

An Analysis of the Annalistic Sources of the Early Mamluk Circassian Period

Volume One

by

Sami G. Massoud
Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University
October 2005
Montreal, Canada

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at
McGill University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.

© Sami G. Massoud, 2005



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-21674-3
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-21674-3

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

الإهداء

هذا من فضل أمي وأبي
جوزفين
و
جبران الخوري ميخائيل مسعود

إلى نور حياتي
ابنتي الحبيبة
جوليا

To my beloved parents

Joséphine
and
Gubrân al-Khûrî Mîkhâ'il Massoud

To the sunshine of my life
My beloved daughter
Julia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

Acknowledgments	v
Notes on Transliteration	vii
Abstract	ix
 INTRODUCTION:	 1
 CHAPTER ONE. The Revolt against Al-Ashraf Sha‘bân and its Aftermath: the Annal of the Year 778/1376-7	
 <u>I. Introductory Remarks:</u>	 23
 <u>II. Contemporary Historians:</u>	
<u>1. Egyptian Historians:</u>	
A. ‘Abd al-Rahmân Ibn Khaldûn	25
B. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir ibn Badr al-Dîn Ibn Habîb al-Halabî	34
C. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq	42
D. Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât	50
 <u>III. Later Historians:</u>	
<u>1. Egyptian Historians:</u>	
A. Badr al-Dîn al-‘Aynî	56
B. Walî al-Dîn Abû Zur‘ah, Ibn al-‘Irâqî	65
C. Taqî al-Dîn Ahmad al-Maqrîzî	70
D. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî	77
E. Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî	86

F. Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Sakhâwî	92
G. ‘Abd al-Bâsit ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî	94
H. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Ibn Iyâs al-Ḥanafî	97
I. Anonymous; <i>Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ’ wa-al-Mulûk</i>	106
2. <u>Syrian Historians:</u>	
A. Taqî al-Dîn Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah	113
IV. <u>Minor Historians:</u>	119
V. <u>Sectional Conclusions:</u>	120
 CHAPTER TWO. The Mintâshî Rebellion and the military and political crises in Syria: the Annal of the Year 793/1390–91	
I. <u>Introductory Remarks:</u>	124
II. <u>Contemporary Historians:</u>	
1. <u>Egyptian Historians:</u>	
A. ‘Abd al-Rahmân Ibn Khaldûn	128
B. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir ibn Badr al-Dîn Ibn Ḥabîb al-Ḥalabî	134
C. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq	139
D. Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât	139
E. Badr al-Dîn al-‘Aynî	150
F. Taqî al-Dîn Aḥmad al-Maqrîzî	157
G. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalânî	164
2. <u>Syrian Historians:</u>	
A. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Saṣrâ	170
B. Aḥmad Ibn Hijjî ibn Mûsâ al-Ḥusbânî	179

III. Later Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî	188
B. ‘Alî ibn Dâwûd al-Jawharî al-Sayrafî	190
C. ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî	194
D. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Ibn Iyâs al-Ḥanafî	195
E. Anonymous; <i>Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ’ wa-al-Mulûk</i>	199

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Taqî al-Dîn Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah	202
---------------------------------	-----

IV. Minor Historians: 208

V. Sectional Conclusions: 208

CHAPTER THREE. Unfinished business in Syria and the Rebellions of Jakam and Nawrûz al-Hâfizî in Egypt: the Annal of the Year 804/1401-2

I. Introductory Remarks: 212

II. Contemporary Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq	217
B. Badr al-Dîn al-‘Aynî	221
C. Taqî al-Dîn Aḥmad al-Maqrîzî	225
D. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalânî	230

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Aḥmad Ibn Hijjî ibn Mûsâ al-Ḥusbânî	239
--	-----

III. Later Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî	246
B. ‘Alî ibn Dâwûd al-Jawharî al-Ṣayrafî	252
C. ‘Abd al-Bâsit ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî	253
D. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Ibn Iyâs al-Ḥanafî	255
E. Anonymous; <i>Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ’ wa-al-Mulûk</i>	260

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Taqî al-Dîn Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah	264
---------------------------------	-----

IV. <u>Minor Historians:</u>	272
------------------------------	-----

V. <u>Sectional Conclusions:</u>	273
----------------------------------	-----

CONCLUSION	275
------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	282
--------------	-----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my daughter, Julia, and to my parents, Joséphine and Gubrân al-Khûrî Mikhâ'il Massoud who, since my early childhood, have instilled in me the love and admiration of Arabic culture, civilization and history, as well as intellectual curiosity. I was, am and will forever be in their debt.

I was blessed to pursue my research on the Mamluks under the guidance of one of the foremost experts in this field, Professor Donald P. Little. Heartfelt thanks go to Professor Little not only for his help, judicious comments and his patience in directing my research, but especially for the steps he has taken to help me launch what I hope will be a successful career as a specialist in Mamluk history.

I am also grateful to all the professors at the Institute of Islamic Studies under whom I have had the honour of studying: Professors Sajida Alvi, my advisor for my M.A. thesis, the person who helped me discover the fascinating Islamic civilisation of the Indian subcontinent; Hermann Landolt who taught me most of what I know about Islamic mysticism and philosophy; and Üner Turgay who introduced me to the history of the Ottoman empire and that of surrounding regions.

I wish also to acknowledge Professor Sam Noumoff, under whose guidance I completed my M.A. in Political Science at McGill and who helped me greatly in getting through the hurdles that then stood in my way: his help and kindness will never be forgotten.

Ann Yaxley and the administrative staff of the Institute of Islamic Studies always looked out for me and allowed me to weather all the bureaucratic hurdles that stood in my way. Thank you all.

At the library of the Institute, I wish to salute Wayne St. Thomas who bore with me throughout the years; Steve Millier who helped me on numerous occasions to clarify texts written in German and to solve bibliographical issues; Adam Gacek, the Library Director and specialist of the Arabic manuscript tradition, answered so many of my questions concerning manuscripts and provided me with truly illuminating insight into them; and Salwa Farahian.

At the McLennan Library of McGill University, I wish to thank Carl Eugene, the Stacks Manager, Peter Santlal and Dolly Rahman, who, over the years, have been of great assistance and who have ended up becoming my friends.

Bruce Craig at the University of Chicago and Li Guo at Notre-Dame were kind enough to make available to me the microfilms of important manuscripts, and so did David Reisman at Yale University, with whom I also had very stimulating exchanges. I wish to thank particularly Bruce Craig of the editorial board of *Mamlûk Studies Review* for allowing me to use sections of an article that I wrote for the journal in chapter two of this dissertation.

Many colleagues and friends supported and encouraged me in this long enterprise: Jacques Chamberland, Claude Goulet, Patrice Wiedmann, Sylvie Richard-Bessette, Lisa Alexandrin, Mike Wood, Sevag Manjikian and others.

A special salute goes to my dear friend Cedrik Goddard with whom I have had so many engaging conversations and whose presence I so dearly miss: his memory and friendship will forever be with me.

Last but not least, my love and appreciation go to my wonderful wife Ann Nagribianko, without whose help I simply could have never successfully completed this difficult endeavour. My love also goes to my brother Michel, my sisters Mayya and Rania, my sister-in-law Grace, my brothers-in-law Élie Traboulsi and Nabil Dabaghi, and my nephews and nieces, Mazen, Gabriel, Raphael, Maysa and Lamia. My love also goes to my in-laws, Céline “Belle-Maman” Blais and Walter Nagribianko who, for so many years, endured my complaints about the vicissitudes of finishing a Ph.D. degree, but always encouraged me to carry on.

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

Consonants	
ا	a
ب	b
ت	t
ث	th
ج	j
ح	h
خ	kh
د	d
ذ	dh
ر	r
ز	z
س	s
ش	sh
ص	ṣ
ض	ḍ
ط	ṭ
ظ	ẓ
ع	‘
غ	gh
ف	f
ق	q
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
ه	h
و	w
ي	y
ة	h or t when in construct The only exception to this rule is the word <i>qudât</i> always written thus
Diacritic Signs and Vowels	
	i
	u
	a
	in

	on
	an
آ	â
او	û
ى	á
اي	î
إيه	îyah
اي	ay
اي	ayy

GENERAL COMMENTS

The spelling and the grammar of all passages in Arabic that were transliterated were left as they appeared in the sources. Only punctuation was added when needed.

Except for the word *fulûs* and for compound words such as *qâdî al-qudât*, plurals of Arabic words (*hâjib*; *nâ'ib*; etc.) have been rendered by means of an s added to the singular form (*hâjibs*; *nâ'ibs*; etc.).

The word *ibn* has been capitalized if appearing in an initial position or when a person was known as *Ibn* so and so: for example, *Muhammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyâs*, but *Sâlih ibn Yahyâ*.

The symbol [?] that follows a given transliterated word, denotes uncertainty as to its spelling. On the other hand, the symbol [...?] indicates that a word is missing because I simply could not decipher the way it was written.

ABSTRACT

The Mamluk Sultanate that dominated Egypt and Syria over slightly more than two centuries and a half (647-922/1250-1517), witnessed the development of a prodigious historiographical production. While the historiography of the Turkish Mamluk period (647-792/1250-1382) has been the object of thorough analyses to determine the patterns of interrelations amongst its authors and the respective value of its most important sources, that of the Early Circassian Mamluk period (roughly, the last quarter of the fourteenth/eighth and the first years of the fifteenth/ninth centuries) has not as of yet received proper attention. In this dissertation, this historiographical production has been surveyed and subjected to an analysis, the methodology of which was pioneered by Donald P. Little, one that consists of close word-by-word comparison of individual accounts in the works of Syrian and Egyptian authors who wrote about this period. The focus here was on specifically non-biographical historical material contained in mostly annalistic works. Amongst the results obtained during this research was the ultimate reliance, at different degrees and depths, of all historians on the works of five authors, namely Ibn Duqmâq (d. 809/1407), Ibn al-Furât (d. 807/1405), Ibn Hijjî (d. 816/1413), al-Maqrîzî (d. 845/1441) and al-'Aynî (d. 855/1451), but especially the first three.

RÉSUMÉ

Le Sultanat Mamelouk qui a dominé l'Égypte et la Syrie durant un peu plus de deux siècles et demi (1250-1517/647-922) a vu se développer en son sein une prodigieuse production historiographique. Cependant, alors que l'historiographie de la période Mamelouk turque (647-792/1250-1382) a fait l'objet de rigoureuses analyses qui ont permis de déterminer l'interdépendance de ses auteurs et la valeur de leurs ouvrages, celle du début de la période mamelouke circassienne (en gros, le dernier quart du quatorzième/huitième et les premières années du quinzième/neuvième siècles) n'a pas reçu l'attention qu'elle mérite. Dans le cadre de cette thèse, nous avons procédé à un survol de cette production historiographique qui a aussi été assujettie à une analyse particulière dont la méthodologie avait été arrêtée par Donald P. Little : celle-ci consiste à effectuer une comparaison serrée, mot à mot, des relations contenues dans les ouvrages des historiens syriens et égyptiens qui ont écrit sur cette période. L'accent a été mis spécifiquement sur la matière historique non biographique de chroniques pour la plupart de nature annalistique. Parmi les résultats obtenus par le biais de cette recherche, on retrouve la dépendance de tous les historiens, à différents degrés et profondeurs, sur ultimement cinq auteurs: Ibn Duqmâq (m. 809/1407), Ibn al-Furât (m. 807/1405), Ibn Hijjî (m. 816/1413), al-Maqrîzî (m. 845/1441) et al-'Aynî (m. 855/1451), mais spécialement les trois premiers.

INTRODUCTION:

At first sight, the era that followed the reign of al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn (d. 741/1341) appears to be unremarkable. Most of his twelve descendents who took office at various intervals after his death, turned out to be failed rulers who were mere puppets in the hands of powerful magnates; and the two who actually managed to exercise their authority, al-Nâsir Ḥasan (748-52, 755-62/1347-51, 1354-61) and al-Ashraf Sha‘bân (764-78/1363-77), ended up being murdered by Mamluk factions.¹ In the eyes of modern-day historians, the two sovereigns who dominated the period that followed did not fare any better. The historical conditions and personal circumstances prevailing during the reigns of al-Zâhir Barqûq (784-91, 792-801/1382-9, 1390-9) and his son, al-Nâsir Faraj (801-8, 808-15/1399-1405, 1405-1412), did not place them in an environment where they could have accomplished the kind of deeds characteristic of, say, Baybars’ reign, something which led Gaston Wiet to exclaim concerning Barqûq’s years in power that they were “mouvementés et ils n’ajoutent rien à la gloire de l’Égypte: les cinquante dernières années du 8^e/14^e siècle sont bien lamentables.”² However, at numerous levels,

¹ See Robert Irwin, *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), pp. 125-160.

² “Barqûk, al-Malik al-Zâhir Sayf al-Dîn,” in *EP*, vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), p. 1082. Beyond the few skirmishes that opposed Barqûq to Tamerlane’s army in 797-8/1393-4 and the undistinguished flight of Faraj from Damascus in 803/1400 in the face of the same enemy, neither father nor son could claim military feats rivaling those of some of their predecessors, the likes of Baybars and Qalâwûn. Politically, neither sultan managed to outshine the legacy of al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn: their reigns, as they are

the historical period the later Qalâwûnids and the father and son pair presided over is more significant than the opinion of some would suggest.

For one thing, even though generally the duration of one's rule is in no way indicative of success, within the highly volatile environment of Mamluk politics, Barqûq has, on a par with Barsbây, the fourth longest reign amongst the forty-eight sultans who acceded to the throne of Egypt and Syria, fourth only to giants such as al-Nâsir Muḥammad, al-Ashraf Qâ'it Bâ'y and al-Zâhir Baybars.³ More importantly, the reigns of Barqûq and Faraj were characterized by the exacerbation of factional politics, which had an impact on the concomitant mechanisms of throne succession;⁴ the increasingly pivotal

described in contemporary chronicles, seem to have been no more than a series of violent struggles pitting various power-hungry Mamluk factions against one another. J. Wansbrough's comment that, within the overall framework of the Mamluks' history, neither reigns of Faraj were particularly constructive because of the constant infighting amongst high ranking emirs, is very much in tune with Wiet's assessment of Barqûq; "Faradj, al-Malik al-Nâsir Zayn al-Dîn Abû'l-Sa'âdat," in *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 781. As a result, whether it was due to the overall negative or aloof attitude of modern-day scholars towards the two sultans or to conditions peculiar to the field of Mamluk studies which made them appear as less of a 'catch' than other rulers, the fact of the matter is that the secondary literature that deals directly with Barqûq and Faraj is surprisingly thin as can be seen in the small number of entries found under the names of these two rulers in the University of Chicago *Mamlûk Bibliography Online*.

³ Barqûq would place third if one takes into account those years, 779-84/1378-82, during which he was *amîr kabîr* and sultan in all but in name. The three rulers mentioned above as well as others have been the subject of at least one monograph by modern scholars, but not Barqûq; among others, Syedah Fatima Sadeque, *Baybars I of Egypt* (Dacca: Oxford University Press, 1956); Peter Thorau, *The Lion of Egypt: Sultan Baybars I and the Near East in the Thirteenth Century* (London and New York: Longman, 1992); Hayat Nasir al-Hajji, *The Internal Affairs in Egypt during the Third Reign of Sultan al-Nâsir Muḥammad b. Qalâwûn, 709-741/1309-1341* (Kuwait: Jâmi'at al-Kuwayt, 1995); Linda S. Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of al-Mansûr Qalâwûn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678-689A.H./1279-1290 A.D.)* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998); Shah Morad Elham, *Kitbugâ und Lâgîn: Studien zur Mamluken-Geschichte nach Baibars al-Mansûrî und al-Nuwairî* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz, 1977); Ahmad Darraj, *L'Égypte sous le règne de Barsbay, 825-841/1422-1438* (Damas: Institut Français de Damas, 1961); Carl F. Petry, *Twilight of Majesty: The Reigns of Mamluk Sultans Al-Ashraf Qâyrbây and Qânsûh al-Ghawri in Egypt* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1993).

⁴ Many observers have pointed out the inherent instability of Mamluk politics and the literature on this subject abounds in explanations of the rules of succession in the sultanate and the role played by factions in the process. The explanations put forward by scholars concerning the mechanisms behind the ascension of Barqûq to power and his son's tragic loss of it, still need to be tested and some need to be revisited for clarification. With regard to Faraj, one needs to explore the extent to which his demise conforms to the pattern of succession of the Circassian period described by Holt - usurpation of the throne by an emir, followed by the accession of his son who after some kind of interregnum is removed from power by yet another usurper - and the reasons why he managed to stay in power for such a long time, thirteen years; P.M. Holt "Mamlûk," in *EP*, vol. 6 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), p. 308. For a description of the rationale behind power politics in later periods of the Circassian Mamluk Sultanate, see Robert Irwin, "Factions in

role played by Syria in political affairs;⁵ the changes that occurred in the administrative structure of the Mamluk Sultanate primarily in response to the changing exigencies of rule;⁶ the inauguration of policies that had a profound impact on the social and political life of their subjects;⁷ etc.

Medieval Egypt,” in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1986), pp. 228-246 and Carl F. Petry *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamluk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), pp. 72-101. See also, Amalia Levanoni “The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate,” in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 26 (1994), pp. 373-4, for an overview of the literature pertaining to this issue.

⁵ It was in Syria that Mintāsh and Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī rebelled against Barqūq, and it was there, at the fortress of al-Karak to be more precise, that he was exiled after his removal from power in 791/1389. It was from Syria that Barqūq launched his reconquest of the throne in 792/1390. Faraj sent no less than seven expeditions to quell rebellions in this region where a rebel emir, Yashbak, even proclaimed himself sultan in 809/1407; Wansbrough, “Faraj,” p. 781. Contemporary primary sources abound in references to the war readiness of the Syrian population whether urban, rural or nomadic; see, for example Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ṣaṣrā’s *Al-Durra al-Mudī’a fi’l-Dawla al-Zāhiriyya: A chronicle of Damascus, 1389-1397*, translated, edited and annotated by William M. Brinner, vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California, 1963), pp. 40ff, for a description of the events surrounding the siege of Damascus by Barqūq in 792-3 and the participation on both sides of indigenous groups, urban and others; see also, below, chapter two, pp. 171-9, 183-5. Despite the importance of Syria, there are relatively few secondary sources that deal specifically with politics in this region during the Mamluk era generally and the Circassian period specifically; see, for example, David Ayalon, “Egypt as a Dominant Factor in Syria and Palestine during the Islamic Period,” in *Egypt and Palestine: A Millennium of Association (868-1948)*, edited by A. Cohen and Gabriel Baer (New York: St. Martin’s, 1984), pp. 17-47; Nicola A. Ziadeh, *Urban Life in Syria under the Early Mamlūks* (Beirut: American University of Beirut Publications, 1953); idem, “Town Administration in Syria under the Early Mamlūks,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Congress of Orientalists*, edited by Zeki Velidi Togan (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), pp. 206-227; Maurice Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks* (Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1923); A. S. Tritton, “The Tribes of Syria in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and Asiatic Studies*, vol. 12 (1947), pp. 567-573; Bernadette Martel-Thoumian, “L’administration d’Alep sous les Mamluks circassiens (IXe-XVe siècle): Le cas des Banu Saffah,” in *Revue du Monde musulman et de la Méditerranée*, vol. 62 (1991), pp. 72-80.

⁶ The creation under Barqūq of new personal treasuries, *al-dīwān al-mufrad* and *dīwān al-amlāk*, both of which were administered by an officer of the sultan’s household, the *ustādh al-dār al-‘āliyah*, needs to be further investigated and to be placed within the framework of declining state revenues. The function of *ḥājib* also experienced some changes under both Barqūq and Faraj. It had started to grow in importance under al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and it continued to witness a significant broadening of its prerogatives as these extended at the expense of *shar‘i* courts. What prompted Barqūq to name six chamberlains and his son Faraj eight deserves to be studied in a comprehensive manner as their action indicates changes in the priorities and the operating of government. Other aspects of the administration of the Circassian Mamluk state should be studied as well, among others, the convergence of the titles of *amīr kabīr* and *atābak al-‘asākīr* in the person of Barqūq; Holt, “Mamlūk,” p. 311.

⁷ Under Barqūq, the *awlād al-nās*, the non-Mamluk descendants of mamluks, experienced a sharp decrease of the *iqṭā’* upon which they depended for livelihood. There were also successful attempts under both him and his son to subject *waqfs* to the control of the state. Not only were parts of the *waqf* revenues alienated for the benefit of the army in cases of military emergency, but on a number of occasions both Barqūq and Faraj tried to suppress them altogether, something which triggered the opposition of the ‘*ulamā’*’; see Ulrich Haarmann, “Mamluk Endowment Deeds as a Source for the History of Education in Late Medieval Egypt,” in *Al-Abḥāth*, vol. 28 (1980), p. 34 and Ahmad Darrag, *L’Acte du Waqf de Barsbay* (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1969), pp. 12-15. The scrutinizing of these measures taken by

Even more significant however is the fact that the arrival of Barqûq to power heralds the beginning of what contemporary and modern historians alike describe as the beginning of the Circassian period of the Mamluk Sultanate.⁸ Whether or not evidence supports this characterization is open for debate,⁹ but the fact remains that the dawn of

Barqûq is all the more necessary since his actions appear to contradict his image as a friend of the religious establishment. References to Barqûq's concern for things religious abound: his piety, the favor he showed to Sufis by insuring them stipends in his *waqf*, his allegiance to famous *awliyâ'*, his patronage of religious buildings and to holy sites in the kingdom, are all noted in both primary and secondary sources; see Ibn Saqrâ, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 92; Haarmann, "Mamluk Endowment Deeds," p. 36; Éric Geoffroy, *Le Soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans: Orientations spirituelles et enjeux culturels* (Damas: Institut Français de Damas, 1995), pp. 105, 125; Donald P. Little, "Relations between Jerusalem and Egypt during the Mamluk Period According to Literary and Documentary Sources," in *Egypt and Palestine: A Millennium of Association (868-1948)*, p. 74. With the change from Bahrî to Burjî rule, says Haarmann, sultans and their courts have tended to be very much involved in the religious and cultural life of their time, with Barqûq being engaged in the harmonizing of 'ilm and *taṣawwuf*; "Arabic in Speech, Turkish in Lineage: Mamluks and Their Sons in the Intellectual Life of Fourteenth-Century Egypt and Syria," in *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 33, no. 1 (1988), p. 86. Unfortunately, nothing comprehensive about the religious life of the period has been written. As a matter of fact, we do not possess for the 'middle' Mamluk period the equivalent of Louis Pouzet's work on religious life in Damascus during the thirteenth century or Éric Geoffroy's study on Sufism in Egypt and Syria cited above, a gap that needs to be addressed; Louis Pouzet, *Damas au VI^e/XIII^e, vie et structures religieuses dans une métropole islamique* (Beirut : Dâr al-Machreq, 1991).

⁸ Even though the presence of Circassians in the Mamluk Sultanate is attested as early as the reign of al-Mansûr Qalâwûn (678-89/1279-90) who recruited many of them for his Burjî regiment, and even though al-Muzaffar Baybars (708-9/1309-10) is reported to have been of Circassian origin, the hegemony of these Caucasian people allegedly began only under Barqûq who 'imported' large number of them from his homeland. On this see David Ayalon, "The Circassians in the Mamluk Kingdom," in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 69, 3 (1949), pp. 137-8. The word hegemony could be qualified by the adjective 'relative' because, as Robert Irwin notes, there were some successful Turkish 'counter-coups' and the sultans of the Circassian era were by no means all Circassian; *The Middle East in the Middle Ages*, p. 158.

⁹ With the exception of a few studies which examined the rise of the Circassians to power, hardly any sustained light has been shed on the conditions which allowed this ethnic group to prevail on the until then dominant Turks; see Ayalon, "The Circassians in the Mamluk Kingdom" and Amalia Levanoni, "Al-Maqrîzî's account of the Transition from Turkish to Circassian Mamluk Sultanate: History in the Service of Faith," in *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt (C. 950-1800)*, edited by Hugh Kennedy (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 93-105. One cannot understand the arrival of Barqûq to power and the concomitant growth of the Circassians without examining in a comprehensive fashion the constitution of strong Circassian factions as early as the reign of al-Muzaffar Hâjjî (747-8/1346-7) but especially during the 'tenure' of Yalbughâ al-'Umarî (ruled as regent from 762/1361 until his death in 768/1366) and the period that followed; Irwin, *The Middle East in the Middle Ages*, p. 134; Holt, "Mamlûk," p. 308 and idem, *The Age of the Crusades*, pp. 124-5. In the same vein, one needs to establish once and for all, by means of the existing primary literature, the extent to which ethnic considerations played a role in the advent of Barqûq and in the crises that beset the reigns of his son Faraj; Wansbrough, "Faradj," p. 781. Still, there are doubts in scholarly circles whether Circassians really dominated the state apparatus beginning with Barqûq. The seminal article authored by Ayalon on the Circassians contains numerous references, culled from primary sources, to ethnic tensions and incidents between Turks and Circassians from the middle of the fourteenth century onward to the reign of Faraj. However, a large number of these references concerning the rise of the Circassians *prior* to that of Barqûq come from much later sources, as late as Ibn Iyâs, a historian who, at least for the period under

this new political epoch coincided with pivotal changes occurring at the level of historiography. During the second half of the fourteenth/eighth and the beginning of ninth/fifteenth centuries, the intellectual scene witnessed the withering away of an entire generation of historians, those who had lived through and just beyond the reigns of al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn. Thus, *Al-Bidâyah wa-al-Nihâyah fî al-Târikh*,¹⁰ the main historical work of Ibn Kathîr (d. 774/1373), the last representative of the ‘original Syrian school,’¹¹ does not extend beyond 768/1366-7.¹² The two works of another Syrian historian who was not connected to the Syrian school, Ibn Ḥabîb al-Ḥalabî’s (710-779/1310-1377) *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh fî Ayyâm al-Manṣûr wa Banîh*¹³ and *Durrat al-Aslâk*

discussion, is highly unreliable; see below, chapters one, pp. 102-106, two, pp. 196-7, and three, pp. 258-60. The need to re-examine this matter within the framework of more recent scholarship is all the more necessary. Levanoni has introduced some data on the relative importance of Turks and Circassians under Barqûq, but has not expanded on the issue; “History in the Service of Faith,” pp. 100-1. Jan Van Steenbergen, a Ph.D. doctoral candidate at the University of Leuven in Belgium, is presently undertaking a study on the emirs of the period between 1341 and 1382, and it is hoped that his and Levanoni’s research will eventually provide answers to the issues raised here.

¹⁰ Edited by Aḥmad Abû Melḥem, vols. 1-14 (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1987); hereafter *Al-Bidâyah*.

¹¹ This school included al-Yûnînî (d. 726/1326), al-Birzalî (d. 739/1338), al-Jazarî (d. 739/1338), al-Dhahabî (d. 748/1348) and al-Kutubî (d. 764/1363). For overviews concerning the appropriateness of differentiating between Syrian and Egyptian ‘schools’ of history writing, see Little, *An Introduction to Mamlûk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâ’ûn* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1970) [hereafter *Introduction*] pp. 46, 95, 98; Li Guo, “Mamluk Historiographic Studies: The State of the Art,” in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 1 (1997), pp. 29-33, 37-39; Reisman, “A Holograph MS of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah’s *Dhayl*,” in *ibid.*, vol. 2 (1998), pp. 24-25, 27-28 and the references therein. On the continuing use by scholars of quotation marks when mentioning the term ‘schools’, see Reisman, “A Holograph MS,” footnote no. 17, pp. 24-25.

¹² The last entry of the book is the news about the murder of Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî; *Al-Bidâyah*, vol. 14, pp. 338-9. On the later parts of Ibn Kathîr’s chronicle see Ashtor’s contention, originally advanced by Laoust, that the last part of *Al-Bidâyah* was written not by Ibn Kathîr himself but by one of his students, probably Ibn Ḥijjî; “Études sur quelques chroniques mamloukes,” *Israel Oriental Society*, vol. 1 (1971), p. 284. While the annal of the year 768 is of great importance as it witnessed the murder of the regicide Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî at the hands of his own Mamluks, among them Barqûq, Ibn Kathîr’s narration with regard to it does not include any original material. Al-‘Umarî had led a revolt in 762 against his *ustâdh*, Sultan al-Nâsir Ḥasan (d. 762/1361), which resulted in the latter’s assassination; see al-Maqrîzî’s *Kitâb al-Sulûk li-Ma’rifat al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk*, edited by Sa’id ‘Abd al-Fattâh ‘Âshûr (Cairo: Dâr al-Kutub, 1970), vol. 3:1, p. 155 [hereafter *Kitâb al-Sulûk*] for a brief summary of Barqûq’s travels and activities following the murder of Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî.

¹³ Edited by Muḥammad Muḥammad Amîn with an introduction by Sa’id ‘Abd al-Fattâh ‘Âshûr, vols 1-3 (Cairo: al-Hay’ah al-Miṣrîyah al-‘Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1976-86).

*fi Mulk Dawlat al-Atrāk*¹⁴ end respectively in 770 and 777. As for Egypt, the other and major pole of the Mamluk Sultanate, *Naṭr al-Jûmân fi Tarâjim al-A'yân*, the chronicle of al-Muqrî (who was still alive by 766/1364-65), the last of the Egyptian historians to have been a contemporary of al-Nâsir Muḥammad, ends in 745/1345.¹⁵

The emergence of a new generation of historians, the likes of ‘Abd al-Raḥmân Ibn Khaldûn¹⁶ (732-808/1332-1406); Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât¹⁷ (735-807/1335-1405); Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir¹⁸ (after 740–808/1340–1406); Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq¹⁹ (745-809/1349-1407); Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hiji²⁰ (751-816/1350-1413); Abû Muḥammad

¹⁴ Of the three manuscripts I have consulted, two, Bodleian Marsh 591 and Bodleian Marsh 223, start at the year 648, and the third, Bodleian Marsh 319, at the year 762. The three manuscripts end respectively in 777, 714 and 801. It is MS Bodleian Marsh 319 that will be used throughout this research since it is the only one to include the annals 778 to 801 written by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, Ibn Ḥabîb’s son; see below, footnote no. 18.

¹⁵ On this author and his work, see Little, *Introduction*, p. 40.

¹⁶ *Kitâb al-‘Ibar wa-al-Mubtada’ wa-al-Khabar*, vols. 1-7 (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-A‘lamî lil-Maṭbû‘ât, 1971)[hereafter *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*] and *Al-Ta’rif bi-Ibn Khaldûn wa Rihlatihi Gharban wa Sharqan*, edited by Muḥammad Ibn Tâwîṭ al-Ṭanḥabî (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta’lîf wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Nashr, 1951) [hereafter *Al-Ta’rif*].

¹⁷ *Târikh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk*, vols. 9.1 and 9.2, ed. by Costi K. Zurayk and Najla Izzeddin (Beirut: The American University of Beirut, 1936-38) [hereafter *Târikh al-Duwal*]; “Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn al-Furât,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 1b-178b, covers the years 773-793.

¹⁸ “Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk,” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 134ff. Contrary to what ‘Âshûr claims in his introduction to *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s *dhayl* [hereafter *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*], at least the manuscript used here, ends in 801 and not 802; see “Introduction to *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*,” p. 20. More on the authorship of this work, below, chapter one, pp. 34-7.

¹⁹ Three editions of *Al-Jawhar al-Thamîn fi Siyar al-Khulafâ’ wa-al-Mulûk* are available: Sa‘îd ‘Abd al-Fattâh ‘Âshûr’s edition (Mecca: Markaz al-Baḥth al-‘Ilmî wa-Iḥyâ’ al-Turâth al-Islâmî, Jâmi‘at Umm al-Qurâ, 1983) [hereafter *Al-Jawhar ‘Âshûr*]; Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn ‘Izz al-Dîn ‘Alî’s edition in two volumes (Beirut: ‘Âlam al-Kitâb, 1985) [hereafter *Al-Jawhar ‘Alî*]; ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salâm Tadmurî’s edition entitled *Al-Nafḥah al-Miskîyah fi al-Dawlah al-Turkîyah* (Sidon and Beirut: al-Maktabah al-‘Asrîyah, 1999) [hereafter *Al-Nafḥah*] which corresponds to volume two of ‘Izz al-Dîn ‘Alî’s edition, namely the Mamluk period. The appellation of *Al-Nafḥah al-Miskîyah* is the title of the manuscript of *Al-Jawhar al-Thamîn* Tadmurî edited and which extended, contrary to the other two, all the way to 805; throughout this thesis, it is this latter version of *Jawhar al-Sulûk* that will be used since its edition is more recent and since also the overlapping text does not differ significantly from one version to the other; see Tadmurî, “Introduction” to *Al-Nafḥah*, pp. 18-20. Also, by Ibn Duqmâq, *Nuzhat al-Anâm fi Târikh al-Islâm*, edited by Samir Ṭabbârah (Sidon and Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-‘Asrîyah, 1999) [hereafter *Nuzhat al-Anâm Ṭabbârah*], “Nuzhat al-Anâm fi Târikh al-Islâm,” MS Gotha orient, A 1572 [hereafter *Nuzhat al-Anâm*], and “Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 197b-205b, which incompletely covers the years 804 and 805.

²⁰ *Târikh Ibn Hiji*, MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458. This manuscript was recently edited by Abû Yahyâ ‘Abd Allâh al-Kandarî, vols 1-2 (Beirut: Dâr Ibn Ḥazm, 2003). Recensions of *Târikh Ibn Hiji* from the hand of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah are to be found in Chester Beatty 4125, 5527 and Köprülü 1027; see Reisman, “A Holograph MS,” p. 48.

Mahmūd ibn Aḥmad Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī²¹ (762-855/1361-1451); Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Maqrīzī²² (766-845/1364-1441), Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Saṣrā,²³ Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī²⁴ (773-852/1372-1449); Ibn Qādī Shuhbah²⁵ (779-851/1377-1448), and others, all of whom lived a substantial portion of their life during Barqūq’s reign and the beginning of his son’s, and/or were actually connected to their regimes, would insure a solid transition in historical writing from the Turkish to the Circassian periods. Most of these authors would in their turn nurse another wave of historians starting with Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf Ibn Taghrībirdī²⁶ (812-874/1409-70), al-Jawharī al-Sayrafi²⁷ (819-900/1416-1494), Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Sakhāwī²⁸ (830-902/1427-97), Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Ibn Iyās²⁹ (852-930/1427-97), etc.

²¹ *‘Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān*, MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2; Ahmet III 2911/19 and Dār al-Kutub MS 1584 *tārīkh*.

²² *Kitāb al-Mawā‘iz wa-al-‘Itibār bi-Dhikr al-Khitāt wa-al-Āthār*, vols. 1-2 (Beirut: Dār Ṣāder, n.d.; reprint of the Būlāq edition) [hereafter *al-Khitāt*]; *Kitāb al-Sulūk*, vols. 1-4; *Mamluk Economics: A Study and Translation of al-Maqrīzī’s Ighāthah*, translated by Adel Allouche (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1994) [hereafter *Mamluk economics*]

²³ See above, footnote no. 5. Volume one of Brinner’s edition, the English translation of Ibn Saṣrā’s work, will be referred to hereafter as *A Chronicle of Damascus*, and volume two, the text of the Arabic manuscript, as *Al-Durrah al-Mudī’ah*

²⁴ *Al-Durar al-Kāminah fī A’yān al-Mi’ah al-Thāminah*, edited by Sālim al-Karnakawī, vols. 1-5 (Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1993) [hereafter *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*]; *Dhayl Al-Durar al-Kāminah fī A’yān al-Mi’ah al-Tāsi’ah*, edited Aḥmad Farīd al-Mazīdī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1998) [hereafter *Dhayl Al-Durar al-Kāminah*]; *Inbā’ al-Ghumr fī Abnā’ al-‘Umr*, edited by Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Mu‘īd Khān, vols. 1-8 (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1986) [hereafter *Inbā’ al-Ghumr*].

²⁵ *Tārīkh Ibn Qādī Shuhba*, vols. 1-4, edited by ‘Adnān Darwīsh (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1977-97). Annals of Ibn Qādī Shuhbah’s monumental *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* are scattered in MSS Chester Beatty 4125, 5527 and Köprülü 1027; see Reisman, “A Holograph MS,” p. 48

²⁶ Within the framework of this research, three editions of *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* will be used: Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shams al-Dīn’s in 16 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1992) [hereafter *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah*]; *The History of Egypt 1382-1467 A.D.* (Part I, 1382-1399), translated and edited by William Popper, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 13 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954) [hereafter *The History of Egypt*]; idem, *Abū’l-Mahāsīn Ibn Taghrī Birdī’s Annals*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 5, part 1-3 (746-800 A.H.) (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932-5) [hereafter *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* Popper]. As for his *Al-Manhal al-Sāfi wa-al-Mustawfi ba’d al-Wāfi* which is not yet fully edited, the following will be used: Gaston Wiet’s *Les Biographies du Manhal Safi* (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1932) [hereafter *Al-Manhal* Wiet], the seven volumes of Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn et al.’s edition (Cairo: Al-Hay’ah al-Miṣriyah al-‘Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1985-1994) [hereafter *Al-Manhal*] and the Dār al-Kutub MS 13475 *tārīkh* [hereafter “Al-Manhal”].

²⁷ *Nuzhat al-Nufūs wa-al-Abdān fī Tawārīkh al-Zamān*, edited by Ḥasan Ḥabashī, vols. 1-3 (Cairo: Maṭba‘at Dār al-Kutub, 1970) [hereafter *Nuzhat al-Nufūs*]

The existence of this long succession of historians, among them the likes of Ibn Khaldûn, al-Maqrîzî, Ibn Taghrîbirdî and Ibn Iyâs, whose works, scholarship and/or fame³⁰ have long inextricably associated them in the minds of many with the history of the Circassian Mamluk Sultanate, should not however overshadow the obstacles which stand in the way of a thorough investigation of Burjî³¹ historiography. Thus, only four of all the historians listed in the preceding paragraph, namely Ibn Khaldûn, Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Hîjjî, were in their prime and were actual eyewitnesses of the events of the period in question. Such a limited number of historians would not have posed any serious problems,³² had it not been for some key practical and material considerations. For example, beyond the fame his *Muqaddimah* procured him in the eyes of his contemporaries³³ and of later generations, one needs to evaluate the importance of Ibn Khaldûn's main historical work, *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, for the events the scholar himself lived through, as his writings about previous periods have turned out to be less original and

²⁸ *Wajîz al-Kalâm fî al-Dhayl 'alâ Duwal al-Islâm*, vols. 1-4, edited by Bashshâr 'Awwâd Ma'rûf et al. (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risâlah, 1995) [hereafter *Wajîz al-Kalâm*] and *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi' li-Ahl al-Qarn al-Tâsi'*, vols. 1-12 (Beirut: Dâr al-Jîl, 1992) [hereafter *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*]

²⁹ *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr fî Waqâ'i' al-Duhûr*, edited by Muḥammad Mustafâ, vols. 1-6 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974-75) [hereafter *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*]

³⁰ Whether this fame was deserved or not is an altogether different matter; see Little, "Historiography of the Ayyûbid and Mamlûk Epochs," in *The Cambridge History of Egypt 640-1517*, edited by Carl Petry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 432-3 [hereafter "Historiography"]

³¹ Notwithstanding Ayalon's argument in favor of not using the term Burjî, I will utilize it interchangeably with that of Circassian to describe the Mamluk polity that came into existence with the advent of Barqûq and ended in 922/1517 with its defeat at the hands of the Ottomans; "Baḥrî Mamlûks, Burjî Mamlûks – Inadequate Names for the Two Reigns of the Mamluk Sultanate," in *Târikh*, vol. 1 (1990), pp. 3-53.

³² Only three sources, for example, have been identified by Little as being truly original for the early reign of al-Nâsir Muḥammad, namely Baybars al-Mansûrî's (d. 725/1325) *Zubdat al-Fikrah fî Târikh al-Hijrah*, Cairo University Library MS 24-28; al-Jazarî's (d. 739/1339) *Hawâdith al-Zamân wa Anbâ'uhu wa-Wafâyât al-Akâbir wa-al-A'yân*, Dâr al-Kutub MS 995 *târikh*; and al-Yûsufî's (d. 759/1357-8) *Nuzhat al-Nâzir fî Sirat al-Malik al-Nâsir*, large excerpts of which can be found in al-'Aynî's *Iqd al-Jumân; Introduction*, pp. 95-6.

³³ See, for example the glowing assessment of the *Muqaddimah* in al-Maqrîzî's obituary of Ibn Khaldûn, where it is described as having no equal and as being "the cream of knowledge and science;" Maḥmûd al-Jalîlî, "Tarjamat Ibn Khaldun lil-Maqrîzî," in *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmi al-'Iraqî*, vol. 13 (1966), p. 235.

useful than the brilliance of his *Prolegomena* would have warranted;³⁴ in the case of Ibn Duqmâq who, along with Ibn al-Furât and Ibn Hījġî, ultimately served as a source to most if not all later historians, modern-day scholars continue to give undue attention to his *Al-Jawhar al-Thamîn*, which is admittedly poorer in information than his more detailed *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Also, some of the writers of this period, Ibn Khaldûn and, increasingly, al-Maqrġzġ, have long ‘monopolized’ the interest of scholars³⁵ while others such as al-‘Aynġ have not received as much attention even though their work was considered by some to be as useful if not superior to that of the latter two.³⁶

Perhaps more important from the point of view of the purposes of the research undertaken within the framework of this dissertation, is the state of scientific inquiry into the historiography of the early Circassian period. On the bright side, a fairly large body of knowledge has been amassed concerning the general field of Mamluk historiographic studies the characteristics of which have been well established: its objectivity; the widespread use of the annalistic format by most Mamluk historians; the tendency of authors to borrow heavily from one another; the rise of Syrian and Egyptian ‘schools’ of history writing, etc.³⁷ However, to paraphrase Li Guo, while there has been a steady

³⁴ Little has shown in his *Introduction* that those parts of *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* that dealt with the reign of Nâsir al-Dġn Muġammad had simply been culled from other histories, pp. 75-6 and idem, “Historiography,” pp. 434-5. For a more positive account of *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, see Tarif Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 222-31, and Muġammad Muġtafâ Ziyâdah who claimed that Ibn Khaldûn was the founder of a school of history writing that blossomed in Egypt and attracted many thinkers such as al-Maqrġzġ, *Al-Mu‘arrikhûn fi Miġr fi al-Qarn al-Khamis ‘Ashar al-Milâdġ* (Cairo: Matba‘at Lajnat al-Ta’lif wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Nashr, 1949), p. 6.

³⁵ In the *Mamlûk Bibliography Online*, there are four hundred and seventy-eight entries under Ibn Khaldûn’s name, one hundred and ten under al-Maqrġzġ versusseven under al-‘Aynġ.

³⁶ Little, *Introduction*, pp. 80-1; idem, “Historiography,” p. 438.

³⁷ For historiographical surveys and accounts on the state of Mamluk studies, see among others, Holt, *The Age of the Crusades*, pp. 207-220; Steven Humphreys, “Bayhaġġ and Ibn Taghrġbirdġ: The Art of Narrative in Islamic Historical Writing during the Middle Periods,” in *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 128-147; Little, “The use of Documents for the study of Mamluk History,” in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 1 (1997), pp. 1-13; idem, “Historiography,” pp. 412-

stream of editions of important sources, efforts still need to be made in terms of the analysis of historical thought and the production of works devoted to individual historians.³⁸ To this and other problems, one might add the fact that the historiographies of the two eras of the Mamluk Sultanate have not received the equal attention of modern scholars. Thanks chiefly to the efforts of Little and Haarmann,³⁹ Bahrī Mamluk historiography, particularly that of the reign of al-Nâsir Muḥammad, has been subjected to detailed and, especially, comprehensive source analysis, which has led to the uncovering of pivotal information: the reliance of most contemporary and later historians on a limited number of sources;⁴⁰ the existence of patterns of interdependence amongst Syrian historians, etc.⁴¹ No comparable research has been undertaken concerning Burjī historiography.⁴² More to the point, the period of interest to us here, that which witnessed the withering away of Qalâwûnī rule and the rise of the Circassians,⁴³ is particularly understudied. With the exception of a certain number of studies of a limited scope and the few words scattered here and there in scholarly articles and monographs,⁴⁴ as well as in the introductory notices authored by the editors of primary sources, nothing for example compares with the surveys written by Linda S. Northrup and by Carl S. Petry on respectively the early Bahrī⁴⁵ and late Circassian⁴⁶ periods.

