enrique — with the support of the French — met in Montiel, and on this occasion the outcome was the opposite. After his defeat, Pedro took refuge in the fortress at Montiel. The fratricide was committed some days later, on 23 March 1369, which corresponds to 13 ʃa‘bān 770 (not 772 as stated by Ibn Ḥaldūn).

Following Pedro I’s death there were several candidates to the Castilian throne, among them, Fernando I of Portugal and the Prince of Wales himself. However, the Prince of Wales did not lay claim to the Crown of Castile by right of his son by Pedro’s daughter as stated by Ibn Ḥaldūn, but his brother John of Gaunt by right of his wife Constanza.

The previous Ibar section on the Nasrids (vol. 7, pp. 551-552) provides a different, somewhat longer, version of this account. To begin with, the Count is referred to as al-qund (a spelling closer to the Spanish conde), not al-qumṭ. Furthermore, some parallel fragments are phrased differently, normally in a more expanded way — the difference in length between the fragments immediately preceding the report on Pedro turning to the Prince of Wales for aid in both sections is, in this regard, self-evident.

More interestingly, the section on the Nasrids contains information that is not found in the following section on the Christian kings. Thus, Ibn Ḥaldūn informs us about Pedro calling on the Nasrid sultan Muḥammad V for help,³⁵ the devastation of several towns (including Jaén, Úbeda, and Utrera), and the siege of Córdoba. By contrast, the section on the Nasrids lacks the report on the disease that caused the Black Prince and his troops to return to their country, and the one on Pedro’s son and Martín López de Córdoba surrendering from Carmona.³⁶

Ibn Ḥaldūn narrates the conflict between Pedro I and his brother Enrique II in yet another part of Ibar, specifically in the section entitled “al-Habar ‘an irtiḡā’ al-Ǧaṣṣira”, ‘On the recovery of Algeciras’ (al-Ibar, vol. 14, pp. 405-408)³⁷ included in the fragment devoted to the Marinids (volume 14 of the Tunisian edition). This section begins with a brief report on Alfonso XI’s (Al-hunṣūḥ) conquest of Algeciras in 743 H (1342-3 CE)³⁸ and his death from the Black Death while

³³ al-Qalqašandī adds “and he asked the reign for him” (Subḥ al-aṣā, vol. 5, p. 269), which may be an addition by the own author by way of clarification, as it is not found anywhere else.
³⁴ The chronicler Pedro López de Ayala (d. 1407) matches the year 1366 CE with 768 H. See López de Ayala, Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla, vol. 1, p. 396.
³⁶ Martín López de Córdoba was an official loyal to Pedro I who took refuge in Carmona together with his own family and Pedro I’s illegitimate children. He was executed in 1371 at Enrique II’s behest. See Valdaliso Casanova, “Martín López de Córdoba”.
³⁸ It was taken in March 1344.
laying siege to Gibraltar in 751 H (1350 CE). This is followed by a rather long excursus on Alfonso XI’s son and successor Pedro. In this section, the word “count” takes the same form as in the section on the Christian kings of Iberia (i.e., al-qumṭ), but it is otherwise a version independent of both this section and the one dealing with the Nasrids. This third version lacks the reports on the Prince of Wales’s marriage to Pedro’s daughter and the disease that afflicted the English troops, and finishes with the report on Pedro’s death at the hands of his brother. By contrast, it contains some remarkable additions. Already in the first three lines of the Tunisian edition (vol. 14, p. 405), we find interesting pieces of information that are not found in the other versions:

After him (Alfonso XI) his son Pedro assumed power over the galālīqa. He acted hostily toward all his brothers, so his brother the Count (al-qumṭ) — the son of a mistress of his father named musammāt in their language ‘ʾ.l.rīq hamza’ — fled to the Count of Barcelona […]. The Count was joined by the marquis (al-markiš) — the son of his maternal aunt — and other counts (aqmāt).

In this small fragment we are told that Enrique was the son of a mistress (hazīyya) of Alfonso XI, denoting Leonor de Guzmán, his favourite. According to the Tunisian edition of Ibn Ḫaldūn’s al-‘Ibar, her name was ‘ʾ.l.rīq hamza’. However, the reading of other editions is ‘ʾ.l.rīq bi-hamza’, that is, ‘ʾ.l.rīq with the grapheme hamza’ (<b>او</b>), transliterated as /ʾ/, which seems more likely to me. As regards her alleged name ‘ʾ.l.rīq’ (maybe a corrupt form for ‘ʾ.n.rīq’), it rather seems to reflect the name ‘Enrique’. It is, therefore, possible that either Ibn Ḫaldūn himself or a copyist committed a mistake and that musammāt ‘named’ in feminine) should be emended to musammā (‘named’ in masculine). If this proved to be the case, ‘ʾ.l.rīq (or ’.n.rīq) would refer to Enrique of Trastámara. The emended text would then, read:

[…] his brother the Count — the son of a mistress of his father — was named (musammā) in their language ’.l.rīq, with a hamza, fled to […]

As regards the marquis who is said to have joined Enrique, he may have been Fernando, Mar-quis of Tortosa (d. 1363). He was the half-brother of Pedro IV of Aragon and, after having supported Pedro I in the war against Pedro IV (War of the Two Pedros) for several months, he changed sides and supported his brother.41 Fernando was the first cousin of Pedro and Enrique by their paternal aunt Leonor of Castile, sister of Alfonso XI.