444; Li Guo, "Mamluk Historiographic Studies," pp. 15-43; Khalidi, *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period*.

³⁸ Li Guo, "Mamluk Historiographic Studies," p. 15.

³⁹ Authors of respectively, *Introduction* and *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit*. Islamkundliche Untersuchungen; 1. (Freiburg: Robischon, 1969); see also, Li Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yûnîni's Dhayl Mir'ât al-Zamân*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

⁴⁰ See above, footnote no. 32.

⁴¹ See Little, *Introduction*, pp. 94-99.

⁴² Little, "Historiography," p. 433.

⁴³ See above, pp. 5-6 and the footnotes therein.

⁴⁴ See following paragraphs.

⁴⁵ Linda S. Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of al-Mansûr Qalâwûn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678-689A.H./1279-1290A.D.)* (Freiburger Islamstudien; 18. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998), pp. 25-61.

This is not to say that we do not have at our disposal any data concerning this historiography. Even the work done by scholars on Bahrî period history has produced very interesting results that are relevant to Burjî historians. Thus, Little, Northrup and Reuven Amitai have all noted that al-Maqrîzî relied heavily on Ibn al-Furât for his accounts of the events of what amounts to much of the second half of the seventh/thirteenth and the early years of the eighth/fourteenth centuries,⁴⁷ and their conclusions very much echo those of the research undertaken here.⁴⁸ Amitai also noted the presence in al-Maqrîzî's writing of a literary device, which consists of conflating together two narrative elements in order to produce what is basically a different one, a technique used by numerous Burjî historians.⁴⁹

To these findings and others, one ought to add the works done on Circassian historiography proper. Eliahu Ashtor was the first to analyze the manuscript of the anonymous *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*,⁵⁰ a late ninth/fifteenth and early tenth/sixteenth centuries chronicle that is part of the same historiographical tradition as Ibn Iyâs's *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*,⁵¹ and that of 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ al-Malaṭî's *Nayl al-Amal fî Dhayl al-Duwal*,⁵² a history that runs from 744 to 896 AH.⁵³ For his part, regarding quantitative data, Jere Bacharach has underlined the existence of patterns of copying of Ibn al-Furât from Ibn Duqmâq, al-Maqrîzî from Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Hajar from both al-'Aynî and al-

⁴⁶ *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 8-14; *Twilight of Majesty*, pp. 5-14; *Protectors or Praetorians?*, pp. 5-12.

⁴⁷ Respectively, *Introduction*, p. 77; *From Slave to Sultan*, pp. 51-2; "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of the Early Mamluk Sulanate (or: Is al-Maqrîzî an Unrecognized Historiographical Villain?)," in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 7:2, pp. 99-100, 102, 105, etc.

⁴⁸ See below, chapters one, pp. 70-2, and two, pp. 157-8.

⁴⁹ Amitai, "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of the Early Mamluk Sulanate," p. 110. See, below, among other instances, chapter one, pp. 75-7.

⁵⁰ MS British Museum, Or. 6854. Hereafter *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*.

⁵¹ "Études sur quelques chroniques mamloukes," pp. 284-7.

⁵² Edited by 'Umar Tadmurî, vols. 1-9 (Sidon and Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-'Asrîyah, 2002). [Hereafter, *Nayl al-Amal*]

⁵³ Ashtor, "Études sur quelques chroniques mamloukes," pp. 287-97.

Maqrîzî, etc.,⁵⁴ all of which have been attested in the research undertaken in the chapters below.⁵⁵ Levanoni and this writer have for their part embarked upon the analysis of sources pertaining to two themes, respectively, the rise of Barqûq⁵⁶ and the opinions expressed by Mamluk historians vis-à-vis this sultan over the course of the entire Burjî period.⁵⁷ Irmeli Perho and Little have examined the relative merits of the works of two authors, respectively al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Taghrîbirdî, and al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî, as historians of contemporary events.⁵⁸ Last but not least, David C. Reisman has greatly contributed to the field not only by ‘discovering’ sections, until then unavailable, of Ibn al-Furât’s *Târîkh al-Duwal* and Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, preserved in a manuscript from the hand of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah,⁵⁹ but also by producing the most detailed analysis of the genesis of the *dhayl* this last author wrote of his teacher Ibn Hîjjî’s history.⁶⁰ However, whether limited by the very nature of their author’s research objectives or by the absence of certain primary sources, even though they contain a wealth of valuable data, none of these studies manages to provide for an overall assessment of early Burjî historiography.⁶¹ All this means that, with the exceptions noted just above, *globally*

⁵⁴ “Circassian Mamluk Historians and their Quantitative Economic Data,” in *Journal of the American Research Center in Cairo*, vol. 11-12 (1974-5), pp. 75, 79-80.

⁵⁵ See relevant sections in chapters one, two and three.

⁵⁶ “Al-Maqrîzî’s account,” pp. 93-105.

⁵⁷ Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of the Reign of Barqûq,” in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol 7:2 (2003), pp. 119-35.

⁵⁸ Perho, “Al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Taghrîbirdî as Historians of Contemporary Events,” in *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt*, edited by Hugh Kennedy (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 107-20; Little, “A Comparison of al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî as Historians of Contemporary Events,” in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 7:2, pp. 205-215.

⁵⁹ MS Chester Beatty 4125. See above, footnote no. 17.

⁶⁰ David C. Reisman, “A Holograph MS,” pp. 19-49.

⁶¹ In some instances, the data presented by some of these authors ended up being erroneous. For example, Ashtor, by virtue of the concise nature of his article, proceeded to make statements that ended up not holding in the face of source analysis, particularly with regard to *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*; see, for example, below, chapter one, p. 107.

speaking we still have not established the value of Burjî historical works in their own right and in relation to one another.

As a result, in the light of what was said above, a critical analysis of the works of Burjî historians with regard to their “originality, sources, and possible interdependence,”⁶² will be undertaken. This historiographical analysis will reproduce, albeit with some modifications, the methodology pioneered by Little in his study of the sources for the reign of al-Malik al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn. In Little’s words,

The nature of the method is disarmingly simple; it is nothing more than comparison, close word-by-word comparison of individual accounts of topics within annals and biographies, with a threefold aim. **One**, given the fact that historians followed in most cases the conventions of the annalistic and biographical genres almost slavishly, what variations can be found in the treatment of individual authors? It is obvious that the variations constitute the author’s originality, whether they consist of stylistic innovations, departures from the conventions of the genres, or the introduction of original subject matter.... A **second**, related, purpose is to characterize Mamlûk historiography in general....; in other words, having pointed out variations, I would attempt to establish the similarities in approach, technique and subject matter. Included under this purpose is the desire to indicate the type of data which can be gleaned from Mamlûk sources, both as to the quantity and quality, so that the beginner in Mamlûk studies can readily discover what variety of subjects the historians both discuss and omit, as well as the difficulties which he can expect to encounter as a result of the mode of presentation. **Third** and most importantly, I am trying to establish what Claude Cahen calls a ‘repertorium’⁶³ of the sources of the period, by which I mean an analytical survey of the sources which aims at classifying them in terms of their value to modern historians. All the goals can be achieved by comparison, which, in the last analysis, aims at disentangling the inter-relatedness and inter-dependence of the sources so as to discover the original contribution of each historian...⁶⁴

The ‘micro’ approach to historiography developed by Little has numerous advantages. By means of textual collation, it allows one to identify similarities and variations amongst chronicles that would help explain the complex of borrowings that is

⁶² Little, “Historiography,” p. 433.

⁶³ Claude Cahen, “Editing Arabic Chronicles: A Few Suggestions,” in *Islamic Studies*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September, 1962), p. 4.

⁶⁴ Little, *Introduction*, pp. 2-3. Emphasis mine.

at the very basis of the process of elaboration of a great many of them. Within a given chronicle, it will help explore, when possible and relevant, the scope of reports and their impact on the way the narrative was constructed, and, consequently, on our appreciation of their contents. Finally, it provides researchers with a detailed understanding of the events of a given year, something which, on a superficial but still important level, is in line with the pursuit of knowledge inherent to any research endeavour, and which sometimes allows one to revisit historical facts. All this overlaps with the third objective highlighted above by Little, the evaluation of the relative merit of a given source not only on historiographical, but also on historical grounds.

The selection of the three annals, 778/1376-7, 793/1390-91 and 804/1401-2, to be subjected to individual source analysis was not done randomly. While, methodologically speaking, this will not permit the generalization of the results obtained from the analysis of these annals to the entire historiographical production of the era under scrutiny, it does, on the other hand, allow one to deal with issues inherent to historical research: among others, the non-availability of some primary sources; the need to concentrate on significant historical occurrences and to find events “covered by the largest number of extant chronicles;”⁶⁵ etc.

For the year 778/1376-7, the most important factor to come into play was the absolute necessity to ‘cover’ Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.⁶⁶ The only existing manuscript of this chronicle that is relevant to the period at hand ends in 779, a year during which nothing out of the ordinary happened; the year 778 thus appeared as a logical choice not only because its contents are ‘meatier,’ but also because it deals with

⁶⁵ Ibid., p.3.

⁶⁶ All the themes, people, sources and events mentioned in this and the following two paragraphs in connection with the choice of annals will be dealt with in the corresponding chapters below.

the regicide of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân, the last effective ruler from the house of Qalâwûn. The rebellion of 778 is significant also because it is the first of a series of incidents that were to lead to the rise of Barqûq, who as a Yalbughâwî mamluk⁶⁷ was an active albeit invisible participant⁶⁸ in the events of this year, and the advent of the Circassians.

The annal of 793/1390-91 was chosen for a number of reasons. First, it gives one the opportunity to closely examine the most important events of the year which happen to have taken place in Syria: the ‘aftershocks’ of Barqûq’s overthrow in 791 and his return to power in 792, namely the ongoing rebellion there of arch foe Mintâsh, which culminated in the quasi-siege of Damascus in 793. Consequently, Syrian sources acquire in this context an important dimension not evident in the case of the year 778: we have at our disposal not only the edited text of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s *Târikh*, but also Ibn Sasrá’s *Al-Durrah al-Mudî’ah* and excerpts from Ibn Hijjî’s *Târikh*.

As for the last annal to be studied, that of the year 804/1401-2, it represents the end of a historiographical cycle. Writers who had relied on *Târikh al-Duwal* for their reports either had to turn to another source, or were mature enough, like al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî, to generate their own, because the works of Ibn al-Furât and of all of the historians who were full-grown men at the time of the emergence of the Circassian Sultanate, save two, ended before this particular year: Ibn al-Furât’s in 803, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s in 801, and Ibn Khaldûn’s in 796; only Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Hijjî continued their production beyond 804, respectively until 805 and 815. As for Ibn Hijjî, we have for the year 804, not only his *Târikh*, but also the entire spectrum of the works Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah authored by relying on this latter chronicle: this makes it possible to bring to partial

⁶⁷ In reference to Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî; see above, footnote no. 12.

⁶⁸ See below, chapter one, pp. 24, 26.

fruition the research started by Reisman on the interrelation amongst the works of these two Syrian historians.

As for the research itself, the order of appearance of its components differs from that adopted by Little, namely the presentation and analysis in one shot of three annals contained in the work(s) of a given writer, and then moving on to those of another. I chose instead to devote an entire chapter to each one of the three annals examined here and to proceed by studying the production of each author, when such a production was available, concerning every one of the three selected years. For example, there is a section on Ibn al-Furât in the first two chapters, but not in the third, because, as I noted above, this author's chronicle does not cover the year 804. Adopting this procedure allowed me to bypass a potential problem: the difficulty of evaluating the merit of an author's work *vis-à-vis that or those of others* by considering in a comprehensive fashion its contents over the course of three annals. In other words, as the research below will show, the production of individual writers can be unequal: if one annal in a given work turns out to be significant in terms of the originality and quality of its *akhbâr*, this does not mean that all other annals will be the same. It is thus preferable to consider the contribution of an author and of his work within the framework of a single annal, and then to reach conclusions concerning each one. This brings me to the order in which authors and their works will be presented in the body of each chapter.

My original intention was to follow Little, that is to use chronological order and level of significance as the two most important factors, but I decided however to use a different method. To simplify matters, the authors were introduced in the text according to their year of birth. This technique ends up paralleling Little's approach: in general, as it to be expected, historians who were contemporary with the early Circassian period

produced more original works than those who were born later, and these had to rely on members of the former group in order to write their histories. There are however two exceptions to this order of presentation. First, like Little, I have allowed for distinctions between Egyptian and Syrian authors in the second and third of the five sections that make up each chapter, namely Introductory Notes, Contemporary Historians, Later Historians, Minor Historians and Sectional Conclusions. Second, even though Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir was younger than Ibn al-Furât, and the latter older than Ibn Duqmâq, the author of *Târikh al-Duwal* appears *after* both of these historians because he borrowed more from them than the other way around.

The two preceding paragraphs dealt with crucial characteristics of the methodology to be followed in this dissertation, but left out the most important one: how will the analytical comparison, which is at the heart of our endeavour, be undertaken?⁶⁹ The element that I have chosen to use as the standard unit of analysis is the individual report. As a result, I have carried out, in **Table 1. A.**, the breakdown of each annal into its *akhbâr* components. These were placed into four broad categories: **political/military/administrative [PMA]** matters, which include political events, military encounters, and appointments to both state, administrative and even religious functions if the latter resulted from political considerations; **religious life [RL]**; **social history/miscellany [SHM]** and **foreign affairs [FA]**. Under each of these headings, one will find entries corresponding to reports found in the sources covered by this research. These entries are made up of a main entry and of one or more secondary ones.

⁶⁹ Additional information regarding this methodology is to be found in the introduction of volume two of this dissertation.

Each main entry has been numbered, for example, PMA1, RL7, SHM57, etc., and then identified with the abbreviation of its author's name written in bold and in brackets at the beginning, such as **[Maq.]** for al-Maqrîzî, **[IF]** for Ibn al-Furât, etc. Here two issues need to be addressed. First, since numbered reports obviously do not occur *naturally* in the texts studied here,⁷⁰ the criteria used in this study to identify individual accounts⁷¹ and to differentiate amongst them, were established in a discretionary manner. In most cases, especially in reports concerning personnel turnover, the *khavar* stood on its own and was thus listed as an independent item, unless it was part of a political event in which case it would generally appear within the story describing it. When an event contained a string of components that nevertheless were clearly linked together as a whole, an attempt was made, only when possible and when needed, to deconstruct the whole into individual components. More often than not, however, identifying individual units was problematic especially where the narrative was denser and more sustained. This necessitated the breakdown of the narrative into coherent units with an underlying theme. Second, the numbering of these main entries was based on their order of appearance in the sources, but mainly in Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-Duwal*, Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, Ibn Hîjjî's *Târikh*, and Ibn Saṣrâ's *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah*. But, even though there is a general chronological order to the main entries in the sense that, say, the event described by PMA1 took place before PMA10, in many instances an account with a higher number might appear *in a given text* before another with a lower one.⁷² This is due to the fact that the contents of a main entry was sometimes used at different stages by different

⁷⁰ Unless editors chose to do so; see, for example, Tadmurî's numbering of the obituaries in the edited text of *Nayl al-Amal*, and the subheadings he gave reports in this work and in *Al-Nafḥah*.

⁷¹ Which I have referred to in my research as reports, *akhbâr*, relations, etc.

⁷² This is all the more apparent in the works from which less primary entries were culled.

historians, and, as was pointed out in the conclusion of chapter two, the dating of events and/or reports varied from one author to the other.⁷³

The main entry itself *generally* consists of the rendering into English of the most extensive, detailed and copious individual report found in any one of the works studied. The terms “rendering into English” is used intentionally instead of “translating into English” to serve as much as a disclaimer as a warning, since this research has *not* been planned as an all-out effort at editing sources or at translating them. All the *basmalât*, laudatory expressions, repetitive adjectives, clearly not useful details, etc., present in an original text have therefore been left out. However, when versions of a given *khobar* offer significant differences amongst them that have a direct bearing on its textual analysis, a more comprehensive and precise translation was provided and appeared between quotation marks.⁷⁴

Under each individual main entry, secondary entries⁷⁵ concerning a given report *as it appears in the other sources* will be listed, for the sake of consistency, chronologically according to the date of birth of authors. These secondary reports, if they are identical or contain the same data as the main entry, will simply consist of the abbreviation of an author’s name placed in brackets, the dating of the event when it diverges from that of the main entry, and the page/folio number(s) where they appear. On the contrary, if they are *significantly* different, they will be in their turn either rendered into English or translated in full. Even though they fundamentally have a central topic,

⁷³ See below, chapter two, pp. 209-10.

⁷⁴ Since Ibn Saṣrā’s *Al-Durrah al-Mudī’ah* and Ibn Taghrībirdī *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* have been edited and translated by respectively Brinner and Popper, whenever needed and/or necessary, the English text of these two works will be used.

⁷⁵ These reports are secondary only to the extent that they did not make it as main entries, which are usually, but not always, longer than the former, and this status in no way diminishes their value or importance.

event or idea in common, one must *not* expect to find in secondary reports the exact textual content of a main entry. As a matter of fact, a report that is more or less long in a given source, might in another work be *radically* shorter so that it ends up covering only one minute aspect of it.

Once the reports have been numbered, they were subjected to three different treatments. In **Table 1. B.**, the *akhbâr* contained in an annal were placed in a way that allows one to verify globally the presence or absence of a report in all the works that were covered. **Table 2. A.** shows, on a single page, for each work, the complete list of all numbered reports *as they appear* in this work. When needed, **Table 2. B.** will feature, side by side, lists of numbered reports of sources that have either a close relationship, as is for example the case with Ibn al-Furât's and al-Maqrîzî's, or a common author, such as the different versions of *'Iqd al-Jumân*.

Throughout the research below, when alluding to *akhbâr* reference will be made to numbered reports only; this will prompt the reader to consult the tables which have been placed in the second volume of this dissertation, most often, I believe, **Table 1.A.**, where s/he will find all the page/folio numbers s/he needs to locate a report in the original source.

One last issue still needs to be addressed: the fact that this dissertation concentrates on *hawâdith* and does not deal directly with obituaries. The practice for Mamluk authors of *târikh* works to include therein both *hawâdith* and *wafâyât* dates back to Ibn al-Jawzî's (d. 597/1200) *Al-Muntazam fî Târikh al-Mulk wa-al-Umam*,⁷⁶ and all the histories examined in this dissertation, with the exception of *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, contained both a section for events and another for obituaries/biographies. However, the proportion

⁷⁶ Little, *Introduction*, p. 100; Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography*, p. 83

of a historical work devoted to each of these sections is nowhere uniform: some authors have chosen to beef up one at the expense of the other, whereas others have found some kind of a middle-ground: in the period being investigated, we thus see Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir inflate the obituaries section of his work and al-Maqrîzî that of events, while Ibn Duqmâq managed to strike a balance between the two.⁷⁷ The fact that the relative weight of events and obituaries changes from one author to another, and, sometimes, within one work, from one annal to another,⁷⁸ the fact also that they are assigned separate places in the text, should then come as no surprise. Despite the existence of interrelationships and similarities between *hawâdith* and *wafâyât*, we are dealing nevertheless with two different genres: to cite Little, “collections of biographies, ..., whether found grouped in biographical dictionaries or following annals, constitute a distinct literary-historical genre with its own requirements and characteristics...”⁷⁹ Biographical material obviously has an undeniable historical dimension that, however, sometimes relates to the chronological unfolding of the events of a given year, but often does not. Since one of the main objectives of this research is to examine *inside the confines of a single annal*, the disposition of *akhbâr* and their interrelation *within* annalistic sources, data from other years are of no great importance to us here. The source criticism of biographical material from the early Circassian period is, scientifically speaking, a worthy endeavour and could have been included in this dissertation: considering, rightly so, this type of data as a source of information separate from but related to annalistic material, Little did just that

⁷⁷ In their annals of the year 778, al-Maqrîzî and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir have devoted to *hawâdith* and *tarâjim*, respectively, twelve and nineteen folios, and thirty-three and seven pages.

⁷⁸ See below, chapter one, p. 37.

⁷⁹ Little, *Introduction*, pp. 100-1.

in chapter two of his *Introduction*,⁸⁰ but because of the very nature of the research I have chosen to conduct, and for questions of personal circumstance, I have decided not to, in the hope of one day dealing with it as part of a separate project.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 101ff

Chapter One
The Revolt against Al-Ashraf Sha‘bân and its Aftermath:
the Annal of the Year 778/1376-7

I. Introductory Remarks:

In many ways, in terms of its contents, the annal of the year 778 is typical of what one finds in the chronicles of the Mamluk period with their often dreary litanies of appointments, personnel turnover, political events, etc. The defining episode of the year, one that occupies the most space in an otherwise very ‘normal’ annal, is without any doubt the murder of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân.

In the middle of Shawwâl 778, Sultan al-Ashraf Sha‘bân (764-78/1363-77), the great grandson of al-Mansûr Qalâwûn, headed towards the Hijâz to perform the *hajj*. At the end of this month, with the arrival of his party in ‘Aqabah, the sultan’s mamluks, with the belated help of Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Dawâdâr (d. 786/1384)⁸¹ and other emirs, rebelled, defeated and prompted him to flee back to Cairo with members of his *khâssakîyah*. In the capital, on the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah, unbeknown to the sultan, another uprising led by Emirs Tashtamur al-Laffâf (d. 779/1377),⁸² Qaratây al-Tâzî (d. 779/1377),⁸³ Aynabak al-Badrî (d. 780/1378),⁸⁴ and others led to the accession of al-Ashraf’s son ‘Alî as the new ruler under the title of al-Mansûr (778-83/1377-81). Upon

⁸¹ He accompanied the sultan to Aqabah and joined the rebellious mamluks there. When Barakah and Barqûq took over the reigns of power the following year, he was exiled to Jerusalem where he died; *Al-Manhal*, vol. 4, pp. 395-6. See also the laudatory obituary written by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir which is replete with verse that the author composed in his honour; “Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk,” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 199b-202a.

⁸² On him, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 6, p. 394.

⁸³ He was a minor emir during the reign of al-Ashraf; after having plotted with his son-in-law Aynabak al-Badrî the coup against the sultan, he was imprisoned by the former and died strangled in exile in 779; “Al-Manhal,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fol. 590b.

⁸⁴ Following the removal from power of his former ally and father-in-law, Qaratây al-Tâzî, he became *atâbak al-‘asâkir* in 779. That same year, Yalbughâwî mamluks launched a *coup d’état* that led to his imprisonment and to the rise of Barqûq; *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 221-4.

his arrival in Cairo, al-Ashraf was arrested in his hiding place and then murdered by the Cairene rebels. In and by itself, the regicide of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân is of great importance to Mamluk history. Historically, it represents the demise of the last effective Qalâwûnî and heralds the rise of the Circassian rulers, and politically, it illustrates in some detail the dynamics of group interaction amongst mamluks: after all, the revolt had been orchestrated by a number of factions, most notably al-Ashraf Sha‘bân’s own, the Ashrafiyah, and the Yalbughâwîyah, those of the *atâbak al-‘asâkir* Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî, who himself had been murdered by his men in Rabî‘ al-Thânî 768 with the tacit approval of the sultan.⁸⁵ Interestingly, the life of Barqûq intersects both of these dimensions of the event at hand: as a Yalbughâwî mamluk, Barqûq had been very much involved in the revolt against al-Ashraf, but at this point in time still had not emerged from obscurity, something which explains the fact that none of the contemporary sources even mention his name in relation to this incident and its immediate aftermath; his involvement would in turn constitute a springboard from which to launch his political career and within a year, the simple mamluk would become *atâbak al-‘asâkir*, the effective ruler of the state.

The regicide of al-Ashraf, very much like that of his uncle al-Nâsir Hasan before him, elicited a variety of commentaries on the part of contemporary and later historians: for example, Ibn Duqmâq referred to the murdered king as a “*shahîd*,”⁸⁶ while Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir imputed to the king’s imprudence and over-confidence the very cause of his own death.⁸⁷ Al-Maqrîzî would make much about the *arriviste* nature of the new regime that came to power after the murder of the sultan and the lowly nature of its military

⁸⁵ See above, footnotes nos. 9, 12 and 67.

⁸⁶ PMA103.

⁸⁷ See below, pp. 41-2.

elite,⁸⁸ thus tainting the views of generations of historians concerning the Circassians and contributing to the glorification of the Bahrî period as a golden age.⁸⁹ Still at the historiographical level, other reasons militated in favour of the selection of this year for analysis. As was noted above,⁹⁰ the only extant copy of Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, a major primary source for this period, ends in 779, and the year 778 contains some of the most copious information (thanks, it is true, to the events surrounding the murder of al-Ashraf Sha'bân) amongst the annals of the late 770s.

II. Contemporary Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. 'Abd al-Rahmân Ibn Khaldûn (732-808/1332-1406):

So much has been said about Ibn Khaldûn and his important contributions to many fields of knowledge that it is unnecessary within the framework of this research to embark upon the exploration of grounds better covered elsewhere.⁹¹ For our purposes suffice it here to note that when he arrived in Cairo from Tunis during Shawwâl 784,⁹² his reputation had preceded him there, and he soon established contacts with important

⁸⁸ PMA74, 104 and 109. On the political activities of the *juhbân* and those Levanoni calls rank-and-file mamluks during the period at hand, see her "Rank-and-file Mamluks Versus Amirs: New Norms in the Mamluk Military Institution," in *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*, edited by Thomas Philipp and Ulrich Haarmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 25-28.

⁸⁹ Not that the Circassian rulers were undeserving of criticism: historians then and now have consistently highlighted the rapacity of the new rulers of Egypt and Syria. However, as a number of secondary sources have pointed out, chief amongst them Levanoni's *A Turning Point in Mamluk History: The Third Reign of al-Nâsir Muhammad Ibn Qalâwûn (1310-1341)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), the seeds of factional in-fighting and instability, of *juhbân* restlessness and of predatory fiscal and economic policies, were very much present in previous periods of Mamluk history. Thus the need to qualify the overall negative picture of the Circassian regime in the works of contemporary and later historians.

⁹⁰ P. 15.

⁹¹ See, for example, Aziz al-Azmeh, *Ibn Khaldûn, An Essay in Reinterpretation* (London: Frank Cass, 1982).

⁹² Walter J. Fischel, *Ibn Khaldûn in Egypt: his Public Functions and his Historical Research (1382-1406), a Study in Islamic Historiography* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967), p. 15.

personalities such as Alṭunbughâ al-Jûbânî (d. 792/1389)⁹³ and with Sultan Barqûq himself,⁹⁴ both of whom, incidentally, were involved in the rebellion against al-Ashraf.⁹⁵ These contacts translated into his appointment by Barqûq as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* on a number of occasions, a position he also occupied after the sultan's death during the first reign of his son Faraj in 804, 806 and 807.⁹⁶

The analysis of the annal of the year 778 in *Kitâb al-'Ibar* affords us with the opportunity to evaluate the position it occupies in early Circassian historiography, in the light of what was said earlier concerning those of its sections dealing with the Bahrî period and the relationship between the seminal *Muqaddimah* and the rest of the work.⁹⁷ Perhaps the most distinctive trait that differentiates between Ibn Khaldûn's chronicle and most others is the fact that it does not have an annalistic format; it is rather a political history of the main Islamic dynasties devoid of the information which traditionally make up annals, such as religious appointments and biographical data. The account of the rebellion against al-Ashraf Sha'bân and its background, thus occupies all the narrative pertaining to the year 778; an account characterized by the sharpness of the analysis Ibn Khaldûn made of the causes behind the coup.

As was noted above, Ibn Khaldûn did benefit from high-level contacts within the new regime Barqûq presided over, and he must have also profited from the esteem and

⁹³ Fischel, *Ibn Khaldûn in Egypt*, pp. 20, 36, 38-9, 76, 164. On al-Jûbânî, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 57-61.

⁹⁴ Fischel, *Ibn Khaldûn in Egypt*, pp. 20-2, 71-81.

⁹⁵ See above, pp. 15 and 24.

⁹⁶ Walter J. Fischel, *Ibn Khaldûn and Tamerlane: Their Historic Meeting in Damascus, 1401 A.D. (803 A.H.); A Study of Ibn Khaldûn's "Autobiography," with a Translation into English, and a Commentary* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952), pp. 47-8 and Kamal S. Salibi, "Listes chronologiques des Grands Cadis de l'Égypte sous les Mamelouks," in *Revue des Études Islamiques*, vol. 25 (1957), pp. 114-5. See also, chapter three, pp. 214-5.

⁹⁷ See above, pp. 8-9, and footnotes 33, 34 and 35 therein.

admiration parts of the elite⁹⁸ had for him, both of which allowed him to have access to varied sources of information. The impact of his particular situation in Cairo is readily discernible in his writing: Ibn Khaldûn went beyond the simple stating of facts to present an analysis that explained the rebellion against al-Ashraf in terms of power politics taking place at the apex of the state. Whereas in other works the uprisings of the mamluks appeared almost literally out of the blue, save maybe for a few comments here and there about the uneasiness of the soldiers on the eve of the sultan's *hajj*,⁹⁹ the reported advice of some people of good will to the sultan not to leave for Mecca,¹⁰⁰ and, especially, the rumoured attempt to kill the sultan by withholding medication from him during his severe illness that year;¹⁰¹ only Ibn Khaldûn's account contained a detailed description of the genesis of the forces unleashed during the coup.

Thus, in paragraphs preceding the events of 778, Ibn Khaldûn provided the background for the rebellion against al-Ashraf by talking about the whereabouts of the Yalbughâwî mamluks, among them, Barqûq, Barakah (d. 782/1380),¹⁰² Alṭunbughâ al-Jûbânî and Jârkas al-Khalîfî (d. 791/1381),¹⁰³ all of whom would play a pivotal role in post-al-Ashraf politics. According to Ibn Khaldûn's account, these individuals, after an unsuccessful bid to power in 769 in the aftermath of their *ustâdh*'s assassination, were subjected to a terrible repression which saw most of them killed and the rest sent to prison

⁹⁸ See above, pp. 8-9. Conversely, see Fischel, *Ibn Khaldûn in Egypt*, pp. 27, 41, etc. for a description of some the problems Ibn Khaldûn encountered in Cairo as a result of the opposition of some scholarly circles.

⁹⁹ PMA41.

¹⁰⁰ PMA48.

¹⁰¹ PMA26. PMA48 and 26 will be dealt with below, pp. 47, 59 and 79.

¹⁰² Barakah al-Jûbânî al-Yalbughâwî was a companion of Barqûq with whom he formed a duumvirate following their rise to power in 779. The two turned against each other in 782 in an internal struggle that saw the victory of Barqûq and the demise then assassination of Barakah; see above, footnote no. 81, and *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 351-5.

¹⁰³ Another Yalbughâwî emir, al-Khalîfî was a staunch ally of Barqûq whose regime he died defending during an encounter against rebels in Syria; *Al-Manhal*, vol. 4, pp. 205-7.

in faraway marches.¹⁰⁴ It was al-Ashraf who put an end to their punishment, upon the advice of his *atâbak*, Mankalîbughâ al-Shamsî (d. 774/1372),¹⁰⁵ who reproached the sultan for having nearly destroyed a powerful fighting force of young recruits, a potential pillar for the regime.¹⁰⁶ The sultan released the Yalbughâwîs from prison (including Barqûq and his friends who were freed from al-Karak) and made them serve under Syrian emirs. This occurred probably in 774, because Ibn Khaldûn says that the release took place five years after their defeat of 769. In Syria, the most experienced amongst them were called upon by Manjak al-Yûsufî (d. 776/1375),¹⁰⁷ the *nâ'ib* of Damascus, to train his own mamluks in the art of spear throwing (“*thaqâfat al-rumh*”). At this stage of the narrative Ibn Khaldûn introduced an account by al-Jûbânî, whom he quoted directly.¹⁰⁸ According to al-Jûbânî, when tensions arose in 774-5 between Uljây al-Yûsufî (d. 775/1373)¹⁰⁹ and the sultan, the latter contacted Manjak for support as did the former. Manjak asked his mamluks for their opinion (“*fa-radda al-amr ilaynâ*”) as to which of the two to support, but they rested their case with him; he decided to send them to Uljây while secretly asking his friend Qaratây al-Tâzî, the *kâfil* of ‘Alî, the heir apparent, to have Uljây press them in the service of the crown prince, thus appeasing both parties. When the conflict with Uljây broke out in 775, the Yalbughâwîs helped the sultan who rewarded them by promoting them.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 458; *Al-Ta'rif*, p. 321.

¹⁰⁵ He was viceroy of Aleppo, then *atâbak al-'asâkir* in Cairo between 769 and 774; “Al-Manhal,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 800b-801a.

¹⁰⁶ *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, pp. 461-2; *Al-Ta'rif* p. 321.

¹⁰⁷ He was viceroy of Damascus from 769 until 775, then from 775-6; “Al-Manhal,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 798b-800b. His children were to play an important role in the politics of Syria during the disturbances of 792-3; see chapter two, pp. 143-5.

¹⁰⁸ “*Akhbaranî bi-dhâlika Altunbughâ al-Jûbânî ayyâm ittişâli bi-hi, qâla...*,” *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 462.

¹⁰⁹ *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 40-44; he replaced Mankalîbughâ as *atâbak* in 774.

¹¹⁰ *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 462.

The gathering of the Yalbughâwîs continued apace at the hands of Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Dawâdâr, the former *dawâdâr*¹¹¹ of Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî, who had formed the project of using them in order to gain power. He convinced the sultan to keep on summoning Yalbughâ’s men from wherever they were for the alleged purpose of strengthening the state. The *ustâdâr* Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ (d. 795/1392),¹¹² Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î’s competitor for the favours of the sultan, opposed the idea of gathering Yalbughâ’s mamluks and warned al-Ashraf of the perils of doing so.¹¹³ To neutralize his opponent, Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î got closer to those young *sultânî* mamluks, members of al-Ashraf’s *khâssakîyah*, whom the sultan had picked, trained and placed in positions of authority, and incited them against Âqbughâ Âṣ through slander and deception.¹¹⁴ In the middle of Jumâdá,¹¹⁵ the *ustâdâr* was arrested and exiled to Jerusalem: Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î then continued gathering the Yalbughâwîs and promoting them to high positions,¹¹⁶ from which they would launch their successful bid to unseat al-Ashraf.

In the same vein, Ibn Khaldûn’s relation of the political causes of the rebellions of 778 provided some light concerning one aspect of the functioning of the Mamluk Sultanate usually shrouded in mystery, namely the habitually unmentioned reasons behind the sacking of military and civilian officials. In his presentation of the conflict between Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ and Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î, Ibn Khaldûn claimed the latter had told the Yalbughâwî mamluks that the former was systematically working

¹¹¹ *Al-Ta’rif*, p. 321.

¹¹² He is listed as *shâdd al-dawâwîn* by Ibn Taghrîbirdî, but as *ustâdâr* by Ibn Khaldûn; “Al-Manhal,” *Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 târîkh*, fol. 659b and *Al-Ta’rif*, p. 54.

¹¹³ In *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, the accounts of the year 778 start with this story, PMA20.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ Most sources have the event occur in the middle of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah.

¹¹⁶ PMA20.

against their interests and that the accusation rang true to them: since the *ustâdâr*'s office dealt with so many of their requests, Ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ could and probably did deny many of them.¹¹⁷ This assertion regarding the work responsibilities of Ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ is interesting not only because it informs one about the practical hands-on dimension of an *ustâdâr*'s work, but also because it provides a political explanation for the sacking of the incumbent which is far removed from that presented by other authors, that, among other things, Ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ was indirectly responsible for the flooding of the Husaynîyah neighbourhood that same year, because his *ustâdâr* had built a pool which overflowed.¹¹⁸

For the rest of the narration, beyond some structural features of his narrative and the story of al-Maqsî both of which will be dealt with just below, Ibn Khaldûn presented nothing really original beyond what can readily be found in the works of contemporary historians, such as Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn al-Furât. For example, he briefly noted the preparations for the *hajj*,¹¹⁹ the appointments, military and political arrangements al-Ashraf made prior to his departure,¹²⁰ the internal exile of his cousins to al-Karak for the duration of his trip,¹²¹ the rebellions in 'Aqabah and Cairo,¹²² the capture and assassination of al-Ashraf after his return to his capital in early Dhû al-Qa'dah,¹²³ the struggle between the two groups of rebels following the return of the 'Aqabah party to Cairo,¹²⁴ etc. The presence of such material common to the works of Ibn Khaldûn, Ibn al-Furât and Ibn Duqmâq can be explained as follows: since the author of *Kitâb al-'Ibar* was not in Egypt during the disturbances he described, he either relied, through the well-

¹¹⁷ *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 462. Ibn Khaldûn did not note the nature of these requests.

¹¹⁸ This is Ibn Taghrîbirdî's take of the issue. See SHM5, and, below, pp. 91-2.

¹¹⁹ PMA50.

¹²⁰ PMA47 and 51.

¹²¹ PMA30.

¹²² PMA59 and 69.

¹²³ PMA82, 84, 88, 92 and 93.

¹²⁴ PMA95ff.

positioned contacts he had, on what he had *heard* about these events which were still ‘fresh’ when he arrived in Cairo in 784; or he copied from available written sources. There are pieces of evidence that support both views.

With regard to the first hypothesis, we have already seen the attention paid by Ibn Khaldûn in explaining the factors leading to the overthrow of the Ashrafî regime, so that it would not be unnatural for him to record the events surrounding the coup d’état and its consequences, all ‘conventional’ topics by the historiographical standards his time; standards he appears to have partially adhered to if one considers his writings on the Bahrî period.¹²⁵ Generally however, the reports concerning the year 778 in *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* are much shorter and poorer in details than those of *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn al-Furât*¹²⁶ and *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, and written using different terminology: for example, whereas Ibn al-Furât and Ibn Duqmâq provided vivid and meticulous description of the sultan’s contingents as they left Cairo for Siryâqûs on the 13th of Shawwâl on their way to Mecca, Ibn Khaldûn restricted himself to generalities, contained in a less than two line passage using his own words, about the grandeur of al-Ashraf’s train.¹²⁷ As for the purely political reports, they set him even more apart from the other two Egyptian contemporary historians. On top of the already mentioned in-depth story about the political infightings at the top of the Mamluk polity, Ibn Khaldûn was probably the first historian to provide an explanation as to the direct cause of the uprising in Cairo in the wake of the sultan’s departure for Mecca, namely the run-in between Qaraṭây al-Tâzî¹²⁸ and al-Maqsî (d.

¹²⁵ See above, footnote no. 34.

¹²⁶ Since the annal of the year 778 is not available in the original text of *Târikh al-Duwal*, I will be using *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn al-Furât* [hereafter *Al-Muntaqâ*], which consists of selections made by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah from Ibn al-Furât’s work; see above, footnote no. 17, and below, footnote no. 239.

¹²⁷ PMA50.

¹²⁸ Ibn Khaldûn does mention that Qaraṭây al-Tâzî, Tashtamur al-Laffâf, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî and Aynabak al-Badrî were all involved in the coup. However, what transpires from *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* is that

795/1393),¹²⁹ the *nâzir al-khâss*,¹³⁰ concerning, interestingly enough,¹³¹ the refusal of the latter to provide fodder rations to the heir apparent's mamluks.¹³² None of this is found in either *Al-Muntaqâ* or *Nuzhat al-Anâm* where the rebellion is described but not explained.

As for the other hypothesis, it can be argued that despite the use by Ibn Khaldûn of wordings different from those of either Ibn Duqmâq or Ibn al-Furât, two authors whose accounts are very close stylistically speaking,¹³³ his *akhbâr* still contain elements similar enough to these two historians' to indicate a pattern of borrowing. This can be seen in PMA70 and parts of PMA75, which describe what took place at the Citadel after the rebels got a hold of 'Alî, the heir apparent:

Ibn Khaldûn: "...*ahdarû walî al-'ahd wa-jâ'û bi-hi 'alâ al-aktâf ilâ al-Îwân fa-ajlasûh 'alâ al-takht, wa-ahdarû Aydamur, nâ'ib al-qal'ah, fa-bâya'a la-hu; thumma anzalûh ilâ Bâb al-Istabl wa-ajlasûh hunâk 'alâ al-kursî...*" [*Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 464]

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*aq'adûh bi-Bâb al-Sitârah, thumma ahdarû Aydamur al-Shamsî fa-bawwasûh al-ard; wa-arkabû Sîdî Amîr 'Alî ba'd khuyûlihim wa-tawajjahû bi-hi ilâ al-Îwân al-Kabîr, fa-aq'adûh bi-hi sâ'ah...wa-aqâma Sîdî Amîr 'Alî bi-al-Istabl, wa-summiya bi-al-Malik al-Manşûr.*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS orient. A 1572, fol. 112b]

Ibn al-Furât: "...*fa-aq'adûh bi-Bâb al-Sitârah, thumma ahdarû [...?] Aydamur al-Shamsî fa-bawwasûh al-ard; wa-arkabû Sîdî Amîr 'Alî ba'd khuyûlihim wa-tawajjahû bi-hi ilâ al-Îwân al-Kabîr Dâr al-'Adl, fa-aq'adûh bi-hi sâ'ah...baqiyyat nahâr al-sabt wa-laylat*

Qaratây was the main mover behind the rebellion, rather than this group of emirs as a whole. Moreover, on two occasions, he emphasized that it was Qaratây who really exercised power in the new regime and that he chose Aynabak as his deputy ("*radîf*"); PMA76 and 103. Interestingly, he added to the list of plotters the name of one Âqtamur al-Khalîlî who is not mentioned by any other author: he could not have been Âqtamur al-Ĥanbalî (d. 783/1381) who had been sent by al-Ashraf to look after the Sa'îd during his absence; if he had Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî (d. 779/1377) in mind, this report goes against Ibn al-Furât's which noted that the said 'Abd al-Ghanî was called upon to pledge allegiance to the sultan only *after* the coup had succeeded; see PMA74. On Âqtamur al-Ĥanbalî and Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî, see, *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 492-3.

¹²⁹ On him see "Al-Manhal," Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fol. 889a.

¹³⁰ PMA68. In *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, Ibn Khaldûn did mention the run-in as having taken place between an unnamed *wazîr* and Qaratây, but the same story is related in *Al-Ta'rif*, where al-Maqsî is presented as *nâzir al-khâss*; p. 322.

¹³¹ It was the refusal of the sultan to provide them with fodder for their mounts that also triggered the rebellion in 'Aqabah; see PMA59.

¹³² PMA68. Qaratây al-Tâzî was so angered by this incident that he decided to act by contacting the mother ("*dâyat*") of the crown prince on the night of the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah and convincing her to go along with his plans to elevate her son to the throne. In *Al-Ta'rif*, the account is somewhat different in that Qaratây managed to convince ("*fa-aghrâ*") 'Alî, the heir to the throne, into seizing power.

¹³³ As will be shown below, the latter copied quite literally from the former a great many of his reports; see below, p. 52.

al-aḥad, wa-al-sultān bi-al-Iṣṭabl. Wa-ḥi yawm al-aḥad, ghayyarū laqab al-sultān wa-laqqabūh bi-al-Mansūr.” [“Al-Muntaqá,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 33b, 34a]

Ibn Khaldūn’s account noted two (the Īwān and Bāb al-Iṣṭabl) out of the three (Bāb al-Sītārah, the Īwān and Bāb al-Iṣṭabl)¹³⁴ stations in the young prince’s itinerary throughout the citadel, and it could be a summary of that of either Ibn Duqmāq’s or Ibn al-Furāt’s. The similarities amongst the works of the three historians, however, still pose more problems than they provide answers: while borrowing in and by itself is a distinct possibility, determining its direction is not a simple task, especially since the general conciseness of the reports in *Kitāb al-‘Ibar* reduces the number of narrative elements that can be compared. It is possible that Ibn Khaldūn relied more on Ibn al-Furāt¹³⁵ than on Ibn Duqmāq because *Kitāb al-‘Ibar* contains details not found in *Nuzhat al-Anām*. For example, PMA57, the list of the religious and civilian personnel who accompanied the sultan on the *hajj*, is present in *Al-Muntaqá* and, in a much reduced version, in *Kitāb al-‘Ibar*, but not in *Nuzhat al-Anām*. Ultimately, both hypotheses might be valid simultaneously: Ibn Khaldūn might have simply added his original political analyses to narrative elements he either heard of from his well-connected sources or saw in written form.

The sharpness of Ibn Khaldūn’s analysis of the political scene in 778 does not extend to all the events of this year. For example, even though Yalbughāwī mamluks

¹³⁴ All these are landmarks of the Citadel in Cairo; see William Popper, *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans, 1382-1468: Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghribirdī’s Chronicle of Egypt*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 15 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955), pp. 19-23.

¹³⁵ This is supported by the results of chapter two; see below, p. 130 footnote no. 540. But then note the fact mentioned just above that Ibn al-Furāt borrowed from Ibn Duqmāq. See also below, footnote no. 249, the possibility that it was Ibn al-Furāt who copied from Ibn Khaldūn, and not the other way around.

were involved in both the 'Aqabah and the Cairo rebellions,¹³⁶ there is nothing in *Kitâb al-'Ibar* to either support or clarify Ibn al-Furât's claim that the two groups had coordinated their actions in order to remove the sultan from office. Furthermore, while Ibn Khaldûn did indicate that it was junior emirs who headed the rebellion in Cairo and that in 'Aqabah Tashtamur al-'Alâ'î appears only belatedly to have joined what was basically a mamluk-led action, one does not get from *Kitâb al-'Ibar* the real weight of the *ajlâb* in the events at hand.¹³⁷

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Ibn Khaldûn's accounts of the year 778, is that, curiously, despite their sharpness and his own fame as a historian in Cairo, his work was not used much by contemporary and later historians.¹³⁸

B. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir ibn Badr al-Dîn Ibn Habîb al-Halabî (after 740–808/1340–1406):

A certain number of facts about Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir are known: he worked in the *dîwân al-inshâ'* in Aleppo where he was born, lived in Damascus for a while then headed to Cairo where he, again, was employed in the chancery,¹³⁹ and garnered a reputation for being quite the *littérateur*.¹⁴⁰ We have already noted that he wrote a *dhayl* to his father

¹³⁶ In the case of the 'Aqabah rebellion, Ibn Khaldûn refers to the Yalbughâwîs as being the most numerous and the most eager of the mamluks who rebelled; as for the events in Cairo, he does note the presence of the mamluks of Emir 'Alî, the crown prince, amongst the rebels; see respectively, PMA59 and 69.

¹³⁷ For this, one has to turn to Ibn al-Furât: first he noted that the initial decision of the coup leaders to pay the mamluks who had participated in the uprising only a portion of the *nafaqah* that they had been promised, almost led to the killing of Tashtamur al-Laffâf (PMA120), and then he indicated in detail the extent to which the new rulers went to gather the promised monies in order to placate the mamluks (PMA123ff); on this *nafaqah*, see below, pp. 49-50, 54 and 59.

¹³⁸ With the possible exceptions of Ibn al-Furât, al-Maqrîzî, 'Abd al-Bâsit al-Malaṭî and Ibn Iyâs; see above, footnote no. 135, and below, pp. 73, 100.

¹³⁹ *Al-Manhal* Wiet, p. 176; *Al-Manhal*, volume 6, pp. 366-368; al-Sakhâwî, *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 4, pp. 3-5. See also below, chapter two, pp. 136-7.

¹⁴⁰ The obituaries cited in the previous footnote are replete with verses he composed on a variety of occasions.

Badr al-Dîn Ibn Habîb al-Halabî's¹⁴¹ *Durrat al-Aslâk*, which starts off where the latter ends, the beginning of the year 778.¹⁴² In his introduction to the edited text of *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*, Sa'îd 'Abd al-Fattâh 'Âshûr noted that many aspects of the subject matter of this book and *Durrat al-Aslâk*¹⁴³ are so similar, that it is more likely than not that the former served as the foundation (“*muswaddah*”) for the latter: the text of *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh* was subjected to *tasjî'* and the years 648 to 677 and 771 to 777 were added to it in order to produce *Durrat al-Aslâk*.¹⁴⁴ Furthermore, 'Âshûr contended that the similarity between *Durrat al-Aslâk* and *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, which is attributed to Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, is so evident in terms of style, tone and methodology, that it is difficult to differentiate between the two. All this, especially the striking contrast with regard to the use of heavy *saj'* in *Durrat al-Aslâk* and its absence in *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*, led 'Âshûr to advance the theory that the whole of the former work, its *dhayl* and all, was written by no other than Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir. According to this theory, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir used his father's work, *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*, covering the years 678 to 770 AH, as a *muswaddah*, to which he then added his own material to produce both *Durrat al-Aslâk* and its *dhayl*, both one work really.¹⁴⁵

The arguments marshalled by 'Âshûr do merit attention and the systematic comparison of the text of overlapping annals might yield interesting information as to the modality of the *tasjî'* process and its impact on the narrative. However, it will not allow putting to rest the issue he raised about the paternity of *Durrat al-Aslâk* and its *dhayl*. External and internal evidence seems to indicate a certain consensus that goes against his

¹⁴¹ On him see the references on page 7 of Amîn and 'Âshûr's edition of *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*.

¹⁴² See above, p. 6 footnotes no. 14 and 18.

¹⁴³ Notably the overlapping years from 678 to 770; 'Âshûr, “Introduction” to *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh*, p. 28.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-9.

reasoning, namely that Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī wrote *Durrat al-Aslāk* and that his son continued it as a *dhayl* from 778 onward.

Thus, Ibn Ḥajar commented in his obituary of Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī that one of his other literary productions was the adaptation in *sajʿ* of another author's work, and that he had also written *Durrat al-Aslāk* in a similar style, something which "is indicative of great knowledge and proficiency in verse and prose, even though he was not of the highest calibre in either one."¹⁴⁶ This indicates, unlike 'Āshūr's argument, that the author of *Tadhkirat al-Nabīh* was capable and willing to use *sajʿ* and/or other styles of writing:¹⁴⁷ it is possible that Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī wrote the two works for different audiences¹⁴⁸ or that he wanted in his *Durrat al-Aslāk* to show what a *littérateur* he was. Furthermore, in the obituary he wrote of two of his brothers, Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī specifically referred to them in *Durrat al-Aslāk* as "*ikhwatī*."¹⁴⁹ Last but not least, if Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir were indeed the author of all of *Durrat al-Aslāk*, why would he not have laid claim to the authorship of the entire work¹⁵⁰ instead of simply stating in the margin of the

¹⁴⁶ *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, vol. 2, p. 29. 'Āshūr faulted Ibn Ḥajar for having said in his *Inbāʿ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, p. 250, that both works were written in prose, and in his *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, vol. 2, p. 30, that Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī used the same method in writing both *Tadhkirat al-Nabīh* and *Durrat al-Aslāk*: "the study [it is unclear as to which study he is referring to] proved that what Ibn Ḥajar advanced is far from the truth, as the style of *Tadhkirat al-Nabīh* is far removed from heavy (*mutakallif*) *sajʿ* and prose, so that such a statement applies only to *Durrat al-Aslāk*;" 'Āshūr, "Introduction," p. 30.

¹⁴⁷ 'Āshūr did not take into consideration the passage quoted in the previous sentence that highlighted Ibn Ḥabīb's editorial prowess, which could have undermined his line of argument.

¹⁴⁸ The comment made by 'Āshūr but unsupported by any evidence, that apart for the use of *sajʿ*, the differences between the two works for the years 678 to 770 are negligible, would go against such a hypothesis; *ibid.*, p. 27. But then, the use of heavy *sajʿ* would become the sole determining factor to differentiate between the two, and this was shown, in the above part of the present paragraph, not to be that relevant after all.

¹⁴⁹ See "Durrat al-Aslāk," MS Bodleian 319, fol. 133a, and the obituaries of the two brothers, Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥusayn and Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, fols. 132b-133a, and in *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, respectively, vol. 2, p. 65, and vol. 4, p. 104.

¹⁵⁰ One might argue that Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir wanted his father to assume the authorship of something he himself had produced. This is possible but unlikely especially since none of the contemporary sources saw fit to mention such a feat of filial piety.

first folio of the annal of 778 that he was continuing his father's history, something which is supported by other sources?¹⁵¹

But perhaps the strongest evidence against what 'Āshūr argued is to be found in Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir's *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk* itself where one remarks a definite evolution between early annals and later ones. Starting with the year 788,¹⁵² but especially with 789,¹⁵³ one notices a propensity on the part of Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir to use less and less *saj'* in his reports, save for those with some degree of biographical content,¹⁵⁴ and to make more and more space for narratives of political events.¹⁵⁵

Whether or not the pattern noted in the previous paragraph regarding later sections of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk* is nothing more than the result of happenstance, the fact remains that the text of the year 778 appears to fall within the category of pre-788 annals: it is almost devoid of historical narrative, does not contain any significant data, and is written in *saj'*. Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir began his annal with the accessions of the new sultan,

¹⁵¹ Fol. 133b. See also Ibn Hajar's above-mentioned obituary of Ibn Ḥabīb al-Ḥalabī.

¹⁵² In the annal of the year 788, the account of the completion of Barqūq's Bayn al-Qaṣrayn *madrasah* complex contains no discernible signs of *saj'*; fols. 220b-221a. The same cannot be said of the other non-biographical account of that year, the one relating the plague in Alexandria - fols. 222b-223a -, which is replete with *saj'*: maybe its very topic, one that deals with death, destiny and the beyond, made it prone to such a stylistic treatment. Regardless, a scientific edition of *Durrat al-Aslāk* and its continuation is needed before any conclusions about the modality of the use of *saj'* by Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir and his father can be formulated.

¹⁵³ See in fols. 228a-b, the account of the expedition sent by Barqūq to the northern marches of Syria to deal with Mīntāsh's rebellion and Tamerlane's incursions in Anatolia.

¹⁵⁴ Namely those dealing with appointments and obituaries. There are parts of reports concerning events of a political nature where Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir did use *saj'*, but these are confined to *akhbār* prone to stylistic licence: for example, those dealing with a characteristic 'villain' such as Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī in the annal of 791; fols 237b-238a, 239a; etc., or where the author utilized panegyrics to relate something about people of importance, such as Barqūq's entry into Damascus in Ramaḍān 793; see chapter two.

¹⁵⁵ To the extent that important events worthy of reporting did take place during a certain year, given Zayn al-Dīn Tāhir's lack of interest in stories with a political content that other historians, such as Ibn al-Furāt and others, faithfully noted. Thus, the annal of 790, an admittedly uneventful year, contains nothing but appointments and obituaries; see "Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk," MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 233b-236b.

al-Mansûr ‘Alî¹⁵⁶ and the Artûqid ruler in Mârdîn,¹⁵⁷ which he followed up with the listing of ten appointments in both Syria and Egypt (two to political-executive,¹⁵⁸ six to judicial¹⁵⁹ and two to administrative¹⁶⁰ positions).¹⁶¹ Then come the only instances where Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir related events pertaining obliquely to the rebellion, namely the *akhbâr* that describe the sickness and the recovery of the sultan as well as the advice of people of good will for him not to perform the pilgrimage that year;¹⁶² these are succeeded by long obituaries of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân, the ruler of Mârdîn, and members of the civilian elite.¹⁶³ Clearly, none of the important political events so thoroughly described in other chronicles, especially the revolt against al-Ashraf, are to be found in Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*.¹⁶⁴

Moreover, the very nature and format of the *akhbâr* in this work appear to preclude the inclusion of certain important details. All the reports therein, especially but not exclusively those dealing with the civilian religious personnel, were written in *saj*.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁶ In little less than two folios of text, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir mentioned the accession of the new sultan following the death of his father. His very laudatory report contains no new information about the circumstances of al-Mansûr ‘Alî’s arrival to the throne; PMA103.

¹⁵⁷ FA2. On the general topic of the Turcomans during the mamluk period, see Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, “The Turcomans and *Bilâd al-Shâm* in the Mamluk Period,” in *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in The Middle-East*, edited by Tarif Khalidi (Beirut: American University of Beirut Press, 1984), pp. 169-180.

¹⁵⁸ The appointment of new *nâ’ibs* to Damascus and Tripoli, respectively Tashamur al-‘Alâ’î [PMA104] and Arghûn al-As‘ardî [PMA136].

¹⁵⁹ RL8, 15, 18, 19, 22, and 23. RL8 relates the appointment of Jalâl al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Nisâbûrî, a.k.a. Jâr Allâh whom some sources note as having cured the sultan from the disease that befell him just prior his departure on the *hajj*; see PMA26.

¹⁶⁰ PMA138 and 139.

¹⁶¹ These appointments do not appear in exactly that order, but still close enough to it.

¹⁶² PMA25, 28 and 48.

¹⁶³ “Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk,” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 139b-148b.

¹⁶⁴ Even in al-Ashraf’s obituary, only five sentences out of twenty-four describe the circumstances of his death after his defeat in ‘Aqabah and the murder of his *khâssakîyah*; *ibid.*, fol. 140a.

¹⁶⁵ Rosenthal wrote the following about the writing of Zayn al-Dîn’s father: “It is obvious that bare facts and concise descriptions could not be pressed into this form. Indeed, the rhymed prose style always showed a considerable disinclination for facts and conciseness....All in all, whatever attractiveness the use of rhymed prose may have added to historical literature in the eyes of the cultured reader, it made no contribution to a deepening of the historical understanding, nor did it produce an essentially new form of historical presentation;” *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 178-9. Since Zayn al-Dîn used the same format as his father, Rosenthal’s comments apply to him as well.

and were extremely deferential to the people they described.¹⁶⁶ This, as such, would not have constituted a problem had it not been for the fact that the author generally excluded any critical assessment of people and events.¹⁶⁷ For example, he spent three folios and a half describing the appointment and achievements of Jalâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Nîsâbûrî al-‘Ajamî, a.k.a. Jâr Allâh, as *Ḥanafî qādî al-quḍât* in Cairo,¹⁶⁸ but did not note a story, reported by Ibn al-Furât and others, that the qadi got his position only after the incumbent, Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Mansûr al-Ḥanafî, refused to agree to a *waqfs* exchange with an emir;¹⁶⁹ such a practice, al-Maqrîzî commented, was not common in Syria and Egypt.¹⁷⁰ The same can be seen in the treatment of the case of one of the two military political appointments. Nowhere does the author mention the important role played by *Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î* in the rebellion against al-Ashraf Sha‘bân in ‘Aqabah¹⁷¹ and that his appointment to the *niyâbah* of Damascus was an indirect consequence of his participation in this event.¹⁷²

The absence of raw historical data is offset, though, by a number of considerations. Firstly, *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* does indeed represent a primary source for the period under study: the only source cited in his work was his father, whose verse he

¹⁶⁶ According to Rosenthal, the use of *saj’* entered historical writing by means of panegyric biographies, *ibid.*, p. 177. Zayn al-Dîn somewhat abandoned his positive tone, when writing about the sovereigns whose life and achievements he touched upon, namely al-Ashraf Sha‘bân and the ruler of Mârdîn; see below, pp. 41-2.

¹⁶⁷ See previous footnote.

¹⁶⁸ See also below, pp. 40, 47 and 79.

¹⁶⁹ Nor did he note the fact that Jâr Allâh helped cure the sultan from his disease and that he did not participate in the conspiracy to kill him during his sickness. This might have been yet another reason Jâr Allâh secured his new position.

¹⁷⁰ PMA27 and RL8. Of interest, is the fact that al-Maqrîzî who is usually so prone to decrying such intrusion of the political arm of the state in the world dominated by men of religion, referred to Jâr Allâh in the report concerning his involvement in the sultan’s recovery as “*shaykhunâ;*” see also Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian.” As to the absence of criticism on the part of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, it might be explained by the fact that, as he himself stated in his chronicle, he was the author of the new qadi’s appointment paper (“*tafwîḍ*”), written on behalf of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân, which he quoted extensively in RL8!

¹⁷¹ PMA59.

¹⁷² On this see PMA99, 101, 102, 104 114, and below, p. 69.

quoted frequently.¹⁷³ And even though it did not, to the chagrin of modern scholars, lead him to elaborate upon the circumstances of his time, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's work in the chancery, on top of his participation in the intellectual life of the city,¹⁷⁴ undoubtedly made him a privileged witness of the major events of the period: on two occasions, he indicated the extent of his albeit passive involvement by mentioning that he wrote, first, as was noted above, the "*tafwîd*" of Jâr Allâh as Hanafî head judge in Cairo,¹⁷⁵ and second, the letter of condolences sent to the successor of the departed Artûqid king, al-Malik al-Muzaffar.¹⁷⁶ Because of his propensity to talk about himself and his literary contributions when writing about contemporaries, his *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* might prove to be invaluable as a source of information about the intellectual life of the period.

Furthermore, one ought to take into account other considerations when evaluating the importance of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* as a source for the year 778. First, there is the peculiar situation of the author who, even though he was born in Syria and started work there as a secretary in Aleppo, ended up spending an important part of his life and career in Egypt; and second, the very genealogy of his work, it being a *dhayl*, thus an appendage to a work with its own fundamental characteristics and objectives, from which the *mudhayyil*, the author's son to boot, either could not or would not deviate:¹⁷⁷ to provide the reader with information, from a Syrian perspective, overwhelmingly about the civilian

¹⁷³ References to his father are made on fols. 138a, 146b and 148a. The very paucity of military/political information in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* can help us preclude the possibility that Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir might have borrowed information from a source he did not cite.

¹⁷⁴ As can be seen in the numerous references he made to his personal acquaintance with many of the people he wrote about - fols. 142 b and 146b -, and in his quoting of their work, whether prose or verse; fols. 135b-136b and 147b-148a.

¹⁷⁵ See above, footnote no. 170.

¹⁷⁶ Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir interrupted his flowery description, warts and all, of the dead king in order to mention ("*katabtu*") that he was the person who wrote on behalf of al-Ashraf the official condolences letter of which he offers a large sampler punctuated by numerous "*wa-minhu*;" "*Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*," MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 140b-141b.

¹⁷⁷ On the issue, see Caesar E. Farah, *The Dhayl in Medieval Arabic Historiography* (New Haven, CT: The American Oriental Society, 1967), pp. 1-2.

a'yân of the Mamluk Sultanate and less so about its military elite, without dwelling upon the vicissitudes of political history. Even though, at least for 778, he stuck to the very format of his father's work in that his *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* lacked political content, except for *akhbâr* on military appointments in Syria,¹⁷⁸ in later years the use of *saj'* would subside while the narrative on political events would increase.¹⁷⁹

But it is perhaps in its generally meagre data that lies the significance of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*. In this respect, the positive tone of the reports dealing with the civilian elites contrasts with the more rough-and-tumble evaluations of al-Ashraf Sha'bân and al-Malik al-Muzaffar's reigns that mixed both laudatory comments with clearly negative ones. For example, even though he noted in his obituary that the sultan loved the company of '*ulamâ*', he pointed out in the same breadth that al-Ashraf liked that of entertainers.¹⁸⁰ Similarly, he appeared to impute to the sultan the responsibility for his own demise: upon his recovery, the sultan insisted on going to the *hajj*, despite the fact that "a group made up of people of good will, members of the elite, as well as grandees from his own government and pillars of the state, told him about delaying this year's pilgrimage, because of their premonition about this year and their fears about the lack of security. Despite this, the strength of his resolve [to go on the pilgrimage] only increased. All this was but something that destiny had determined ("*wa-mâ dhâka illâ li-amr quddira an yakûn*").¹⁸¹ In the same vein, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir noted that "al-Ashraf arrogantly refused to see the reality of the danger to his person, and thus did not prepare

¹⁷⁸ Unless he selected these two men for reasons of personal acquaintance, the only apparent motive behind the mentioning of Tashtamur al-'Alâ'i and Mankalîbughâ al-Ahmadî is that they were nominated to Syrian *niyâbats*.

¹⁷⁹ See the section on Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir in chapter two, pp. 134-9.

¹⁸⁰ "Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk," MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fol. 139b.

¹⁸¹ PMA48. Clearly, "*quddira an yakûn*" referred to the fate that met the sultan as a result of his persistence to leave and his unwillingness to take into account what the *sulahâ'* and *a'yân* told him about postponing the *hajj*.

himself for the day of judgement. He instead contented himself by pleasing his entourage and collaborators; he also became greedy in terms of reaching his aims with the help of those amongst his mamluks and *ghilmân* he counted on; and he was killed by the party he had trusted....”¹⁸²

Last but not least, despite its shortcomings, mainly its lack of narrative on political events, *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* is nevertheless an important work: Ibn Duqmâq in his *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, Ibn al-Furât in his *Târikh al-Duwal*, as well as other historians, have quoted Zayn al-Dîn’s work, mostly in their obituaries¹⁸³ section, but also in the main body of their narrative.¹⁸⁴

C. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq (745-809/1349-1407):

Ibn Duqmâq was the grandson of ‘Izz al-Dîn Aydamur, an emir of al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn, and as a member of the *awlâd al-nâs*, he grew up in an environment steeped in military tradition.¹⁸⁵ Not unlike other first to third generation members of this class,¹⁸⁶ Ibn Duqmâq espoused the life of the intellectual and enthusiastically took up the writing of history so that he ended up writing in this field,

¹⁸² “Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk,” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fol. 140a.

¹⁸³ Al-Maqrîzî who generally does not mention his sources in his historical narrative, cited Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir directly in his obituaries section; *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, p. 296.

¹⁸⁴ For example, the summary made by Ibn Duqmâq of the passage quoted above where the sultan is advised by close advisors and people who wished him well not to leave for the *hajj*; see PMA48.

¹⁸⁵ For biographical information about Ibn Duqmâq, see the introductory chapters of *Al-Jawhar ‘Âshûr*, pp. 3-22; *Al-Jawhar ‘Alî*, pp. 7-20; *Nuzhat al-Anâm Tabbârah*, pp. 9-23; and especially *Al-Nafḥah*, pp. 5-28. For a comprehensive list of primary sources that deal with the life of Ibn Duqmâq, see *Al-Nafḥah*, pp. 17-18.

¹⁸⁶ The list would include, for the Bahrî period, the likes of Ibn al-Dawâdârî (d. 713/1335), Salâh al-Dîn Khalîl ibn Aybak al-Safadî (d. 763/1362), and for the Burjî era, Ibn Taghrîbirdî (d. 874/1470), Khalîl ibn Shâhîn (d. 872/1468) and his son ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî (d. 920/1515), and Ibn Iyâs (d. 930/1524). For an overall review of the contribution of *awlâd al-nâs* to the literary output of the period, see Ulrich Haarmann, “Arabic in Speech,” pp. 81-114.

said al-Maqrîzî, “around two hundred volumes.”¹⁸⁷ Again like many others from this group, he must have been independently wealthy because the only position he is reported to have held during his lifetime was that of *wâlî* of Damietta, which he occupied for a short while just before he died.¹⁸⁸

The value of Ibn Duqmâq as a major historian of the period at hand is corroborated by a number of factors. First and foremost, his contemporaries were near unanimous in recognizing his importance as a scholar, despite what some of them considered being a shortcoming, namely his “lack of knowledge of Arabic.”¹⁸⁹ For example, in the opening pages of his *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, Ibn Hajar readily acknowledged Ibn Duqmâq, along with Ibn al-Furât, as a one of his major sources,¹⁹⁰ while al-Maqrîzî stated that he was very knowledgeable in the affairs of the Turkish state.¹⁹¹ But even more important than acknowledgments is the sheer fact that many contemporary and later historians copied from him: even though *Târikh al-Duwal* is more copious in terms of sheer data than Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, the latter’s accounts form the backbone of Ibn al-Furât’s narrative to which he added his own original material; Ibn Hajar also noted that al-‘Aynî had so extensively borrowed from Ibn Duqmâq that he copied entire pages from his work, spelling mistakes and all.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁷ *Durar al-‘Uqûd al-Farîdah fî Tarâjim al-A’yân al-Mufîdah*, vol. 1., edited by Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn ‘Izz al-Dîn ‘Alî (Beirut: ‘Âlam al-Kutub, 1992) [hereafter *Durar al-‘Uqûd*], p. 162.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

¹⁸⁹ Al-Sakhâwî, *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 1, p. 145. Or that he was “*qalîl al-fiqh*,” al-Maqrîzî, *Durar al-Uqûd*, vol. 1, p. 163; see also below, footnote no. 192.

¹⁹⁰ Vol. 1, pp. 2-3. That Ibn Hajar considered him to have scholarly precedence over Ibn al-Furât can be sensed in the following statement he made about Ibn Duqmâq: “most what I have copied [in *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*] is from him or from what Ibn al-Furât had copied from him;” p. 3.

¹⁹¹ *Durar al-‘Uqûd*, vol. 1, p. 163.

¹⁹² *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, pp. 2-3. Ibn Hajar wrote that al-‘Aynî “mentions in his description of some events what indicates that he actually witnessed them ...[but] the event would have taken place in Egypt while he was still in ‘Ayntâb...”; p. 3. As will be seen below, al-‘Aynî’s annal for the year 778 is basically an identical copy of Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Al-Maqrîzî’s *Kitâb al-Sulûk* also ultimately bears the mark of Ibn Duqmâq since it is based upon Ibn al-Furât. Astonishingly, in his obituary of our author, al-

Also, the secondary sources that deal with his works¹⁹³ mention a host of people whose historical writings he used as sources, but none of these save three, namely Badr al-Dîn Ibn Ḥabîb al-Ḥalabî, his son Zayn al-Dîn Ṭâhir, and al-Nuwayrî al-Iskandarî (was still alive in 775/1372),¹⁹⁴ lived during this period or wrote about it. One might assume, as Ashtor does, that Ibn Duqmâq relied on oral information or eyewitness accounts, his and other people's, to write "the history of events of his own time."¹⁹⁵ This might actually explain the absence, in the main body of his historical narrative and in the obituaries section, of references to other sources, with the exception of the poets Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-‘Attâr al-Dunaysirî (d. 794/1392)¹⁹⁶ and ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Aybak (d. 803/1400),¹⁹⁷ and both Ibn Ḥabîb al-Ḥalabî and his son Zayn al-Dîn Ṭâhir.¹⁹⁸ In the main body of the narrative, Ibn Duqmâq relied on Zayn al-Dîn Ṭâhir for a number of his reports, in some instances

Maqrîzî had this to say about Ibn Duqmâq: "...but he was of poor cognizance, and he contented himself with copying whatever was between his hands, so that someone who knew the truth about his endeavor would attribute it his to absent-mindedness;" [!!!] *Durar al-‘Uqûd*, vol. 1, p. 163. Nevertheless, in his "Introduction" to *Al-Nafḥah*, Tadmurî quotes al-Maqrîzî acknowledging his indebtedness to Ibn Duqmâq in at least one instance; p. 12.

¹⁹³ For example, Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn ‘Izz al-Dîn ‘Alî, *Arba‘at Mu‘arrikhîn wa-Arba‘ Mu‘allafât min Dawlat al-Mamâlik al-Jarâkisah* (Cairo: Al-Hay‘ah al-Miṣrîyah al-‘Āmmah lil-Kitâb, 1992), pp. 122-3; *Al-Nafḥah*, pp. 16-7 and Ashtor, "Some Unpublished Sources for the Bahrî Period," in *Studies in Islamic History and Civilization*, edited by U. Heyd, (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961), pp. 28-9.

¹⁹⁴ Author of a history of Alexandria, *Kitâb al-Ilmâm bi-al-I‘lâm fî mâ Jarat bi-hi al-Aḥkâm wa-al-Umûr al-Maqḍîyah fî Wâqî‘at al-Iskandarîyah*, vols 1-7, edited by ‘Azîz Suriâl ‘Aṭfîyah (Hyderabad: Matba‘at Majlis Dâ‘irat al-Ma‘ârif al-‘Uthmânîyah, 1968-76)

¹⁹⁵ Ashtor, "Some Unpublished Sources," p. 28.

¹⁹⁶ On this *littérateur*, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 177-9. His verse was quoted once within the main body of the narrative, in PMA102, and a number of times in the obituaries section, in fols. 118a, 121a-b and 123a.

¹⁹⁷ On him, see the references in *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 34 footnote no. 207. He was quoted twice in the obituaries section of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*; fols. 120a-b.

¹⁹⁸ There are a few instances of problematic quotations. For example, Ibn Duqmâq introduced the second part of al-Ashraf's obituary which he copied from Zayn al-Dîn Ṭâhir's *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* by citing Badr al-Dîn Ibn Ḥabîb rather than his son, even though after 778, we are definitely dealing with the son's *Dhayl* and not the father's *Durrat al-Aslâk*; see "Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 118a-119a and the corresponding section in "Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk," MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fols. 139b-140a. Ibn Duqmâq makes the same kind of mistake in the obituary of al-Malik al-Muzaffar, the ruler of Mârdîn; "Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 119a-b.

copying him word-for-word, but by leaving out the flowery commentaries, without however mentioning him as his source.¹⁹⁹

One however needs to be aware of some problematic aspects of the oeuvre of Ibn Duqmâq. First is the fact that the only relevant parts of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* that are extant today cover only a limited number of years, from 768 to 779²⁰⁰ and 804-805.²⁰¹ According to Sa'îd 'Abd al-Fattâh 'Âshûr, two manuscript volumes of this work that start respectively in 659 and 777²⁰² are available at Dâr al-Kutub al-Miṣrîyah MS 1740 *târikh*,²⁰³ but all attempts to get a hold of them have led to naught as they are apparently lost! This renders more problematic the exploration of one aspect of the historian's life that is of great relevance to our topic, namely his closeness to Barqûq. Ibn Duqmâq, so it seems, wrote a no longer available biography of the sultan, *Iqd al-Jawâhir fî Sîrat al-Malik al-Zâhir* which he later summarized in a work entitled *Yanbû' al-Mazâhir fî Sîrat al-Malik al-Zâhir*.²⁰⁴ But beyond the admiration, feigned or real, he demonstrated towards

¹⁹⁹ See, for example, PMA48, RL18, RL19, FA2, etc. See also, Ashtor, "Some Unpublished Sources," p. 28.

²⁰⁰ Contrary to what Ashtor said, MS Gotha A 1572 does not end in 799 but indeed in 779; "Some Unpublished Sources," p. 28.

²⁰¹ MS Chester Beatty 4125, 197b-206a.

²⁰² The two almost identical articles on Ibn Duqmâq in *EI*¹ and *EI*² both of which were written by J. Pedersen, and both of which are admittedly older than the sources listed in the following footnote, maintain that *Nuzhat al-Anâm* ended with the events of 779, and that, upon Barqûq's request, it was later followed by a dynastic history of Egypt whose name, curiously, the author of the articles does not mention but which is, probably, *Al-Nafḥah*; *EI*¹, vol. 2, p. 374, and *EI*², vol. 3, p. 756. Bacharach claimed, without providing any reference, that *Nuzhat al-Anâm* ended in the year 779 and that *Al-Nafḥah* is nothing but a continuation of the first work; "Circassian Mamluk Historians," p. 76. Needless to say, that until more is done to put some order in the 'genealogy' of Ibn Duqmâq's works (partly by finding Dâr al-Kutub MS 1740 *târikh*), the issue will not be put to rest.

²⁰³ *Al-Jawhar 'Âshûr*, p. 13. The same almost word-for-word information is to be found in Tadmurî's "Introduction" to *Al-Nafḥah*, p. 26. It is obvious that either Tadmurî copied from 'Âshûr or that both used the same source without acknowledgment. No date as to with which year volume two ends is provided. In his introductory comments to his edition of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* covering the years 628-659, Samîr Tabbârah wrote that Dâr al-Kutub al-Miṣrîyah has an eighty-page manuscript of this work which starts with the reign of al-Manṣûr 'Alî in 778 and ends in 804; p. 15. Whether or not he is referring to the second volume of Dâr al-Kutub MS 1740 *târikh* is not clear; if he is, then we know that it ends in 804.

²⁰⁴ Al-Maqrîzî, *Durar al-'Uqûd*, vol. 1, p. 163. According to 'Alî, it was also upon the request of the said sultan that Ibn Duqmâq wrote his *Al-Nafḥah*; *Al-Jawhar 'Alî*, vol. 1, p. 29.

al-Zâhir and which is to be found reflected in some incredibly laudatory comments he made about him,²⁰⁵ it is difficult to determine, except for the meagre *Al-Nafḥah* and, in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, the annal of 779, the year which witnessed the rise of Barqûq, whether or not the connection between historian and king had had any impact on the former's interpretation of events and on the originality of his information.

Second, there is a significant qualitative and quantitative discrepancy between *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and *Al-Jawhar al-Thamîn*, a.k.a. *Al-Nafḥah*.²⁰⁶ In the shorter *Al-Nafḥah*, which was written as a dynastic history and which covers the entirety of the early Circassian period until 805,²⁰⁷ the annal of 778 contains twenty-seven reports²⁰⁸ to the ninety-three of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.²⁰⁹ But even the fact that *Al-Nafḥah* contains a bit less than a third of the reports of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* needs to be qualified: even though all but two of the *akhbâr*²¹⁰ in the former work are found in the latter, they are dramatically and systematically shorter, and they do not contain any information that is truly original.²¹¹

²⁰⁵ Such as, for example, “*Allâh adhalla a’dâ’ dawlatihi wa-abâdahum bi-qahrihi wa-saṭwihi*,” *Al-Jawhar ‘Alî*, p. 294.

²⁰⁶ See above, footnote no. 19.

²⁰⁷ *Al-Jawhar ‘Âshûr* and *Al-Jawhar ‘Alî* both end in 797.

²⁰⁸ Twenty-six PMAs, zero RLs, one SHM and zero FA.

²⁰⁹ Eighty-one PMAs, nine RLs, three SHMs and one FA.

²¹⁰ PMA25 and 94. In the context of a short work such as *Al-Nafḥah*, the presence of these two reports is understandable: PMA25 simply states that the sultan got involved in the preparations for the *hajj*, an endeavour nowhere plainly reported in *Nuzhat al-Anâm* but amply reflected in at least one account, namely PMA30; as for PMA94, a biographical sketch of al-Ashraf, its absence from the main body of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* is no surprise since this work contains a large obituary of the deceased sultan.

²¹¹ In a few instances though, the narrative of *Al-Nafḥah* is different, and even though this difference is insignificant in that it does not alter the overall reconstruction of events, it is interesting because it shows the liberty historians took in terms of weaving and rearranging their narrative. Thus in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, Ibn Duqmâq paused after mentioning the arrest of al-Ashraf and the fact that Aynabak al-Badrî, one of the Cairo conspirators, made him disclose the location of his arsenal (“*dhakhâ’ir*”), and wrote that it was said that Aynabak had hit him on the soles of his feet; in *Al-Nafḥah* the element of uncertainty is abandoned and the sultan is presented as having disclosed the location of his arsenal after being hit.

Al-Nafḥah thus appears to be a *mukhtaṣar* or a smaller adaptation of the more detailed and thus superior *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.²¹²

Third, even though it contains the majority of the entire range of the one hundred and forty-five *akhbâr* that make up the year 778 found scattered, in varying numbers and density, in the works of other historians of this period, *Nuzhat al-Anâm* is by no means the best or the most complete. It is true that probably most of the eighty-six reports *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and *Al-Muntaqâ* have in common are of Duqmâqian origin, and that, consequently, Ibn al-Furât owes much to Ibn Duqmâq from whose work he copied word-for-word. However, one needs to keep in mind that Ibn al-Furât's work contains fifty²¹³ extra reports to Ibn Duqmâq's eight.²¹⁴ Beyond sheer numbers, Ibn al-Furât's accounts also beat Ibn Duqmâq's quality-wise, in terms not only of the fifty *akhbâr* absent from *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, but also at the level of a great many of those the two authors have in common. Ibn Duqmâq for example simply noted the appointment of Qadi Jâr Allâh, as *Hanafi qâdî al-quḍât*, but did not report two stories found in *Al-Muntaqâ*: that in early Rajab, Jâr Allâh and the Mâlikî Qadi Zakî al-Dîn Abû al-Barakât had refused to participate in a conspiracy led by some doctors and emirs to kill the sultan by withholding treatment while he was very sick;²¹⁵ and that, a few days later, the said Jâr Allâh was nominated *Hanafi qâdî al-quḍât* at the intercession of Zakî al-Dîn Abû al-Barakât only

²¹² There is no textual indication, at least none I came across, that indicates that *Al-Nafḥah* was indeed an abridgement of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. However, the fact that the latter work does not contain any original material not found in the former, except for minor reports [see footnote no. 210 above], does support the direction of the filiation between the two. It is thus reasonable to surmise that the more copious *Nuzhat al-Anâm* was written first and that it served as a blueprint for the shorter *Al-Nafḥah*.

²¹³ PMA3, 4, 12, 25, 27, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 57, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 72, 75, 79, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 98, 101, 110, 114, 115, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 134 and 135; RL2, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 21; SHM7, 9, 10, 14 and 16; F4. One needs to keep in mind that, considering the results of the research about the annal of 793, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah included in *Al-Muntaqâ* the great majority *but not all* the reports in *Târikh al-Duwal*, so that we might assume that the original annal of 778 in Ibn al-Furât's hand was more copious.

²¹⁴ PMA7, 8, 11, 32, 129 and 130; RL5 and 18.

²¹⁵ PMA26.

after the incumbent, Sharaf al-Dīn ibn Mansūr al-Hanafī, did not agree to a *waqf*s exchange with an emir.²¹⁶ As for the reports both authors have in common, an examination of the beginning of PMA59 shows how Ibn al-Furāt used this Duqmāqian *khbar* about the rebellion in ‘Aqabah but added to it a large number of details and numerous dramatic turns:

Ibn Duqmāq: “*Wa-fi yawm al-arba‘ā*, *ṭalabū al-mamālik al-‘alīq, fa-qīla la-hum: ‘ilā al-Azlam.*”²¹⁷ *Fa-abaw an ya’kulū al-simāt ‘asr yawm al-arba‘ā*. *Wa-rakibū ‘alā al-sultān laylat al-khamīs, wa-hum, Tashtamur al-‘Alā’i al-Dawādār, wa-Mubārak al-Tāzī [etc.]...*” [“Nuzhat al-Anām,” MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 113a]

Ibn al-Furāt: “*Wa-fi yawm al-arba‘ā salkh Shawwāl, ijtama‘a al-mamālik al-sultāniyah bi-manzilat al-‘Aqabah wa-ṭalabū min al-sultān al-‘alīq, fa-qīla la-hum: ‘ilā al-Azlam.*’ *Fa-sa’alūh an yunfiqa ‘alayhim nafaqah yunfiqūnahā ‘alā ghilmānihim wa-man ma’ahum min al-[...?] wa-ghayrihim. Fa-qāla la-hum: ‘mā ‘indī illā al-bashmāt wa-al-sha‘īr. Fa-rādadūh [?] marrāt, fa-naharahum wa-tawa‘adahum. Fa-madaw ilā al-Amīr Arghūn Shāh,*²¹⁸ *ra’s nawbah, wa-akhbarūh bi-mā ittafaqa la-hum ma’ al-sultān. Fa-qāla la-hum: ‘hattā amdī ilayhi wa-ajtami’ bi-hi.’ Fa-kharajū min ‘indihi, wa-madaw ilā al-Amīr Tashtamur al-Dawādār wa-akhbarūh bi-mā ittafaqa la-hum, wa-qālū la-hu: ‘in lam yunfiq ‘alaynā, wa-illā qatalnāh.’ Fa-qāla la-hum: ‘Isburū hattā ajtami’ bi-hi.’ Wa-madā ilayhi wa-sa’alahu an yunfiqa ‘alayhim. Fa-imtana‘a, fa-rādadahu [?] ilā an sabbahu wa-qāla la-hu: ‘taḥkum ‘alayya fī Miṣr wa-hunā aydan?,’ wa-haddadahu. Fa-kharaja min ‘indihi fa-ahdaqa bi-hi al-mamālik wa-sa’alūh, fa-akhbarahum bi-mā ittafaqa la-hu ma’ al-sultān. Wa-kāna ghālib al-mamālik [...?] wa-shabāb wa [...?] min mamālik Yalbughā al-Khāssakī, fa-ittafaqu ‘alā qatl al-sultān wa-man ma’ahu min khāssakīyatihi. Wa-qālū lil-Amīr Tashtamur ba‘da mā labisū al-silāh wa-ahātū bi-khāmihi: ‘irkab ma’anā, wa-illā qatalnāk.’ Fa-lam yajid buddan min mutāwa‘atihim, fa-albasa mamālikahu, wa-rakaba ma’ahum. Wa-akhadhū ma’ahum al-Amīr Zayn al-Dīn Mubārak al-Tāzī [etc.]...*” [“Al-Muntaqā,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 34a-b]

Perhaps the best illustration of the pivotal information absent from reports common to both authors or lacking altogether in *Nuzhat al-Anām*, is the story of the

²¹⁶ PMA27. The fact that he had helped cure the sultan also probably played an important role in securing his appointment.

²¹⁷ A station on the pilgrimage route to Mecca from Cairo located on the northern shores of the Arabian Peninsula side of the Red Sea; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, pp. 53 and 56-7, map no. 2.

²¹⁸ A senior member of the sultan’s *khāssakīyah*, he was killed by the Cairene rebels just before his *ustādh* was captured and murdered; on him see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 1, p. 313.

*nafaqah*²¹⁹ paid to the mamluks who participated in the rebellion. In *Al-Muntaqá*, references to it abound. In PMA69, the reader is informed that the ringleaders in Cairo, on the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah, promised various mamluks²²⁰ ten thousand dirhams or five hundred dinars to those who would rally their cause. On the 13th, days after the murder of al-Ashraf and the birth of the new regime, when the emirs decided to reduce the *nafaqah* to one hundred dinars per individual, the mamluks revolted and even captured Tashtamur al-Laffâf who was saved only through the intervention of Qaratây al-Tâzî who promised them their due.²²¹ This is then immediately followed by a string of reports documenting the persons and groups of people who had to be mulcted in the following days to pay for what turned out to be a huge expenditure: the orphans’ fund;²²² senior administrative officials, including the *wazîr* and *nâzir al-khâss*;²²³ junior administrative officials;²²⁴ the *muhtasib*;²²⁵ a number of merchants²²⁶ and of eunuchs,²²⁷ and the viceroy of Alexandria, Ibn ‘Arrâm.²²⁸ This episode culminated with PMA135 in which Ibn al-Furât noted the payment of the *nafaqah* at the end of Dhû al-Qa‘dah, its total value and the number of mamluks thus remunerated,²²⁹ and then recapitulated the groups that were mulcted to gather the promised monies. In *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, nowhere is there *any* mention of a

²¹⁹ This is by no means the only example. See, for example, PMA59, which was extensively quoted just above, as well as PMA60, 62, 64, 65, 66 and 67, some of which are not to be found in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, all providing additional original details on the rebellion in ‘Aqabah and its aftermath.