The general contents of the rest of Pedro I’s biography inserted into the section on the recovery of Algeciras by the Muslims are found in one of the other versions, or in both, but the wording is different. Furthermore, in this section Ibn Ḫaldūn elaborates a little further on the War of the Two Pedros (1356-1369). There are also important differences as regards chronology. In this section, the sequence of the narrated events is more similar to the narrative in the Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla of the chronicler Pedro López de Ayala (1332-1407), who was a contemporary of the events and witnessed some of them.42 Thus, Ibn Ḫaldūn states that Pedro traveled to the Prince of Wales in 767 H, which corresponds to 1365-6 CE. Since Pedro met the Black Prince in Bayonne and Bordeaux in August 1366 (23 ḏū l-qaʿda – 23 ḏū l-ḥiǧǧa 767), the chronology in this version is more accurate than that in the other sections, according to which the meeting between Pedro and the Black Prince would have taken place after Enrique defeated his brother in 768/1366-7. Likewise, in this section, Pedro’s request for help from Muhammad V, and the latter’s destruction of towns such as Úbeda and Jaén, are recorded after the report on the Prince of Wales (not before, as in the section on the Nasrids), which is also more accurate, as these events took place in 1368.

After the report on Enrique killing Pedro, Ibn Ḫaldūn says that this civil war left the borders unguarded, encouraging the Muslims to take back Algeciras, which they did in 770 H (1369 CE).

In sum, Ibn Ḫaldūn included in his Ibar three different, mutually independent, versions of the conflict between Pedro I and his half-brother Enrique, Count of Trastámara, who would reign as Enrique II. For the sake of comparison and clarity, the following table shows the chronological sequence of the events in each version (which, as noted, is more accurate in the third version).

---

41 Ramón Pont, “El infante Don Fernando”.
42 For a criticism of López de Ayala’s account of the reign of Pedro, see Estow, Pedro the Cruel, pp. xxv-xx. According to Estow, López de Ayala “is the best informed and most complete source of contemporary narrative material on the reign of Pedro”, even though his objectivity, reliability and accuracy must be questioned (Estow, Pedro the Cruel, p. xx).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Pedro I’s death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 768/1366-7 the ǧalāliqa revolt against Pedro and call Enrique back from Barcelona, to where he had fled upon their father’s death.</td>
<td>In 751/1350-1, after his father’s death from the plague, Pedro accedes to the throne.</td>
<td>In 751/1350-1, after his father’s death from the plague, Pedro accedes to the throne of the ǧalāliqa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War between Pedro and the king of Barcelona.</td>
<td>Enrique takes refuge with the king of Barcelona.</td>
<td>Because of Pedro’s hostility, Enrique, accompanied by the marquis and other counts, takes refuge with the count of Barcelona.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro calls on Muḥammad V for help.</td>
<td>Pedro I of Castile conquers most of Pedro IV of Aragon’s territory and besieges Valencia.</td>
<td>The count of Barcelona refuses to deliver Enrique to Pedro.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nasrid sultan devastates Jaén, Úbeda, and other strongholds (maʿāqil) of the Frontera, and besieges Córdoba.</td>
<td>In 768/1366-7 Enrique defeats Pedro and seizes Castile. The Christians submit to him.</td>
<td>Long war between the two Pedros. Pedro I takes many strongholds. He besieges Valencia and sends his fleet to this city.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro travels to the Prince of Wales, and gives his daughter to him in marriage.</td>
<td>Pedro travels to the Prince of Wales, and gives his daughter to him in marriage.</td>
<td>The Christians revolt against Pedro and call his brother back.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique is defeated and Pedro regains the country.</td>
<td>Pedro and the Prince of Wales seize Castile and the Frontera.</td>
<td>He goes to Córdoba. The people of Seville revolt against Pedro.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Frankish troops return and Enrique regains the country.</td>
<td>An infectious disease afflicts the English troops and they return home.</td>
<td>Pedro flees to the Prince of Wales and calls on him for help in 767/1365-6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique besieges Pedro in a fortress of Ḡilliqiya and kills him.</td>
<td>Enrique defeats Pedro. The latter takes refuge in a fortress.</td>
<td>The Prince of Wales and his men seize the kingdom, and then return to their country.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Besieged by Enrique, Pedro asks for shelter from one of Enrique’s men. Pedro is given away to Enrique.</td>
<td>Enrique conquers the rest of the kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrique kills Pedro in 772/1370-1.</td>
<td>Pedro calls on Ibn al-Āḥmar for help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn al-Āḥmar devastates Úbeda, Jaén and other major cities (amsār). He then returns to Granada.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrique defeats his brother and kills him.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Despite the extraneous elements in the three ʿIbar accounts of Pedro I’s reign, their relationship to contemporary Spanish sources is evident. After leaving Tunis at the age of 20, Ibn Ḫaldūn spent thirty years in the western Maghreb and al-Andalus, devoting himself to both political and intellectual pursuits.52 He spent three years in Granada — from 1362 to 1365 — where he enjoyed the favour of Muḥammad V. As Ibn Ḫaldūn himself says in his autobiography, he went to Seville in 765/1365-4, in order to ratify the Peace Treaty signed by Pedro I with the Muslim kings of al-ʿudwa (the other shore of the Mediterranean). The Castilian king even offered to restore to Ibn Ḫaldūn the properties of his ancestors in Seville, provided he stay on with him, an offer that Ibn Ḫaldūn refused.54 Beyond doubt, there would have become acquainted with some information on the Christian kings, which he would later use for the fragment devoted to al-Andalus in his ʿIbar. In fact, as discussed below, al-Maqrīzī informs us that Ibn Ḫaldūn heard from Muḥammad V the information on Pedro I that al-Maqrīzī would later receive from Ibn Ḫaldūn.