²²⁰ Ibn al-Furât noted that they belonged to the following groups: the mamluks of the royal princes (“*mamâlik al-asyâd*”); those left behind by the emirs to guard their properties; a few unemployed mamluks (“*wa-ba‘d al-mamâlik al-battâlah*”) and soldiers from the *halqah*; see PMA69.

²²¹ PMA120.

²²² PMA121.

²²³ PMA123.

²²⁴ PMA124.

²²⁵ PMA125.

²²⁶ PMA126.

²²⁷ PMA128.

²²⁸ PMA131.

²²⁹ Three thousand mamluks are said by Ibn al-Furât to have been rewarded. Throughout the tribulations of the *nafaqah* episode, he referred primarily to *julbân*; see, for example PMA124 and 125.

nafaqah having been paid to anyone, and the only oblique references to it are PMA123, 129 and 130, where only the fact of the mulcting of, respectively, senior administrative and two groups of eunuchs is mentioned.²³⁰

Nuzhat al-Anâm is undoubtedly *the* original source for the period at hand in that it was copied extensively by other authors, such as Ibn al-Furât, and, as we shall see below, al-‘Aynî. However, it adds few original elements to those that can be had in *Al-Muntaqá*, a far superior work which has the added advantage of including almost all of its reports. To summarize, one cannot get a sense of the complexities of the events of the year 778 by relying solely on *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.

D. Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât (735-807/1335-1405):

Compared to other authors whose works have been or will be examined and about whom something is known, Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât’s biography is doubtless the least glamorous. Even though he came from a family many of whose members occupied important positions in the administrative apparatus of the Egyptian state during the third and fourth/ninth and tenth centuries,²³¹ he himself made a living as a legal witness in locations on the outskirts of Cairo, and the only prestigious position he occupied appears to have been that of *khatîb* at a *madrasah* in Old Cairo.²³²

According to Claude Cahen, his work, *Târikh al-Duwal*, does not seem to have been much valued by his contemporaries, probably, among other things, because of its weak writing style.²³³ Perhaps Cahen’s judgement was hasty especially that he himself

²³⁰ Incidentally, PMA129 and 130 are two of the five reports peculiar to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.

²³¹ Ahmad ‘Abd al-Majîd al-Shâmî, *Dirâsah fî Makhtûât Târikh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk, al-ma’rûf bi-Târikh Ibn al-Furât al-Hanafî* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Anjilû al-Misriyah, 1983), p. 8.

²³² Al-Shakhâwî, *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 8, p. 51.

²³³ “Ibn al-Furât,” *EF*², vol. 3, p. 792. This charge was also made by al-Sakhâwî; *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 8, p. 51. If length of biography is any indication of importance, in *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, that of Ibn al-

noted that al-Maqrîzî and other historians had made heavy use of it. The list of borrowers is actually quite long and extends over a period of a century: al-Maqrîzî, Ibn Hajar, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, al-Jawharî, Ibn Iyâs and possibly Ibn Khaldûn, al-'Aynî and al-Malaîf.²³⁴ As a matter of fact, no history of the year 778 and generally of the early Circassian period can be written without reference to *Târikh al-Duwal*.

For a long period of time only a small portion of this work was available to students of Mamluk history: the three volumes edited in Beirut covering the years 683-696/1284-1295 and 789-799/1387-1397. The 'rediscovery' by David C. Reisman at the Chester Beatty library in Dublin of a manuscript written in Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's execrable handwriting,²³⁵ brought to the attention of scholars new sections of this chronicle. The manuscript is actually constituted of a number of components,²³⁶ among them selections made by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah from Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-Duwal*²³⁷ and Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*,²³⁸ named respectively *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn al-Furât* and *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*.²³⁹ A comparison of the accounts of the year 793 in the edited version of *Târikh al-Duwal* with those of *Al-Muntaqá*, shows that, even though shorter, the latter work does indeed correspond to the former and appears to be more

Furât's son's covers two pages and his half a page; Ibid.; respectively, *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 4, pp. 186-8, and 8, p. 51.

²³⁴ According to al-Shâmî, Ibn Taghrîbirdî also borrowed from Ibn al-Furât even though I have not been able to ascertain this in the three annals I have analyzed for this dissertation; *Dirâsah fî Makhtûât Târikh al-Duwal*, p. 29.

²³⁵ For a description of Chester Beatty 4125; see Reisman, "A Holograph MS," pp. 20-1. The microfilm of the manuscript was kindly lent to me by David C. Reisman.

²³⁶ These are mainly recensions written by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah of Ibn Hîjjî's *Târikh*; see "A Holograph MS," pp. 25-6, 31-4.

²³⁷ MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 1b-178b.

²³⁸ Ibid., fols. 197b-206a. The annalistic format and copious contents of these folios, which cover the years 804-5, precludes the possibility that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah used *Al-Nafhah*.

²³⁹ Since the two *muntaqás* do not overlap chronologically, when used individually, they will both be referred to throughout this dissertation as *Al-Muntaqá* unless they are being discussed at the same time, as in this sentence, in which case their complete title will be provided.

copious than one would have expected in view of its title.²⁴⁰ The procedure adopted by Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah in order to constitute *Al-Muntaqá* will be discussed mostly in chapter three, but it is clear however that he did ‘manipulate’ Ibn al-Furât’s text, among other things,²⁴¹ by placing the obituaries at the end of the events of each month, very much like his mentor Ibn Hījī had done in his *Târikh*,²⁴² but contrary to the author of *Târikh al-Duwal* who placed them in alphabetical order at the end of each year.²⁴³

On top of considering the particular circumstances of its genesis, any evaluation of Ibn al-Furât’s *Târikh al-Duwal* as it appears in *Al-Muntaqá* has to take into account two very important facets of the work. First, as has been remarked above, the backbone of *Târikh al-Duwal* is without any doubt Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm*: even at the risk of repetition, one ought to note that all the *akhbâr* contained in the latter, save for eight, are to be found in the former. In most cases, Ibn al-Furât usually either copied word-for-word or slightly changed the phrasing of some reports, as can be seen in the following, PMA6:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-fihâ, rasama al-sultân fî shahr Safar bi-hudûr al-sâhib Karîm al-Dîn ibn al-Ghannâm min Makkah, wa-kâna mujâwiran bi-hâ. Fa-arsala la-hu najjâbayn, fa-hadara ilâ al-abwâb al-sharîfah yawm al-jum‘ah hâdî ‘ashar Rabî‘ al-Âkhar aw thâni ‘asharahu.*” [“*Nuzhat al-Anâm*,” MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 109a]

Ibn al-Furât: “*Fîhi, rasama al-sultân bi-hudûr al-wazîr Karîm al-Dîn ibn al-Ghannâm min Makkah, wa-kâna jawâra bi-hâ. Fa-arsala ilayhi najjâbayn, fa-hadara ilâ al-abwâb*

²⁴⁰ See chapter two below, pp. 204-5.

²⁴¹ See, for example Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah’s ‘intrusion’ in the text of *Al-Muntaqá* where he commented in an obituary: “*kadhâ qâlahu Ibn al-Furât wa-huwa innamâ mâṭ fî sâdis hâdhâ al-shahr;*” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 29b. The text of the annal of this year, fols. 28a-45b, contains a number of marginalia. Most are corrections consisting of one or a few words. With the exception of one, all the ‘meatier’ marginalia, some of which are accompanied by the letter *h* for *hâshiyah*, as in fol. 43a, are to be found in those sections containing obituaries: in all probability these are addenda to Ibn al-Furât’s text; as to the exception, it is part of PMA134; see below, footnotes nos. 256 and 317.

²⁴² Ibn Hījī’s work was conceived as a supplement to the histories of other Syrian scholars such as al-Birzâlî and al-Dhahabî; see Reisman, “A Holograph MS,” p. 28. More on Ibn Hījī and his work in chapters two, pp. 179-88, and three, pp. 239-46.

²⁴³ ‘Alî, *Arba‘at Mu‘arrikhîn*, p. 59. It is unlikely that Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah simply copied a different manuscript than that used by Zurayk and Izzeddin, the editors of the Beirut edition of *Târikh al-Duwal*, since only one copy of the work is reputed to have been written; al-Shâmî, *Dirâsah fî Makhtûṭ Târikh al-Duwal*, pp. 9, 14.

al-sharîfah fi hâdî 'ashar shahr Rabî' al-Âkhar aw thâni 'asharahu" ["Al-Muntaqá," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 28a]

In others instances, such as SHM5, which recounts the flooding of the Husaynîyah neighbourhood in Cairo,²⁴⁴ he used clearly identifiable elements of Duqmâqian narrative interspersed with his own data:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-fi al-'ashr al-awwal min Rabî' al-Âkhar, ghariqat al-Husaynîyah. Wa-sabab dhâlika anna Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-maqarr al-Nâsirî ibn Âqbughâ Âs, ista'jara makân ja'alahu birkah, wa fataha majrâh min al-khalij al-Hâshimî lil-mâ'. Wa-ghafala 'anhu, fa-ghariqa fawq al-alf bayt, wa-waqa 'û li-anna 'amâratahâ tawb nayy, wa baqiya makânahum sâhah. Wa-fi dhâlika yaqûl ba'd udabâ' al-'asr....*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 109a-b]

Ibn al-Furât: "*Wa-fi al-'ashr al-awwal minhu, inqata'a maqta' 'azîm min al-khalij bi-al-qurb min Qanâtîr al-Awazz. Wa-sabab dhâlika anna al-Amîr Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-Amîr ibn Âqbughâ Âs, ista'jara makânan ja'alahu birkah, wa-fataha majrâh min al-khalij ilayhâ. Fa-mashâ al-mâ' wa-ghafala 'anhu al-muwakkal bi-hi, wa-ittasa'a al-khirq, wa-zâda al-mâ', wa-fâda min al-birkah, wa-sâha ilâ an wasala ilâ istabl Sharaf al-Dîn [Nâsir al-Dîn²⁴⁵] bi-jiwâr jâmi' al-Husaynîyah, wa-hadama dûr kathîrah wa-hârât bi-al-Husaynîyah. Qila kânat al-dûr al-latî tahaddamat fawq al-alf li-anna 'amâratahâ kânat bi-labin, wa-baqiya makânahâ sâhah.*" ["Al-Muntaqá," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 28b]

Still in other accounts, such as PMA59 that was extensively quoted in the previous section on Ibn Duqmâq, the information added by Ibn al-Furât drowns components, words really, which are nevertheless recognizably Duqmâqian.²⁴⁶

Second, *Kitâb al-Duwal*, i.e. *Al-Muntaqá*, a work considered by Ibn Hajar for example, to be second to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*,²⁴⁷ is actually by far superior to it. The reason behind this is that *Al-Muntaqá* contains a substantial number of in-depth additional data that appear to be original.²⁴⁸ in the list of sources Ibn al-Furât is alleged to have used for

²⁴⁴ On this incident see above, p. 30, and below, pp. 53, 58, 72-3, 92, 117 and 123.

²⁴⁵ The name in brackets was written in the margin of fol. 28b, and is accompanied by a s, for sâhh.

²⁴⁶ See above, p. 48.

²⁴⁷ See above, footnote no. 190.

²⁴⁸ See above, pp. 47-50.

the elaboration of his work, only one, Ibn Duqmâq, was a contemporary.²⁴⁹ One can only surmise that he either consulted non-written, i.e. verbal, sources, or that he was himself an eyewitness of the events and dramas he described in his work. After all, even though he did not occupy a lofty position in any of branches of the state apparatus open to non-Mamluks, namely the financial department, the secretariat and the judiciary, his belonging to a well-known family and the possibly close contacts he might have established with certain sectors of the population in his capacity as legal witness, could have afforded him ample opportunities to observe the political and religious scenes of his times. We noted earlier that Ibn al-Furât's chronicle managed to convey the atmosphere of political volatility brought about by the coup, by reporting the unwillingness of its leaders in Cairo to keep their promise to pay a *nafaqah* to the mamluks and then their decision to decrease the amount of money promised; only after death threats were uttered against Tashtamur al-Laffâf did the heads of the new regime react swiftly and dramatically by gathering, extra-legally, the needed amounts of money.²⁵⁰ The same can be said about the whereabouts of the rebels in 'Aqabah, following their successful uprising against the sultan. In the narrative of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, their trek back to Cairo

²⁴⁹ Al-Shâmî however fails to mention Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir from whom Ibn al-Furât borrowed material in order to compose his obituaries; see chapter two, pp. 149-50. In *Al-Muntaqâ*, PMA48 contains some Tâhirian elements, but it was actually borrowed from *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Even though Ibn Duqmâq is, by far, Ibn al-Furât's most important source, there is one indication that points to a possible borrowing from Ibn Khaldûn. *Al-Muntaqâ* reports a story about the refusal of al-Maqsî, the *nâzir al-khâss*, to give their due in money and meat to those in Cairo who were to take part in the coup. This *khavar*, PMA68, allows Ibn al-Furât to explain why the rebels in Cairo laid in wait for al-Maqsî and tried to catch him *after* the rebellion had taken place to get him to provide them with what he refused to give them *before*. The fact that the same incident, presented somewhat differently, can be found in *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, in the same sequence of events, namely *before* the coup took place on the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah, and the fact that the passage in al-Furât's text started with the words "*wa-bi-khatti ba'dihim*," might be construed as proof that Ibn Khaldûn's chronicle was copied by the author of *Târikh al-Duwal*; on PMA68, see above, pp. 31-2 and footnote no. 130 therein. However, it is possible that these words were added not by Ibn al-Furât, but rather by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, the compiler of *Al-Muntaqâ*.

²⁵⁰ See above, p. 34 and footnote 137 therein.

includes the following events:²⁵¹ an attempt to convince the caliph to assume the sultanate [PMA60]; one stop at ‘Ajrûd,²⁵² where they learned about the assassination of al-Ashraf, followed by one at Birkat al-Hajj [PMA95]; finally, their actual return to the capital on the 7th of Dhû al-Qa‘adah and their defeat there at the hands of the Cairenes [PMA99]. In *Al-Muntaqá*, it goes as follows: PMA60 is followed by a story reporting the mobbing of the leaders of ‘Aqabah party by the populace after they had decided to cancel the *hajj* and to return to Cairo [PMA62]; an episode, still at ‘Aqabah, about a forced purchase imposed on the pilgrims [PMA64]; a stop at Abyâr al-‘Alâ’î, wherefrom some pilgrims were allowed to resume the *hajj* [PMA65]; another stop at Nakhl,²⁵³ where the fear that the sultan had made it back to Cairo led some of the rebels to part ways with their brothers and to go to Syria [PMA66]; a stop of ‘Ajrûd, then Birkat al-Hajj [PMA95]; and finally the battle between the two groups of rebels [PMA99]. The value of *Al-Muntaqá* lies in the fact that Ibn al-Furât added information of his own or greatly expanded that which he borrowed from Ibn Duqmâq, thus offering the most comprehensive coverage.

As well, at the level of both social and religious life, *Al-Muntaqá* offers more reports than *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. For example, Ibn al-Furât noted the protest by the Sufis of Sa‘îd al-Su‘adâ’ *khânaqâh* against Jâr Allâh, their shaykh,²⁵⁴ or the scolding of the *dawâdâr* of Âqtamur al-Hanbalî, the *nâ’ib al-saltanah*, at the hands of the Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-*

²⁵¹ Here and in the following sentence, I have listed only those reports that deal with the return of the ‘Aqabah party to Cairo. Naturally, there are numerous reports interspersed amongst them.

²⁵² A station on the pilgrimage route to Mecca located just before Suez; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 53 and map no. 4.

²⁵³ Abyâr al-‘Alâ’î is a spot located forty miles west of Nakhl, a station on the pilgrimage route to Mecca from Cairo located in the heart of the Sinai Peninsula; see *ibid.*, pp. 53 and 56-7, map no. 2.

²⁵⁴ RL2.

quḍāt,²⁵⁵ etc. Ultimately, no other source, except *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, comes close to providing modern-day researchers with such wealth of information, as does *Târîkh al-Duwal*.²⁵⁶

III. Later Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Badr al-Dîn al-‘Aynî (762-855/1361-1451):

As his name indicates, Badr al-Dîn Al-‘Aynî was born in ‘Ayntâb in Northern Syria.²⁵⁷ The geographical location of the town very close to Turkish-speaking areas meant that al-‘Aynî was fluent in Turkish, something which was to help him greatly during his career. He started his religious education in ‘Ayntâb, then in Aleppo, and after visiting various cities in the Mamluk empire, he eventually settled down in Cairo. There, he was to have, despite a few shortfalls, a distinguished and successful career as *muhtasib*,²⁵⁸ *Ḥanafî qâḍî al-quḍât*, courtier, and prolific religious scholar and historian.

Al-‘Aynî’s most important historical work, a universal chronicle entitled *‘Iqd al-Jumân fi Târîkh Ahl al-Zamân*,²⁵⁹ has been described by Little as surpassing, for the Bahrî

²⁵⁵ PMA4. On the issue of the intrusion of men of the sword in the realm of the qadis, a recurring theme in certain chronicles, see Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian,” pp. 125-6.

²⁵⁶ *Al-Muntaqâ* contains a story, PMA134, that is found in no other work: in the margin of fol. 39a, Ibn al-Furât (or Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah??) reported that Aynabak al-Badrî wanted to make a sultan out of Aḥmad ibn Yalbughâ because he was really the son of al-Nâsir Ḥasan, and not of Yalbughâ al-‘Umari’s. The incident is said to have occurred in Rabî‘ al-Awwal of the following year (“*wa-qîla inna dhâlika innama kâna fi rabî‘ al-awwal min al-sanah al-âtiyah fi rabî‘ al-shahr...*”).

²⁵⁷ The biographical data of this paragraph are based on W. Marçais’ article on al-‘Aynî in the *EF*² vol. 1, p. 814.

²⁵⁸ Al-Maqrîzî competed with al-‘Aynî on a number of occasions for the *ḥisbah*, something which explains the animosity between the two men. On this and al-‘Aynî’s rivalry with Ibn Ḥajar, see Anne F. Broadbridge, “Academic Rivalry and the Patronage System in Fifteenth-Century Egypt: Al-‘Aynî, al-Maqrîzî, and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalânî,” in *Mamluk Studies Review*, vol. 3 (1999), pp. 89-96; see also below, p. 70 and chapter three, p. 215.

²⁵⁹ For the year 778, two manuscripts of this work were used, namely MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2, a holograph manuscript [fols. 58b-61a], and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târîkh* [fols. 199-221]. According to ‘Abd al-Râziq al-Tantâwî al-Qarmûtî, this last manuscript is made up of two components: one from the hand of Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad and another from al-Akhmîmî’s, respectively al-‘Aynî brother and student; “Introduction” to the edited text of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* (Beirut: Al-Zahrâ’ lil-‘lâm al-‘Arabî, 1989), p. 51. Based on the argumentation developed below and on textual evidence from the analysis of the year 793 undertaken in chapter two of this dissertation, the annal of the year 778 in Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh* was probably

period, all other sources, because of the sheer importance of original data it holds,²⁶⁰ whether the text of works no longer extant,²⁶¹ or, when compared to al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, because of superior in-depth coverage of events.²⁶² Little added that "its historical and historiographical value is enhanced by al-'Aynî's frequent practice of naming his sources and, unlike al-Maqrîzî, quoting rather than paraphrasing them, which enables us to identify and to verify unsubstantiated statements about the Bahrî period which appear in other Burjî histories."²⁶³

However, for the period at hand, namely the year 778, *Iqd al-Jûmân* has absolutely nothing original to offer: its importance lies in the fact that it is nothing but a mere replica of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.²⁶⁴ Often, al-'Aynî simply copied word-for-word, added or removed words here and there, or introduced very light changes, but the text of *Iqd al-Jumân* remains unmistakably close to that of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, as can be seen in the following, PMA20:

from Ahmad ibn Ahmad's hand and later sections of the manuscript covering later periods of the Burjî period from al-Akhmîmî's. Of note is the fact that the folios of this manuscript are numbered in a non-traditional manner as each page has a different numerical value. Al-Qarmût's edition covers the years 825-50/1421-47 and is based on yet another manuscript, namely the more complete Ahmet III 2911/19, which will be used alongside Ahmet III 2911/B2 in chapter three below. An edition of al-'Aynî's *Iqd al-Jumân*, based on Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh*, edited by Imân 'Umar Shukrî - *Al-Sultân Barqûq, Mu'assis Dawlat al-Mamâlik al-Jarâkîsah, 784-801 1382-1398: min Khilâl Makhtûât Iqd al-Jumân fî Târîkh Ahl al-Zamân li-Badr al-Dîn al-'Aynî* (Cairo: Maktabat Madbûlî, 2002) - was published in 2002 and covers Barqûq's reign years 784-801/ 1382-1398. Donald P. Little has brought to my attention yet another edition of *Iqd al-Jumân* covering apparently the years 815-823 and published in Cairo in 1985 by a Maṭba'at 'Alâ', but I have not been able to find any reference to it anywhere.

²⁶⁰ Introduction, p. 80-81.

²⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 81.

²⁶² Ibid., pp. 83-4.

²⁶³ Ibid., p. 81.

²⁶⁴ The extent of the copying was such that even Ibn Duqmâq's inconsistencies in terms of the chronological narration of events were followed by al-'Aynî. For example, the dated news on fols. 115b-116b of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* start with the 18th of Dhû al-Qa'dah, which is then followed by the 29th of the same month, then by the 21st, then by the 19th, then by the 12th, then by the 28th. Al-'Aynî followed this very order except that he did not include all the data, so that only three dated items are to be found in his *Iqd al-Jumân*, namely 18th of Dhû al-Qa'dah, followed by the 29th, then by the 28th; "Iqd al-Jumân," Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh*, fols. 212-213. The Ahmet III manuscript was not used in the comparison just undertaken because two of the dated events listed in the previous sentence are written in the top margin of fol. 60b, something which makes it impossible to figure out their exact order of appearance in the text.

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-fi yawm al-ithnayn thâni ‘ashar Jumâdá al-Ákhirah, musika al-maqarr al-Nâsirî Muḥammad ibn Áqbughâ Ás, ustâdâr al-‘âliyah, wa-nuḥfiya ilá al-Quds battâlan wa-nuḥfiya ba‘dahu bi-yawm Muḥammad, waladuhu.*” [“Nuzhat al-Anâm,” MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 110a]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Wa-musika Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Áqbughâ Ás, wa-nuḥfiya ilá al-Quds battâlan wa-nuḥfiya ba‘dahu bi-yawm Muḥammad Shâh, waladuhu.*” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 58b]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Yawm al-ithnayn thâni ‘ashar Jumâdá al-Ákhirah, musika al-maqarr al-Nâsirî Muḥammad ibn Áqbughâ Ás, ustâdâr al-‘âliyah, wa-nuḥfiya ilá al-Quds battâlan wa-nuḥfiya ba‘dahu bi-yawm, Muḥammad Shâh, waladuhu.*” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târiḥ*, fols. 200-1]

In other instances, al-‘Aynî did take some liberty with the text, as he moved, added and/or changed narrative elements within given reports, such as SHM5:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-fi al-‘ashr al-awwal min Rabî‘ al-Ákhar, ghariqat al-Husaynîyah. Wa-sabab dhâlika anna Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-maqarr al-Nâsirî ibn Áqbughâ Ás, ista‘jara makân ja‘alahu birkah, wa fataha majrâh min al-khalij al-Hâshimî lil-mâ’. Wa-ghafala ‘anhu, fa-ghariqa fawq al-alf bayt, wa-waqa ‘û li-anna ‘amâratâhâ tawb nawayy, wa baqiya makânahum sâhah. Wa-fi dhâlika yaqûl ba‘d udabâ’ al-‘asr....*” [“Nuzhat al-Anâm,” MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 109a-b]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Wa-fi al-‘ashr al-awwal min Rabî‘ al-Ákhar, ghariqat al-Husaynîyah, wa-kharuba alf bayt wa-akthar. Wa-sabab dhâlika anna Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr Muḥammad ibn Áqbughâ Ás, ista‘jara makân ja‘alahu birkah, wa-fataha la-hu majrâ min al-khalij, fa-taharraka al-mâ’, wa-ghafila ‘anhu, fa-ghariqat.*” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 59a]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Wa- fi al-‘ashr al-awwal min Rabî‘ al-Ákhar, ghariqat al-Husaynîyah, wa-kharubat alf bayt wa-akthar. Dhâlika bi-sabab anna Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr Muḥammad ibn Áqbughâ Ás, ista‘jara makân ja‘alahu birkah, wa-fataha la-hu majrâ min al-khalij, fa-taharraka al-mâ’, wa-ghafalû ‘anhu, fa-ghariqat.*” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târiḥ*, fol. 200]

Al-‘Aynî’s reliance on Ibn Duqmâq did not however lead him to include in his work the whole spectrum of reports found in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. The Ahmet III and Dâr al-Kutub manuscripts comprise, respectively, fifty-four²⁶⁵ and sixty-three²⁶⁶ out of the eighty-one PMAs, seven out of the nine RLs,²⁶⁷ two out of the three SHMs²⁶⁸ contained

²⁶⁵ The PMAs missing from MS Ahmet III 2911/B2 are the following: PMA6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26, 28, 32, 33, 34, 38, 47, 95, 117, 127, 128, 129, 130 and 133.

²⁶⁶ The PMAs missing from Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târiḥ* are the following: PMA7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 22, 23, 32, 38, 47, 117, 127, 128, 129, 130 and 133.

²⁶⁷ In both manuscripts the missing RLs are the following: RL5 and 9.

²⁶⁸ In both manuscripts the missing SHM is SHM8.

in Ibn Duqmâq's work.²⁶⁹ The percentage of reports that did find their way into *'Iqd al-Jumân* are then relatively high, and for PMAs reports it reaches around sixty-seven and seventy-seven percent in, respectively, the Ahmet III and Dâr al-Kutub manuscripts. Most of the missing reports are PMAs that cover a number of topics: turnover of junior personnel²⁷⁰ and of senior administrators in Egypt, mostly *wazîrs*;²⁷¹ news concerning the court in Cairo;²⁷² etc. Others are relatively more important, such PMA26 and 28, two very short reports about the sickness and recovery of the sultan; PMA95, the story about the arrival of the 'Aqabah rebels in 'Ajrûd; and PMAs 128, 129 and 130, which list individuals, all eunuchs, who were mulcted for the *nafaqah*. However, the absence of the information that could be had by means of these *akhbâr*, along with the fact that *'Iqd al-Jumân* contains no original data and that *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, the work upon which al-'Aynî's work is based, is considerably poorer in information than, say, *Târikh al-Duwal*, reduce the significance of al-'Aynî's work and lead one to simply dismiss it as a source for the year 778.

No ready-made explanation can be put forward to explain the apparent qualitative discrepancy between, on the one hand, those earlier sections of *'Iqd al-Jumân* referred to by Little and the later annals of the years 793 and 804, which, it will be shown below, are of a superior quality,²⁷³ and on the other, the contents of the year 778. A number of hypotheses can be advanced in this regard. For one thing, in 778, al-'Aynî had not yet

²⁶⁹ Only three reports are present in *'Iqd al-Jumân* but absent in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. PMA1 with which al-'Aynî started off his annal, and PMA135, a short account of the payment of the *nafaqah*, are present in both manuscripts of *'Iqd al-Jumân*. As for PMA94, a short biographical sketch of al-Ashraf, it is embedded in the main body of Ahmet III 2911/B2, but its equivalent, the sultan's necrology, can be found in the obituaries section of the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript.

²⁷⁰ Such as emirs of forty or *kashifs*; See PMA7, 8, 10, 11, 23, 32, 33, 34 and 38.

²⁷¹ PMA6, 13, 21, 22 and 133.

²⁷² PMA14, 15 and 47.

²⁷³ See chapters two, pp. 150-3, and three, pp. 221ff.

embarked upon the trek that would eventually lead him to Egypt,²⁷⁴ and thus could not have been an eyewitness to what had taken place there. And even if he had been around in Cairo, at age sixteen, it is unlikely that he would have been impressed by the events surrounding al-Ashraf's murder to the extent that he would have started taking notes. Also, the known original sources for the year 778, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn al-Furât,²⁷⁵ are admittedly less numerous than those for the annals studied by Little,²⁷⁶ so that *'Iqd al-Jumân* could not, for the early Burjî era at least, have preserved no longer extant works for posterity.²⁷⁷ One might also conjecture about the nature of al-'Aynî's historiographical production, as Little has done with those annals of *'Iqd al-Jumân* that deal with the middle Burjî period: after noting the fact that the only published sections of *'Iqd al-Jumân* for the Circassian period, namely the years 825-50/1421-47,²⁷⁸ are poorer in details than earlier ones, Little remarked that "this contemporary section reads almost like a day book which may have been intended as a first draft of a later work, planned but not completed."²⁷⁹ Even though the contents of the year 778 in the two manuscripts studied here can by no means be construed as anything resembling a diary, it might be possible that for this particular period of the Burjî era, al-'Aynî had elaborated a blue-print for a more complete work to be based on Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.

²⁷⁴ See chapter two, pp. 153-4.

²⁷⁵ One might want to add Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir for the obituaries.

²⁷⁶ For the year 694, Little identified no less than eight sources used at various degrees by al-'Aynî; *Introduction*, p. 81.

²⁷⁷ Actually, one could argue that it does: since both manuscripts of *'Iqd al-Jumân* preserved substantial sections of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, and since the last extant annal of the latter work is the year 779, it is possible that al-'Aynî used Ibn Duqmâq's work for later annals of this work. However, given the fact, as will be shown in chapters two and three, that authors do change the textual foundation of their works, nothing guarantees that post-779 annals in *'Iqd al-Jumân* are based on *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.

²⁷⁸ See above, footnote no. 259.

²⁷⁹ "Historiography," p. 438.

But even if al-‘Aynî had included the entire breadth of reports for the year 778 in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, his *‘Iqd al-Jumân* would still fall short of other chronicles. This statement is of great importance because one ought to keep in mind that the two manuscripts used here could be in fact, not versions of an original text of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, but rather summaries of it. MS Ahmet III 2911/B2 is from al-‘Aynî’s hand and covers the years 727 to 835, and Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, of which I have at my disposal folios 160 to 476, the years 771 to 798, but which I assume to run all the way to 850.²⁸⁰ It is clear from the systematic comparison I have undertaken of the text of the annal of 804 in both MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Ahmet III 2911/19,²⁸¹ that the former is poorer in information than the latter. It is possible that the shorter MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târikh*, which is mainly from the hand of *Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad*, al-‘Aynî’s brother, are indeed a summary, maybe no other than *Târikh al-Badr*,²⁸² of an original and longer version of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, presumably volume eighteen of MS Ahmet III 2911. According to Joe Van Steenbergen, from the University of Leuven, a comparison of the extant manuscript of *Târikh al-Badr* available at the British Library²⁸³ and covering the years 717-798, with Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, has led him to conclude that the two are clearly identical.²⁸⁴

However, what has just been argued might contradict al-Qarmût’s contention that Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh* is just another copy of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* written mainly by the hand of al-‘Aynî’s brother, *Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad*, and which he, al-Qarmût, used

²⁸⁰ See al-Qarmût, “Introduction,” p. 51

²⁸¹ This manuscript covers the years 799 to 850.

²⁸² *Târikh al-Badr*, according to Qarmût, is an eight-volume summary of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*; see his “Introduction,” p. 41.

²⁸³ MS BL OIOC Add 22,360.

²⁸⁴ This information was kindly forwarded to me by Joe Van Steenbergen in an email exchange regarding the genealogy of al-‘Aynî’s works.

concurrently with MS Ahmet III 2911/19 to edit the annals from 824 to 850: nowhere in his discussion of his sources does he note that the Cairo manuscript was shorter than that of Istanbul.²⁸⁵ To explain such a discrepancy, one might hypothesize that the annals of the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript used by al-Qarmût covering the years 824 to 850, were more complete and closer to the original written in Badr al-Dîn's hand, that is Ahmet III 2911/19, than earlier annals such as 778. Maybe the later parts of Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh* used by al-Qarmût were from the hand not of Ahmad ibn Ahmad, but al-Akhmîmî's, al-'Aynî's student,²⁸⁶ who could have copied more from his teacher's work than the latter's brother had.

This however still does not solve the problem of the relationship between the two manuscripts used here. As we have seen in the case of SHM6 and PMA20, both of which were transcribed above, the two manuscripts are closer to one another than to any other source. And yet, there are clear differences between them. Ahmet III 2911/B2 conforms more to the format most typical of al-'Aynî's historical writing, that of the topical order for the presentation of his *akhbâr*:²⁸⁷ it starts with a large introduction which mentions the whole list of the regime's main functionaries, whether religious, military or administrative [PMA1]; it is then followed by a section listing officials who were exiled [PMA2, 20, 23 and 9], then by another list of appointments [PMA16, 18, RL8, PMA31, 37, 39 and 34]: unlike other historians who described the vicissitudes of certain careers as they occurred during a given year, al-'Aynî lays everything down in the introduction. The rest of the text of this manuscript continues with the stories about the abolition of tax-farming [SHM6], the flooding of a Cairo neighbourhood [SHM6], the numerous reports

²⁸⁵ See al-Qarmût, "Introduction," p. 51.

²⁸⁶ See above, footnote no. 259.

²⁸⁷ Little, "Historiography," p. 438.

concerning the tragedy of al-Ashraf, etc., and ends with obituaries. The Dâr al-Kutub manuscript starts off somewhat similarly with the listing of the sultan's viceroys in Syria, but the rest follows to a great extent the order of *sard* of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. The affinities between this manuscript and Ibn Duqmâq's can also be seen in terms of the relatively higher number of reports, all PMAs, that it contains, sixty-five to the fifty-seven of the Istanbul manuscript. Consequently, not only is its scope broader, but, concerning many individual reports, it also conveys a fuller and more precise picture of the events of the year 778.²⁸⁸

This can be seen in the string of reports that describe the events surrounding the battle that took place upon the return of the 'Aqabah party to Cairo, which led to the victory of the Cairenes. For a start, contrary to his brother, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad followed the exact sequencing of reports in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*,²⁸⁹ while in Ahmet III 2911/B2 PMA95 is not even part of the line-up and PMA96 is very much incomplete compared to the full account given by Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad:

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*wa-sârû ilâ an ataw ilâ Birkat al-Hujjâj, fa-sâra ilayhim jamâ'ah min al-qâ'imîn bi-al-Diyâr al-Misrîyah, wa-kânat 'alâ talî'at Tashtamur Quṭluqtamur al-'Alâ'î al-Tawîl, fa-kasarahum, wa-sâqa warâ'ahum ilâ Qal'at al-Jabal. Fa-lammâ kâna qarîban min al-Qal'ah, katharû 'alayhi fa-masakûh.*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 114a]

Al-'Aynî: "...*wa-sârû ilâ an waṣalû ilâ Birkat al-Hujjâj, fa-sâra ilayhim jamâ'ah min al-qâ'imîn bi-al-Diyâr al-Misrîyah, wa-kânat 'alâ talî'at Tashtamur Quṭluqtamur al-'Alâ'î al-Tawîl, fa-kasarahum, wa-sâqa khalfahum ilâ al-Qal'ah. Fa-lammâ kâna qarîb min al-Qal'ah, katharû 'alayhi fa-masakûh.*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh*, fol. 208]

²⁸⁸ Interestingly, in the annal of the year 793, the situation is reversed, as the Istanbul manuscript is more complete than that of Cairo; see chapter two, pp. 155-7.

²⁸⁹ The 'Aqabah rebels headed back to Cairo [PMA67], and reached 'Ajrûd wherefrom they went to Birkat al-Ḥajj, after they heard about the assassination of al-Ashraf [PMA95]; Quṭluqtamur al-'Alâ'î, who led the vanguard of the 'Aqabah rebels, met and defeated a group of Cairenes who were sent to confront them, but was himself later overwhelmed after following them all the way back to the Citadel [PMA96]; Âqtamur al-Ḥanbalî, who had been sent to the Sa'îd, returned to Cairo and joined forces with the rebels there [PMA97]; in a final clash, the Cairenes defeated Tashtamur al-'Alâ'î [PMA99], who then sued for peace and an amnesty [PMA102].

Al-‘Aynî: “...*wa-lammâ waṣalû ilá Birkat al-Ḥajj, sâra ilayhim jamâ‘ah min al-qâ‘imîn bi-Miṣr.*” [“*Iqd al-Jumân,*” MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 60a]

Before proceeding any further, let us recapitulate: MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târiḫ* are similar to *Târiḫ al-Badr*; for the year 778 at least, the first conforms more to the classical appearance of annals written by al-‘Aynî while the second is closer to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*; the annals of the years 824 to 850 in Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târiḫ* appear to be identical to the more complete Ahmet III 2911/19 manuscript. What is one to make of all this? The answer to this question is not easy. One could argue that the differences noted above between MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târiḫ* could be accounted for by the fact that each one of the two brothers chose to summarize the main copy of *Iqd al-Jumân* differently, one by straying from its Duqmâqian foundation and the other by drawing closer to it. This however still does not solve the problem of their relationship with *Târiḫ al-Badr*. Had Van Steenbergen had in his possession Ahmet III 2911/B2 for him to compare to both the Cairo and the British Library manuscripts, he would have been able to reach some conclusions concerning the interrelations amongst the three works; but this was not the case. In the light of the information above and until volume eighteen of MS Ahmet III 2911/18 is studied for comparison, one may hypothesize the following: that we are dealing here with two summaries of *Iqd al-Jumân*, with a twist however. One, the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript, is apparently identical to *Târiḫ al-Badr*, and the other, Köprülü MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, is from Badr al-Dîn’s own hand but its real ‘identity’ is still not clearly determined;²⁹⁰ that the British Library manuscript Van Steenbergen used in his comparison with Dâr al-

²⁹⁰ Because of the closeness of MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târiḫ* and of what was said above about the similarities between the extant text of *Târiḫ al-Badr* and the latter work, it is unlikely that either one constitutes what al-Qarmûṭ called *Mukhtaṣar al-Mukhtaṣar*, ostensibly a summary of *Târiḫ al-Badr*; see al-Qarmûṭ, “Introduction,” p. 41.

Kutub MS 1584 *târikh* is not in fact *Târikh al-Badr*, but rather perhaps MS Ahmet III 2911/18, and, consequently, that the two manuscripts used here are not summaries but indeed the full text of *Iqd al-Jumân*.²⁹¹ Clearly, both hypotheses are weak, especially the second: after all, as was noted above and as will be shown below in chapter three, MS Ahmet III2911/B2 is indeed less copious than MS Ahmet III2911/19, and therefore cannot belong to the same ensemble of manuscripts. Here again, as was the case with Ibn Duqmâq and others, no definitive conclusions can be drawn until some order is put in the classification and identification of al-‘Aynî’s works.

B. Walî al-Dîn Abû Zur‘ah, Ibn al-‘Irâqî (762-826/1360-1422):

Like most of the authors whose works were introduced above, Ibn al-‘Irâqî was born into a scholarly Egyptian family.²⁹² Biographical notices written about him and his father are long and laudatory in tone: the fact that the father of Walî al-Dîn, Zayn al-Dîn,²⁹³ was a teacher of an esteemed and respected scholar such as Ibn Hajar undoubtedly made for a positive appraisal of them as even the usually poisonous pen of al-Sakhâwî not only spared the father-and-son pair, but also produced a very positive assessment of them.²⁹⁴

Walî al-Dîn held numerous positions during his lifetime, mostly as a teacher, but his crowning achievement was to be named *Shâfi‘î qâdî al-qudât* in 824, a position he was not to enjoy for very long time because of a conspiracy organized by Mamluk emirs

²⁹¹ J. Van Steenberghe himself entertained this possibility by basing himself on the tentative conclusions I had communicated to him regarding MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târikh*.

²⁹² The biographical sketch in this paragraph is based on the one presented by Sâlih Mahdî ‘Abbâs in the introductory pages of his edition of Ibn al-‘Irâqî’s *Al-Dhayl ‘alâ al-‘Ibar*, vol. 1, pp. 7-32.

²⁹³ He had also been chief qadi of Medina; Salibi, “Listes chronologiques,” p. 90.

²⁹⁴ See his obituaries of, respectively, the son and the father in *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 1, pp. 336-344 and vol. 4, pp. 171-178.

who allegedly disliked his uprightness.²⁹⁵ Like many other scholars of his generation, Walî al-Dîn tried his hand at the writing of history and produced a number of works, two of which were *dhayls* to *dhayls* written by his father to al-Dhahabî's (d. 748/1348) histories. As was the case with the historiographical output of previous historians, there appears to be some confusion regarding al-Dhahabî's works, a confusion that needs to be dissipated if Ibn al-'Irâqî's are to be placed in a proper perspective.

According to the *EF*², al-Dhahabî summarized his *magnum opus*, *Târîkh al-Islâm wa-Wafayât al-Mashâhîr wa-al-A'lâm*, in two works, *Kitâb Duwal al-Islâm* [a.k.a *Al-Târîkh al-Saghîr*] and *Al-'Ibar fî Akhbâr al-Bashar mimman 'Abar*, which, when combined, "give a fairly good synopsis of the whole of *Târîkh al-Islâm*," since the former concentrated more on political events and the latter on biographies.²⁹⁶ The authors of the *EF*² article then continued by saying that the book entitled *Al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar* was "a transcript, enlarged in some passages, of al-Dhahabî's [*Al-'Ibar fî Akhbâr al-Bashar mimman 'Abar*] by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah."

As for Ibn al-'Irâqî and his father, the article argues that they wrote continuations of *Târîkh al-Islâm* from 701/1301-2 to 740/1339-40, but that only Walî al-Dîn's is extant.²⁹⁷ On the other hand, Sâlih Mahdî 'Abbâs asserts, without giving much detail about the nature of these works, that al-Dhahabî extracted from his *Târîkh al-Islâm* a shorter book entitled *Al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar*, which, like the former, covered the year 1 to 700 of the Muslim era.²⁹⁸ Al-Dhahabî then wrote a *dhayl* to his *Al-'Ibar fî*

²⁹⁵ Salibi, "Listes chronologiques," p. 90.

²⁹⁶ All the data in this paragraph is based on Mohammad ben Cheneb and J. de Somogyi's article in *EF*², "Al-Dhahabi," vol. 2, pp. 214-6.

²⁹⁷ 'Adnân Darwish seems to concur, partly at least, with the *EF*² article as Zayn al-Dîn's work is listed as a *dhayl* to al-Dhahabî's *Târîkh*, but his son's is identified as a *dhayl* to al-Dhahabî's *Kitâb al-'Ibar*; Darwish's French "Introduction" to the first part of *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shubah*, vol. 2, p. 39.

²⁹⁸ All the data in this paragraph is based on Sâlih Mahdî 'Abbâs, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-4.

Khabar man 'Abar covering the years 701 to 740, to which the father and son pair, Zayn al-Dîn and Walî al-Dîn, produced *adhyâl* of their own, thus continuing it, respectively, from 741-763 and from 762-786: 'Abbâs' edition is of Walî al-Dîn's *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar*.²⁹⁹ The purpose of this digression is not to solve the debate about the genealogy of al-Dhahabî's works and the relationship therewith of Walî al-Dîn and his father,³⁰⁰ but rather to underline the unfinished and tentative dimension of any historiographic investigation.