When Pedro I died, in 1369, Ibn Ḫaldūn was already back in North Africa. He would return to Granada in 1374 for two months. Ibn Ḫaldūn arrived in Cairo in 1382, that is, during the reign of Juan I of Castile (r. 1379-1390), whose son and successor Enrique III (r. 1390-1406) is the last of the Castilian kings mentioned in al-ʿIbar. As noted by Dozy, Ibn Ḫaldūn made two versions of the section on the Christian kingdoms of Iberia: the first one, in Tunis around 1380; the second one, in Cairo around 1392.55 As argued in this article, we can now add a “third version”, which is represented by manuscript Add 232,72 of the British Library containing marginal additions in Ibn Ḫaldūn’s handwriting. Al-Qalqašandī would have relied on the second version as his Ṣubḥ al-ʿaʾšā lacks those additions.

To write this section, Ibn Ḫaldūn must therefore have relied partly on memories and/or notes he had written down —56 some of which he would later transmit orally to his disciple al-Maqrīzī, as we will see — and this fact most likely accounts for (some of) the mistakes in the fragment on the successors of Enrique II, dealt with in the next subsection, which features a greater number of errors than other fragments.

3.2. Enrique II’s successors in al-ʿIbar

For Enrique II’s son and successor, Juan I of Castile, who is referred to as “Ḏūn Ğuwān”, 57

---

53 For Ibn Ḫaldūn’s life, and further bibliography, see e.g. Manzano Rodríguez, “Ibn Jaldūn, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān”; Cheddadi, “Ibn Ḫaldūn, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān”; Ito, “Writing the Biography of Ibn Ḫaldūn”.
55 Dozy, Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne, vol. 1, p. 97. In this regard Dozy’s version of the fragment and al-Qalqašandī’s Ṣubḥ al-ʿaʾšā contain some fragments that are not found in the editions previous to the Tunisian one. See, for example, the fragment on Juan I (al-ʿIbar, vol. 7, pp. 576-577), which is found in Dozy’s Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne (vol. 1, p. xxiv [Arabic text] and vol. 1, p. 121 [trans.]), and al-Qalqašandī’s Ṣubḥ al-ʿaʾšā (vol. 5, p. 269), but not in Šihāda and Zakkār’s edition of al-ʿIbar (cf. vol. 4, p. 234). See also footnote 57 below.
57 Rendered as such in the Tunisian edition (vol. 7, p. 576); also in Dozy, Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne, vol. 1, p. xxiv, and al-Qalqašandī, Subḥ al-ʿaʾšā, vol. 5, p. 269. Other copies refer to Sānghūl Sāŋgā (Sancho) as Enrique’s son and successor, and omit a good deal of information on Juan I’s reign, including the mention of his successor. According to Dozy, the mistakes in the first version of al-ʿIbar must have
some of the reports provided are correct, such as his defeat by the Portuguse in 788 H (1386-7 CE), a clear reference to the victory of the forces commanded by João I of Portugal over those of Juan I of Castile at the Battle of Aljubarrota on 14 August 1385. The date of Juan I’s death is given as 791 H (1389 CE), which is also correct, or almost, as the king died one year later (specif. on 9 October 1390, i.e., 28 šawwāl 792). What is not correct, to my knowledge, is the report according to which another of Enrique II’s sons named “Ǧūmis” (Gómez ?) fled to Granada when his brother acceded to the throne and, later, supported the Portuguese king (al-burtu qaṣ). It may refer to Alfonso Enríquez, Count of Noreña and Gijón (d. ca. 1400), the eldest natural son of Enrique II, who rebelled against his half-brother Juan I of Castile and entered into negotiations with the Portuguese. Equally untrue is Juan I’s victory over Joaño I and the former’s conquest of Lisbon.

As regards the successor of Juan I of Castile, his name is said to be Pedro (Bīṭrūḥ), instead of Enrique (III). Ibn Ḥaldūn says that as a young child, he was tutored by the markīš — “the maternal uncle of his grandfather” Enrique II — who also held the regency. The maternal uncle of Enrique II, the brother of his mother Leonor de Guzmán, was Alonso Meléndez (or Alfonso Méndez) de Guzmán, who was Grand Master of the Order of Santiago. However, he had died of disease in 1342 during the siege of Algeciras,59 that is, 37 years before Enrique III’s birth (1379). Among the tutors of Enrique III, who was 11 years old when his father died, was Alfonso, Marquis of Villena (d. 1412),60 who was also a member of the council that assumed the regency upon Juan I’s death in 1390.61 It is therefore possible that Ibn Ḥaldūn is referring to the Marquis of Villena.62 In 1393, not having yet reached the age of 14, Enrique III assumed power; he died in 1406, the same year as Ibn Ḥaldūn.

4. Pedro I of Castile and his successors in al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farida

4.1. Pedro I in Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda

As noted above (sect. 2), al-Qalqašandi took the information on Pedro I and his successors from the section on the Christian kings in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar, of which he extracted some relevant information so as to give an abridged but coherent version (Ṣubḥ al-aʿšā, vol. 5, p. 269).


Then, almost two pages of al-Ǧalīlī’s edition of Durar al-ʿuqūd deal with the territory of each of the four Christian kingdoms of al-Andalus — Castile, Portugal, Navarre and Barcelona — and the history of Castile prior to Pedro I, from Alfonso VIII (r. 1158-1214) to Alfonso XI (r. 1312-1350). As regards the real biography of Pedro I of Castile, al-Maqrīzī constructed it by combining the accounts provided in the ‘Ibar sections on the Nasrids and the Christian kings of Iberia, which is already evident from the fact that Enrique, Count of Trastámara, is referred to as “al-qumṭ, who is [also] named al-qund”. The beginning of the passage is closer to the account included in the section on the Christian kings of Iberia, with some details from the section on the Nasrids; from there on, most of the information is drawn from the section on the Nasrids. Al-Maqrīzī will return to the other section for the last part...
of the passage, but, before this, he introduces a fragment that is found nowhere in *al-ʾIbar*. As Takao Ito has demonstrated, al-Maqrīzī also received this fragment from his master, in this case orally.\(^{63}\) The biography that al-Maqrīzī devotes to his teacher Ibn Ḫaldūn in *Durar al-ʾuqūd* also contains this part not included in *al-ʾIbar*,\(^{64}\) and there al-Maqrīzī says that Abū Zayd (the *kunya* of Ibn Ḫaldūn) related to him (*ḥaddaṭanā*) what he (Ibn Ḫaldūn) had heard from Muhammad V, who, in turn, had received it from “the ṭāğiya\(^{65}\) king of Castile Pedro” himself (obviously the Castilian king could not possibly have informed the Nasrid sultan about the whole fragment, which includes the account of the former’s own death).

Returning now to the entry on Pedro I in al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar al-ʾuqūd al-farīda* after mentioning the marriage of the Prince of Wales to Pedro’s daughter — as reported in the *ʿIbar* section on the Nasrids and informing us that the Castilians and the Franks took possession of Castile and the Frontera — as reported in the *ʿIbar* section on the Christian kings — al-Maqrīzī mentions the disease that affected the troops of the Prince of Wales and made them return to their country, but he offers a rather detailed description of the symptoms of the disease. According to al-Maqrīzī, after a few nights with Pedro, one morning the Prince’s troops woke up covered from head to feet by vermin (*qaml*), which rotted their bodies and caused high fever. Most of them died after three nights. It seems evident that al-Maqrīzī is here describing the symptomatology of the bubonic plague.

The account of Pedro I’s reign inserted into the biography devoted to Ibn Ḫaldūn in al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar al-ʾuqūd* is very similar up to this point (though more abridged), with the exception that it contains no reference to the Prince of Wales’s marriage to Pedro’s daughter. From this point onward, the contents of both versions are essentially the same, but the wording is somewhat different, the version included in the biography of Ibn Ḫaldūn being slightly longer than the one in the biography of Pedro.

Al-Maqrīzī goes on to recount that, once the Prince and his troops had returned to England, the Count marched towards his brother, and laid siege to him in a fortress of Ǧilliqiya. Here al-Maqrīzī’s account is similar to that in the *ʿIbar* section on the Nasrids, but then provides a much more detailed version of Enrique killing Pedro. For the sake of comparison, I offer below a translation of this episode as it appears in the biographies devoted to Pedro I and Ibn Ḫaldūn in al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar al-ʾuqūd*.

---

**Durar al-ʾuqūd**, vol. 1, p. 485 (biog. of Pedro I)

> When the son of the Prince returned [to his country], the Count (*al-qumṭ*) and his men marched towards his brother. He took possession of the lands, and laid siege to his brother Pedro in a fortress of Ǧilliqiya. They exchanged letters aimed at reconciliation. However, when Pedro went down to the Count, the latter proceeded to insult Pedro, jumped on him, and both engaged in a fight for a long time until Pedro threw down his brother the Count, brought him to the ground, and got the upper hand. As none had weapons, one of the servants of the Count came close to him, and handed him a knife. With it the Count split open his brother Pedro’s belly. Then, the Count moved back, and delivered Pedro the coup de grâce, killing him. The Count reigned after Pedro. He ordered the hanging of the slave that handed him the knife because, according to their custom, a person who kills a king or helps to kill him must be killed. Pedro was killed in 772. And it is sometimes said…

**Durar al-ʾuqūd**, vol. 2, p. 405 (biog. of Ibn Ḫaldūn)

> As soon as the son of the Prince left, the Count (*al-qumṭ*) started out against his brother. Pedro was not in a position to battle against him owing to his incapacity to compete in strength with him, so he sent a letter to him [asking him] for reconciliation. The Count replied with a deception. Then, the *funš*\(^{66}\) went to him to conclude peace. When they met, the Count started to insult the *funš*, jumped on him, and both engaged in a fight for a long time until the Count fell down and the *funš* got the upper hand. As none of them had weapons, a client (*mawla*), one of the slaves of the Count, came close to him, and handed him a knife with which the Count split open the belly of the *funš*. Then the Count drew back, grew excited, and delivered him the coup de grâce. He reigned afterwards. He ordered the hanging of the slave that gave the knife to him because, according to their custom, a person who kills a king or helps to kill him must be killed. Had he not been given the knife, he would not have been able to kill the *funš*.

---

\(^{63}\) Ito, “Writing the Biography of Ibn Khalūn”, p. 520.


\(^{65}\) This term, which literally means ‘tyrant’, was used as an appellation of the Byzantine emperor and, by extension, of the king of the infidels. See Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 1857a (part 5).

\(^{66}\) This term, derived from the name “Alfonso”, was used as a title for the kings of Castile. See al-Qalqašandī, *Ṣubḥ al-aʾṣā*, vol. 5, p. 484, and vol. 8, p. 33.
The information on Pedro I of Castile inserted into the biography devoted to Ibn Ḥaldūn ends at this point.