Interestingly, for all the complications alluded to above, Walî al-Dîn's work is quite mediocre and contains no original data whatsoever, due primarily to the 'compressed' nature of the *akhbâr* to be found in it. This can be explained by looking at the genealogy of the work. Both *Al-'Ibar fî Akhbâr al-Bashar mimman 'Abar* and *Al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar* proceeded from the prosopographical sections of al-Dhahabî's *Târikh al-Islâm*, and thus focus on people rather than events, and, consequently, in Walî al-Dîn's annal for the year 778 in his *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar*, obituaries occupy about twenty-seven pages to the nearly five devoted to *hawâdith*.³⁰¹

Often it is hard to figure out where Walî al-Dîn got his *akhbâr*, so condensed is his information and so generic are his descriptions. A careful collation of his work with that of other historians, however, indicates that he borrowed from Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat*

²⁹⁹ Hereafter this work will be referred to *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar*. Farah appears to somewhat agree with both the *EF*² article and 'Abbâs' explanations: according to him, al-Dhahabî extracted from *Târikh al-Islâm* both *Duwal al-Islâm* and *Al-'Ibar fî Akhbâr al-Bashar mimman 'Abar* [not *Al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar*]; al-Dhahabî then wrote a *dhayl* to *Al-'Ibar* covering the years 701-740/1301-1339; in their turn the father and son pair wrote two sets of *adhyâl* to this latter *dhayl* covering, respectively, the years 765-785 and 762 to an unspecified date. Moreover, Farah claimed that the Ibn al-'Irâqîs wrote a *dhayl* to the *dhayl* produced by al-Jazarî to al-Dhahabî's *Târikh al-Islâm*; but in a footnote he said that Zayn al-Dîn's *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar*, which covers the years 762-786, might be might the same work as Zayn al-Dîn's *dhayl* from the 'lineage' of *Al-'Ibar fî Akhbâr al-Bashar mimman 'Abar*; *The Dhayl*, pp. 20-21.

³⁰⁰ I have by no means exhausted all the elements of this debate as they intersect with the historiographical production of other historians; neither did I actually examine the works of al-Dhahabî or analyze all the biographical literature on both him and the Ibn al-'Irâqîs which is pregnant with data waiting to be studied.

³⁰¹ See vol. 2, pp. 427-459.

al-Anâm in order to compile his book, at least for the year 778. This can be seen in numerous passages as, for example, PMA53, in which the first stage of the sultan's itinerary on the way to the Hijâz is described:

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*fa-tawajjaha ilâ Siryâqûs aqâma bi-hâ yawman thumma rahala minhâ fa-nazala ilâ al-Birkah fa-aqâma bi-hâ ilâ yawm al-thalâthâ' thâni 'ishrî Shawwâl...*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 111b]

Ibn al-'Irâqî: "*tawajjaha ilâ Siryâqûs wa-aqâma bi-hâ yawman wâhidan thumma rahala ilâ al-Birkah fa-istamarra bi-hâ ilâ yawm al-thalâthâ' thâni 'ishrî Shawwâl...*" [Ibn al-'Irâqî, *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar*, vol. 2, pp. 428-9]³⁰²

There is however no doubt that Walî al-Dîn also complemented that which he borrowed and summarized from *Nuzhat al-Anâm* with at least one other source, as can be seen in RL11, in which the appointment of Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qirimî (after 710-780/after 1310-1378)³⁰³ is recorded:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-fi yawm al-ithnayn râbi' 'ashar Shawwâl ukhli'a 'alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qirimî wa-istaqarra shaykh al-khânaqâh al-Ashrafiyah bi-al-Suwwah,*³⁰⁴ *wa-istaqarra al-sultân bi-hi shaykh al-shuyûkh wa-batulat mashyakhat al-shuyûkh min khânaqâh Siryâqûs.*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 111a]

Ibn al-Furât: "*Wa-fi yawm al-ithnayn râbi' 'asharahu khala'a al-sultân 'alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qirimî wa-wallâhu mashyakhat khânaqâh al-madrasah al-Ashrafiyah al-latî ansha'ahâ tahta Qal'at al-Jabal, wa-sammâhu shaykh al-shuyûkh wa-ubtila hâdhâ al-ism 'an al-shaykh bi-mashyakhat Siryâqûs.*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 32b]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fi yawm al-ithnayn râbi' 'asharahu khuli'a 'alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn 'Ubayd Allâh al-Qirimî wa-istaqarra fi mashyakhat al-madrasah al-Ashrafiyah, waluqqiba bi-shaykh al-shuyûkh, wa-ubtila hâdhâ al-laqab min mutawallî mashyakhat khânaqâh Siryâqûs, fa-sakanahâ, wa-darrasa bi-hâ qabl an takmula 'amâratuhâ.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, pp. 273-4]

³⁰² Even though it is somewhat unlikely that Ibn al-'Irâqî would have used two works that are very similar to one another, in at least one instance, his text is closer to al-'Aynî's than to Ibn Duqmâq:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Fa-inkasara al-sultân huwa wa-Arghûn Shâh, Sarghitmish, Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî, Bashtak al-Khâssakî, Arghûn al-'Izzî wa-Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî...*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 113a]

Al-'Aynî: "*Fa-inkasara al-sultân wa-haraba huwa wa-Arghûn Shâh, Sarghitmish, wa-Baybughâ, wa-Bashtak, wa-Arghûn Kutuk wa-Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî...*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh*, fol. 206]

Ibn al-'Irâqî: "*Fa-inkasara al-sultân wa-haraba huwa wa-Arghûn Shâh, Sarghitmish, wa-Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî wa-Bashtak wa-Arghûn al-'Izzî wa-Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî...*" [*Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar*, vol. 2, p. 429]

³⁰³ On him see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 7, pp. 404-6.

³⁰⁴ The area where the ramp leading to the northern side of the citadel was located; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 27.

Ibn al-‘Irâqî: “*Wa-fi al-yawm al-madhkûr, khuli ‘a ‘alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ’ al-Dîn al-Qirimî bi-mashyakh al-khânaqâh al-Ashrafiyah al-mustajaddah wa-tadrîsihâ wa-aqâma bi-hâ wa-ju ‘ila shaykh al-shuyûkh mutlaqan.*” [*Al-Dhayl ‘alâ al-‘Ibar*, vol. 2, p. 428]

Clearly, even though al-Maqrîzî’s and Ibn al-‘Irâqî’s reports are not identical, they contain similar elements of meaning³⁰⁵ that are not to be found in other chronicles, namely the fact the *madrasah* was built recently and that al-Qirimî lived and taught there. This calls for a number of hypotheses that cannot, at least for now, be tested: either both authors used a common source, maybe Zayn al-Dîn Ibn al-‘Irâqî whose *Al-Dhayl* to *Al-‘Ibar* covers, according to Farah, the years 765-785,³⁰⁶ or al-Maqrîzî borrowed from Walî al-Dîn since it is *probable* that *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was written after *Al-Dhayl ‘alâ al-‘Ibar*.³⁰⁷

Ibn al-‘Irâqî’s work cannot be of value for anyone interested in investigating the events of the year 778. The care which he took to summarize political events led him, for example, to state that the mamluks who rebelled against al-Ashraf in ‘Aqabah immediately went back to Cairo where, with Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î in the lead, they were defeated: most other sources concur that the return of Tashtamur took place in different stages and that a vanguard sent by him under Quṭluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î’s lead beat the Cairenes before he eventually lost out and asked for *amân*...and the *niyâbah* of

³⁰⁵ Throughout this dissertation, when comparing different citations from a number of sources, those sections that are not italicized indicate similarities between texts.

³⁰⁶ Farah, *The Dhayl*, pp. 20-1; this chronological coverage of Zayn al-Dîn’s work does not however agree with that mentioned by ‘Abbâs, namely 741-763; see above, footnote no. 299.

³⁰⁷ This hypothesis would hold if indeed *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was written later than *Al-Dhayl ‘alâ al-‘Ibar* something which is probable if one takes at face value the following contentions: first, that *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was the last of a series of historical works, starting with *al-Khitât*, depicting various periods of the history of Egypt; Muḥammad Mustafâ Ziâdah, “Târîkh Hayât al-Maqrîzî,” in *Dirâsât ‘an al-Maqrîzî* (Cairo: Al-Hay’ah al-Miṣrîyah al-‘Âmmah lil-Ta’lif wa-al-Nashr, 1971), pp. 18-19; second, that *al-Khitât* was written between 819 and 839; idem, *Al-Mu’arrikhûn fî Miṣr fî al-Qarn al-Khâmis ‘Ashar al-Milâdî, al-Qarn al-Tâsi’ al-Hijrî* (Cairo: Maṭba‘at Lajnat al-Ta’lif wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Nashr, 1954), p. 10; and third, that evidence suggests that the first draft of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was written sometime around or after 823-826 but no earlier than his return from Damascus following the death of Faraj in 815; this last piece of information was kindly made available to me by Nasser Rabbat.

Damascus.³⁰⁸ Ultimately, the importance of *Al-Dhayl 'alá al-'Ibar* lies in the fact that it served as a blue-print to al-Sakhâwî's *Wajîz al-Kalâm* which will be examined below.

C. Taqî al-Dîn Ahmad al-Maqrîzî (766-845/1364-1441-2):

Al-Maqrîzî's fame as a historian of the later Mamluk sultanate is second only to Ibn Khaldûn's and need not be revisited.³⁰⁹ His real life story however does not parallel his reputation as one of the foremost historians of the early Circassian period, both in the past³¹⁰ and today.³¹¹ After occupying various positions, among others in the chancery and as deputy qadi, he managed to secure the prestigious position of *muhtasib* in 801, under Barqûq, and then in 803, under his son Faraj, only to lose it in both cases to al-'Aynî, the man who would consequently become his rival.³¹² Later, in 810, he accompanied Faraj to Damascus where the sultan offered him a number of positions that he nevertheless refused.³¹³ Whether it was a voluntary withdrawal from the rat race in which those seeking the patronage of the powerful were involved, or simply a question of his being unsuccessful at it, the fact remains that upon his return to Cairo,³¹⁴ al-Maqrîzî appears to have abandoned the pursuit of employment and to have devoted himself wholeheartedly to the writing of history.³¹⁵

For the annal of the year 778, the primary significance of al-Maqrîzî lies in the fact that quite unconsciously, he has replicated the contents of Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-*

³⁰⁸ See above, pp. 63-4.

³⁰⁹ See volume 7:2 of the *Mamluk Studies Review* devoted entirely to him.

³¹⁰ See Broadbridge, "Academic Rivalry," p. 103. Not that all assessments were glowing as can be seen in *ibid.*, p. 99.

³¹¹ For laudatory assessments of al-Maqrîzî's oeuvre, see Little, *Introduction*, p. 77

³¹² Broadbridge, "Academic Rivalry," pp. 87, 89-90.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

³¹⁴ At which point he did that is unclear; see Massoud, "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian," p. 136 footnote no. 62.

³¹⁵ Broadbridge, "Academic Rivalry," pp. 87, 89-92.

Duwal.³¹⁶ all of the one hundred and thirteen reports of *Al-Muntaqá*'s, save four³¹⁷ and the verse of Ibn al-'Attâr, are to be found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, and one sure way of deciphering the often-unreadable handwriting of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's *Al-Muntaqá* is to read along in al-Maqrîzî's chronicle where the overwhelming majority of events occur at the same stage as in *Târikh al-Duwal*.³¹⁸

For all their similarities, however, the two chronicles are less identical than, say, *Iqd al-Jumân* is to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. This is due primarily to the fact that al-Maqrîzî invested a lot of effort in rewriting, using his own words, whatever he copied, without however stamping out elements that allow the careful reader to realize his overwhelming reliance on Ibn al-Furât's work. Little had commented concerning earlier sections of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* dealing with the Bahrî period, that al-Maqrîzî's constantly reworked borrowed texts in order "to invest his unidentified sources with stylistic uniformity and anonymity."³¹⁹ This can be seen at work everywhere in the annal of the year 778, as well as in that of 793.³²⁰ Consider the following, PMA14:

Ibn al-Furât: "*Wa-fi al-'ashr al-akhîr minhu, sakkana al-sultân khâssakîyah judud fi Bâb al-Dâr, fi bayt al-Amîr Anûk, wa-ja'alahum anyâb al-tawâshî Sharaf al-Dîn Mukhtass wa-huwa mutahaddith 'alayhim. Wa-rasama al-sultân fihi an yûqifahum fi khidmatihî, wa-lâ yuq'idahum. Wa-kana minhum, al-Amîr Bashtâk 'Abd al-Karîm al-Khâssakî.*" ["*Al-Muntaqá*," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 28b]

³¹⁶ Little made similar comments concerning those parts of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* that deal with the reign of al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâwûn; *Introduction*, pp. 76-80.

³¹⁷ The arrival of news to Cairo about the pilgrims [PMA3]; the appointment of Arûs al-Nizâmî to an emirate of forty in Aleppo [PMA10]; the birth of a son to Emir Anûk, al-Ashraf's brother [PMA15]; and the story about Aynabak al-Badrî's intention to make a sultan out of Aḥmad ibn Yalbughâ because he was allegedly the son of al-Nâsir Ḥasan [PMA134].

³¹⁸ One will find the exceptions to the chronological parallelism between *Al-Muntaqá* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk* mostly in some sections of the months of Dhû al-Qa'dah and Dhû al-Ḥijjah; see, for example the following sequencing of reports beginning with the account of the rebellion in Cairo, PMA69:

Ibn al-Furât: PMA69, 70, 71, 68, 72, 74, 75 and 76.

Al-Maqrîzî: PMA69, 70, 71, 72, 68, 73, 72, 74, 75 and 76.

³¹⁹ "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Four Mamluk Chronicles for 737-45," in *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 19 (1974), p. 260.

³²⁰ See chapter two, pp. 157-9.

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fi akhariyyât hâdhâ al-shahr, istajadda al-sultân khâssakîyah min mamâlîkihi, wa-askanahum fi bayt al-Amîr Anûk, bi-jiwâr Bâb al-Dâr min al-Qal‘ah. Wa-qaddama ‘alayhim al-tawâshî Sharaf al-Dîn Mukhtass al-Ashrafî, wa-amarahu an yûqifahum bayna yadayhi, wa-lâ yada‘ ahâdan minhum bi-al-julûs, fa-sârû mudâfih. Wa-minhum, al-Amîr Bashtâk ‘Abd al-Karîm al-Khâssakî.*” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:1, p. 266]

All the elements in *Al-Muntaqâ* were reproduced, albeit differently, by al-Maqrîzî.

To the recognizably Furâtian reports which constitute the bulk of his narrative, al-Maqrîzî sometimes added his own original material, as can be seen in SHM5, a report twice cited above:³²¹

Ibn al-Furât: “*Wa-fi al-‘ashr al-awwal minhu, inqata‘a maqta‘ ‘azîm min al-khalîj bi-al-qurb min Qanâtîr al-Awazz. Wa-sabab dhâlika anna al-Amîr Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-Amîr ibn Âqbughâ Âs, ista‘jara makânan ja‘alahu birkah, wa-fataha majrâh min al-khalîj ilayhâ. Fa-mashâ al-mâ’ wa-ghafala ‘anhu al-muwakkal bi-hi, wa-ittasa‘a al-khirq, wa-zâda al-mâ’, wa-fâda min al-birkah, wa-sâha ilâ an wasâla ilâ istabl Sharaf al-Dîn [Nâsir al-Dîn³²²] bi-jiwâr jâmi‘ al-Husayniyah, wa-hadama dûr kathîrah wa-hârât bi-al-Husayniyah. Qîla kânat al-dûr al-latî tahaddamat fawq al-alf li-anna ‘amâratahâ kânat bi-labin, wa-baqiya makânahâ sâhah.*” [“*Al-Muntaqâ*,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 28b]

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fi awâ‘il hâdhâ al-shahr, inqata‘a maqta‘ min al-khalîj qarîban min Qanâtîr al-Awazz, sababuhu anna al-Amîr Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-Amîr ibn Âqbughâ Âs al-Ustâdâr, ‘amila birkah bi-jiwâr al-khalîj min sharqiyyihi, li-yajtami‘ fihâ al-samak, wa-fataha la-hâ min jâni‘ al-khalîj majrât yadkhul minhâ al-mâ’. Fa-qawiya al-mâ’ wa-ittasa‘a al-khirq hattâ fâda al-mâ’, wa-aghraqa mâ fi tilka al-jihah min al-dûr fi yawm al-jum‘ah tâsi‘ihi. Fa-kharubat ‘iddat hârât kâna fihâ mâ yanîf ‘an alf dâr, wa-sârat sâhah. Wa-ta‘iba al-Amîr Husayn ibn al-Kûrânî ta‘aban kabîran hattâ sadda al-maqta‘ khishyatan an taghruqa al-Husayniyah bi-asrihâ. Wa-anfaqa fihâ ziyâdah ‘alâ thalâthat alâf dirham fi thaman akhshâb wa-nahwihâ. Wa-istamarrat tilka al-diyâr kharâban ilâ yawminâ, wa-‘umila mawdi‘ ba‘dihâ basâtîn, wa-mawdi‘ ba‘dihâ birak mâ.’” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:1, p. 265]*

Here, beyond the common Furâtian foundation of both reports, al-Maqrîzî added data concerning the exact date and location of the incident, as well as about the efforts made

³²¹ See above, pp. 53 and 58, and below, p. 117.

³²² The name in brackets was written in the margin of fol. 28b, and is accompanied by a ṣ, for ṣahh.

by the *wâlî* of the city to solve the problem and the state of the affected area in his own time.³²³

Kitâb al-Sulûk also differs from Ibn al-Furât's work because it contains original *akhbâr* nowhere to be found in *Al-Muntaqâ*. The problem here is that, as long as the holograph annal of the year 778 in *Târikh al-Duwal* is not available, it is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty that the reports absent from *Al-Muntaqâ* but present in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, are so because of the manipulations of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah.³²⁴ Keeping this in mind, one can hypothesize that all of these reports, save one,³²⁵ can be traced back to possibly three writers. From Ibn Duqmâq, the author of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* probably borrowed PMA7, 11, 129 and 130, all concerning relatively minor officials; all of these were either too short to allow for differences to appear in the writing, or written à la al-Maqrîzî, i.e., in his own words, as can be seen in PMA129:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-fihâ, musika Mukhtass al-Ashrafî, wa-Jawhar al-Skandarî, wa-Sunbul, ra's nawbah, wa-udkhillû ilâ Qâ'at al-Sâhib.*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 116a]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fîhi, qubida 'alâ al-tawâshî Mukhtass al-Ashrafî, wa-al-tawâshî Jawhar al-Skandarî wa-al-tawâshî Sunbul, ra's nawbah, wa-udkhillû ilâ Qâ'at al-Sâhib 'alâ mâl ulzimû bi-hi.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, p. 292]

Al-Maqrîzî also probably lifted RL23 either directly from Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, or from someone who copied word-for-word from him, because he provided the whole name (*kunyah, laqab, etc.*) of the appointee as *Hanafî qâdî al-quḍât* in Aleppo, Muḥibb al-Dîn ibn al-Shihnah, as it appears in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*. Finally, it is possible that al-

³²³ For other reports where al-Maqrîzî added original information, see above, pp. 68-9, the transliteration of RL11.

³²⁴ See above, pp. 51-2.

³²⁵ PMA7, 11, 94, 129, 130, RL23 and SHM13. In *Târikh al-Duwal*, the biographical sketch of al-Ashraf, PMA94, placed by al-Maqrîzî and others in the main body of their annal, is found in the obituaries section.

Maqrîzî borrowed SHM17 from Ibn Khaldûn who is the only other author to mention the advent of the plague in Egypt at the very end of the year:

Ibn Khaldûn: “*Wa-asâb al-nâs fî âkhir al-sanah tâ‘ûn ilâ awwal sanat tis‘ wa-sab ‘în.*” [Kitâb al-‘Ibar, vol. 5, p. 465]

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fî hâdhihi al-sanah, ibtada‘a al-wabâ‘ min Dhî al-Qa‘dah, fa-mâta jamâ‘ah kathîrah bi-al-tâ‘ûn, wa-kharajat al-sanah wa-al-wabâ‘ shadîd.*” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:1, p. 295]

To the similarity, tenuous as it may be, between the two texts one might add the fact that SHM17 is the final report in both chronicles, and that it is likelier that al-Maqrîzî borrowed from Ibn Khaldûn than the other way around: at the time of the latter’s death in 808, neither *al-Khitât* nor *Kitâb al-Sulûk* had been written,³²⁶ and moreover al-Maqrîzî is known to have attended lectures given by the author of *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*.³²⁷

As for the reports that are to be found only in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, they number five, PMA19, 63, 73, 109 and SHM13, a minute figure compared to the one hundred and forty-four *akhbâr* al-Maqrîzî culled principally from *Târîkh al-Duwal* and possibly from the other sources listed just above. Of these reports, all of which are interesting in their own right,³²⁸ two merit special attention because they reflect aspects of al-Maqrîzî’s personality as a historian. PMA109, a diatribe against the *ajlâb* and their endemic factionalism, is representative of a large number of negative opinions he expressed throughout those annals of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* pertaining to the Burjî period, about the sorry state of the Mamluk polity, the decay of its society, the corruption of its elites, etc.,

³²⁶ See above, footnote no. 307.

³²⁷ See al-Jalîlî, “*Tarjamat Ibn Khaldun lil-Maqrîzî*,” pp. 217-8.

³²⁸ PMA19 is about an appointment to the viceroyalty of Safad; PMA63 relates the looting by the mamluks of the supplies in ‘Aqabah originally intended to the pilgrims; PMA73 concerns an episode of the tribulations of al-Maqsî in the wake of the rebellion in Cairo; PMA109 is a diatribe by al-Maqrîzî against the rising star of the *ajlâb*; and SHM13 is a short account of the fire that destroyed the *madrasah* complex then being built by al-Ashraf below the citadel.

generally then, about the vicissitudes of his age.³²⁹ Thus, in another instance, al-Maqrîzî did not hesitate to heap abuse on a clique of Mâlikîs who had managed to secure their positions through the intercession and interference of Emir Qaratây al-Tâzî; and whereas Ibn al-Furât quoted the acerbic verse of Ibn al-‘Attâr to make his point, al-Maqrîzî stated “and he [the new Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât*] promoted a group of Mâlikîs who were looked down upon, and who, in the eyes of people, were of no standing and not very highly regarded (“*wa-‘inda al-nâs ghayr wajîhîn wa-lâ mu‘tabarîn*”).”³³⁰ SHM13 in its turn probably reflects the interest that al-Maqrîzî had in things topographical; an interest that culminated with the writing of *al-Khitât*. In the annal of the year 778, there is another case where he displayed his interest in the physical feature of his city, namely SHM5, which we have extensively quoted above. Similarly, one might argue that it was the attention he paid to local matters and to his own person that led him to add data to reports he borrowed from Ibn al-Furât.³³¹ For example, when he related in RL13 the story concerning a new appointment to the *hisbah*, a position he later occupied himself, that of Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Qaysarî al-‘Ajamî, “a Persian faqir (*min fuqarâ’ al-‘Ajam*),” he mentioned that the populace was said to have poked fun at the nominee on account of him having sold dates for a living at the gate of the Mâristân!

One final commentary. Al-Maqrîzî used in his work an editorial technique that will be seen at work in the chronicles of other historians throughout this and the other two annals studied within the framework of this dissertation: to borrow one or more narrative

³²⁹ See Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian,” especially pp. 120-30.

³³⁰ RL16. In the same vein, consider PMA50. In this *khâbar*, yet another where additional data was inserted into a Furâtian report, al-Maqrîzî noted the presence of “*arbâb al-malâhî wa-al-mukhâyilîn*” in the sultan’s convoy heading to Mecca, but then commented, “*fa-ankara al-nâs dhâlika min ajli annahu ghayr lâ‘iq bi-al-hajj.*”

³³¹ This should not lead one to assume that al-Maqrîzî’s accounts are consistently ‘meatier’ than Ibn al-Furât. In all fairness to the latter, there are instances where he provided more information than al-Maqrîzî did such as in PMA26 which is more detailed than its equivalent in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

elements from one report in order to use it as a ‘building block’ in another. In *Al-Muntaqá*, the description of the events leading up to the murder of al-Ashraf’s *khâssakîyah*,³³² PMA85, is reported twice. The first instance consists of a series of reports: PMA83, revolves around the capture of a man, unidentified in the narrative, who had been travelling along with the sultan to Mecca, and his disclosure of the whereabouts of the sultan’s companions at Qubbat al-Naṣr,³³³ PMA85 describes the murder of the members of the *khâssakîyah*, but not of the sultan who had previously decided to hide in the city in the company of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî (d. 793/1391);³³⁴ since the killers had not managed to capture the sultan, Ibn al-Furât reported in PMA86 that the leaders of the rebellion in Cairo proclaimed that whoever hid the sultan would be punished, but that the one who turned him over would be rewarded. The second instance is more dramatic: a great commotion occurred in Cairo amongst the populace as a camel driver and a mamluk, one of whom turned out to be Qâzân al-Yarqashî, the *amîr akhûr* of Ṣarghitmish al-Ashrafî, announced the return of the sultan to the city. Upon his capture, Qâzân gave up the hiding place of his companions at Qubbat al-Naṣr, etc. In *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, al-Maqrîzî resorted to the first story, but, like Ibn Duqmâq from whom Ibn al-Furât copied his report, he did mention the name of the person who was arrested, namely Qâzân al-Yarqashî. But to construct his PMA86, he used a portion of Ibn al-Furât’s second version of PMA83, namely the turmoil caused by the appearance of the man who would turn out to be Qâzân al-Yarqashî and his companion, along with the bulk of PMA86:

³³² Those murdered were Ṣarghitmish al-Ashrafî, Arghûn Shâh, Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî, Bashtak al-Khâssakî and Arghûn al-‘Izzî. They, the sultan and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî had fled back to Cairo from ‘Aqabah after their defeat there; see PMA59.

³³³ An edifice located North East of the Citadel; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 33.

³³⁴ PMA82. Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî was a member of Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî’s inner circle but was superseded in the quest for power by al-‘Umarî’s younger mamluks, chief among them Barqûq. He joined the rebellion against the sultan in 791 when he was the viceroy of Aleppo, the very city where he would meet his maker in 793. On him see “Al-Manhal,” *Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 târîkh*, fols. 842a-845a.

Ibn al-Furât: “*Wa-qîla: lammâ kân ba’d al- zuhr min yawm al-ahad, qâmat hajjah ‘azîmah fî al-nâs, wa-qafalû mâ kânû fatahû min dakâkînihim, wa-ushî’a anna hajjân wa-mamlûk qadimâ min ‘ind al-sultân...*” [PMA83/“Al-Muntaqâ,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 35b]

“*Thumma amara arbâb al-dawlah wâlî al-Qâhirah an yunâdî ‘alâ al-sultân, anna man akhfâh, hulla mâluhu wa-dammuhu lil-sultân, wa-man ahdarahu, un’ima ‘alayhi bi-in’âm kabîr.*” [PMA86/Ibid., fol. 35a]

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-qad idtaraba al-nâs bi-al-Qâhirah, wa-aghlaqû mâ futiḥa min al-hawânî, wa-kathura takhalluquhum lil-hadîth fî amr al-sultân wa-al-qâ’imîn bi-al-dawlah. Wa-nûdiya bi-al-Qâhirah wa-Misr ‘alâ al-sultân, wa-tawa’ada man akhfâh, wa-idtaraba al-nâs...*” [PMA86/Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:1, p. 281]

What is significant here is not whether or not there was indeed turmoil amongst the populace in Cairo during the events recounted in both PMA83 and 86, or that the license to which al-Maqrîzî had recourse changed our understanding of these two incidents. Rather, the importance of the analysis conducted here lies in the fact that there *was* indeed a transfer of a narrative element between two related but nevertheless different reports.

D. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî (773-852/1372-1449):

Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî was undoubtedly one of the most respected thinkers of the Burjî Mamluk period. According to the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, his life as “*hadîth* scholar, judge, and historian, [...] constitutes the final summation of the sciences of *hadîth* and makes him one of the greatest, and at the same time, most typical representatives of Muslim religious scholarship.”³³⁵ He was born into a wealthy family of merchants, members of which displayed a keen interest in religious learning. His youth was divided between the extensive travels he undertook in various parts of the Mamluk empire and Yemen, and studying at the hands of scholars, notably Zayn al-Dîn al-‘Irâqî who became his main teacher. His professional career was quite successful, and to quote Van Arendonk and Schacht, “it followed the usual pattern of lecturer, professor and head

³³⁵ C. Van Arendonk and Joseph Schacht, “Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî,” in *EI*², vol. 2, pp. 776-778. The remainder of this paragraph is based on this article.

of college, and finally, judge.”³³⁶ In 827/1423, Sultan Barsbây appointed him Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât*, a position he was to occupy on and off for a total of twenty-one years, all the way until 852, the year he died.

In the field of religious sciences Ibn Hajar wrote extensively, and one of his most famous books was *Al-Fath al-Bârî*, a commentary on al-Bukhârî’s *Sahîh*, a work that attracted al-‘Aynî’s criticisms, something which caused the two to be entangled in what Broadbrige called “a certain amount of poetic rivalry.”³³⁷ As a historian, Ibn Hajar left behind a number of works, mostly biographical dictionaries³³⁸ and an annalistic history, *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, which extends from the year 773/1372³³⁹ until 850/1446. This historical production is however of unequal quality. Whereas *Al-Durar al-Kâminah* and its *Dhayl* constitute standard works for the period at hand, *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, at least the annals studied in this dissertation, certainly does not deserve Hasan Habashî’s characterization that its historical data and biographical notices were superior to those of other chronicles of the same period.³⁴⁰

Structurally, one striking characteristic of this chronicle is the lack of proper dating of events and the absence of any chronological coherence in the narration. For instance, for the year 778, the overwhelming majority of reports start with “*wa-fihâ*” and

³³⁶ Ibid., p. 777.

³³⁷ “Academic Rivalry,” p. 98; see also, Aftab Ahmad Rahmani, “The life and works of Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî,” in *Islamic Culture*, vol. 47 (1973), pp. 59-61, 172-4.

³³⁸ *Al-Durar al-Kâminah; Dhayl al-Durar al-Kâminah; Raf’ al-Isr ‘an Quḍât Miṣr*, edited by Hâmid ‘Abd al-Majîd et al., vols. 1-2 (Cairo : Al-Amîrîyah, 1957-61); *Al-Majma’ al-Mu’assis lil-Mu’jam al-Mufahras*, edited by Yûsuf ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Mîr’ashlî (Beirut: Dâr al-Ma’rifah, 1992). Ibn Hajar wrote other biographical dictionaries but they fall outside the temporal scope of this study; see Van Arendonk and Schacht, “Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî,” p. 778

³³⁹ This chronicle was intended as a *dhayl* to the *dhayl* written by Ibn Kathîr to his own history, and, with regard to obituaries, to Muḥammad Ibn Râfi‘ Sallâmî’s (d. 774/1372) *Wafayât*, a work that has been edited by Abd al-Jabbâr Zakkâr (Damascus: Manshûrât Wizârat al-Thaqâfah fi al-Jumhûrîyah al-‘Arabîyah al-Sûrîyah, 1985), both of which ended in 773; *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, p. 4.

³⁴⁰ “Introduction” to the Cairo edition of *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1 (Cairo: Lajnat Ihya’ al-Turâth al-Islamî), p. 23. Habashî might have been referring to later sections of the *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* which described events and people contemporaneous to Ibn Hajar.

the few dated events which appear in the text follow a distorted sequence: Muḥarram, Rajab, Shawwâl, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Sha'bân, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Shawwâl, Dhû al-Qa'dah, Dhû al-Qa'dah!³⁴¹ Such incoherence could have been explained by what appears to have been, in the opening page of this annal, an attempt on the part of Ibn Hajar to provide a connected narrative by grouping together, to form a complete story, related *akhbâr* that in most other chronicles appear according to a chronological sequence. Thus, he started his narration with the story of the sultan's see-sawing between sickness and health; his cure at the hands of both Zakî al-Dîn Abû al-Barakât al-Mâlikî and Jâr Allâh al-Hanafî; the appointment of Jâr Allâh to the Hanafî head-judgeship as a reward after the resignation of Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Manṣûr, the previous incumbent; and finally, as a backdrop to Jâr Allâh's just mentioned promotion in Rajab to the position of *qâdî al-quḍât*, his removal in Muḥarram from the headship of the Sa'îd al-Su'adâ' *khânaqâh* following the complaints of its inmates.³⁴² Another cluster of *akhbâr* then follows, all pertaining to the alleged attempt at reviving *maghânî* tax-collection at the hands of Ibn Âqbughâ Âs; the latter's exile to Jerusalem as a result thereof; finally, a detailed description of these taxes and a reminder of the fact that al-Ashraf had them abolished.³⁴³ This original way of presenting historical data is nowhere repeated in the rest of the annal, the rest of which is made up of various segments of the story of the rebellion against and assassination of al-Ashraf Sha'bân, interspersed with unrelated reports. Unlike other chronicles where the events of the coup form a whole, it is thus difficult to get a clear image of their unfolding if one relies exclusively on *Inbâ' al-*

³⁴¹ On the issue of chronological inconsistencies, see Muḥammad Kamâl 'Izz al-Dîn, *Ibn Hajar al-Asqalânî Mu'arrikhân* (Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1987), pp. 123-7.

³⁴² PMA26, 28, RL28, PMA27, RL2, 8, in that order.

³⁴³ SHM9, PMA20, SHM6, in that order.

Ghumr. Still at the structural level, yet another phenomenon damageable to the flow of the narrative is the fact, less pronounced in the case of the year 778 than in the annals of 793 and 804, that Ibn Hajar repeated the same data in three different instances,³⁴⁴ for no obvious reasons.³⁴⁵

At the level of its contents, this work appears to be the exact opposite of, say, *Kitāb al-Sulūk*: whereas the obituaries' section of the latter is small when compared to its historical narrative, in the former, thirty pages of necrological notices dwarf the nine pages packed with short reports about political events, appointments, news from other parts of the Islamic world, etc.³⁴⁶ About the major story of the annal, the demise of al-Ashraf, nothing original can be detected, except for cases of apparent over-summarizing which leaves the reader unclear about the true meaning of given passages. Thus, while other contemporary chronicles clearly stated that, following the sultan's defeat at the hands of the rebels at 'Aqabah, he had sought refuge with his party back at Qubbat al-Naṣr but had left the premises along with Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī *before* the Cairenes' raid which resulted in the murder of his *khāssakīyah* there, Ibn Hajar had the sultan and his companion barely escaping their assailants.³⁴⁷ Similarly, he maintained that the leader of the 'Aqabah rebel faction, Ṭashtamur al-'Alā'î, tried to set up the caliph as sultan upon his return to Cairo, while the other chroniclers who dwelt upon this story place it in the

³⁴⁴ PMA76, 104 and 132.

³⁴⁵ This issue will be tackled in-depth in chapter two, pp. 165-6.

³⁴⁶ The study of the relationship between the obituaries of the *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* and those of *Al-Durar al-Kâminah* would make for a worthwhile investigation. On a related issue see Muḥammad Kâmil 'Izz al-Dîn's "Al-'Alâqah Bayn al-Tarâjim wa-al-Ḥawâdith fi Ḥawliyyât *Inbâ' al-Ghumr bi-Abnâ' al-'Umr*," in *Majallat Ma'had al-Makhtûṭât al-'Arabiyah* (1985), vol. 29, part 2, pp. 631-646.

³⁴⁷ PMA85.

immediate aftermath of al-Ashraf's defeat, thus *before* al-'Alâ'î and his men had reached the capital to stake their claim to power.³⁴⁸

The problems outlined above, especially the highly condensed and disorganized nature of the narrative, coupled with his Maqrîzîan propensity to rewrite, using his own words, other authors' *akhbâr*, often make it arduous, but not impossible, to determine the identity of sources from which Ibn Hajar himself acknowledged having borrowed. In the introduction of his work,³⁴⁹ he mentioned that he used, in the following order, the chronicles of Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Duqmâq, Ibn Hijiî, al-Maqrîzî, al-Fâsî (d. 832/1428),³⁵⁰ Ibn al-Aqfahsî (d. 820/1418),³⁵¹ al-'Aynî,³⁵² and Ibn Khaṭīb al-Nâsirîyah (d. 843/1440).³⁵³ Of these authors, it can be established with some degree of certainty that Ibn Hajar relied on only three, namely Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Hijiî in the elaboration of the annal of 778.³⁵⁴ Sometimes, the origin of the borrowing is obvious: for example, the report concerning the appointments made by the sultan prior to his departure to the *hajj* is most

³⁴⁸ PMA100.

³⁴⁹ See above, p. 43. Ibn Hajar borrowed from other than the historians listed here and in his introduction as 'Izz al-Dîn showed in *Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalâni*, pp. 205-213.

³⁵⁰ On him, see F. Rosenthal, "Al-Fâsî," in *EI*², vol. 8, pp. 828-9.

³⁵¹ On him, see *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi*, vol. 3, pp. 202-4.

³⁵² See above, footnote no. 192. Following the comments he made about al-'Aynî's total reliance on Ibn Duqmâq in the introduction to his *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, Ibn Hajar's added: "I did not preoccupy myself with his [al-'Aynî's] mistakes, but simply took from him what I did not have in terms of the events that I think he witnessed but we did not;" vol. 1, p. 3.

³⁵³ On him, see *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi*, vol. 5, pp. 303-7.

³⁵⁴ This does not mean that Ibn Hajar did not rely on the others elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the analysis of the annals of the years 793 and 803 will show that he depended on al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî for a number of his reports; see chapters two, pp. 167-8, and three, pp. 234-5; see also Bacharach, "Circassian Mamluk Historians," pp. 79-80. Ibn Khaṭīb al-Nâsirîyah's *Durr al-Muntakhab fî Takmilat Târikh Halab*, a continuation of Ibn al-'Adîm's (d. 660/1262) *Bughyat al-Talab fî Târikh Halab*, is, like the *mudhayyal 'alayh*, a biographical dictionary dealing with the city of Aleppo, a work Ibn Hajar is known to have relied upon heavily for his *Al-Durar al-Kâminah*; Farah, *The Dhayl*, pp. 12-3, 36 footnote no. 146, and Sami Dahan, "The Origin and Development of the Local Histories of Syria," in *Historians of the Middle East*, edited by Bernard Lewis and P.M. Holt (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 112-3. As for al-Fâsî, he is the author *Shifâ' al-Gharâm bi-Akhhâr al-Balad al-Harâm*, vols. 1-2, edited by 'Abd al-Salâm al-Tadmurî (Beirût: Dâr al-Kitâb al-'Arabî, 1985) and *Al-Iqd al-Thamîn fî Târikh al-Balad al-Amin*, vols. 1-7, edited by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qâdir 'Atâ (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1998), which are, respectively, a topographical and historical work, and a biographical dictionary, both with an exclusive focus on Mecca. With regard to Ibn al-Aqfahsî, what I managed to garner about him is that he was a *hadîth* specialist, which means that Ibn Hajar might have relied on him for biographical data.

probably taken from Ibn al-Furât since it is not to be found in Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*:

Ibn al-Furât: "...*amara al-Amîr Sayf al-Dîn Âqtamur al-Hanbalî an ya'khudha ma'ahu jamâ'a min al-umarâ' wa-al-ajnâd wa-yusâfir ilâ al-Wajh al-Qiblî wa-yuqîm hunâk ilâ an ya'ûd al-sultân min al-Hijâz li-hifz al-bilâd min al-'Arab.*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 32a]

Ibn Hajar: "*wa-arsala Âqtamur al-Hanbalî ilâ al-Sa'îd fî jamâ'a min al-umarâ' li-hifz al-bilâd min al-'Arab.*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol.1, p. 192]³⁵⁵

Incidentally, the following report, PMA44, which complements the one just noted, shows how Ibn Hajar reworked borrowed *akhbâr*: he summarized in one sentence ("*wa-arsala 'iddah min al-umarâ' ilâ sâ'ir al-thughûr li-hifzihâ aydan*") Ibn al-Furât's more detailed *khâbar* about the destinations of those emirs who were given various defensive missions around the Egyptian realm.

Ibn Hajar also borrowed from Ibn Duqmâq. In his report on the siege of the royal quarters of the Citadel by the Cairene rebels following the departure of al-Ashraf to the *hajj*, when the rebels asked for Emir 'Alî, the heir apparent, Ibn Hajar had them justify their request for the young prince by saying "*anna al-sultân mâd,*" the very same words used in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.³⁵⁶

There are also indications that Ibn Hajar probably used Ibn Hijiî or a source that relied heavily on him, to relate a few *akhbâr*,³⁵⁷ all dealing with Syria. In the case of at least one report, SHM15, the filiation between the two authors is strong since Ibn Hajar quoted him directly by saying "*Qâla Ibn Hijiî,*" but in the case of the others it can be established only by means of circumstantial evidence. As will be shown in chapter three in the section dealing with Ibn Hijiî, the latter's *Târîkh* is replete with purely Damascene

³⁵⁵ PMA43.

³⁵⁶ PMA70.

³⁵⁷ SHM2, 3, 15 and 19; RL20.

reports, whether meteorological and astrological occurrences, or local stories:³⁵⁸ in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, the *akhbâr* just noted are all of the same nature. Furthermore, three of these five reports are to be found in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, which is a summary of a recension made by Ibn Qâdî Shubah of Ibn al-Hijjî's history, and thus contains most but not all the accounts of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*.³⁵⁹ Finally, it should come as no surprise that Hijjîan stories found their way into *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* since it is reported that the two scholars knew and used each other's works.³⁶⁰

The original data in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* is limited, as is to be expected from a work written some time after the actual events it describes. It consists of eight reports found only in this work³⁶¹ and in that of those who used it.³⁶² Two of these accounts, FA5 and 6, are stories about regions on the periphery of the Mamluk Empire, respectively Mosul and Tlemcen. The fact that in this and in the other annals studied here, Ibn Hajar included more FA reports than any other historian might be a reflection of the interest in things foreign he probably developed as a result of his extensive travels. However I have not been able to identify his source or sources, even though the account about North Africa might have been taken from Ibn Khaldûn's *Kitâb al-'Ibar*. The rest of the original reports are a true miscellany. We have already dealt with PMA100, which we have said did not correspond, in terms of the facts it contains, to the historical consensus established by

³⁵⁸ See chapter three, p. 242.

³⁵⁹ See below, p. 115.

³⁶⁰ Darwîsh, French "Introduction," p. 38; 'Izz al-Dîn, *Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalânî*, pp. 212-3.

³⁶¹ In only one instance, RL16, did Ibn Hajar insert additional information in a report taken from another source: while the setting of the accession of al-Bisâtî as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Cairo instead of al-Ikhnâ'î, thanks to the intercession of one Ibn al-Labbân, a client of Qaratây al-Tâzî, is reported in *Al-Muntaqâ* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* is the only work to note that the new appointee was the previous incumbent's deputy and that he held court not in the house of the then viceroy of Cairo Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî, but on Main street, "al-shâri' al-A'zam;" on this street which vertically cut through the eastern quarters of Cairo, see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, pp. 23, 28-31. RL16 has been analyzed above, p. 75.