Al-Maqrīzī’s account of Pedro’s death contains historical elements — or rather, elements that are found in literature — but some of them are original — or, at least, I have not found them anywhere else. In his Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla, López de Ayala⁷⁰ recounts that Men Rodríguez de Sanabria, a nobleman loyal to Pedro, met secretly with the Breton military commander Bertrand Du Guesclin (d. 1380), who supported Enrique, and on behalf of Pedro offered him some towns and money in exchange for Pedro’s freedom. Du Guescin accepted, but then informed Enrique. On the night of 23 March 1369 Pedro left the fortress and entered the tent of Du Guesclin. The supporters of Enrique would not let him go until Enrique entered the tent. López de Ayala’s account of the encounter between the brothers reads as follows:

E así como llegó el Rey Don Enrique, travó del Rey Don Pedro. E él non le conocía (…) é dicen que dixo el Rey Don Pedro dos veces: “Yo só, yo só”. E estonce el Rey Don Enrique conocióle é firióle con una daga por la cara; e dicen que amos á dos el Rey Don Pedro é el Rey Don Enrique cayeron en tierra, é el Rey Don Enrique que le firió estando en tierra de otras feridas. E allí murió el Rey Don Pedro á veinte é tres días de marzo…⁶⁸

Al-Maqrīzī adds another version of Pedro’s death, introduced by “wa-qad qīla” (‘And it is sometimes said’), which is more in line with López de Ayala’s account. This second version is an almost verbatim reproduction of that included in the section on the Christian kings of Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar.⁶⁹

Other historians added details to López de Ayala’s account, some of which remind us of al-Maqrīzī’s first, more expanded, version of the episode, the one that he apparently received from Ibn Ḥaldūn orally and also included in his biography of his teacher in Durar al-ʿuqūd. In his Bienandanzas e fortunas (book xvii) Lope García de Salazar (d. 1476) offers an account based on López de Ayala’s, but with important differences. In general, García de Salazar offers an abridged version, but it contains some details missing from López de Ayala’s Crónicas that were widespread in literature:⁷⁰

E el rey don Pero luego lo conoció en la palabra e dixo altas vozes esforçadamente, aunque beía su muerte, “yo só, yo só” dos vezes e fuese abraçar con él con su daga en la mano e cayeron anvos en tierra. E el rey don Enrique cayó devaxo e el rey don Pero sobre él, ca era mucho valiente e esforçado; e yoyiendo devaxo, diele el rey don Enrique por el rostro con la daga un golpe e, quando los franceses e castellanos vieron qu’el rey don Pero andava buscando con la daga por donde diese con ella al rey don Enrique, que estaba todo armado e con bacinete e visera, trabáronle de las piernas e volviérongello devaxo. E con el ayuda d’ellos cortóle la caveça e fizola echar en un rio, donde nunca pareció, e el cuerpo levaron a la Puebla de Alcoçer.⁷¹

As we can observe, both García de Salazar and al-Maqrīzī state that someone helped Enrique to kill his brother, by seizing Pedro by the legs and turning him over so that Enrique could get on top, according to García de Salazar; by handing Enrique a knife since both rivals were unarmed, according to al-Maqrīzī.

There are different versions concerning the identity of the person who helped Enrique II to kill his brother. Tradition has it that it was the abovementioned Bertrand Du Guescin who helped Enrique, and who said, “I neither remove nor make a king, I merely help my master”, which is a common saying in Spanish: Niquito mi pongo rey; pero ayudo a mi señor. This is, for example, the version of the nine-teenth-century writers Duque de Rivas (d. 1865) in El fratricidio (ballad IV) and José Zorrilla (d. 1893) in El Zapatero y el rey (act IV, scene IV).⁷² Far from having Du Guescin put to death, Enrique granted him titles on top of those he already held, including that of Duke of Molina and Soria.⁷³

⁷⁰ See above, p. 5, col. b (from “When it was evident” to “and killed him”).
⁷¹ For a comparison between López de Ayala’s and García de Salazar’s accounts, see Valdaliso Casanova, “Fuentes para el estudio del reinado de Pedro I de Castilla”, pp. 266-267.
However, documents chronologically much closer to the facts do not attribute the deed to the Breton commander, at least not to his direct action. The account by the fourteenth-century French historian Jean Froissart (d. ca. 1405) is particularly relevant. He states in his Chroniques that it was the Viscount of Rocaberti who seized Pedro by the legs. According to Froissart, as soon as Enrique entered the room, he said to his brother, “Where is that Jewish son of a whore who calls himself king of Castile?”, to which Pedro replied, “You are the son of a whore. I am the son of good king Alfonso”. This exchange of insults between Pedro and his brother Enrique — who, as noted, was an illegitimate son of Alfonso XI by Leonor de Guzmán — is reminiscent of the passage in al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-uqūd al-farīda where the Prince of Wales is reported to have called Enrique a “son of adultery” (ibn zinya) in order to substantiate his claim to the throne of Castile by right of his son by Pedro’s daughter. Al-Maqrīzī’s account is undoubtedly based on the version included in the section on the Christian kings in Ibn Haldūn’s al-ʾIbar, but again it offers a slightly expanded version that includes the insulting words addressed by the Prince of Wales to Enrique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Prince of Wales, king of the Franks, contended with him in behalf of the son he had by Pedro’s daughter — according to the custom of the Christians, the son of the daughter is the one who is made king — arguing that the Count was not trueborn (īlam yakun li-rišdā).</td>
<td>The Prince of Wales, king of the Franks, started out against the Count. A male son had been born to him by Pedro’s daughter, and he considered that he should inherit the throne from his grandfather Pedro by virtue of their custom, according to which it is the son of the daughter who becomes king. Then he insulted the Count [by telling him] that he was not trueborn and he was just the son of adultery (īlam yakun li-rišdā wa-tinnamā huwa ibn zinya).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the entries on Muḥammad V and Yūsuf II in Durar al-uqūd al-farīda, al-Maqrīzī also records the information on Pedro’s plea for aid from the Nasrid ruler, which serves him to present two additional accounts of the Castilian Civil War. The passage included in the entry on Yūsuf II (Durar al-uqūd, vol. 3, p. 554) is a very abridged version of the ʾIbar account in the section on the Nasrids. More interesting is the account offered in the entry on Muhammad V (Durar al-uqūd, vol. 3, p. 261). This version is also similar (though more abridged) to that included in the section on the Nasrids in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʾIbar, but with a substantial difference: according to this version, it was Pedro who married the daughter of the Prince of Wales, and had a male son by her, whereby the Prince of Wales fought against the Count in behalf of his grandson (raʾā anna ibn ibnatihi huwa al-malik, lit. ‘he considered that the son of his daughter was the king’), and not his own son. Pedro, when he was still infante of Castile, was betrothed to Joan, daughter of Edward III of England, and hence sister of Edward of Woodstock, Prince of Wales, but she died of the Black Death in 1348 on her journey to Castile before the marriage could take place. As noted above, it was John of Gaunt who claimed the throne in the name of his wife Constanza, who was Pedro’s daughter.

From where did al-Maqrīzī take the information on Pedro of Castile that is not found in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʾIbar? As said above, Ito has demonstrated that al-Maqrīzī heard from his teacher Ibn Ḥaldūn the longer version of Pedro I’s death, i.e., the one included in the Durar biographies devoted to Pedro I and Ibn Ḥaldūn, which contain the description of the disease that killed most of the Prince of Wales’s troops and a detailed account of Pedro’s death at his brother’s hands.

But what about the version included in the biography of Muḥammad V? It is possible that the authority of al-Maqrīzī for this version was also Ibn Ḥaldūn, and that al-Maqrīzī accidentally mixed up

---


75 Froissart, Chroniques, vol. 7, pp. 81-82; Chronicles, pp. 173-174. This version was echoed by the sixteenth-century chronicler of the Aragonese Crown Jerónimo Zurita (d. 1580) in his Anales de la Corona de Aragón. Zurita, Anales de la Corona de Aragón, book 10, ch. 5.

76 Froissart, Chroniques, vol. 7, p. 81; Chronicles, p. 173.

77 Russell, “Una alianza frustrada. Las bodas de Pedro I de Castilla y Juana Placentagénit”.

78 Ito, “Writing the Biography of Ibn Khaldūn”, p. 520.
the information on who married whose daughter. Bearing in mind that the rest of the biography is based beyond doubt on the section on the Nasrids in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar, this is indeed the most plausible explanation. That said, we know that al-Maqrīzī relied on at least one other textual or oral source for the history of the Christian kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula, in order to continue the narrative of the Crown of Aragon until Alfonso V (r. 1416-1458).79 Therefore, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that al-Maqrīzī also relied on this unidentified source to embellish Ibn Ḥaldūn’s account of the history of the Castilian kings until Enrique III (r. 1390-1406).80

Be that as it may, the fact is that al-Maqrīzī even mentions Enrique III’s successor, Juan II of Castile (r. 1406-1454), as well as other Castilian kings, but he does so not in the biography of Pedro I of Castile, but in that of Pedro IV of Aragon.

4.2. Pedro IV of Aragon and his successors in Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda

Pedro IV of Aragon’s biography in al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿuqūd contains, as shown below, a great deal of information that is not found in al-ʿIbar (words in boldface are found only in al-Maqrīzī’s book):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro [IV] began to rule after the year 20 of that century (i.e., 720/1320-1) […] and died in 787 (1385-6 CE), when he was close to seventy. After him, his son the Duke (al-dukk) succeeded to the throne, and his brother Martín ruled alone in Zaragoza, one of their provinces, as co-ruler of his brother the Duke. After some years, he went out with his fleet and took the island of Sicily from the hands of its inhabitants. It became part of their provinces.</td>
<td>Pedro [IV] acceded to the throne of Barcelona after the year 720 (1320-1 CE). He remained in power for around 70 years, and died in 787 (1385-6 CE). His brother Indrīk killed him in Seville. After him, his son the Duke (al-dukk) F.r.d.rīk stood up. His brother Martín son of Pedro ruled alone in Zaragoza. After some years, he went out and took the island of Sicily. When Indrīk died, he was succeeded by his son Juan son of F.d.rīk. The latter was killed by a horse near Guadalajara, a town five days north of Toledo. It so happened that, while riding with his troops, he fell off his horse, and his foot remained stuck in the stirrup; the horse went on galloping with him until he died. After him, his son Don Indrīk son of Juan stood up till his death, and after him, his son Don Juan son of Indrīk son of Juan son of F.d.rīk. Then, Fernando son of Indrīk son of Juan — the latter is the one who was killed by the horse — set out from the lands of the fūnš. He left Seville to fight against the Catalans, people of Barcelona, whose king Martín had died. He overcame them and ruled over Barcelona and other cities until his death. After him, his son Alfonso son of Don Fernando stood up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79 The last Aragonese king mentioned in the ʿIbar passage on the kingdom of Barcelona is Martin I (r. 1396-1410). Furthermore, the biography dealing with Pedro IV of Aragon in al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿuqūd also contains information on Martin I’s predecessors that is not found in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s al-ʿIbar. Al-Maqrīzī may have received it orally from his teacher, but there is no doubt that he had to rely on, at least, another source for the information on kings Fernando I (r. 1412-1416) and Alfonso V (r. 1416-1458), whose accession to the throne took place after Ibn Ḥaldūn’s death.