³⁶² These were 'Abd al-Bâsîṭ al-Malaṭî and Ibn Iyâs who used the latter's *Nayl al-Amal*; see below, pp. 96 and 99.

contemporary works,³⁶³ PMA77 recounts an episode of the rebellion in Cairo: according to Ibn Hajar, when the rebels decided to proclaim al-Ashraf's son 'Alî as new ruler, al-Qirimî scolded them and told them not to betray the sultan who "is your *ustâdh* and who was good to you and freed you from jail and gave you money, so why would this be his reward?,"³⁶⁴ SHM12 narrates the occurrence of an eclipse during the month of Shawwâl: had it taken place in Syria, this report could have been credited to Ibn Hijiî, but since no location for it is mentioned, we might surmise that it had occurred in Egypt and that Ibn Hajar was the only author to make note of it.³⁶⁵ The remaining two, PMA145 and RL17, are more problematic in that their subject matter overlaps both Egypt and Syria. The first reports an incident concerning the viceroy of Baalbek and the second, the visit of Badr al-Dîn al-Subkî, a Syrian religious figure whose career spanned the two poles of the Mamluk realm,³⁶⁶ made to his brother, Walî al-Dîn, in Damascus, and his return to Cairo: in the annals of 793 and 804, Ibn Hijiî, a well-connected Damascene scholar himself, provided information not only on events taking place in the regions close to his home town,³⁶⁷ but also the movement of prominent personalities between Egypt and Syria.³⁶⁸ The bottom line is that PMA145 and RL17 were probably taken from Ibn Hijiî's *Târikh*.

Overall, *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* offers a rather poor account of the events of the year 778: it does not contain as much information as many other contemporary and earlier chronicles, and it suffers from basic structural problems which, when added to

³⁶³ See above, pp. 80-1.

³⁶⁴ Al-Qirimî had been appointed by al-Ashraf as the Shaykh of the *madrasah* he was having built.

³⁶⁵ It is possible that the event might have occurred in another year but was mistakenly incorporated by Ibn Hajar in this annal. This would not be the first time he would have committed such a blunder; see chapter three, p. 235.

³⁶⁶ A Damascene qadi of the prominent al-Subkî family, he occupied the function of Shâfi'î *qâdî al-quḍât* on a number of occasions between 779/1378 and 797/1395, and died in 803/1400. On him, see "Al-Manhal," Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 732a-b, and Salibi, "Listes chronologiques," pp. 86-8.

³⁶⁷ See chapters two, pp. 182ff, and three, pp. 242ff.

³⁶⁸ See chapter three, p. 245.

inconsistencies in the contents of some reports³⁶⁹ and the fact that it is a condensed summary, and not a very good one at that, of other people's work, make for a second rate work. 'Izz al-Dîn has tried to explain this state of affairs by arguing that Ibn Hajar did not give the first volume of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, which covers the years 773 to 800, much of his attention because he really intended his book to be a history of the ninth century, and also since he had already written extensively about the eighth by means of his *Al-Durar al-Kâminah*. 'Izz al-Dîn contended that the opening of the narrative of the year 801 resembles that of the first page of a new work, with its lists of kings, important office-holders, etc.³⁷⁰ The problem with such an explanation is that it was normal for historians to start the narrative of the first year of a new century by using such artefacts peculiar to historical writing.³⁷¹ Perhaps most telling about the standing of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* in the eyes of posterity is the fact that even al-Sakhâwî, one of Ibn Hajar's most devoted students, chose for the year 778 of his *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, to copy the history of Walî al-Dîn Ibn al-'Irâqî,³⁷² the son of his mentor's teacher Zayn al-Dîn al-'Irâqî,³⁷³ rather than *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*.

³⁶⁹ On top of those already alluded to on pp. 80-1, consider the following. In PMA9, Ibn Hajar stated that H_usayn ibn al-K_urânî was replaced by al-Sharîf Baktamur as *wâlî* of Cairo. All the other sources that mention this incident noted that the new appointee was one Baktamur al-Sayfî Tumântamur and that al-Sayyid Baktamur al-Sharîf was rather chosen as *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî [PMA11]. Similarly, in PMA132, a report that describes events that had taken place *after* the coup against al-Ashraf and the sultan's murder, Ibn Hajar wrote in one instance that Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî was appointed as *nâ'ib al-saltanah* and in another Âqtamur al-Hanbalî.

³⁷⁰ 'Izz al-Dîn, *Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalânî*, p. 117. In another instance, 'Izz al-Dîn stated that Ibn Hajar wrote *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* as a rough draft and did not get around to finalizing it; p. 115. Hasan Habashî acknowledges the fact that the original manuscript of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* written by the author himself is indeed a *muswaddah*, but does not comment about the seven different other manuscripts he consulted; "Introduction," pp. 22-3.

³⁷¹ See, for example pp. 915-6 of volume 3:2 of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* where al-Maqrîzî does just that.

³⁷² See above, the section on this author.

³⁷³ On Ibn Hajar's relations with Zayn al-Dîn Ibn al-'Irâqî, see Rahmani, "The life and works of Ibn Hajar," *Islamic Culture*, vol. 46 (1972), pp. 81, 175, 177-8.

E. Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî (812-874/1409-70):

Like Ibn Duqmâq, Ibn Taghrîbirdî is yet another representative of the *awlâd al-nâs* class who shone as intellectuals during the Mamluk period. That he occupies a central position in the field of Burjî historiography is reflected by the fact that his three most important historical works, *Al-Manhal*, *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* and *Hawâdith al-Duhûr fi Madâ al-Ayyâm wa-al-Shuhûr*, were published very early on, starting with an edition of the second in Leiden in the middle of the nineteenth century, and culminating with the on-going work in Cairo on his *Al-Manhal*.³⁷⁴

It is quite possible that the interest shown by scholars in his works was purely accidental, the result of, say, happening upon manuscripts at an early stage, but the fact remains that his contribution to our understanding of things Mamluk was very significant.³⁷⁵ In many ways, the family history of Ibn Taghrîbirdî and his personal circumstances have greatly contributed to making him an astute and pivotal observer of Mamluk society and polity. The son of a high-ranking emir who played a key role during the reigns of both Barqûq and Faraj,³⁷⁶ Abû al-Mahâsin was otherwise connected to these last two men by means of one of his sisters who had married Faraj.³⁷⁷ His high standing within Mamluk military society allowed him to maintain himself thanks to an *iqtâ'* and to keep good company with a number of later sultans, due among other things to his

³⁷⁴ *Hawâdith al-Duhûr* was first edited by Popper under the title of *Extracts from Abû'l-Mahâsin ibn Taghrî Birdî's Chronicle Entitled Hawâdith ad-Duhûr fi Madâ'l-Ayyâm wash-Shuhûr*, parts 1-4, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 8 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1930-1942). On the composition of these works and their interrelationships, see Popper, "Introduction" to *The History of Egypt*, pp. xix-xxiii.

³⁷⁵ See Popper, "Introduction," pp. xxii and Little, "Historiography," pp. 438-9, for evaluations, both negative and positive, of Ibn Taghrîbirdî's work made by contemporary and modern historians.

³⁷⁶ He served as *atâbak al-'asâkir* under Barqûq and as viceroy of Damascus under his son Faraj; see 'Abd al-Fattâh 'Âshûr, "Makânât Ibn Taghrîbirdî bayna Mu'arrikhî Mîsr fi al-Qarn al-Tâsi' al-Hijrî," in *Al-Mu'arrikh Ibn Taghrîbirdî Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf, 813-874* (Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Misriyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1974), pp. 93-95. See also below, chapter three, pp. 247ff.

³⁷⁷ 'Âshûr, "Makânât Ibn Taghrîbirdî," p. 95.

knowledge of Turkish,³⁷⁸ the mother tongue of his *Rûmî* father. Also, contrary to other members of his class whose exclusion from the military or the limited role they played in it came as a result of their free-born status, Ibn Taghrîbirdî apparently excelled in military prowess and even accompanied Barsbây in 836/1432 during a campaign in Syria.³⁷⁹ Moreover, also to his advantage, were his links to the world of the civilian *a'yân*. He grew up in a scholarly environment because, after the death of his father in 815/1412, he was cared for by another of his sisters who was, sequentially, the wife of two *quḍât al-qada'*, one *Hanafi* and the second *Shâfi'î*.³⁸⁰

Of his non-prosopographic historical works, only *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is of interest to us since *Hawâdith al-Duhûr* starts in 845/1441 and ends in 874/1469. *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, contrary to most chronicles studied above,³⁸¹ does not follow the annalistic format; it reads rather like a dynastic history: the events which make up the reign of each individual ruler are presented and, after his death, they are then followed by obituaries placed under yearly headings.³⁸²

Contrary to what numerous modern scholars have maintained,³⁸³ at least for the events of the year 778, Ibn Taghrîbirdî did not rely massively on al-Maqrîzî: the overall pattern of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, its narrative scheme and even basic wording, is

³⁷⁸ Very much like the way some of his contemporaries criticized Ibn Duqmâq for his alleged lack of knowledge of Arabic, the Turkish roots of Ibn Taghrîbirdî prompted al-Sakhâwî's now famous "what else can be expected of a Turk," when commenting about errors in his works; Haarman, "Ideology and History, Identity and Alterity: The Arab Image of the Turk from the 'Abbasids to Modern Egypt," in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 20 (1988), p. 183. See also al-Sakhâwî's biography of the historian where the offending citation is to be found and where, interestingly, he notes that he thought Ibn Taghrîbirdî to be knowledgeable "*fi ahwâl al-Turk wa-manâsibihim*;" *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 10, p. 306.

³⁷⁹ William Popper, "Abû al-Mahâsin, Djamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf Ibn Taghrî Birdî," in *EF*², vol. 1, p. 142.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.* and *idem*, "Introduction," p. xvi.

³⁸¹ With the exception of *Kitâb al-'Ibar* and *Al-Nafḥah*.

³⁸² Ziâdah, *Al-Mu'arrikhûn fî Misr*, p. 95. Thus the narrative of the events of the year 778 is divided into two parts, namely vol. 11, pp. 55-66 and 118-123, because of the obituaries of al-Ashraf's reign.

³⁸³ See, for example, Maḥmûd Ismâ'îl 'Abd al-Râziq, "Manhaj Ibn Taghrîbirdî fî Kitâbihî '*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*,'" in *Al-Mu'arrikh Ibn Taghrîbirdî Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf, 813-874* (Cairo: AL-Hay'ah al-Misrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1974), p. 120.

unmistakably Duqmâqian. The presence in the narrative of a clearly identified citation from al-‘Aynî’s *‘Iqd al-Jumân*,³⁸⁴ namely al-Ashraf’s obituary, could have led one to posit that it was the latter work and not *Nuzhat al-Anâm* that constituted the foundation of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*.³⁸⁵ Moreover, it is more likely that Ibn Taghrîbirdî would have wanted to curry favour with al-‘Aynî, a well-connected man whose historical works, when they were read at the court, are reported to have led him to embrace the profession of historian,³⁸⁶ rather than with a person, namely Ibn Duqmâq, who had long been dead. However, a careful collation of the three texts is inconclusive, as some of the passages in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* appear closer to *‘Iqd al-Jumân* than to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, and vice versa. For example, in the following excerpt from PMA83, about Qâzân al-Yarqashî’s arrest, *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is closer to *‘Iqd al-Jumân* than to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*:

Ibn Duqmâq: “...*jâ’ahum al-khabar bi-anna shakhṣ bi-ism Qâzân al-Yarqashî kâna musâfiran suhbat al-sultân wajadûh mutanakkir fa-masakûh wa-ataw bi-hi ilayhim...*” [*Nuzhat al-Anâm*,” MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 112b-113a]

Al-‘Aynî: “...*jâ’ahum al-khabar bi-anna shakhṣan yusammâ Qâzân al-Yarqashî kâna musâfiran suhbat al-Sultân al-Malik al-Ashraf wajadûh mutanakkiran fa-masakûh wa-ataw bi-hi ilâ al-umarâ’...*” [“*Iqd al-Jumân*,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, fol. 206]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: “...*jâ’ahum al-khabar anna shakhṣan yusammâ Qâzân al-Yarqashî kâna musâfiran suhbat al-Sultân al-Ashraf ilâ al-Hijâz al-Sharîf wajadûh mutanakkiran fa-masakûh wa-ataw bi-hi ilâ al-umarâ’...*” [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 59]

In PMA30, it is the other way around, as Ibn Taghrîbirdî included in his account on the sending away of al-Ashraf’s relatives to al-Karak, a line found in *Nuzhat al-Anâm* but in neither manuscripts of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*:

Ibn Duqmâq: “...*kull hâdhâ wa-al-sultân da’if wa-harakat al-Hijâz al-Sharîf ‘ammâlah.*” [*Nuzhat al-Anâm*,” MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 110b]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: “...*kull dhâlika wa-al-sultân mutada’if wa-harakat al-Hijâz ‘ammâlah.*” [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 56]

³⁸⁴ PMA94.

³⁸⁵ This citation can be found a bit more expanded in “*Iqd al-Jumân*,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, fol. 215; “*Nuzhat al-Anâm*,” MS Gotha A 1572, fols. 116a-b.

³⁸⁶ Popper, “Abû al-Mahâsin,” p. 142.

While the great majority of the data in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is Duqmâqian in origin, Ibn Taghrîbirdî did borrow some information from al-Maqrîzî. For example, in his description of the magnificence of the convoys departing to Mecca, Ibn Taghrîbirdî supplemented the passage from *Nuzhat al-Anâm* with additional data pertaining to the foodstuffs brought along by the sultan, found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* but in neither *Nuzhat al-Anâm* nor *Târîkh al-Duwal*.³⁸⁷

Still, there are reports that are nowhere to be found in other works. For example, to his account of al-Ashraf's last moments that he copied from *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and/or *'Iqd al-Jumân*, Ibn Taghrîbirdî offered an alternate version of the event which described, with a wealth of topographical details, the itinerary of the captured king towards the Citadel, disguised as an emir: the rebels had put military clothes on the sultan, for fear, stated Ibn Taghrîbirdî, that the populace would recognize him and would free him from their grasp, so great was the love of his subjects for him.³⁸⁸ It may also be that Ibn Taghrîbirdî relied on the eyewitness accounts of actual participants in the rebellion for the details he noted.

Such an explanation is more than plausible. Abû al-Mahâsin was not a passive copier shackled in by other authors' narrative. With regard to the actual process of writing, he often rephrased using his own words accounts found elsewhere, as in the following, PMA48, where he rewrote the original Duqmâqian text:

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*wa-ashâra 'alayhi jamâ'ah min al-ṣulahâ' wa-al-a'yân bi-ta'khîr al-hajj fî tilka al-sanah, fa-ya'ba wa-mâ yazdâd illâ quwwah fî al-'azm...*" ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 112a]

³⁸⁷ PMA50. Either Ibn Taghrîbirdî copied from al-Maqrîzî or they both used a common source.

³⁸⁸ PMA93.

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: "...*wa-hawâshih wa-khawâssihi yanhûnahu 'an al-safar fi hâdhihi al-sanah, wa-huwa lâ yaltafit ilâ kalâmihim.*" [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 56]³⁸⁹

As for contents, he made up for the dearth of non-political facts in his chronicle by adding to it the type of information which makes his work extremely useful: the accounts he reported from people who lived through this period, namely his father's associates and acquaintances, and the first-hand knowledge he had of the Mamluk military personnel of his age. At the end of the events of 778, Ibn Taghrîbirdî mentioned that he himself had met numerous Ashrafi Mamluks at the beginning of the reign of Barsbây, notably Emir Âqsunqur al-Ashrafi and others.³⁹⁰

Perhaps the most enduring characteristic of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is the coherence of its narrative. As was the case with *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, it is unencumbered with reports that weigh down the momentum of the story line, something which makes of it the easiest-to-read history of the period. This is furthermore enhanced by a multitude of comments found throughout that clarify the text. For example, following the alternate account of al-Ashraf's last moments, Ibn Taghrîbirdî related the whereabouts of the 'Aqabah rebels and, in order to shed light on an otherwise unclear aspect on the rebellion, namely the extent of the interaction between the two groups of rebels, he wrote:

All this, and they did not know what had happened in Egypt in terms of their [the Cairenes'] rebellion and the accession of Emir 'Alî; each party attacked the sultan, without the other knowing anything and without any prior agreement between the two; this is indeed strange, since the battle took place in 'Aqabah where the Sultan was defeated.³⁹¹

³⁸⁹ This line is originally from Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*; see above p. 54 footnote no. 249.

³⁹⁰ PMA102.

³⁹¹ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 62; PMA61. This, of course, does not mean that Ibn Taghrîbirdî's version of events is true, since Ibn al-Furât claimed the contrary: that the mamluks in Cairo and those accompanying al-Ashraf had agreed that the sultan would be killed on the way to the Hijâz; see above, footnote no. 220 and PMA69.

To the tightly knit narrative and the concern for clarification, one might add another aspect peculiar to *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, the frequent use of proverbial expressions, some Qur'ân-inspired³⁹² to exhort or to lament a certain state of affairs. Unlike al-Maqrîzî, whose criticisms were bitter and motivated by concerns over matters of religion, social order and the fate of the Muslim Mamluk body politic,³⁹³ Ibn Taghrîbirdî's moralizing is more political in nature in that it brings the attention of the reader to the wretchedness and amorality of the world of government. Thus, after the report on the defeat of the 'Aqabah rebels upon their return to Cairo, Ibn Taghrîbirdî exclaimed:

I say: how wretched (“*mâ ashqâ*”) are those people in 'Aqabah, as they were a cause behind the vanishing of the realm of their *ustâdh*, al-Malik al-Ashraf, and his death (“*wa-dhahâb muhjatihî*”), without them gaining anything. On the contrary, they lost out in this and the other world. For they have rebelled against their *ustâdh* and disobeyed him for no reason. The damage they caused comprised what happened to the pilgrims and to others, and they committed ugly things. All this is what they are guilty of. As for this world, they have lost out completely, as their *iqtâ*'s were taken away from them, and they lost their positions and properties; some died a terrible death, and after that, no king ever appointed them, instead they were exiled to the fringes of the realm and they were mortified from anger at the humiliation and degradation they experienced...³⁹⁴

This kind of commentary only adds to a definite feeling of intimacy one senses from reading *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*. Even if it was probably intended, in the general scheme of things, to be consulted by a large audience, *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* was to serve primarily a specific function, namely the edification and the entertainment of a particular group. Ibn Taghrîbirdî had declared that he had written the book for himself and for his

³⁹² 'Abd al-Râziq, “Manhaj Ibn Taghrîbirdî,” p. 117.

³⁹³ On this, see Massoud, “Maqrîzî as a Historian of Barqûq.”

³⁹⁴ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 64. Contrary to what Ibn Taghrîbirdî maintained, some Ashrafi mamluks were going to have another *heure de gloire* at the time of Mintâsh who was himself one of them; see chapter two.

friends, particularly Muḥammad, Sultan Jaqmaq's son.³⁹⁵ This helps account for the melodramatic tone Ibn Taghrîbirdî imparted to some of his reports: after all, *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* was construed as "a work by a courtier for courtiers."³⁹⁶

Perhaps a most interesting way of concluding this section on Ibn Taghrîbirdî is to examine his take on the dismissal of Ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ. Whereas Ibn Khaldûn explained it by referring to power politics within the household of al-Ashraf, and Ibn al-Furât to an attempt at reviving taxes on singers, Ibn Taghrîbirdî accounted for the incident by means of Ibn Âqbughâ Âṣ's indirect responsibility in the flooding of the Ḥusaynîyah, since it was his *ustâdâr* who had built the pool which overflowed!³⁹⁷

F. Shams al-Dîn Muhammad al-Sakhâwî (830-902/1427-97):

Al-Sakhâwî was a pivotal character of the fifteenth century Mamluk intellectual scene.³⁹⁸ A student of Ibn Ḥajar for whom he showed unbounded respect, he excelled in the religious sciences, more particularly in the study of *ḥadîth*. It is in this field that he got gainful employment as *shaykh al-ḥadîth* in various educational institutions in Cairo, and it is in pursuit of knowledge therein that he travelled to various parts of the Mamluk Empire, including the Ḥijâz where he actually died in 902/1497. The attention he paid throughout his life to prophetic traditions intersected with his interest in history, since it was his opinion that in his time this discipline was in decline partly as a result of lack of historical knowledge, a view he expressed in *Al-I'lân bi-al-Tawbîkh li-man Dhamma Ahl*

³⁹⁵ Popper, "Abû al-Mahâsin," p. 142; Little, "Historiography," p. 439.

³⁹⁶ Little, "Historiography," p. 439.

³⁹⁷ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 54.

³⁹⁸ The data in this biographical sketch is based on Petry, "Al-Sakhâwî," in *Et*², vol. 8, pp. 881-2; Little, "Historiography," p. 443, and the editors' "Introduction" to the Beirut edition of *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, vol. 1, pp. 7-27.

al-Târikh.³⁹⁹ It probably also led him to produce his monumental *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, a twelve volume biographical dictionary of famous men and women of his age. The notices contained therein impress by their sheer numbers and stand out for the caustic tone that al-Sakhâwî often adopted in them. According to Petry, "al-Sakhâwî disguised a propensity for personal vindictiveness against his adversaries and those of his associates under the guise of a pious wish to evaluate his contemporaries' moral probity in order to assess the validity of their opinions, both for interpretation of the *Shari'a* and the giving of historical detail."⁴⁰⁰ Al-Sakhâwî also wrote two annalistic histories, both conceived as *adhya'l* to other works: *Al-Tibr al-Masbûk fî Dhayl al-Sulûk*,⁴⁰¹ which covers the years 845-851/1441-1447,⁴⁰² a *dhayl* to al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, and *Wajîz al-Kalâm fî al-Dhayl 'alâ Duwal al-Islâm* to al-Dhahabî's *Duwal al-Islâm*.⁴⁰³ Because of its time frame, *Al-Tibr* is irrelevant to our purposes here; as for *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, it starts off in 745/1345 and ends in 898/1493,⁴⁰⁴ and thus covers the annal under study.

In their introduction to *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, the editors stated that for the periods he was not a contemporary of, al-Sakhâwî relied on a number of works, chief amongst them Ibn al-Hajar's. No mention is made of Ibn al-'Irâqî's *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar* the text of which, when collated with that of *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, proves without any doubt its indebtedness to the former, again, at least for the year 778. This can be seen not only in the very order of appearance of *akhbâr* but also in the almost identical wording of both texts.

³⁹⁹ (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqî, 1930-1931).

⁴⁰⁰ Petry, "Al-Sakhâwî," p. 882.

⁴⁰¹ *Al-Tibr al-Masbûk fî Dhayl al-Sulûk*, edited by Ahmad Zakî (Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyat al-Azharîyah, 1972).

⁴⁰² Farah, *The Dhayl*, p. 16.

⁴⁰³ See above, the section on Ibn al-'Irâqî.

⁴⁰⁴ Farah, *The Dhayl*, p. 20.

There are however some differences between the two. Sometimes al-Sakhâwî does not mention, within a given report, a few of Ibn al-‘Irâqî’s words; but more often than not, he adds data not found in *Al-Dhayl ‘alá al-‘Ibar*, some of them clearly his own reflections,⁴⁰⁵ and others that he culled, not surprisingly, from Ibn Hajar’s *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, as can be seen in the following, PMA20:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Fî yawm al-ithnayn thâni ‘ashar Jumâdá al-Âkhirah musika al-maqarr al-Nâsirî Muhammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs ustâdâr al-‘âliyah wa-nufiya ilá al-Quds battâlan...*” [“Nuzhat al-Anâm,” MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 110b]

Ibn al-‘Irâqî: “*Wa-fî yawm al-ithnayn thâni ‘ashar Jumâdá al-Âkhirah umsika al-Amîr Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs al-ustâdâr wa-nufiya ilá al-Quds battâlan.*” [*Al-Dhayl ‘alá al-‘Ibar*, vol. 2, p. 427]

Ibn Hajar: “*Wa-fî athnâ’ dhâlika kâna Ibn Âqbughâ Âs takallama fî i‘âdat damân al-maghânî...*” [*Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, p. 191]

Al-Sakhâwî: “*Wa-fî thâni ‘ashar Jumâdá al-Âkhirah umsika al-Amîr Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs al-ustâdâr wa-nufiya ilá al-Quds battâlan li-kawnihi takallama fî i‘âdatihi, wa-li-ghayr dhâlika.*” [*Wajîz al-Kalâm*, vol. 1, p. 221].

As with Ibn al-‘Irâqî’s *Al-Dhayl ‘alá al-‘Ibar*, *Wajîz al-Kalâm* adds absolutely nothing to our knowledge of this period.

G. ‘Abd al-Bâsit ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî (844-920/1440-1515):

‘Abd al-Bâsit al-Malaṭî belonged to an *awlâd al-nâs* family which, even though less prestigious than Ibn Taghrîbirdî’s, maintained itself within Mamluk military society for two generations.⁴⁰⁶ ‘Abd al-Bâsit’s father, Khalîl ibn Shâhîn (d. 872/1468), who was the son of a minor *Zâhirî* Barqûq emir, managed to be active both as a high-ranking emir, despite the unwritten rule preventing sons of mamluks from entering the mamluk-based military system of the state, and as an intellectual. He occupied numerous functions under

⁴⁰⁵ As when he added “*wa-tawajja ‘a kathîr min al-nâs la-hum fî dhâlika,*” after noting the internal exile of the sultan’s cousins to al-Karak; PMA30.

⁴⁰⁶ The biographical sketch in this paragraph is based on Ashtor, “Études sur quelques chroniques mameloukes,” pp. 287-8; Petry, *Twilight of Majesty*, pp. 8-9; Tadmurî’s “Introduction” to *Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 1, pp. 5-71.

Barsbây, Jaqmaq, Înâl and Khushqadam, among others, that of *wazîr* and viceroy of Malatyah, and he studied under the most brilliant minds of his era and produced works of his own in the religious and secular sciences.⁴⁰⁷ ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ partially followed his footsteps and became a distinguished intellectual well trained in the subjects which made up the traditional curriculum. And even though he derived his income from being a physician, he produced a large number of works which were enriched by the numerous travels he embarked upon both with his father and on his own; travels which took him from east to west, from Andalusia to the Ottoman marches of Anatolia.

Of the numerous historical works authored by ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ, only one is of interest to us here,⁴⁰⁸ *Nayl al-Amal fî Dhayl al-Duwal* which he intended as a *dhayl* to al-Dhahabî’s *Duwal al-Islâm*.⁴⁰⁹ The text of *Nayl al-Amal* is very thin and thus would have posed a problem in terms of the genealogy of its contents, had its indebtedness to *Kitâb al-Sulûk* not been so apparent. Even when condensed, the overwhelming majority of its *akhbâr* easily betray their Maqrîzîan origin, as can be seen in the following collation of PMA25 and 26:

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fîhi rasama al-sultân bi-tajhîzihi lil-safar ilâ al-Hijâz; fa-baynamâ hum fî ‘amal uubat al-safar idh marida al-sultân maradan shadîdan hattâ urjifa bi-mawtihi*

⁴⁰⁷ He is the author of *Zubdat Kashf al-Mamâlik wa-Bayân al-Turuq wa-al-Masâlik* which offers “un tableau précis du gouvernement de l’Égypte et de la Syrie au milieu du XVème siècle;” Jean Gaulmier, “Introduction” to the edition of Venture de Paradis’ translation of *Zubdat Kashf al-Mamâlik* (Beirut: Institut Français de Damas, 1950), p. liv.

⁴⁰⁸ His still unedited *Al-Rawḍ al-Bâsim fî Hawâdith al-Umr wa-al-Tarâjim*, of which only fragments are extant, covered according to his own admission, a period of time starting with the year of his birth, namely 844. As for his *Nuzhat al-Asâtin fî man Waliya Miṣr min al-Salaṭîn* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqâfah al-Dîniyah, 1987), which was edited by ‘Izz al-Dîn, it is so devoid of any worthwhile data that we will have no use for it here. See Guo’s stern assessment of it in his, “Mamluk Historiographic Studies,” p. 21, where he wondered about the editing and publishing of “a work of such little importance.”

⁴⁰⁹ Tadmurî, the editor of this work, argues that it is considered as a summary of *Al-Rawḍ al-Bâsim*. Unless he is referring to later years, his suggestion does not hold since *Nayl al-Amal* starts off a full century earlier than *Al-Rawḍ al-Bâsim*; Tadmurî, “Introduction” to *Nayl al-Amal*, pp. 36-7. Of interest is the fact, noted by Tadmurî, that the format of *Nayl al-Amal* is not identical to that *Duwal al-Islâm* since in his work ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ placed the obituaries at the end of the events of each month, rather than at the very end of the annal as al-Dhahabî had done; p. 57.

ghayr marrah wa-nukisa 'iddat nakasât, ittuhima fihâ atïbbâ'uhu bi-muwâfaqatihim ba'd al-umarâ' 'alâ halâkihi, fa-qâma bi-'ilâjihî shaykhunâ Abû al-Barakât Muhammad, al-faqîh al-Mâlikî, wa-shaykhunâ Jalâl al-Dîn Jâr Allâh, wa-huwa [...] Abî al-Baqâ' Mahmûd al-Nîsâbûrî al-Hanafî, hattâ tamma bar'uhu." [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:1, p. 269]
 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ: "Wa-fihî amara al-sultân bi-tajhîzihi ilâ al-Hijâz; fa-baynamâ hum fî hâdhihi al-uhbat idh marîda al-sultân wa-urjifa bi-mawtihi ghayr marrah, wa-sâra yatanassal, thumma intakasa hattâ ittuhima atïbbâ'uhu, fa-qâma bi-'ilâjihî al-Shaykh al-'allâmah Jalâl al-Dîn Jâr Allâh Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Mahmûd al-Nîsâbûrî, al-Hanafî, wa-shârahahu al-Zakî Abû al-Barakât Muhammad al-faqîh al-Mâlikî hattâ tamma bar'uhu." [Nayl al-Amal, vol. 2, p. 113]

'Abd al-Bâsiṭ also borrowed three reports from Ibn Hajar's *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, two of which dealt with foreign affairs⁴¹⁰ and the other with a climatic event, namely an eclipse.⁴¹¹ In a chronicle so little prone to detail, the presence of two reports describing political events from outside the Mamluk realm might be a reflection of the keen interest 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ had in things foreign fostered as a result of numerous travels.

Even though not the most striking in terms of the space it occupies in the text of *Nayl al-Amal*, is the fact that in one instance 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ showed an important aspect of his personality, namely his profound dislike of the Circassian regime,⁴¹² something which places him on an equal footing with al-Maqrîzî. Immediately after reporting his first *khabar*, the encounter during which the Shâfi'î *qâdî al-quḍât* admonished and humbled a minor military official, he exclaimed: "Look at these times and then at ours! Would a *qâdî al-quḍât* dare in our era, to request the presence of Azbak the *atâbak*'s *ghulâm*, let alone his *dawâdâr*?"⁴¹³

Nayl al-Amal falls in the same category as Ibn al-'Iraqî's *Dhayl* and al-Sakhâwî's *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, not in that it concentrates on biographies, but rather because it lacks any intrinsic value. Its significance is to be sought in its format, its sources and the way it

⁴¹⁰ FA4 and 6.

⁴¹¹ SHM12. See above, pp. 83-4.

⁴¹² This issue is very well researched by Tadmurî; "Introduction" to *Nayl al-Amal*, pp. 64-66.

⁴¹³ PMA4. See above, pp. 55-6 and footnote no. 255 therein.

reflects important aspects of ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ’s career and interests, and especially in the impact it was to have on Ibn Iyâs’ *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*.

H. Muhammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyâs al-Hanafî (852-930/1448-1524):

The third generation descendant of a Mamluk emir, Ibn Iyâs⁴¹⁴ was in many ways similar to Ibn Taghrîbirdî in that he had inherited from his great grandfather a sizeable *iqṭâ’* which allowed him to sustain and to devote himself to the writing of history. But contrary to Abû al-Maḥâsin, who was a familiar of the court and played a role in it, Ibn Iyâs apparently had lost the kind of contacts his own father, of Ibn Iyâs’ own admission, had maintained with his Mamluk milieu.⁴¹⁵

From a variety of points of views, the life, times and career of Ibn Iyâs correspond to two important events: first and foremost, the end of the Circassian Mamluk state, whose defeat at the hands of the Ottomans in 922/1517 he witnessed, and no less important, the general decline of Muslim historiography. As regards the first aspect, secondary sources are unanimous in considering him the foremost historian of the transition from Mamluk to Ottoman rule, and especially of Qânṣûh al-Ghawrî’s reign

⁴¹⁴ The biographical data in this and the following paragraph are based on William M. Brinner, “Ibn Iyâs,” in *EF*, vol. 2, pp. 835-7; Ziâdah, *Al-Mu’arrikhûn*, pp. 46-55; Little, “Historiography,” 440-1; Muḥammad Mustafâ, “Introduction” to his edition of vol. 1:2 of *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*, pp. 5-12; and Petry, *Twilight of Majesty*, pp. 9-10.

⁴¹⁵ The absence of any biographical data about him in any contemporary works has led modern scholars to advance a number of hypotheses concerning both his standing as a historian in his own time and his relationship with the court. Ziâdah thus argued that, because of the presence in his works of numerous panegyrics dedicated to this or that emir, sultan or public figure, Ibn Iyâs was some kind of an official historian, even though this position is not known to have ever existed within the Mamluk state, and regardless of the fact that he never acknowledged occupying such an official function. Ziyâdah postulated, among other things, that Ibn Iyâs was maybe one of those men of letters who lived on the margins of the sultan’s entourage in the expectation of recognition and fame; *Al-Mu’arrikhûn*, pp. 50-1. In any case, the high opinion which modern historians have of him was not apparently shared by his contemporaries since none of them are reported to have written anything about him: biographical material concerning Ibn Iyâs thus had to be culled from his own works.

(906-22/1501-16),⁴¹⁶ as to the second, it is with him that the tradition of great chroniclers comes to an end in both Syria and Egypt, only to resurface at the end of the twelfth/eighteenth century with al-Jabartî and others.

The fact that Ibn Iyâs is considered to be *the* historian of the Mamluk *fin de régime*, which occurred almost one and a quarter century after the events surrounding the murder of al-Ashraf Sha'bân, does not disqualify him for consideration as a historian of the year 778. As a matter of fact, when it comes to sheer size, his annal for this year is second only to al-Maqrîzî's and Ibn al-Furât's, and is therefore one of the fullest amongst the chronicles surveyed until now. The presence of such a large amount of data can be explained by the fact that the overwhelming majority of *akhbâr* in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* correspond to most of those found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*: even though Ibn Iyâs mentioned al-Maqrîzî only once in the body of his text,⁴¹⁷ and even though he changed the wording of reports, his indebtedness to the latter is readily apparent. Ibn Iyâs, however, also relied partly on *Nayl al-Amal*: he did not cull from it any original data, rather he incorporated in his work some pivotal comments made by 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ, and he based the overall structure of the first six pages of his *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* on that of corresponding pages in *Nayl al-Amal*. Thus, for a few pages, he placed in the text of his work four of the eight obituaries recorded by 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ at the end of the events of Rabî' al-Awwal, Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah and Rajab, while he placed the rest of the necrologies at the end of the annal.⁴¹⁸ Also, Ibn Iyâs rephrased 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ's lament which came after the latter had

⁴¹⁶ Petry, *Twilight of Majesty*, p. 7.

⁴¹⁷ "*Naqala dhâlika al-Maqrîzî fi al-Sulûk*," in SHM5, the report describing the flooding of the Husayniyah neighbourhood; vol. 1:2, p. 166.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-199.

reported the encounter noted just above in PMA4, between the Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* and an emir’s official, but gave it his own ‘spin’:

‘Abd al-Bâsit: “*Fa-anzur ilá dhâlika al-zamân wa-zamâninâ hâdhâ, hal yajtarî qâdî quḍât ‘asrinâ an yaṭluba ghulâm al-Atâbak Yazbak, fadlan ‘an dawâdârihi?*” [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 2, p. 109]

Ibn Iyâs: “*Wa-ayna hâdhâ min af‘âl quḍâtinâ, wa-khudû ‘ihim lil-umarâ’ wa-talab al-jâh, wa-hubbihim lil-manâsib awjaba khafd al-umûr al-shar‘iyah, wa-al-qiyâm li-hurmat al-Shar‘ al-sharîf.*” [*Badâ‘i‘ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 165]⁴¹⁹

Ibn Iyâs might have also relied on two other sources for which evidence is however not definitive. One report, about eclipses, SHM12, is reminiscent of Ibn Hajar:

Ibn Hajar: “*Wa-fi Sha‘bân minhâ khasafa al-shams wa-al-qamar jamî‘an fa-tala‘a al-qamar khâsifan laylat al-sabt râbi‘ ‘asharahu thumma injalâ bi-sur‘ah qabl al-farâgh min ṣalât al-maghrib wa-kasafa min al-shams bayn al-zuhr wa-al-‘asr yawm al-sabt thâmin ‘ishrînihi akthar min nisfihâ wa-istamarrat ilá ba‘d al-‘asr fa-sulliyya lil-shams wa-lam yuṣalla lil-qamar.*” [*Inbâ‘ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, p. 196]

‘Abd al-Bâsit: “*Wa-fihi kusifat al-shams wa-khusifa al-qamar jamî‘an, al-qamar fi laylat râbi‘ ‘asharahu wa-al-shams fi thâmin ‘asharahu.*” [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 2, p. 115]

Ibn Iyâs: “*Wa-fi yawm thâmin ‘ishrîn Safar, kasafat al-shams kusûfan fâhishan, wa-dhâlika ba‘d al-zuhr, wa-istamarrat fi al-kusûf nahwa arba‘în darajah.*” [*Badâ‘i‘ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 164]

Ibn Iyâs recounted only the solar eclipse, but either got its date wrong or consciously altered it for whatever reason, and added information found in neither ‘Abd al-Bâsit’s nor Ibn Hajar’s works; but contrary to *Nayl al-Amal* from whom one would have expected him to have culled his information, he did remark, like Ibn Hajar, that the incident had taken place in the afternoon. As we shall see below in a number of instances, it appears that mixing story elements from different sources is one of the numerous narrative

⁴¹⁹ Ibn Iyâs systematically echoed the complaints formulated by al-Maqrîzî about the vices of the new regime that was coming into existence and which was to culminate with the arrival of Barqûq to power; on this see Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian,” pp. 119-120, footnote no. 3.

techniques Ibn Iyâs resorted to while writing his chronicle,⁴²⁰ so that it is possible that he borrowed simultaneously from the two other authors.⁴²¹

At least one element of *Kitâb al-'Ibar* can also be detected in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*: Ibn Iyâs was the only historian other than Ibn Khaldûn and the anonymous author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk* to narrate that during the sultan's flight to Cairo from 'Aqabah, Muḥammad ibn 'Îsâ, the sultan's camel driver, suggested to al-Ashraf and his party to lead them to Syria.⁴²² Ibn Iyâs went on to develop the topic further by having Muḥammad ibn 'Îsâ mention the military and political options that would have become available to the sultan if he did head to Syria. Because the accounts are too different to establish 'filiation' with enough certainty, one might want to postulate that Ibn Iyâs either did use *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, or a source common to both authors.

Another relatively small piece of evidence indicates that Ibn Iyâs also borrowed from Ibn Taghrîbirdî. We have already mentioned the passage in PMA61 where the author of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* made a remark about the relationship between the two rebel groups in 'Aqabah and Cairo.⁴²³ Ibn Iyâs embarked upon the same kind of endeavour, except that, first, he did so within the framework of PMA95, and second, he erroneously commented that the two rebellions had taken place on the same day. Significantly, Ibn Iyâs employed the expression "*min gharâ'ib al-ittifâq*" to describe the

⁴²⁰ See below, pp. 102ff.

⁴²¹ In another instance, Ibn Iyâs actually quoted Ibn Ḥajar citing a Mâlikî Shaykh who, when, in a dream, he informed the Prophet that the sultan had planned a pilgrimage to Mecca, he was told that al-Ashraf would never make it; PMA48. This report, which is not part of Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* for the year 778, can be found in al-Suyûtî's *Husn al-Muhâdarah*. It is actually possible that Ibn Iyâs used *Husn al-Muhâdarah* as his source since as can be seen from the present discussion he did borrow haphazardly and intermittently from 'Abd al-Bâsîṭ, and possibly from Ibn Ḥajar and Ibn Khaldûn; see below, pp. 119-20.

⁴²² PMA78.

⁴²³ See above, p. 90.

fact just mentioned, almost the same as that used by Ibn Taghrîbirdî, “*hâdhâ min gharîb al-ittifâq*,” to convey that neither group knew what the other was doing.⁴²⁴

On top of the data borrowed from other sources, one finds in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* a substantial amount of information that is to be found in no other source. These data are multifaceted: they are made up either of full-fledged reports⁴²⁵ or of pieces of information grafted onto *akhbâr* Ibn Iyâs has in common with other historians. Some of it poses no problem in terms of determining its origin: he might have relied either on an unknown contemporary source or on his own retrospective observations concerning the scene of the year 778. For example, at the very beginning of the annal, after noting in PMA2 the dismissal of al-Nashû from the *wizârah*, Ibn Iyâs stated in PMA6 that Ibn al-Ghannâm was sent for from the Hijâz only after al-Maqsî, who elsewhere is presented mostly as *nâzir al-khâss*,⁴²⁶ asked to be exempted from the job.⁴²⁷ It is possible that al-Maqsî did indeed replace al-Nashû, only to give up his position, an interlude *maybe* too brief to have attracted the attention of other contemporary chroniclers.⁴²⁸ As for the commentary he added to PMA105, a report that lists appointments to emirates of one hundred in the wake of the rise of the new regime, that Aynabak al-Badrî was “the owner of the street that bore his name,”⁴²⁹ it is possible that there was a place in the city still named after this emir. Also emblematic is SHM13, where Ibn Iyâs added information to a *khâbar* of probable Maqrîzîan origin.⁴³⁰ In *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, the report is a bit misleading as al-Maqrîzî

⁴²⁴ Variations of this expression were used elsewhere by Ibn Iyâs: in SHM4, “*fa-'udda dhâlika min al-nawâdir al-gharîbah, wa-al-ittifâq al-'ajîb*,” in SHM12, “*wa-hâdhâ min gharâ'ib al-waqâ'i'*,” respectively in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 164 and p. 196. Both these reports described eclipses.

⁴²⁵ PMA5, 41', 56, 90; SHM4; FA1.

⁴²⁶ See above, p. 32 and footnote no. 130 therein.

⁴²⁷ PMA5.

⁴²⁸ In the same vein, see PMA56 and FA1.

⁴²⁹ “*Sahîb al-darb al-mansûb ilayhi*,” *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 190.

⁴³⁰ See above, p. 75.

commented that as a result of the fire in al-Ashraf's *madrasah*, "*tafâ'ala al-nâs bi-dhâlika 'alâ al-sultân:*" unless the verb "*tafa 'ala,*" to feel optimistic, has a secondary meaning when used with "*'alâ,*" al-Maqrîzî's relation does pose a problem, because immediately after he added that "this was indeed what happened as [the sultan] was killed as will be mentioned later, God willing."⁴³¹ Ibn Iyâs circumvented this 'snag' by writing, *before* he introduced the bit of narrative about the optimism of people regarding the sultan, that al-Ashraf himself had come down from the citadel to combat the fire. This piece of information, again like the others analyzed in this paragraph, might be true. However, as will be argued just below, it is also very likely that many of them were nothing but dramatic embroiderings, which have no foundation in historical fact and therefore need to be used with extreme care by modern historians.

Ibn Iyâs imparted a *very* distinctive mark to a large number of reports and data, something that often makes them plainly unreliable. This distinctive mark can be seen at work at two levels. At one level, in at least one instance, SHM6, Ibn Iyâs provided a contemporary explanation to a phenomenon that occurred in the past. In his account of *damân al-maghânî*, he stated that the practice had been abolished a long time ago until "*wuzarâ' al-sû*" brought it back because of the huge revenues it generated; he then noted that the *maghânî* tax had to be paid by singers on a yearly basis to *al-dîwân al-mufrad*: the problem is that this particular *dîwân* was the brain-child of Barqûq and did not come into existence until after he assumed sultanic powers in 784/1382.⁴³²

⁴³¹ *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, p. 271.