80 Pedro IV of Aragon was born in 1319, started to reign in 1336, and died in 1387 at the age of 67.

In addition to containing some simple mistakes, such as attributing Pedro IV of Aragon around 70 years of rule instead of age at death (the ʿIbar text is ambiguous in this regard), the Durar passage on this king and his successors is rather confusing. First, it conflates information on the Crown of Aragon with information regarding the Crown of Castile. Thus, Pedro IV is said to have been killed by his brother “Indrīk” (from the Spanish ‘Enrique’) in Seville in 787/1385-6. Pedro IV died in 1387, but the rest of the report is obviously inspired by Pedro I’s biography. The son and successor of Pedro IV is referred to as al-dukk, “the Duke”, in reference to king Juan I (r. 1387-1396), first Duke of Girona — title of the
in the Baix Empordà. He was the natural son of Enrique II.

The mistakes in Durar al-‘uqūd seem to be due to misunderstandings and conflation between the history of the Castilian and Aragonese crowns, which al-Maqrīzī had received (in writing or orally) both from his teacher and from other sources for the information on kings that ruled after Ibn Ḫaldūn’s death, namely, Juan II of Castile (r. 1406-1454), Fernando I of Aragon (r. 1412 to 1416), and his son and successor Alfonso V of Aragon (r. 1416-1458), referred to as “Alfunsū b. Dūn F.r.nādū”. The fact that both Juan I of Castile and Juan I of Aragon — apart from bearing the same name — and his name is never given.

5. Note on Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s A māl al-ẓām

As a last brief note, Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb — the renowned polymath and politician (Loja, 713/1313 – Fez, 776/1374) — also offers some information on Pedro I of Castile86 in the chapter devoted to the Christian kings of Iberia in his A māl al-ẓām fi- man būyiʿa min al-mulūk qabla l-iḥtilām Christian Iberia in his A māl al-ẓām fi- man būyiʿa min al-mulūk qabla l-iḥtilām. It will not discuss this chapter in depth as it has been studied at length by Justin Stearns, as noted at the beginning of the present article, but I have been able to confirm that the information Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb provides is totally different from that offered by Ibn Ḫaldūn, as already observed by Stearns himself and others.87 The authority of Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb for his chapter is the Jewish scholar Yūsuf b. Waqqār of Toledo. Ibn Waqqār visited Granada from Castile — whose king he served as a physician — and related to Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb what he had read in a book.

86 See the collective volume on diplomatic relations of the Mamluk sultanate edited by Bauden and Dekkiche, Mamluk Cairo, a Crossroads for Embassies; particularly relevant for the present article is chapter 14, “Diplomatic Correspondence between Nasrid Granada and Mamluk Cairo”, written by Boloix Gallardo. For the reuse al-Maqrīzī made of documents issued by the Mamluk chancery as writing material for his own works, see, e.g., Bauden, “Du destin des archives en Islam”; Hirschler, “From Archive to Archival Practices”, esp. pp. 8-12, where further references can be found.


88 On the relationship between Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb and Pedro I, see Marquer, “La figura de Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb como consejero de Pedro I de Castilla”.


written at the behest of the “Great King Don Alfonso”. Martínez Antuña identified the book as the Estoria de España of Alfonso X of Castile (r. 1252-1284), an identification that obviously poses non-negligible problems to accept.91

As Justin Stearns states, Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s account is in general more accurate than Ibn Ḫaldūn’s.92 As regards the account of Pedro I’s reign specifically, A māl al-aʿlām93 does not include the mistakes found in al-ʿIbar. Furthermore, the former provides the names of people and places that are not found in the latter. Thus, Enrique II is referred to as “Inrīq” (an accurate transliteration of ‘Enrique’); the battle between the two parties is said to have taken place in “Nāǧira” (Nájera);94 also, the name of the fortress where Pedro was killed is provided, taking different forms in the manuscripts, some paleographically closer to the original ‘Montiel’ than others: M.nṯīl, M.nšīl, Q.šīl, Š.n.t.l, etc. A māl al-aʿlām, however, lacks important details that are offered by al-ʿIbar, including the names of the Prince of Wales and Muhammad V.

As regards Pedro I’s death, Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb says that when Pedro was besieged by his brother, he bribed a group of Enrique’s servants. When the servants had Pedro in their custody, they informed Enrique, who hurried to Pedro and killed him at the end of Ramadan 769 (20 April – 19 May 1368). Except for the date, this account is undoubtedly related to that offered by López de Ayala. Since Enrique II was the king that was reigning over Castile when Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb died, the section on the Castilian kings in A māl al-aʿlām ends with the report of his accession to power.

6. Conclusion

As said in the introduction, this article shows that Arab historians paid attention to the history of Christian medieval Iberia, which conflicts with the view that Arabic historiography showed little or no concern for the history and culture of non-Muslim societies. It mainly focuses on what they say about Pedro I the Cruel/Just, king of Castile. As argued throughout it, Pedro I was given a special attention by Arab historians, not only by historians such as Ibn Ḫaldūn and Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb, who were his contemporaries and even met him, but also al-Maqrīzī, who was only five years old when Pedro I died, and who lived far away from the land this king reigned over. Pedro I’s end at the hands of his half-brother Enrique, who ruled Castile as Enrique II, possibly produced a deep impression on Ibn Ḫaldūn, and this would be reflected both in his work and in his disciple’s, al-Maqrīzī. Each described this event at length in three/four different passages of their respective Kitāb al-ʿIbar and Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda, even though this episode of Castilian history was not directly related to the specific topic being dealt with in the text. In the case of the teacher, he even took the opportunity to include this report in the fragment on the recovery of Algeciras by the Muslims in 1369. His pretext to do so was the fact that the Castilian Civil War distracted the Castilians from their Muslim neighbours, whereby the latter took advantage of the situation to recover Algeciras — a town that Alfonso XI (r. 1312-1350), father of Pedro I and Enrique II, had taken from the Muslims twenty-five years earlier.