⁴³² Bernadette Martel-Thoumian, *Les Civils et l'administration dans l'état militaire Mamlouk (IX^e/XV^e siècle)* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas : 1991), p. 53 and footnote no. 103 ; see also above, footnote no. 6.

The other distinctive feature of Ibn Iyâs' historical writing is the absolute liberty he took in rearranging the story line and plots of certain events, so that his narrative is at odds with the accounts of most other historians. Even though, as has been shown throughout this present discussion, historians did differ from one another in terms of depth of coverage, narrative detail and perspective, there is however a large body of facts around which there appears to be agreement, and Ibn Iyâs very often is outside of this 'consensus.' The following examples, two amongst many, will both illustrate the narrative technique used by Ibn Iyâs to alter some events, and provide tentative explanations as to why he proceeded the way he did.

When the rebellion started in Cairo on the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah, its leaders headed to the citadel in order to place the sultan's son, Emir 'Alî, on the throne. This led to an exchange between the rebels and the eunuchs in charge of the prince, which in many chronicles took the form of a dialogue between the two parties.⁴³³ Whereas in the other chronicles, the rebels simply claim that the sultan had died when asked by the eunuchs why they should hand the crown prince over to them, Ibn Iyâs staged the following dialogue:

*"Fa-qâlû la-hum: 'wa-mâ al-khabar?' Qâlû: 'sami'nâ anna al-sultân lammâ waṣal ilâ al-'Aqabah, wathabû 'alayhi al-mamâlik hunâk wa-qatalûh, fa-ukhrijû lanâ ibn ustâdhinâ Amîr 'Alî hattâ nusaltinahu.' Wa-lam yakun li-hâdhâ al-kalâm sihhah bi-mawt al-sultân, fakâna al-fa'l bi-al-mantiq kamâ yuqâl: Ihfaz lisânak an taqûl fa-tabtali inna-al-balâ' muwakkal bi-al-mantiqi."*⁴³⁴

Clearly, this was simply an occasion for Ibn Iyâs to introduce a verse, as the whole passage smacks of literary license: the mention of the 'Aqabah rebellion by the Cairenes could have fit into the narrative of the story had Ibn Iyâs subscribed, like Ibn al-Furât, to

⁴³³ On the intrusion of dialogues written in colloquial Arabic in Mamluk period histories, see Haarmann, *Quellenstudien*, p. 179.

⁴³⁴ *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 175. PMA70.

the theory according to which there was an agreement between the two groups for the mamluks accompanying the sultan to kill him on the way to the *hajj*. Furthermore, as Ibn Iyâs himself reported, it is only *after* the capture of Qâzân al-Yarqashî that the Cairene rebels heard about the rebellion against the sultan at ‘Aqabah.⁴³⁵

Another story line inconsistency has to do with the whereabouts of the sultan following his defeat in ‘Aqabah and the slaughter of his *khâssakîyah*. Like other chroniclers, Ibn Iyâs recounted in PMA85, the capture and murder of the *khâssakî* emirs at Qubbat al-Naṣr by the Cairene rebels who were acting upon the information provided by Qâzân al-Yarqashî. Among those killed was Arghûn Shâh al-Ashrafî, but, curiously, in a subsequent *khobar*, Ibn Iyâs reported that the said Arghûn, whom he had pronounced killed, and not Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî as all other chronicles concurred, was in the company of the sultan when the latter decided to part with his *khâssakîyah* and to go to Cairo *before* the attack by the Cairenes. The following passage, which is made up of PMA88, 84, 89, parts of PMA91 and 92, in that order, contains the rest of the narrative for this complex of events, and deserves to be quoted at length:

“*Fa-atâ [the sultan] ilâ al-Qâhirah, wa-dakhalahâ taht al-layl, huwa wa-al-Amîr Arghûn Shâh; fa-balaghahu mâ jarâ bi-Miṣr fî ghaybatihî, wa-qad saltanû ibnahu Amîr ‘Alî, wa-khal‘uhu min al-mulk, wa-jarâ mâ jarâ. Fa-bâta warâ’ al-Jabal al-Aḥmar*⁴³⁶ ‘alâ al-raml ilâ âkhir al-layl, fa-insalla min ‘ind Arghûn Shâh wahdahu bi-mufradihi, wa-mashâ ‘alâ aqdâmihi min al-Jabal al-Aḥmar, hattâ atâ ilâ hârat al-Jawdarîyah, fa-ikhtafâ bi-hâ ‘inda imra’ah, yuqâlu la-hâ Âminah, zawjat Ibn al-Mushtawlî, wa-kânat min ‘iyâl ummihi Khawand Barakah, wa-qîla innahâ muraddî‘at al-sultân, fa-ikhtafâ ‘indahâ...*Fa-aqâma al-sultân fî bayt Âminah, bi-al-Jawdarîyah, ayyâman...Thumma anna Âminah al-madhkûrah tawajjahat ilâ ‘ind al-Amîr Aynabak al-Badrî, wa-ijtama‘at bi-hî, wa-qâlat la-hu: ‘inna al-sultân qad ikhtafâ ‘indî wa-anâ khâ‘ifah min tabi‘atihî...’*” [Badâ‘i’ al-Zuhûr, vol. 1:2, pp. 179-80.]

⁴³⁵ PMA83.

⁴³⁶ A hill located North East of the Citadel, close to Qubbat al-Naṣr; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 33.

The preceding passage is interesting on a number of accounts. First, we have no information concerning the whereabouts of Arghûn Shâh who, if we are to believe this narrative, had been left behind by the sultan at Jabal al-Aḥmar; the same Arghûn Shâh whom Ibn Iyâs listed, as we said earlier, as one of those killed at Qubbat al-Naṣr! Second, almost everything about this passage and its continuation is different from the facts established by the other chronicles: Âminah becomes a relative of the sultan, his wet nurse to boot; she is sent back to her place dressed in military attire [!] in the company of a hundred mamluks;⁴³⁷ these mamluks ended up capturing the sultan after he managed to escape to the roof, and even though Aynabak promised Âminah that neither herself nor her property would be harmed,⁴³⁸ they looted her house, including the granite floors, and that of her immediate neighbours!⁴³⁹ Either, the whole passage was borrowed from a source not used by any other historian, or Ibn Iyâs simply created an environment replete with the typical ingredients of the *roman* genre: family bonds betrayed, providential retribution, the vicissitudes of fate,⁴⁴⁰ action, etc.

The discussion above prompts the following question: was Ibn Iyâs writing history or fiction? The answer is that he was doing both. Despite the profound changes to which he subjected a number of his reports, the information he used to construct his narrative is made up of plain historical facts; what Ibn Iyâs did was to romanticize certain events, when these lent themselves to it, and to alter the story line for dramatic purposes. The presence of numerous verses, mostly one liners placed here and there to illustrate

⁴³⁷ The text might be referring to the mamluks: "...Aynabak arsala ma'ahâ mâ'at Mamluk min mamâlikihî, wa-hiya mulabbasat âlat al-harb..." *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 180; PMA92.

⁴³⁸ Notice the exquisite play on words: "'Na'am, takûnî âminah 'alâ nafsik wa-baytik' [!]," *ibid.*

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁰ Ibn Iyâs marvelled about the twists and turns of destiny when he asserted, again wrongly, that both revolts occurred the very same day: "...wa-kâna yawm nahs mustamirr, fa-'udda dhâlika min al-nawâdir al-gharibah," *ibid.*, p. 184; PMA95.

something, to make a point of morality or to edify,⁴⁴¹ but also that of a very long poem in colloquial Arabic describing the saga of al-Ashraf,⁴⁴² only adds to the entertainment value of Ibn Iyâs' work. To cite Haarmann,

Indeed, the *Badâ'i' az-zuhûr* of Ibn Iyâs can be characterized as history in only a very limited way: in its popular thematics and its fabulist embellishments, alien to historical factuality, this last great medieval Arabic chronicle was linked to the historicized folk romance, hence to the light prose that was extremely popular at the time but was not recognized as literature. [This type of prose] had developed as a substratum from the days of earliest Islam until Mamlûk times, next to, or, more accurately, beneath, scholarly historiography, but was now reintegrated with it for the first time since the tenth century.⁴⁴³

I. Anonymous; *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*:

The last of extant Egyptian Circassian sources to which I had access, is *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*, a still unedited chronicle available at the British Museum.⁴⁴⁴ Ashtor claimed that the author of this manuscript is unknown, while Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qâdir 'Aṭâ, the editor of a new Beirut edition of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*,⁴⁴⁵ advanced that *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* is either a third copy of a chronicle written by 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Bistâmî entitled *Nazm al-Sulûk fî Masâmir al-Mulûk*, or an altogether different work, but by the same author still.⁴⁴⁶ The problem with 'Aṭâ's contention is that al-Bistâmî died in 858/1453, whereas the last entry in the manuscript at hand is, according to Ashtor, Dhû al-Hijjah 902.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴¹ See, for example, PMA56, 70, 92, 94 and 109.

⁴⁴² *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, pp. 185-187; PMA95.

⁴⁴³ "Auflösung und Bewahrung der klassischen Formen arabischer Geschichtsschreibung in der Zeit der Mamluken," in *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 121, p.55; the translation quoted here is Little's; "Historiography," p. 441.

⁴⁴⁴ The manuscript of this chronicle, MS British Museum, Or. 6854, was kindly made available to me by Bruce Craig of the University of Chicago.

⁴⁴⁵ *Kitâb al-Sulûk li-Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulûk*, vols. 1-14 (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1997). This work is however not based on manuscript sources, but on the Cairo edition!

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 32. On this author see, M. Smith, "Al-Bistâmî," in *EI*², vol. 1, p. 1248.

⁴⁴⁷ "Études sur quelques chroniques," p. 285..

Notwithstanding, the difficulty of establishing the genealogy of this work, we are in the presence of a chronicle probably written at the very beginning of the tenth century AH. From the point of view of number of reports, it compares with Ibn Duqmâq's *Al-Nafḥah*, Ibn al-'Irâqî's *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar* and al-Sakhâwî's *Wajîz al-Kalâm*.⁴⁴⁸ However, with regard to content, style and overall nature, it belongs to a category of its own along with another source authored by a near contemporary, Ibn Iyâs: despite the huge discrepancy in size between them, *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* and *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*⁴⁴⁹ share a lot in common, in that they are both late Mamluk sources and contain plainly unreliable accounts. Overall, as we shall see below, *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* does not reflect, at least for the annal at hand, Ashtor's assertion that it contains original data not found in contemporary sources.⁴⁵⁰

The annal of the year 778 is made up of eleven folios of which four are taken up by one *zajal* poem, either copied from Ibn Iyâs or from a source common to both works, which is part of the biographical sketch of al-Ashraf⁴⁵¹ that actually concludes the annal. This leaves seven and a half folios loaded with forty reports that are dense and concise; so concise in fact that they end up containing a pool of narrative elements common to a wide range of sources. This makes tracing the genealogy of a certain number of them almost impossible.⁴⁵² In the case of others accounts, the presence of more discernible components, as well as the results of the analysis of the annal of the year 793 and 804,⁴⁵³

⁴⁴⁸ *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*: thirty-seven PMAs; two RLs; one SHM; *Al-Nafḥah*: twenty-six PMAs; one SHM; *Dhayl*: thirty-five PMAs; four RLs; two SHMs; *Wajîz al-Kalâm*: thirty-six PMAs; four RLs; one SHM.

⁴⁴⁹ This chronicle is third in size after *Kitâb al-Sulûq* and *Al-Muntaqâ*.

⁴⁵⁰ "Études sur quelques chroniques," p. 285.

⁴⁵¹ See PMA94. Ashtor had remarked that beginning with the reign of Barqûq the author's account become more detailed and that he starts placing biographical notices of noteworthy people in a section at the end of each sultan's reign; *ibid.*, p. 285.

⁴⁵² See, for example, PMA69.

⁴⁵³ See chapters two, pp. 199ff, and three, pp. 261-2.

revealed that the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* had relied on *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*⁴⁵⁴ to produce his work.⁴⁵⁵ For example, PMA48, as it appears in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, was reproduced almost as is in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*:

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*wa-ashâra 'alayhi jamâ'ah min al-sulahâ' wa-al-a'yân bi-ta'khîr al-hajj fî tilka al-sanah fa-ya'bâ wa-mâ yazdâd illâ quwwah fî al-'azm...*" ["*Nuzhat al-Anâm*," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 112a]

Anonymous: "...*fa-ashâra 'alayhi ba'd al-sulahâ' bi-tark al-hajj fî hâdhihi al-sanah, wa-abâ wa-lam yaqbal minhum dhâlika.*" ["*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266a]

In PMA74, components were somewhat tossed around, but they are nevertheless closer to their equivalents in *Nuzhat al-Anâm* than in any other source:

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*wa-arsalû khalf al-umarâ' al-ladhîn bi-al-madînah, fa-tala'û ilâ Sûq al-Khayl wa-abaw an yatlu'û al-Qal'ah. Fa-anzalû Sidî Amîr 'Alî ilâ al-Istabl, fa-tala'a ilâ 'indihi sâ'ir al-umarâ' al-ladhîn bi-al-madînah, wa-bâsû al-ard wa-halafû la-hu...*" ["*Nuzhat al-Anâm*," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 112b]

Anonymous: "...*wa-arsalû talabû al-umarâ' al-ladhîn hum bi-al-Qâhirah, fa-tala'û ilâ Sûq al-Khayl, fa-talabûhum an yatlu'û ilâ al-Qal'ah, fa-abaw min dhâlika. Fa-nazila ilayhim al-Amîr 'Alî bin al-sultân ilâ al-Harrâqah*⁴⁵⁶ *al-latî fî al-Istabl al-sultânî, fa-'inda dhâlika tala'û ilayhi sâwir al-umarâ' wa-bâsû la-hu al-ard...*" ["*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266a]

Furthermore, *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* contains markers peculiar to *Nuzhat al-Anâm* that no other sources have, such as the verse by Ibn al-'Attâr cited by Ibn Duqmâq in PMA102, which deals with the surrender of *Tashtamur al-'Alâ'î* following his defeat.

⁴⁵⁴ There is circumstantial evidence that might indicate that Ibn Taghrîbirdî might have influenced the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*. On p. 100 above, we have noted that Ibn Iyâs had reflected, just like Abû al-Mahâsin, about the relationship between the two rebel groups in 'Aqabah and Cairo, by using the expression "*min gharâ'ib al-ittifâq*," but that he had erred by stating that the two rebellions had taken place on the same day. Ibn Iyâs's remark was made within the framework of PMA95, but in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* it occurs in PMA61, just as in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*.

⁴⁵⁵ Because of the problem outlined in the previous sentence, it is hard to determine the proportion of accounts originating in either one of these works.

⁴⁵⁶ "Harrâqa Pavillion (al-Harrâqa), an elevated construction forming part of, or immediately N of, the Stables, with a reception hall (maq'ad) and sleeping quarter (mabît)..." Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 23.

In the case of Ibn Iyâs, the numerous idiosyncrasies in the text of *Badâ'i' al-Sulûk* allow one to ascertain the filiation between it and *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* since many of them also appear in the latter work. PMA56, for example, is found only in these two chronicles:

Ibn Iyâs: "*Wa-dabata umûr al-mamlakah qabl khurûjihi ilâ al-Hijâz, wa-akhadha ma'ahu min al-umarâ' man yakhshâ ba'sahu, wa-taraka bi-al-Qâhirah min al-umarâ' man yarkun ilayhi...*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 171]

Anonymous: "...*wa-kâna al-sultân dabata umûr al-mamlakah qabl an yakhruja ilâ al-Hijâz, wa-akhadha ma'ahu min al-umarâ' man kâna yakhshâ minhu, wa-taraka fî al-Qâhirah man yarkun ilayhi min al-umarâ'...*" ["*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266b]

In PMA50, the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* summarized the long description of al-Ashaf's train the day of its departure to Mecca, but included in his report, among other things, a point mentioned only by Ibn Iyâs:

Ibn Iyâs: "*Fa-kâna bi-hi...qitârayn muhammalah ashjâr muzhirah fî tînihâ, mâ bayn yâsmîn wa-nisrîn wa-ward wa-manthûr wa-marsîn, wa-ghayr dhâlika min al-azhâr, wa-hiya fî sanâdiq khashab muzaffatah mithla al-marâkib.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 172]

Anonymous: "...*hattâ hamala ma'ahu qitârayn muhammalah ashjâr muzhirah fî tînihâ fî sanâdiq khashab, wa-ghayr dhâlika min al-ashyâ' al-gharîbah al-latî lam yusma' li-mithlihâ.*" ["*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266a]

In RL11, we see that *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* reproduced the same mistakes as *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, namely, the miswriting of the appointee's name, *Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qirimî*, as *Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qanawî*:

Ibn Iyâs: "...*wa-akhla'a 'alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn 'Ubayd Allâh al-Qanawî, wa-istaqarra bi-hi fî mashyakhat madrasatihi al-latî ansha'ahâ bi-ra's al-Suwwah...*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 174]

Anonymous: "...*thumma anna al-sultân akhla'a 'alâ al-Shaykh Diyâ' al-Dîn al-Qanawî, wa-istaqarra bi-hi fî shaykh madrasatihi al-latî fî al-Suwwah.*" ["*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266a]

To his borrowed material, the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* added his own original data, mostly small pieces of information, which are however neither substantial in

quantity nor pivotal in importance. For example, in PMA78,⁴⁵⁷ whereas Ibn Iyâs reported that Muḥammad ibn ‘Īssá mentioned “*al-bilâd al-shâmîyah*” as a potential destination for the sultan to regroup his forces and to take back power in Cairo, the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* had him propose Gaza specifically. In PMA99,⁴⁵⁸ whereas Ibn Duqmâq and even Ibn Iyâs noted that after he was defeated upon his return to the Egyptian capital Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î fled to al-Kîmân, a region located south west of the Citadel, between the latter and Old Cairo,⁴⁵⁹ in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* he is reported to have headed towards al-Bâb al-Mahrûq, which is in the eastern wall of the city, north of the Citadel.⁴⁶⁰

The originality of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* is to be found elsewhere than in the presence of these basically negligible pieces of information. It lies rather in the techniques its author used to craft his narrative. In the case of a substantial number of reports, the anonymous author did more than simply copy the works of others, in that he also embarked upon an endeavour which, interestingly, is also characteristic of *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*. As we shall see in the chapters two and three below,⁴⁶¹ these two late Mamluk Circassian chronicles feature numerous instances where their authors literally fused elements originating from other works to produce their own reports. In the case of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, this can be seen, among others, in the following, PMA47, where components from *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* were used:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-rasama li-nâyib al-saltanah wa-li-sâyir al-umarâ’ [an] yatlu ‘û ilâ al-Qal‘ah fî kull yawm mawkib ilâ al-Qal‘ah wa-yadkhulû ilâ Bâb al-Sitârah,*⁴⁶² *wa-takhruj al-asyâd awlâd al-Maqâm al-Sharîf al-Malik al-Ashraf Sha‘bân bi-Bâb al-Sitârah, fa-*

⁴⁵⁷ As we have argued earlier, this report might have been originally drawn by Ibn Iyâs from Ibn Khaldûn’s *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*; see above, p. 100.

⁴⁵⁸ See above, pp. 55-6.

⁴⁵⁹ See al-Maqrîzî, *al-Khitât*, vol. 1, p. 343.

⁴⁶⁰ Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 24.

⁴⁶¹ See below, chapter two, pp. 198-9, and chapter two, pp. 257-8, 262-3.

⁴⁶² A gate located on the eastern side of the Royal Palaces complex of the Citadel; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 21.

yadkhulû al-umarâ' yabûsû aydîhim wa-yaq'udû al-sighâr sâ'ah latîfah, thumma yaqûm Sîdî Amîr 'Alî, wa-huwa akbar awlâd al-sultân qâyim 'alâ qadamayh wa-yaqûlu bi-yadihi: 'bi-ism Allâh'..." ["Nuzhat al-Anâm," MS Gotha A 1572, fol. 112a]

Ibn Iyâs: "*Wa-rasama lil-umarâ' al-muqîmîn bi-al-Qâhirah an kul yawm ithnayn wa-khamîs yahdurû ilâ al-khidmah 'inda Bâb al-Sitârah, wa-yu'tû al-khidmah ilâ walad al-sultân Sîdî 'Alî, wa-yaqifû sâ'ah latîfah, thumma yaqûm Sîdî 'Alî bin al-sultân min majlisihi wa-yushîr lil-umarâ' bi-yadihi: 'bi-ism Allâh'...*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 171]

Anonymous: "*Wa-rasama li-nâyib al-saltanah wa-baqiyyat al-umarâ' al-ladhîn hum muqîmîn bi-al-Qâhirah, an yatlu'û ilâ al-Qal'ah fî kull yawm ithnayn wa-khamîs, yadkhulû ilâ Bâb al-Sitârah wa-yatlubû al-asyâd awlâd al-sultân wa-yu'tûhum al-khidmah; wa-kâna al-Amîr 'Alî akbar awlâd al-sultân. Fa-imtathalû al-umarâ' dhâlîka...*" [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266b]

Another technique employed by the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* consists of using a word contained in a report by, say, Ibn Iyâs, in a context different from that in which it originally appeared. Consider the two following segments from PMA50, which we have already discussed,⁴⁶³ and PMA76, which recounts the proclamation of Emir 'Alî as al-

Mansûr:

Ibn Iyâs: "...*ashjâr muzhirah fî tînihâ, mâ bayn yâsmîn wa-nisrîn wa-ward wa-manthûr wa-marsîn, wa-ghayr dhâlîka min al-azhâr, wa-hiya fî sanâdîq khashab...*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 172]

Anonymous: "...*ashjâr muzhirah fî tînihâ fî sanâdîq khashab, wa-ghayr dhâlîka min al-ashyâ' al-gharîbah al-latî lam yusma' li-mithlihâ.*" [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 266a]

Ibn Iyâs: "...*wa-daqqat al-bashâ'ir fî al-Qal'ah, wa-lam yaltafitû ilâ mubâya'at al-khalîfah la-hu...*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol.1:2, p. 175]

Anonymous: "...*wa-daqqat la-hu al-bashâ'ir, wa-khallafû la-hu al-amr....*" [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 267a]

In PMA50, the expression "*min ghayr dhâlîka*" stayed as is, but introduced a different element in the narrative; in PMA76, the word "*al-khalîfah*" was transformed into the verb "*khallafû*." As to what prompted the use of such a procedure, two explanations can be put forward. In the case of the first report, the anonymous author was maybe trying to avoid the enumeration of the type of trees carried to Mecca; as for the second report, he might

⁴⁶³ See above, p. 109.

have been trying to solve the problem inherent to Ibn Iyâs's relation, namely the fact that no caliph was present in Cairo when Emir 'Alî was enthroned. But since the whole annal is rather short and concise, he could have simply refrained from mentioning whatever information he did not see fit to include in his work. The other explanation would be that he simply wanted to indulge in artistic license.

This leaves one with the impression that the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* was more interested in the form his narrative would take than in its historical veracity. Such an impression is further reinforced by the fact that, like Ibn Iyâs, he took some liberty in rewriting history. The effect is much less dramatic than in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, a massive chronicle where playing around with the chronological unfolding of events and even with the very contents of reports, seriously lessened its value. For one thing, whether by design or by accident, the author did not reproduce all the pitfalls of Ibn Iyâs's narrative, as for example, in PMA85, where he followed the historical consensus established by other chroniclers in saying that the sultan had left Qubbat al-Naṣr for Cairo with Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and not Arghûn al-Ashrafî.⁴⁶⁴ On the other hand, in other instances where Ibn Iyâs got things right, the anonymous author got things wrong. In PMA59, he claimed that when the sultan fled from 'Aqabah he was accompanied by members of his *khâssakîyah*, as well as by "emirs of forty and of ten, and by *sultânî* mamluks,"⁴⁶⁵ while Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Iyâs mentioned only the *khâssakîs*. As for the murder of the latter at the hands of the Cairenes, PMA85, he said that it had taken place in 'Ajrûd and not at Qubbat al-Naṣr as historians who were contemporaries to the event claimed. In the light of what has just been argued, the information available only in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* could turn out not to be

⁴⁶⁴ See above, p. 104.

⁴⁶⁵ "Jawâhir al-Sulûk," MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 267b.

original after all, but rather part and parcel of the dramatic character its author maybe wanted to impart to his text. Thus, it is possible that the mention of al-Bâb al-Mahrûq in PMA99 as the destination of Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î⁴⁶⁶ was more of a narrative strategy used to emphasize in a concise manner the utter defeat of this emir – *al-Mahrûq* means the burnt – than a correction by the author of other historians’ facts.

Generally then, while deserving of attention on historiographical grounds, *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* is not a very useful source for the events of the year 778.

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Taqî al-Dîn Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah (779-851/1377-1448):

Born into a Shâfi‘ite scholarly household in Damascus, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah studied a variety of religious sciences so that, according to his son, “at the pinnacle of his knowledge, [he] was the master of [his *madhhab*] in all of Syria.”⁴⁶⁷ Even though he held on a number of occasions the position of qadi in Damascus, a city that he rarely left during his lifetime, his major interest was in teaching and writing, two activities he never ceased to indulge in until his death. As a result, he is known to have authored a large number of works in *fiqh*, prosopography and history.⁴⁶⁸

Despite his significance as one of the two truly Syrian authors of the period being studied,⁴⁶⁹ not much has been written about him. In fact, the only secondary sources which shed some light on his career and work are David C. Reisman’s articles⁴⁷⁰ and ‘Adnân Darwîsh’s French and Arabic introductions to his edition of the first part of Ibn

⁴⁶⁶ See above, p. 110.

⁴⁶⁷ Quoted in Darwîsh’s Darwîsh’s French “Introduction.” p. 15. Translation from French mine.

⁴⁶⁸ The biographical sketch in this paragraph is based on the data provided by Darwîsh in *ibid.*, pp. 15-18.

⁴⁶⁹ The other being Ibn Hîjjî.

⁴⁷⁰ “A Holograph MS,” and “Review of Adnân Darwîsh’s edition of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*,” in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 5 (2001), pp. 175-80.

Qâdî Shuhbah's *Târîkh*.⁴⁷¹ This scarcity of secondary sources about him only makes it harder to fathom a historical output that appears to be difficult to properly classify, so varied and misleading are the titles given to his works by his biographers and modern scholars alike.⁴⁷²

In the introduction⁴⁷³ to his *Târîkh*, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah stated that his master, Ibn Hîjjî, wrote a history⁴⁷⁴ that covered the years 741-747 and 769-815 minus the year 775. Before his death, Ibn Hîjjî asked him ("awsânî") to fill the chronological gap from 748 to 768, but when he embarked upon this endeavor, he noticed that his master had failed to include in his work a large number of obituaries and events mostly from outside of Syria. This led Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah to write a long *dhayl*, to which Darwîsh referred as *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, where he expanded his teacher's text while following his methodology. *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* was then summarized into a smaller version, about the third of the size of the former: it is this shorter work that was edited in four volumes by 'Adnân Darwîsh as *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*.⁴⁷⁵ That much can be ascertained: our author wrote

⁴⁷¹ To date, only three entries appear under Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's name in the *Mamlûk Bibliography Online*: David Reisman's seminal article, but not his book review; an article on the bathhouses of Damascus by Muḥammad Aḥmad Daḥmân, "Madâris Dimashq wa-Ḥammâmâtuha," in *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmî al-'Arabî*, vol. 22 (1947), pp. 232-246, 320-333; and an anaemic article, by Joseph Schacht, in the *EF*, that does not do justice to him; vol. 3, p. 814.

⁴⁷² See Darwîsh's discussion of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's work in his French "Introduction," vol. 2, pp. 16-34 and Reisman, "A Holograph MS," pp. 25-29.

⁴⁷³ All the data in this paragraph is based on Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's introduction to his *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, mainly pp. 111-2, and on Darwîsh's French translation of it in pp. 29-30, both of which are in vol. 2 of Darwîsh's edition.

⁴⁷⁴ *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*. This work is extant in a complete form only for the years 796-815 in MS Berlin 9458 which has been recently edited in Beirut; see above, footnote no. 20; see also, below, chapter three, pp. 239ff.

⁴⁷⁵ As Reisman noted in his review of Darwîsh's edition, "the work edited by Darwîsh is actually an abridgement of a larger history entitled 'Dhayl,' a historical record originally begun by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's master Ibn Hîjjî but later expanded by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah;" "Review of 'Adnân Darwîsh's edition," p. 175. The work, argued Reisman elsewhere, could more aptly be titled *al-Mukhtaṣar*; "A Holograph MS," p. 29. But throughout this dissertation, for the sake of convenience, it will be referred to as *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*. As to *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, in using this particular title, I am only following Adnân Darwîsh's characterization of this work as such; see his "Introduction," to volume 2 of *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, p. 27. In my article on al-Maqrîzî, I have mistakenly referred to *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* as the *Dhayl*.

two books, one large, which he construed as a *dhayl* to another work, and a summary of it. Now while it is clear from Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's own words, that the 'other work' that provided the impetus and the foundational blueprint to these two works,⁴⁷⁶ was *Târîkh Ibn Hījî*, Darwîsh offered another genealogy, and a misleading one at that. In the section of his French introduction where he tried to present his own conclusions concerning "le problème des oeuvres historiques d'Ibn Qâḍî Shuhba," Darwîsh stated under the entry for *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal* that it "commence à l'année 741/1340, là où s'arrête al-Dhahabî dans le 'Ibar, dont notre auteur fait un complément et un rectitatif pour ce qu'ont omis al-Birzâlî, Ibn Kafîr, Ibn Rafî'."⁴⁷⁷ The problem here is that, as can be seen in the explanations presented by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah himself in his introduction, it is clear that it was Ibn Hījî who undertook the writing of a *dhayl* to fill the vacuum: Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah could be construed as having written rectifications to *Târîkh Ibn Hījî*, but only obliquely to the works of the other authors, through the improvements he brought to his teacher's chronicle.

Based on Reisman's study and on the analysis I have undertaken in the third chapter of this dissertation,⁴⁷⁸ the elaboration of *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal* was part of a process involving two recensions of *Târîkh Ibn Hījî*. The first is basically an almost identical copy of Ibn Hījî's original work;⁴⁷⁹ to this initial recension, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah added data from two pairs of Egyptian sources to produce his second recension, *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal* proper: in some annals, it was Ibn Furât's *Târîkh al-Duwal* and al-Maqrîzî's

⁴⁷⁶ Such is indeed Reisman's take on the issue; "A Holograph MS," pp. 28ff.

⁴⁷⁷ Darwîsh, French "Introduction," p. 27. The only mention Darwîsh made of Ibn Hījî was when he noted the fact that Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah used his master's methodology.

⁴⁷⁸ "A Holograph MS," pp. 31ff and, below, chapter three, pp. 264ff.

⁴⁷⁹ For an analysis of the differences between the first recension and *Târîkh Ibn Hījî*, see chapter three, pp. 264-5.

Kitâb al-Sulûk,⁴⁸⁰ and, in others, Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and again al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.⁴⁸¹ As stated earlier, *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* in its turn was summarized as a *mukhtaṣar*, namely the *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* edited by Darwîsh.

For 778, since neither the first nor the second recensions are available,⁴⁸² we are left with the shortest⁴⁸³ and least informative annal written by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah, that found in *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*. As Reisman has shown in collating, for the year 797/1394, the narratives of the first and second recensions with that of *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*, the latter work does not contain information not found in *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, and it simply records "the most important events and biographies."⁴⁸⁴ An analysis of the annal of the year 778 in *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* also confirmed yet another conclusion reached by Reisman and mentioned in the previous paragraph, namely Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's indebtedness to Ibn al-Furât, of whose *Târikh al-Duwal* he compiled a *muntaqâ*,⁴⁸⁵ for his *akhbâr* about events that took place outside of Syria. Those borrowed Furâtian reports, sometimes accompanied by the expression "*Qâla ba'd al-mu'arrikhîn*," were either copied verbatim or, in the instance of larger ones, simply summarized to fit the reduced format of *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*, as can be seen in SHM5, the report dealing with the flooding of a Cairo neighbourhood:

Ibn al-Furât: "...inqata'a maqta' 'azîm min al-khalij bi-al-qurb min qanâtir al-Awazz, wa-sabab dhâlika anna al-Amîr Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Qâyâmâz, ustâdâr al-Âmir Ibn Âqbughâ Âs, ista'jara makânan ja'alah birkatan wa-fataha majrâh min al-Khalij ilayhâ fa-mashâ al-mâ' wa-ghafila 'anhu al-muwakkal bi-hi wa-ittasa'a al-kharq wa-zâda al-mâ' wa-fâda min al-birkah, wa-sâha ilâ an wasâla ilâ istabl Sharaf al-Dîn [Nâsir al-Dîn]

⁴⁸⁰ This is the case of the annals of 778 and 793.

⁴⁸¹ This is the case of the annal of 804.

⁴⁸² See the table of extant annals established by Reisman on p. 48 of his "A Holograph MS."

⁴⁸³ Darwîsh mentioned the existence of a *Mukhtaṣar Mukhtaṣar al-Dhayl*, a summary of *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*, which is still in manuscript form and has not been published; French "Introduction," p. 27.

⁴⁸⁴ "A Holograph MS," p. 38. Reisman reached more conclusions in his analysis of the year 797 than the one mentioned here indicates; see *ibid.*, pp. 34-42.

⁴⁸⁵ See above, pp. 51-2.

bi-jiwâr jâmi' al-Husaynîyah; wa-hadama dûr kathîrah wa-hârât bi-al-Husaynîyah. Qîla kânat al-dûr al-latî tahaddamat fawq al-alf... ["Al-Muntaqá," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 28b]

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: "*Inqata'a maqta' 'azîm min khalîj Miṣr bi-al-qurb min qanâtir al-Awazz ilá an waṣala ilá jâmi' al-Husaynîyah wa-hadama dûran bi-al-Husaynîyah; qîla: kânat al-dûr al-latî tahaddamat fawq al-alf.*" [*Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, vol. 3, p. 506]

That Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah probably copied from Ibn al-Furât and not from any other known source can be ascertained by the fact that the expressions "*inqata'a maqta' 'azîm*" and "*ilá an waṣala*," etc., are to be found only in *Al-Muntaqá* and not in Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Concerning borrowings from other Egyptian sources, the available evidence is meagre. There is only one report, PMA19, which relates the appointment of one Tamurbây al-Damurdâshî as viceroy of Safad, that is found in no other sources but *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, something which indicates the reliance of the Syrian author on al-Maqrîzî by means, most probably, of the second recension. But PMA19 may very well have been a Hijjîan report that found its way simultaneously into the two above-mentioned works.

This last point leads us to consider the Syrian dimension of *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*. Considering that this work is after all the brainchild of a Damascene historian, the percentage of Syrian reports appears to be relatively small, but if one takes into account the overwhelming significance of the regicide of al-Ashraf and the fact that no noticeably important incidents took place in Syria during the year, it has no particular relevance.⁴⁸⁶ Reports concerning Syria number nineteen⁴⁸⁷ out of a total of ninety-six. A few of these echo events taking place in Cairo, such as the one, placed almost

⁴⁸⁶ As will be seen below, in his narrative of the year 793, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah gave their due importance to events taking place in and around his hometown not only because of the way they influenced the Mamluk body politic as a whole, but also because of their dramatic impact on his life and that of the other inhabitants of Damascus; see also chapter three, pp. 242-6.

⁴⁸⁷ PMA24, 29, 35, 111, 116, 122, 137 and 140; RL1, 3, 4, 10, 20 and 24; SHM1, 2, 3, 11 and 18.

immediately following the news about Ibn ʿAqbughā ʿĀs's arrest, which related the detaining of his deputy in Damascus, one Ibn Qafjaq.⁴⁸⁸ The rest of them however deal with purely Syrian local events as varied as politico-military affairs,⁴⁸⁹ religious life,⁴⁹⁰ miscellany and oddities.⁴⁹¹ As to their origin, one can postulate that most if not all of these reports are of Hijjīan origin. The evidence for this is multifaceted but largely circumstantial. First, there is the genealogical dimension, the fact that *Tārīkh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah* is a summary of a chronicle founded on *Tārīkh Ibn Hijjī*. Second, there are no other *known*⁴⁹² Syrian sources or source available for the year at hand. Third, the *nature* of the information contained in these Syrian reports, corresponds to that of those included by Ibn Hijjī in his *Tārīkh*.⁴⁹³ Finally, some of these *akhbār*⁴⁹⁴ can be found, written similarly, in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, and the analysis of the annals of the years 793 and especially 804 contained in this work has shown that they contain stories from *Tārīkh Ibn Hijjī*.⁴⁹⁵

In summary, due to its *mukhtaṣar* nature, except for Syrian reports, *Tārīkh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah* does not contain any original information that cannot be had from other sources, namely Ibn al-Furât's *Tārīkh al-Duwal*, al-Maqrīzī's *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and Ibn Hajar's *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*. In the light of the unavailability of other Syrian sources, especially Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah's own *Al-Dhayl Al-Muṭawwal*, covering the year 778, the only redeeming aspects of *Tārīkh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah* are, first, the fact that it does contain

⁴⁸⁸ Respectively PMA20 and 24. See also PMA111 and 116 which pertain to the events surrounding the coup against al-Ashraf.

⁴⁸⁹ PMA29, 35, 122, 137 and 140.

⁴⁹⁰ RL1, 3, 4, 10, 20 and 24.

⁴⁹¹ SHM1, 2, 3, 11 and 18.

⁴⁹² See chapter two, pp. 133-4.

⁴⁹³ See chapter three, pp. 242ff.

⁴⁹⁴ RL20; SHM2, 3 and 18.

⁴⁹⁵ See below, chapters two, p. 168, and three, p. 233.

information about Syria, and second, that, thanks to ‘Adnân Darwîsh, its edited version allows modern scholars partly to decipher the manuscript of *Al-Muntaqá*, which was written, as was noted above, in Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s unreadable script.

IV. Minor Historians:

There is a host of chronicles that mention the events of the year 778 in so little detail that they are of little or of no use for this research. Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad Al-Qalqashandî (756-821/1355-1418), whose importance as the author of the now famed *Subḥ al-A‘shâ fî Sinâ‘at al-Inshâ*⁴⁹⁶ need not be revisited,⁴⁹⁷ also authored a book entitled *Ma‘âthir al-Inâfah fî Ma‘âlim al-Khilâfah*.⁴⁹⁸ both contain very short, identical and unoriginal accounts of the pilgrimage and death of al-Ashraf.⁴⁹⁹ Al-Suyûfî’s (d. 911/1505) *Târîkh al-Khulafâ*⁵⁰⁰ and *Husn al-Muhâdarah fî Akhbâr Misr wa-al-Qâhirah*⁵⁰¹ contain nothing of interest⁵⁰² except that in the latter work one finds the quote from Ibn Hajar, mentioned by Ibn Iyâs, about the Prophet’s prophecy concerning al-Ashraf, and another *khâbar* from *Inbâ‘ al-Ghumr* about Tashtamur al-Dawâdâr’s attempt to enthrone the caliph.⁵⁰³ Aḥmad ibn Yûsuf al-Qirmânî, (d. 1019/1610) the author of *Akbâr al-Duwal wa-Âthâr al-Uwal fî al-Târîkh*,⁵⁰⁴ contains a highly condensed story about the rebellion; so condensed in fact that the whole episode is expedited in three sentences.⁵⁰⁵

⁴⁹⁶ Vols. 1-14 (Cairo: Dâr al-Kutub al-Khidawîyah, 1913).

⁴⁹⁷ On him see, Régis Blachère, “Quelques réflexions sur les formes de l’encyclopédisme en Égypte et en Syrie du VIII^e/XIX^e siècle à la fin du IX^e/XV^e siècle,” in *Bulletin d’Études orientales*, vol. XXIII (1970), pp. 17-19, and Little, “Historiography,” p. 444.

⁴⁹⁸ Edited by ‘Abd al-Sattâr Aḥmad Farrâj, vols. 1-2 (Beirut: ‘Âlam al-Kutub, 1980)

⁴⁹⁹ Respectively, vol. 3, p. 438 and vol. 2, p. 174.

⁵⁰⁰ (Cairo: 1305H).

⁵⁰¹ (Cairo? Beirut: , nd).

⁵⁰² Respectively, pp. 202-203, and vol. 2, pp. 59 and 79.

⁵⁰³ P. 79; PMA67.

⁵⁰⁴ Edited by Aḥmad Ḥuṭayṭ and Fahmî Sa‘d, vols. 1-2 (Beirut: ‘Âlam al-Kutub, 1992).

⁵⁰⁵ Vol. 2, pp. 289- 290. For all its shortness, or rather because of it, al-Qirmânî’s account is factually wrong since in it the rebels attacked and captured the sultan in the Citadel.

A string of Syro-Lebanese histories, the importance of which will become apparent in the analysis of the annal of 793,⁵⁰⁶ also covered, but in a superficial way, the year 778. Sâlih ibn Yahyâ (early 15th century) in his *Akhhbâr al-Salaf min Dhurriyyat Buhtur bin 'Alî Amîr al-Gharb bi-Bayrût*, a.k.a. *Târikh Bayrût*,⁵⁰⁷ dealt with al-Ashraf's murder as part of one of numerous sections found throughout his work, a history of his Druze feudal family based in the vicinity of Beirut, which relates extra-Lebanese events.⁵⁰⁸ Ibn Sibât al-Gharbî, who like Sâlih ibn Yahyâ hailed from the Gharb district of Syria, wrote an annalistic chronicle known as *Târikh Ibn Sibât*,⁵⁰⁹ which even though relatively important for the Syrian/Gharbî perspective it offers concerning contemporary events, has nothing new to add to what is already known, except for the truly original story, related in a couple of sentences, according to which al-Ashraf was killed at 'Aqabah *after* he had performed the *hajj*; an alternative story of the same event had the sultan killed, still at 'Aqabah, on his way to Mecca, at the end of Shawwâl.⁵¹⁰ Ibn Sibât's history was in its turn used by Maronite historian, Patriarch Istfân al-Duwayhî, in his *Târikh al-Azminah*,⁵¹¹ which reproduces almost word for word the account of al-Ashraf's death in *Târikh Ibn Sibât*.⁵¹²

V. Sectional Conclusions:

Perhaps the most important finding of this first chapter is the ultimately massive indebtedness of all historians to either Ibn Duqmâq or Ibn al-Furât, or to both

⁵⁰⁶ See below, chapter two, p. 175.

⁵⁰⁷ Edited by Kamal Salibi et al. (Beirut: Dâr al-Mashreq, 1969).

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 230-1.

⁵⁰⁹ Edited by 'Umar Tadmurî, vols 1-2 (Tripoli: Jarrûs Press, 1993).

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 721. The consensus is that the sultan was murdered either on the 5th or on the 6th of Dhû al-Qa'dah in Cairo.