However, it is the disciple, the Cairene al-Maqrīzī, who offers the most detailed description of Pedro I’s death, in addition to further information on this and other kings of Christian Iberia that is not found in Kitāb al-ʿIbar, which is otherwise his main source for this fragment. A good deal of this information al-Maqrīzī received it orally from his teacher. Besides, the Egyptian historian undoubtedly relied on another source or sources in order to add material regarding events that took place after the death of Ibn Ḫaldūn, but perhaps also to embellish the latter’s account of the history of Christian Iberia from Pedro I of Castile and Pedro IV of Aragon onwards.

One can only speculate on the reasons why Pedro I aroused the interest of Ibn Ḫaldūn and al-Maqrīzī, why the disciple devoted an entry of his biographical dictionary to him (in which he included information on his predecessors and successors), and why the information both of them provide, which has a “historical” basis and is obviously related to contemporary Spanish sources, offers so many inaccuracies and inconsistencies. The answer to the first two questions may be the mere fact that Ibn Ḫaldūn had met Pedro I in

94 Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb offers a detailed account of this battle in al-Ḥaṭīb (vol. 2, pp. 22-23).
person, and he must have largely talked to his pupil al-Maqrīzī about the Castillian king, about his war with Pedro IV and his brother Enrique, and about his death, which occurred when Ibn Ḫaldūn was already back in North Africa.

Apart from that, the only certainty is that both Ibn Ḫaldūn and al-Maqrīzī incorporated into their respective works reports on Christian Iberia that had somehow reached Mamluk Egypt, thus showing an interest in the history of a non-Muslim society at the other end of the Mediterranean. This interest is particularly striking in the case of the Egyptian al-Maqrīzī, who never visited those remote territories. As shown in this article, Ibn Ḫaldūn introduced some of those reports shortly before his death, in the form of marginal additions, whilst al-Maqrīzī added to the material he had received from his teacher by inserting into his work information on events occurred after Ibn Ḫaldūn’s death. That said, it is not possible to know through which channels they received that information (from Western travelers/migrants, official letters, or otherwise), and to ascertain whether they received it already distorted or whether the mistakes, mix-ups and “non-historical” elements in their narratives (if contrasted with contemporary Spanish sources) must be attributed to the creative imagination of either of them, to misrecollections or misinterpretations, or to a combination of all this.

Appendix

Next, I offer the names and chronology of the Christian kings of Asturias, León and Castile as found in Ibn Ḫaldūn’s Kitāb al-ʿIbar, with the Spanish names and accepted chronology between parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date of death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balāyuh b. Qāquluh/Fāfuluh (Pelayo son of Fávila, r. 718-737)</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>133 H (750-1 CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāquluh (Fávila, r. 737-739)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uḏfūnš b. Biṭruh (Alfonso I, son of Pedro of Cantabria, r. 739-757)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>142 (759-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrūyluh (Fruela I, r. 757-768)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152 (769-70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ūrāl b. Farrūyluh (Aurelio, son of Fruela of Cantabria, r. 768-774)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158 (774-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣaylūn (Silo, r. 774-783)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmund (Bermudo I, r. 789-791)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>168 (784-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uḏfūnš (Alfonso II, r. 783 and 791-842)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūr.qāṭ (Mauregato, r. 783-789)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uḏfūnš b. Ṣaylūn (Alfonso II, son of Fruela I, r. 791-842)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>227 (841-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ruḏmīr, son of his paternal uncle59 Burmund (Ramiro I, son of Bermudo I, r. 842-850)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣ.d.mūš (Alfonso III, r. 866-910)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garsiya (Garcia I of León, r. 910-914)</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>311 (923-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdūn (Ordoño II of León, r. 914-924)</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>311 (923-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.lūb.ruh (Fruela II of León, son of Alfonso III, r. 924-925)</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uḏfūnš (Alfonso IV of León, son of Ordoño II, r. 926-931)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruḏmīr b. Urdūn (Ramiro II, son of Ordoño II, r. 931-951)</td>
<td>329 (940-1) / 339 (950-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdūn b. Ruḏmīr b. Urdūn (Ordoño III, son of Ramiro II, r. 951-956)</td>
<td>345 (956-7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šālǧa/Šānǧuh b. Ruḏmīr (Sancho I, son of Ramiro II, r. 956-958)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruḏmīr (Ramiro III, r. 966-985)</td>
<td>374 (984-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmund b. Urdūn (Bermudo II, son of Ordoño III, r. 985-999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uḏfūnš (Alfonso V, r. 999-1028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farḏiland, son of Šānǧuh b. Anrīkuh (Fernando I, son of Sancho III of Navarre, r. 1037-1065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 The reading of the Tunisian edition is “ibn ʿammat Burmund” (the son of the paternal aunt of Bermudo), which, I think, is a corrupt reading for “ibn ʿammihi Burmund” (the son of his paternal uncle Bermudo). As first cousin of Alfonso II’s father (Fruela I), Bermudo I was Alfonso II’s cousin once removed.
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