⁵¹¹ Edited by Butrus Fahd (Beirut: Dâr Lahad Khâtir, n.d.), pp. 323-4

⁵¹² On the complex of relations amongst Maronite chronicles and Muslim sources, see Kamal S. Salibi, *Maronite Historians of Mediæval Lebanon* (Beirut: The American University of Beirut, 1959).

simultaneously, whether directly or through the works of those who copied from either one of them, particularly al-Maqrîzî. Such an observation has an overall important impact on modern scholarship. The conclusions reached regarding the systematic interrelations between al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and Ibn al-Furât's *Târîkh al-Duwal* not only confirm what scholars had been saying all along,⁵¹³ but also put into question certain statements about the two authors, particularly the former. Thus, the often-quoted citation, allegedly al-Maqrîzî's, in which the author of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* decried the ignominious end of Turkish rule at the hands of the Circassians following Barqûq's victory over his erstwhile ally Barakah during the month of Rabî' al-Awwal 782, turns out to be a re-worked version of Ibn al-Furât's:

And the Turkish government came to an end completely. They [the Turkish *Amirs*] were pursued, executed, banished and imprisoned. **And the Circassians had already spoken among themselves, saying that there would be a great civil war that would be put down, and after it another one would break out between them and the Turks in which they would vanquish the Turks after a fight, and [then] they would be under their command. And when there was the rebellion led by Īnâl, they spoke of it aloud and so unashamedly and made it public to the degree to the degree that the most senior and the most junior of them spoke of it. And thus it indeed happened...**⁵¹⁴

This should in no any way lead one to downplay either the enmity displayed by al-Maqrîzî towards Barqûq or the importance of the former as *the*, or one of *the*, foremost ideologues of the state's decline under the Circassians: from a cursory survey of those annals of *Târîkh al-Duwal* covered by MS Chester Beatty 4125 but not by Zurayk and Izzedin's edition, it appears that the overwhelming majority of instances where the text of

⁵¹³ See above, p. 11.

⁵¹⁴ The translation is Levanoni's, "Al-Maqrîzî's account of the Transition," p. 95; see also *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, p. 385. The sections of the citation written in bold are almost identical to the equivalent text in *Târîkh al-Duwal*; "Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 75a. Al-Maqrîzî placed his 'revisited' passage at the *end* of the account about the military confrontations between Barqûq and Barakah, whereas in *Al-Muntaqâ* it appears at its beginning. There are some small parts from Ibn al-Furât's citation that did not make into al-Maqrîzî's, but they are not pivotal.

Kitâb al-Sulûk expressed hostility towards Barqûq⁵¹⁵ cannot be traced back to Ibn al-Furât. However, in view of the importance of the discovery of Chester Beatty MS 4125 by David C. Reisman, extra care should be taken by modern historians, this one included, with regard to the hypotheses they generate as a result of their research, in that they ought to insist on the non-definitive nature of their results: the discovery, classification and analysis of sources not yet edited or found, especially those mentioned by Mamluk authors themselves, then become all the more important.

Another important find is the liberty taken by various authors with historical truth. It is not argued here that the historical narrative of any one historian can be ascertained as fact; nor am I attempting here to establish the ontological veracity of the ‘factual consensus’ we discussed above. Rather, authors often appear to have chosen a certain narrative that goes against, alters or plays with the text of the source or sources they relied upon. The examples taken from Ibn Iyâs’ *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* are perhaps glaring, but many ‘second generation’ historians who depended on the works of others, had recourse to artistic license. The story of Ibn Âqbughâ Âs whose dismissal was accounted for in three different ways is a case in point: in the absence of irrefutable evidence, each one of the explanations stands on its own.⁵¹⁶ But what prompted Ibn Taghrîbirdî to ‘choose’ such a light even though tragic event as the drowning of the Husaynîyah, as his explanation for the sacking of Ibn Âqbughâ Âs, even though he had undoubtedly been exposed to Ibn Duqmâq and/or al-‘Aynî, neither of whom provided any explanation for the dismissal, and to al-Maqrîzî who along with Ibn al-Furât accounted for it by referring to the resumption of *maghânî* tax-collection? Were the interests of somebody higher up the

⁵¹⁵ Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian,” pp. 120-30.

⁵¹⁶ See above, p. 92.

Mamluk pecking order harmed by the drowning for which Ibn Âqbughâ Âs was ultimately blamed? If so, there is no hint about it in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*. The large number of these instances begs a study that, at the micro level, would use the tools of discourse analysis to account for such narrative choices.

One 'weakness' of the present chapter is that it did not allow for an in-depth analysis of Syrian sources. In order to remedy this state of affairs, the annal of the year 793 will be studied in the following chapter, precisely because it describes dramatic events which took place in Syria in general and in Damascus in particular, in which the sultan of the day, Barqûq, participated both indirectly and directly, and for which we have in our possession three different sources, namely the works of Ibn Sasrá, Ibn Hijjî and Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah.

Chapter Two
**The Mintâshî Rebellion and the military and political crises in Syria:
the Annal of the Year 793/1390-1**

I. Introductory Remarks:

The year 793 did not, on the foreign policy front, witness the kind of drama that would occur later on when Barqûq, the head of the still awe-inspiring Mamluk state, and Tamerlane exchanged threats and ultimatums in the year 796,⁵¹⁷ and skirmished on the marches of their respective empires. Neither did it witness tragic and dramatic events such as the assassination of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân in 778 or Barqûq’s own inglorious removal from power in 791 at the hands of both Mintâsh (d. 795/1393)⁵¹⁸ and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî. Politically, however, it is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable years of al-Zâhir’s reign: it represents the culmination of a series of events that started with the rebellions of the just mentioned pair, respectively, at the end of 789 and in Safar of 791;⁵¹⁹ his eviction from power in Jumâdá al-Âkhirah of 791;⁵²⁰ his exile to al-Karak and his escape therefrom in Ramadân;⁵²¹ his military feats and defeats in Syria in late 791 and early 792;⁵²² and his return to the throne in the middle of Safar 792.⁵²³ 793 was the year during which his power was finally consolidated and he was not to suffer from any major threat until his death in 801/1399.

⁵¹⁷ See, for example, *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 371-374.

⁵¹⁸ Tamurbughâ al-Ashrafî, a.k.a. Mintâsh, was a mamluk of al-Ashraf Sha‘bân who succeeded in finding himself a place in the sun in the first part of Barqûq’s reign, a period whose political history still needs to be written. It was his rebellion at the end of 789 in the city of Malatyah where he was viceroy, and the subsequent rallying of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî to his cause, which eventually led to the downfall of Barqûq in 791. On Mintâsh, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 4, pp. 94-99.

⁵¹⁹ See *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, pp. 206ff and 210ff.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 234ff.

⁵²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 268ff and 287ff.

⁵²² *Ibid.*, pp. 294ff.

⁵²³ *Ibid.*, vol. 12, pp. 3ff.

Also of interest is the very nature of the *akhbâr* of this annal. In the various histories that were examined here, reports concerning Egypt or originating in it dealt primarily with the usual and routine cycles of mulctings, firings and appointments of both civilian and military personnel, and had it not been for a few *akhbâr* concerning the depredation of Bedouins,⁵²⁴ and the steps taken during the sultan's absence in Syria by Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî, his *nâ'ib al-ghaybah*, to restrain and/or prevent social practices then common amongst the Cairene population,⁵²⁵ nothing would have differentiated 793 from other not too exciting years of the reign of al-Zâhir. What stands out though is the Syrian dimension of a large proportion of the events that were the object of reports.⁵²⁶ What took place in Syria in 793 ran the gamut of problems often encountered by Mamluk rulers in that part of their empire: intriguing on the part of former and present foes and friends; the involvement of nomadic formations, both Arab and Turcoman, in the region's political and military affairs; the power relations between the Mamluk polity and its vassal states; etc.⁵²⁷ To this, one ought to add Barqûq's own visit to Syria from Ramadân until Dhû al-Hijjah; a visit prompted by the inability of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî⁵²⁸ to score a decisive victory against Mintâsh, let alone to capture him. Last but not least is the particular state of war brought about by the 'quasi-siege' of Damascus by Mintâsh from the beginning of Rajab until the middle of Sha'bân, during which the Mintâshîs, who were entrenched outside of the western walls of Damascus

⁵²⁴ See, for example, PMA3.

⁵²⁵ See, for example, SHM20, 21 and 22. See below, pp. 152-3, 195.

⁵²⁶ This proportion varies according to the geographical location and the particularities of the historians, those of Bilâd al-Shâm being more loquacious about things Syrian than those of Egypt.

⁵²⁷ All these items will be dealt with below.

⁵²⁸ After they had taken power in Cairo following their successful rebellion against Barqûq, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and Mintâsh ended up fighting it out as a result of the coup undertaken by the latter against the former. Upon the return of Barqûq to power, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî was released from prison and later nominated viceroy of Damascus, a position that entailed, among other things, the prosecution of the war against Mintâsh; *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 6ff.

fought against the loyalists under the command of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, while the links of both groups to the Syrian hinterland remained uninterrupted.⁵²⁹ This war of attrition engendered a mass of information in the Syrian sources, about siege warfare, the topography of the Syrian capital, the multifaceted reactions of the population to the conflict, etc.

One might argue that the disturbances that accompanied Barqûq's regaining of power in late 791 and early 792, are more interesting than those of 793: in the first two years the sultan was personally involved in the fighting and it was he who spearheaded the siege of Damascus from the middle of Dhû al-Qa'dah 791 to the middle of Muḥarram 792, an episode which from the points of view noted above is as worthy of consideration as the events of 793. But tying up together the narrative elements and chronological loose ends of the events and reports of either 791 or 792, an essential component of the historiographical analysis being undertaken here, would have become so challenging because of their high numbers and density, that reaching significant conclusions would have been seriously hampered. In this context, the year 793 has the added advantage of being briefer than the other two.

From the historiographical point of view, one of the most important aspects of the year is the absence of Ibn Duqmâq. As was noted in the previous chapter,⁵³⁰ the only work written by Ibn Duqmâq that 'covers' the year 793 is the very short, sketchy and poor account of that year found in *Al-Nafḥah*. In the absence of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* manuscripts that deal with the last two decades of the eighth century AH, no definitive statements can be made about Ibn Duqmâq's contribution to the historiography of this

⁵²⁹ See especially Ibn Ṣaṣrâ, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. 76-91 and "Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî" MS Köprülü 1027, fols. 94b-99b.

⁵³⁰ Chapter one, pp. 44-6.

period. We thus have to wait until the very beginning of the ninth century, the year 804 to be more precise,⁵³¹ before we can again evaluate the importance of this historian.

The absence of Ibn Duqmâq is somewhat offset by other important historiographical features. For the year 793, two ‘versions’ of Ibn al-Furât’s *Târikh al-Duwal* are available: the edition of the original text and the recension made of it by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn al-Furât*, something which will allow for a systematic comparison of the two works, an occasion not afforded to us for the year 778. Most importantly, on top of the histories of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, which are, respectively, an amalgam of Syrian and Egyptian *akhbâr* and an Egyptian chronicle written by a Syrian *émigré* to Cairo, we have at our disposal a body of purely Syrian chronicles. Ibn Hujjî’s *Târikh Ibn Hujjî* made it possible to partly deconstruct Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* into its Furâtian and Hujjîian components, and Ibn Saṣrâ’s *Al-Durrah al-Mudî’ah* to explore important aspects of life in Syria at the end of the ninth/fourteenth century, not to mention the fact that the availability of these sources will allow for a comparison between the Syrian and Egyptian ‘schools.’

Finally, from the point of view of the historians themselves, a few comments are in order here. More historians joined the group made up of Ibn Khaldûn, Ibn al-Furât, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir and Ibn Duqmâq as contemporaries of the events of 793: al-‘Aynî at thirty-one years of age, al-Maqrîzî at twenty-seven and Ibn Hajar at twenty, were young men old enough to have either heard of, followed or been impressed by the events of this year. We thus see two of them, al-‘Aynî and Ibn Hajar, intervene directly in the main

⁵³¹ See above, p. 6 footnote no. 19, chapters one, p. 45 footnote no. 201, and three, pp. 217ff.

body of their respective works as self-conscious narrators of and/or participants in a few of the year's events.⁵³²

II. Contemporary Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. 'Abd al-Rahmân Ibn Khaldûn (732-808/1332-1406):

The text of the year 793 in Ibn Khaldûn's *Kitâb al-'Ibar* does not deviate from the fundamental format he adopted for his work. Here as in the case of 778, he presented an uninterrupted political history of the year devoid of the reports about military and civilian appointments usually found in annalistic chronicles.

His interest in things political appears at the very beginning of that section of his work comprising the events of 793: it starts with a long passage about the tribulations of the career of Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî (d. 801/1399),⁵³³ a senior Yalbughâwî emir, and his arrival in Cairo during the month of Safar.⁵³⁴ This is then followed by a very similar report dealing this time with the summoning also from Syria of yet another leading emir, Aytamish al-Bajâsî (d. 802/1399).⁵³⁵ The coming of the two to Cairo, noted Ibn Khaldûn, reflected Barqûq's renewed confidence and came as the result of the strengthening of his rule.⁵³⁶ Also to be found at the beginning of the accounts of 793, is a report about the arrival of the emissary of the ruler of Tunis with a letter from his master congratulating the sultan for his return to power: whereas in the other chronicles, this story was

⁵³² For al-'Aynî, see SHM9, and for Ibn Hajar, SHM29.

⁵³³ See "Al-Manhal," Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 112b-114a.

⁵³⁴ PMA19.

⁵³⁵ PMA37. On Aytamish al-Bajâsî, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 143-151 where al-Bajâsî was rendered as al-Bajjâsî.

⁵³⁶ *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, vol. 5, pp. 499, 500; PMA19 and 37.

expedited in two to three lines,⁵³⁷ in *Kitâb al-'Ibar* it occupies half a page and details the long links between the two rulers. Here Ibn Khaldûn showed his interest in things diplomatic and in matters pertaining to his region of origin, the Maghrib.

The rest of the events deal with *the* political story of the year, Mintâsh's on-going rebellion against the sultan. This section has three important characteristics: first, we are dealing here with a continuous narrative replete with all that entails on the part of Ibn Khaldûn in terms of efforts at clarity; second, even though he reworked those reports of *Târîkh al-Duwal* he used and sometimes strayed from them, his indebtedness to Ibn al-Furât is evident; thirdly, he relied on a source or on sources depicting in some detail political and military events in Syria.

With regard to the first characteristic, Ibn Khaldûn provided in his narrative numerous pieces of information to facilitate its flow and to weave together its components, a concern not found in the works of most authors of annalistic histories. Thus, probably in reference to the events of the previous year, he set the stage for the story about Mintâsh by stating that the latter had been in the company of Turcomans ever since he parted ways with the Arabs, and that when, in the middle of 793, he took the decision to head towards Damascus, he did so, as some said, reported Ibn Khaldûn, as a result of the enticement of al-Nâsirî who was planning to capture him.⁵³⁸ In another instance, Ibn Khaldûn accounted for the departure of Barqûq for Syria, just after the sentence in which he noted the ongoing warring in Damascus: Mintâsh's siege of the city and the fighting there had lasted for most of Rajab and Sha'bân, and the sultan decided to

⁵³⁷ FA1.

⁵³⁸ PMA86. Here Ibn Khaldûn echoes PMA5 in which Ibn al-Furât and those who relied on his work mentioned a deception used by Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and Aytamish al-Bajâsî during the month of Muḥarram to attract the Mintâshîs of Damascus out of their hideouts.

act when news about it reached him and made him worry about al-Nâsirî and his lack of determination in dealing with Mintâsh.⁵³⁹

Using such pivotal information in order to produce an uninterrupted account of numerous events is all the more important in view of the fact that, at a very basic level, the ‘raw material’ of the narrative in *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* is made up of reports authored by others, primarily Ibn al-Furât.⁵⁴⁰ Even though Ibn Khaldûn sometimes summarized and/or rephrased his words, the influence of Ibn al-Furât can be seen in the following passage drawn from PMA95, one amongst many:

Ibn al-Furât: “...*wa-nazala* [Mintâsh] *bi-al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ wa-nazala al-umarâ’ al-ladhîn ma’ahu fi buyût al-ladhî hawl al-Qaṣr wa-anzala jamâ’ah min ashâbihi fi jâmi’ Tankiz wa-jamâ’ah fi jâmi’ Yalbughâ.*” [*Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 255]

Ibn Khaldûn: “...*fa-nazala* [Mintâsh] *bi-al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ wa-anzala al-umarâ’ al-ladhîn ma’ahu fi al-buyût hawâlî al-Qaṣr wa-fi jâmi’ Shakan wa-jâmi’ Baybuḡâ.*” [*Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 501]⁵⁴¹

The filiation between the two authors is self-evident in this particular passage. In others,⁵⁴² it is less blatant but still discernible in terms of the choice of story items and their order of appearance. Thus, in PMA269, contrary to Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Khaldûn refrained from describing the present sent to the sultan while he was on his way to Aleppo by the Turcoman chief Sûlî Dûlghâdir,⁵⁴³ but he did note, like the author of *Târîkh al-*

⁵³⁹ Ibn Khaldûn was not the only historian to make note of this pivotal piece of information and to use it to explain the sultan’s decision to go to Syria as Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir and al-‘Aynî also did; see PMA104, the references therein and the discussion below, pp. 131-2, concerning Ibn Khaldûn’s sources about Syria.

⁵⁴⁰ It is possible that the authors of *Târîkh al-Duwal* and *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* used a common source directly. As was noted in the previous chapter, Ibn Khaldûn’s accounts are written in such a particular way that it is difficult to establish with great certainty their indebtedness to either Ibn Duqmâḡ or Ibn al-Furât, authors of works *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* is close to. In the absence of the accounts of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* for 793, it will be impossible to completely rule out a common source for Ibn Khaldûn and Ibn al-Furât.

⁵⁴¹ The names in the citation from *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* are obviously typos: Ibn Khaldûn’s work still awaits a thorough scientific edition. Al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ, the mosques of Tankiz and Yalbughâ are all located west of the citadel; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 36 footnote no. 216, p. 114 footnote no. 688.

⁵⁴² Such as PMA48, 49, 87, 88 and 91, etc.

⁵⁴³ Along with Sâlim al-Dûkârî, Dûlghâdir is frequently mentioned in the events of the year 793. On Sûlî and his family, see J.H. Mordtmann and V.L. Ménage, “Dhû’l-Kadr,” in *EF*, vol. 2, pp. 246-7 and *Al-Manhal*, vol. 6, pp. 183-6. As for Sâlim al-Dûkârî, apart from the obituary of a person, Dimashq Khujâ ibn

Duwal, the arrival of a delegation from the tribe of ‘Īsá and Muhannâ⁵⁴⁴ pledging loyalty to him: the wording is somewhat different, but the contents are the same.

Things become more problematic however when dealing with the reports of Syrian origin and/or dealing with Syria. The problem lies in the fact that despite a number of similarities between them and those of other historians, it is close to impossible to determine their genealogy. For example, as was noted above,⁵⁴⁵ Ibn Khaldûn, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir and al-‘Aynî used Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî’s alleged disloyalty to explain the sultan’s decision to go to Syria: all three authors placed PMA104 at more or less the same stage of their narrative, but save for a cluster of identical words in *Kitâb al-‘Ibar* and *‘Iqd al-Jumân*,⁵⁴⁶ there is hardly any resemblance between these two sources and *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*. The same problem can be seen in PMA241,⁵⁴⁷ the report about al-Nâsirî’s reception of the sultan when the latter entered Southern Syria on his way to Damascus. All the accounts of this report have a word or words in common, particularly those used to describe Barqûq’s behaviour towards al-Nâsirî,⁵⁴⁸ but Ibn Khaldûn said that the meeting took place at Qâqûn,⁵⁴⁹ Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir⁵⁵⁰ at al-Lajjûn,⁵⁵¹ and Ibn Saṣrâ at al-

Sâlim al-Dûkârî, who appears to be his son, and the scattered references throughout contemporary and later histories, I have not as of yet located detailed information about him; *Al-Manhal*, vol. 5, pp. 324-5.

⁵⁴⁴ The tribal formation of renegade Arab Emir Nu‘ayr ibn Hayyâr; on him see “Al-Manhal,” *Dâr al-Kutub* 13475 MS *târikh*, fols. 812a-813a. On the Arab tribes during this period see M.A. Hiyari, “The origins and Development of the Amirate of the Arabs During the Seventh/Thirteenth and Eighth/Fourteenth Centuries,” in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 38:3 (1975), pp. 508-24; A.S. Tritton, “The Tribes of Syria in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” in *ibid.*, vol. 11 (1943-6), pp. 567-73.

⁵⁴⁵ See above, footnote no. 539.

⁵⁴⁶ Ibn Khaldûn: “*Wa lammâ balagha al-khabar ilâ al-Sultân...*” [*Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 500]

Al-‘Aynî: “*...wa-balagha al-khabar bi-dhâlika ilâ al-Sultân...*” [“*‘Iqd al-Jumân*,” Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 97a]

⁵⁴⁷ See also, PMA192 and 244, for similar features. More on PMA241, below, pp. 161 and 163.

⁵⁴⁸ For example, the verb “*tarajjala*” used by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, Ibn Khaldûn and al-‘Aynî.

⁵⁴⁹ Qâqûn was a fortress located off the coast half way between Gaza and Northern Palestine; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 245, footnote no. 1481. In *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, the name of this locality is given as Qânûn.

⁵⁵⁰ See PMA241 and references therein. More importantly, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah in his *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* also referred to al-Lajjûn; it might very well be that this report was taken from Ibn Hijjî, even though, in the light of what will be argued below, it is impossible to confirm; see below, pp. 185-8.

Ghawr!⁵⁵² Finally, adding to the confusion, there is the problem of chronological inconsistency in PMA184, a report mentioned only by Ibn Khaldûn and Syrian authors, namely, Ibn Saṣrâ, Ibn Hījġî and Ibn Qâḏġi Shuhbah. According to what can be gleaned from the Syrian sources, on the 16th of Sha‘bân, Tumântamur, a pillar of the Mintâshġ camp deserted and joined al-Nâṣirġ;⁵⁵³ this desertion and the fear that more would take place led Mintâsh to lift his siege of the Syrian capital; on the following day, al-Nâṣirġ would experience a crushing defeat at the hands of Nu‘ayr at Dumayr.⁵⁵⁴ Curiously, Ibn Khaldûn placed the desertion of Tumântamur *after* the battle of Dumayr, contrary to what contemporaries who lived through the events maintained.

What is to be made with all this? One way out is to present possible scenarios for each one of the three reports analyzed above. In the case of PMA104, we might argue first, that it originates with *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, whose words were altered by the other historians who made use of it; second, that the whole issue is mere coincidence, a requirement for the easy flow of the narrative used by these authors; and third, that there is a third source used by all and adapted differently to fit each author’s individual work. Concerning Yalbughâ al-Nâṣirġ’s meeting with the sultan, because of the variety of locales, we might posit the following: either all the authors used a common source⁵⁵⁵ but played around with historical truth and thus made al-Nâṣirġ welcome the sultan to Syria in

⁵⁵¹ Al-Lajġûn is located about twenty miles north of Qâqûn; see William Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 48 and map no. 13.

⁵⁵² A region of the Jordan valley located south of Tiberias Lake; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 87, footnote no. 511. All the locales mentioned here are part of one of the routes from Gaza to Damascus; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria Under the Circassian Sultans*, vol. 15, p. 48 and map. no. 13. This route includes a halt at Irbid, a city where, according to Ibn Duqmâq, the sultan stopped on his way to Damascus; see PMA245.

⁵⁵³ In *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, it is Yamâztamur. PMA184 is discussed below; see pp. 133, 143 footnote no. 618.

⁵⁵⁴ When talking about this battle, sources actually refer to ‘Adhra’ and Dumayr, two villages of the Ghûṭah located north-east of Damascus, together; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 125 footnotes no. 740 and 741; on the significance of this battle, see also below, pp. 132, 143-4, 175, 184 and 196-7.

⁵⁵⁵ Maybe Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm* or some other unknown Syrian source or sources?

three different places [!], or we are in the presence of three different strains of *akhbâr*, namely Ibn Khaldûn's unknown source (Qâqûn), Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's (al-Lajjûn) and Ibn Saṣrâ's (al-Ghawr) or even more.⁵⁵⁶ For PMA184, we have Ibn Khaldûn's unknown source, and, here again, Ibn Hiji's and Ibn Saṣrâ's own different eyewitness and/or first-hand accounts.

As to the 'other' source or sources assumed to be lurking in the background, even though we lack the evidence to make a decisive identification, there are some clues as to what the environment in which it was produced might have been. In his edition of Ibn Saṣrâ's *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah*, Brinner noted that the list of the *nâ'ibs* of Damascus presented by the author within the framework of the annal of 799⁵⁵⁷ was similar to that of Ibn Tûlûn (d. 953/1546) in his *I'lâm al-Warâ bi-man Wuliya Nâ'iban min al-Atrâk bi-Dimashq al-Shâm al-Kubrâ*.⁵⁵⁸ The section of *I'lâm al-Warâ* that dealt with the period between 658-863/1260-1458 is basically the recension of a work on the same topic written by one Shams al-Dîn al-Zamalkânî⁵⁵⁹ to which Ibn Tûlûn added comments and corrections.⁵⁶⁰ Brinner hypothesized that al-Zamalkânî's "work, which has not otherwise been preserved, seems to have been based on the same source as that used by Ibn Saṣrâ considerably later."⁵⁶¹ The point here is that there appears to have been in Syria a number

⁵⁵⁶ We could be dealing with two more different strains of *akhbâr*: first, al-'Aynî who provided details not found elsewhere, namely the description of the horse on which Barqûq made Yalbughâ ride; second, Ibn Hiji who, as we argued earlier in footnote no. 550, is probably the source of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's report. A variety of other combinations can, of course, be considered.

⁵⁵⁷ *Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. 235-252.

⁵⁵⁸ Edited by Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmân (Damascus: Dâr al-Fikr, 1984) [hereafter *I'lâm al-Warâ*]; see also, Henri Laoust, editor and translator, *Les Gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamlouks et les premiers Ottomans* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1952) [hereafter *Gouverneurs*].

⁵⁵⁹ About al-Zamalkânî, nothing is known except that he died during or after the year 863/1458; *Gouverneurs*, pp. xxviii ff.

⁵⁶⁰ *I'lâm al-Warâ*, p. 30.

⁵⁶¹ *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. xviii. Another historian is mentioned by Ibn Tûlûn in the first pages of *I'lâm al-Warâ*, one 'Alî al-Yaldânî (d. 814/1412), yet another Damascene who also wrote about the same topic. Ibn Tûlûn noted that he had not used that source even though the historian Taqî al-Dîn al-Asadî noted

of authors who were not particularly famous but whose historical works or oral reports were nevertheless used either by their contemporaries or by later historians.

The bottom line is that beyond establishing the existence of a Furâtian and Syrian strain of *akhbâr* in the *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, there is no way of ascertaining the identity of the latter group of reports.

B. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir ibn Badr al-Dîn Ibn Habîb al-Halabî (after 740–808/1340–1406):

In the previous chapter, we have indicated that starting with the year 788, but especially with 789, there is a propensity on the part of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir to use less and less *saj'* in his reports and to make more and more space for narratives of political events.⁵⁶² This trend is evident in the annal of the year 793: of a total of about twenty-four folios, eleven⁵⁶³ relate the political and military events of the year, notably the sultan's trip to Syria. Still, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir does not seem to have departed from the fundamental format of his father's work described in the previous chapter, in that he paid little attention to issues which were unimportant to the eyes of the Syrian-born and raised, Egyptian *littérateur* and civil servant that he was.⁵⁶⁴ However, more so than in the case of the year 778, one can get a much clearer picture of the overall unfolding of key events,

its existence in his *Târikh*; pp. 29-30 and *Gouverneurs*, p. xvii. Ibn Tûlûn quoted two of this al-Asadî's works, his *Dhayl* and *Târikh*: p. 29, year 814; p. 60, year 817 and p. 66, year 836. Is the historian Taqî al-Dîn no other than Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, one of whose *nisab* is al-Asadî? In the light of what we know about him, we might assume so, since Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah did write histories covering the years noted above; see Darwish's French Introduction, pp. 19-27, notably p. 27. One comment concerning the introduction to the French translation of *I'lâm al-Warâ*: Laoust was wrong in assuming that the Sayyid al-Husaynî whose *Dhayl alâ 'Ibar al-Dhabî* Ibn Tûlûn used to complement the data presented by al-Zamalkânî, was Hamzah ibn Ahmad al-Dimashqî al-Husaynî (d. 874/1469), since the Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Hamzah al-Husaynî who actually wrote this *dhayl* died in 765/1364; see *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 3, pp. 163-4; Duhmân's introduction to *I'lâm al-Warâ*, p. 13, and Darwish's French "Introduction," p. 36.

⁵⁶² See above, chapter one, p. 37.

⁵⁶³ Reports about appointment that contain a core of historical data but which are submerged by the usual stock formulae used by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir have not been included in this calculation; see, for example, RL16, the *khavar* concerning the appointment of Jamâl al-Dîn al-Qaysarî as *Hanafî qâdî al-quḍât* in Cairo.

⁵⁶⁴ See chapter one, pp. 40-1.

notably in Syria where most of the important ‘action’ was. And it is precisely its inclusion of a fair share of *akhbâr* pertaining to Syria, some mentioned only obliquely or not at all by other historians, that *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* stands out, especially in view of its own ‘limited’ format.

Thus, with the exception of religious appointments that took place in both regional poles of the Mamluk Empire, there are no reports that deal specifically with Egypt. All three military appointments are to Syrian *niyâbâhs*⁵⁶⁵ and most of the political/military events⁵⁶⁶ that are reported by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir take place in Syria, such as military operations,⁵⁶⁷ details about the itinerary of the sultan from Egypt thereto;⁵⁶⁸ his arrival and stay in Damascus at the end of Ramadân,⁵⁶⁹ his trip to Aleppo and his stay there⁵⁷⁰ and his return to Cairo by means of Damascus⁵⁷¹ at the end of the year.⁵⁷²

The Syrian ‘dimension’ of many of the reports in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* is likely due to the very position of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir. It is probable that he received his Syrian

⁵⁶⁵ PMA298. Interestingly, these appointments and those of religious figures occur haphazardly in the main body of the text and their appearance does not seem to obey any chronological consideration.

⁵⁶⁶ Only a handful of these, such as the few details about the preparations for the sultan’s departure to Syria, took place in Egypt; see PMA199, 200, 217 and 224.

⁵⁶⁷ These would include, among others, the skirmishes between the forces of Syrian *nâ’ibs* and those of Mintâsh at ‘Ayntâb, which, prior to the coming of the loyalist troops, was on the verge of falling into the hands of Mintâsh after enduring much suffering [PMA9]; the arrival of Mintâsh in Damascus at the very beginning of Rajab, and the beginning of warfare around the city [PMA87, 91 and 98]; the encounter between the loyalists and the rebels at al-Kiswah, south of Damascus, at the end of Sha’bân, following the lifting of the siege of the city by Mintâsh earlier in the middle of the month [PMA215 and 233]; the raids ordered by the sultan against the Turcomans upon reaching Aleppo at the end of Shawwâl [PMA280], etc. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir is the only historian, along with Ibn Saṣrâ, to report some of the events taking place in Northern Syria which would eventually lead to Mintâsh’s long dash to Damascus, namely the military activity of loyalist Syrian troops there, starting at the end of 792 and spilling into the early months of 793: PMA7 and PMA8 are exclusive to Ibn Saṣrâ, and PMA9 to Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, while PMA33 is common to both; by common, I do not mean identical. For other Syrian-related *akhbâr* peculiar to *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, see PMA282, 293, 302 and 309.

⁵⁶⁸ PMA230 and 232.

⁵⁶⁹ PMA241, 244, 246 and 248.

⁵⁷⁰ PMA258, 264, 267, 274, 280, etc.

⁵⁷¹ PMA299, 302, 309, 314, 321 and 326. PMA302 and 309, which describe the sultan’s arrival in, respectively, Hama and Homs on his way back to Damascus, are unique to *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*.

⁵⁷² Many of the reports mentioned in the previous seven footnotes are common only to Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir and Syrian authors. See Tables II. 1. A. and II. 1. B. in volume two of this dissertation.

data, limited as they may be,⁵⁷³ from an extended network of acquaintances in his land of origin,⁵⁷⁴ something which was then made easier by the position he occupied in the chancery, the department of the Mamluk bureaucracy responsible, among other things, for the correspondence of the sultan.⁵⁷⁵ It is also possible that he himself was part of the sultan's expedition to Syria. Even though he made no mention of his own person, he did note in his work that most men of the sword and men of the pen accompanied the sultan at the end of Sha'bân 793 on his expedition to Syria, and that only very few functionaries and emirs remained in Egypt in the service of Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî, the *nâ'ib al-ghaybah*.⁵⁷⁶ That he might have been part of the movement of the court to Syria⁵⁷⁷ is likely since he was still in the employ of the state in 793.⁵⁷⁸ This can be seen in the numerous details in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* about Barqûq's movements between Egypt and Syria.⁵⁷⁹

But which of the following, his probable spatial proximity to Barqûq during his trip, the opportunistic requirements of his career as a Mamluk bureaucrat or the

⁵⁷³ His reports are limited in terms of both their quantity and depth when compared to Ibn Ṣagrâ's and Ibn Hiji's rich and dense narratives. There is nothing for example in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* about the siege of Damascus, save for the report about Mintâsh's arrival in the city and the mention of the raid his lieutenant Shukr Ahmad launched inside of it; see above, footnote no. 567.

⁵⁷⁴ Such a network could have been established by members of his own family, namely his father and his uncle Sharaf al-Dîn Husayn, whose biographies mention their travels between Syria and Egypt during their lifetime; see *Al-Durar al-Kâminah*, vol. 2, p. 29 and vol. 4, p. 104; *Durrat al-Aslâk*, fol. 132b.

⁵⁷⁵ On those attributions of *dîwân al-inshâ'*, where Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir is reported to have worked, which are relevant here, see Petry, *Civilian Elite*, p. 204-5, and Martel-Thoumian, *Civils et Administration*, pp. 40-1.

⁵⁷⁶ "Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk," fols. 267a-b; see PMA199 and 200.

⁵⁷⁷ This would not have been the first visit he made to his homeland after his installation in Egypt at an unknown date: as late as 791, he recorded in his work that he was in the company of Yûnus al-Nawrûzî, Barqûq's *dawâdâr*, when the latter, on his way to Egypt after his defeat at the hands of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, was killed in Syria in Rabî' al-Thâni by the Arab tribal leader 'Anqâ' ibn Shaṭî (d. 794/1391); see *ibid.*, fol. 239a and the obituary of Yûnus in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 320.

⁵⁷⁸ Even though it is impossible to ascertain Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's presence in the chancery in the year 793, it is probable that he was working in this office, because as far down as 795 he is placed there by one of the sources: Ibn al-Furât cited a written *khavar* from Ibn Duqmâq (an echo of which can be found in *Al-Nafḥah*, pp. 269-270) where the latter reported hearing the information from Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir who is presented as one of the secretaries of the *dast* and the scribe of an Emir Qulumṭây al-'Uthmânî; *Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 247-8.

⁵⁷⁹ See above, footnotes no. 568, 570 and 571.

primordial allegiance to a Muslim chief of state, can account for his very loyalist stand in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk*, another characteristic of this work? Maybe a combination of the three; but regardless, he was consistent in his reverential approach to Barqûq and his enmity towards his foes.⁵⁸⁰ This can be seen in his reporting of Mintâsh's dash towards Damascus already mentioned above: whereas all the other sources, including the Syrians,⁵⁸¹ were clear concerning the peaceful overtaking of cities (Hama, Homs, etc.) by the Mintâshîs on their way south, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir was the only one to comment that they had abused the inhabitants of Hama.⁵⁸² To this, one might want to add the harsh words he had for Mintâsh and especially Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî⁵⁸³ in the narrative of the chronicle, which are paralleled by praises for the Sultan.⁵⁸⁴

What is the significance of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir at the historiographical level? It has been shown above that it is possible that he made use of a network of Syrian informants, and/or had gone to Syria that very year, that he worked in a department where dealing with information was an important aspect of work, and that he generally reported less *akhbâr* than others. That we can, in the light of the factors just mentioned, account for a large portion of his reports, precludes to a large extent, the possibility that he used *identifiable* sources, especially for his reports on Syria. His writing style is unique, and a collation of reports that have a common theme, found in the *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk* and in

⁵⁸⁰ It is true that he was very reverential to al-Ashraf Sha'bân in his obituary in the annal of the year 778, but he still did include in it a certain number of criticisms; see chapter one, pp. 41-2.

⁵⁸¹ PMA87. With regard to this report, it is noteworthy that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah used mostly Ibn al-Furât's account in *Târikh al-Duwal*. Even Ibn Saṣrâ's chronicle is devoid of information about any alleged wrongdoing on the part of Mintâsh and his men.

⁵⁸² "Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk," Bodleian Marsh 319, fol. 264a.

⁵⁸³ See, for example, PMA104 and his scathing obituary in *ibid.*, fols. 271b-272a.

⁵⁸⁴ PMA246.

contemporary works, shows no convincing evidence of similarity amongst them.⁵⁸⁵ Then, he either had access, as was argued above, to special sources of information about Syria,⁵⁸⁶ or he disguised, whether wilfully or not, data that he borrowed from contemporary works.

The annal of 793 in this chronicle does give us a certain picture of this year's event, but it is far from complete. The overall paucity of data in Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's work has two consequences: first, even though he might have relied on written sources, it is less than likely that his work would have preserved important data from an otherwise no longer extant history; and second, there are no indications that his non-biographical reports have found their way into the works of other historians.⁵⁸⁷ He did however have an impact on other historians as he is one of the most often quoted sources in the obituaries section of contemporary and later chronicles.⁵⁸⁸ Ultimately, the originality of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* lies in the person of Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, a man with a foot in both his homeland of Aleppo and his Cairene place of residence, a situation that greatly influenced him and his work. The whole purpose of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* appears to have been to inform the reader in a peculiar literary style, from a Syro-Egyptian perspective, about the civilian *a'yân* of the Mamluk Sultanate, while providing

⁵⁸⁵ There is a cluster of words contained in a report that might indicate that he either borrowed from Ibn al-Furât, or the exact opposite. But this will be dealt with below in the section about Ibn al-Furât, since it is more likely that the latter borrowed from Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir than the other way around; see below, pp. 149-50.

⁵⁸⁶ These might have included written sources not available today; on this see above, pp. 133-4, and below, p. 201.

⁵⁸⁷ There is however the possibility that some small sections, words really, from some of his reports might have found their way into the works of others; see below, p. 190 footnote no. 839.

⁵⁸⁸ Attested borrowings from *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* are too numerous to be mentioned; for the year 778, see above, footnote no. 198, and for 793, see, for example, Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 286-7.

information about the military elite, without however dwelling upon the vicissitudes of political history.

C. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq (745-809/1349-1407-8):

The loss of Dâr al-Kutub MS *târikh* 1740, which supposedly contains the *Nuzhat al-Anâm* annal of the year 793, leaves historians with *Al-Nafḥah* as the only source written by Ibn Duqmâq. Had it not been for the acknowledged status of Ibn Duqmâq as an important source for the early Circassian period, *Al-Nafḥah* would have been deservedly relegated to the Minor Historians section, so poor are its contents for the year 793.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the meagre slightly more than two pages⁵⁸⁹ dealing with this year that would have allowed a historian to properly reconstruct its major events. The existence of a cluster of ‘meaty’ *akḥbâr* that deal with Barqûq’s stay in Aleppo at the end of Dhû al-Qa‘dah,⁵⁹⁰ might allow us to reach some conclusions regarding the genealogy of accounts found in the works of other historians, but there is hardly anything original in the rest of the text except the mention by the author of the sultan’s stop, unreported by others, at Irbid on his way to Damascus.⁵⁹¹

D. Nâsir al-Dîn Ibn al-Furât (735-807/1335-1405):

For the year 793, even if weak on reports about and from Syria, Ibn al-Furât’s chronicle is the most copious and comprehensive of all surviving historical works produced during this period. About half of the *akḥbâr* in Table II. 1. A. can be found in *Târikh al-Duwal*, the highest proportion in all the chronicles examined in this research. The great majority of historians who wrote about this period are either directly indebted

⁵⁸⁹ Pages 262-4.

⁵⁹⁰ PMA288, 294 and 296.

⁵⁹¹ PMA245.

to it or, knowingly or unknowingly, incorporated its reports by means of a third party. Ibn Khaldûn relied on it, and so did al-‘Aynî,⁵⁹² Ibn Hajar,⁵⁹³ Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah,⁵⁹⁴ and especially al-Maqrîzî whose *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, nothing but a ‘slimmer’ version of *Târikh al-Duwal*,⁵⁹⁵ was to become the foundation for the works of historians such as Ibn Taghrîbirdî,⁵⁹⁶ Ibn Iyâs and others⁵⁹⁷

But even if it probably constitutes the most important of sources, at least for political events concerning Egypt and general political/administrative/religious appointments, it contains none of the *wealth* of information found in the works of Syrian authors about the nearly two months⁵⁹⁸ of fighting in and around Damascus, between the Mîntâshîs and a Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî unable or unwilling to defeat the sultan’s foes. This aspect of the battles in Damascus was very well ‘covered’ by Ibn Sasrá and Ibn Hijjî, and one has to wait until Barqûq’s departure from Cairo,⁵⁹⁹ before the appearance in *Târikh al-Duwal* of *akhbâr* from or about Bilâd al-Shâm sometimes paralleling those of the two Syrian authors, and sometimes exceeding them in details, such as the reports about the sultan’s stay in Aleppo and the events surrounding it.⁶⁰⁰ It is not that Ibn al-Furât did not include in his work information about Syria prior to the sultan’s trip there. He actually *did*, but these data lacked details and are of a second-hand nature since they were brought to Cairo by post-riders or by representatives of both Syrian and Egyptian military office-

⁵⁹² See below, pp. 154-5

⁵⁹³ See chapter one, pp. 81-2, and below, pp. 166-7.

⁵⁹⁴ See chapter one, pp. 116-7, and below, pp. 204-5.

⁵⁹⁵ See chapter one, pp. 70-1, and below, pp. 157-9.

⁵⁹⁶ For 793 at least; see below, p. 189. Research in chapter one has shown that for the year 778, Ibn Taghrîbirdî relied on a Duqmâqian source, either Ibn Duqmâq’s work itself, or one based on it, such as al-‘Aynî’s.

⁵⁹⁷ See below, pp. 192-3, 194-5 and 198.

⁵⁹⁸ Rajab and Sha‘bân.

⁵⁹⁹ *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 259ff; PMA201.

⁶⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 266-271. See especially PMA294, 296, 297 and 298.

holders shuttling between the two regions. The analysis of this type of reports in the *Tarīkh al-Duwal* might help clarify the reasons behind certain inconsistencies between this chronicle, on the one hand, and mainly Syrian sources, on the other: in the case of some reports, there is a systematic difference in the way Ibn al-Furât's *akhbâr* from Syria *via* post-riders and messengers described what was going on there, and the evidence presented by Ibn Hijjî and Ibn Sasrá.

The first report about events in Damascus was that brought on the 5th of Rajab by Kumushbughâ al-Sarâytamurî, the *dawâdâr* of Qarâdamurdâsh al-Ahmadî (d.794/1392)⁶⁰¹ the then viceroy of Aleppo, who informed people in Cairo about the arrival of Mintâsh in the Syrian capital.⁶⁰² The second report⁶⁰³ arrived on the 27th of Rajab by means of a post-rider with news that Mintâsh had been defeated and was besieged at Qasr al-Ablaq,⁶⁰⁴ this had occurred after the coming of loyalist soldiers from Gaza and of Arghûn Shâh al-Ibrâhîmî (d. 801/1398),⁶⁰⁵ the emir Barqûq had recently nominated *hâjib al-hujjâb* of Damascus.⁶⁰⁶ The Syrian sources do not agree with this turn of events. First, if one considers that it takes about four days for a post-rider to do the Damascus – Cairo route,⁶⁰⁷ the only victory the messenger could have been referring to was the retaking on the 23rd of this month by al-Nâsirî and the loyalist forces of an important landmark, the building of Bahâdur,⁶⁰⁸ but no mention is made of a defeat of the

⁶⁰¹ On him see "Al-Manhal," Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târīkh*, fols. 589b-590b.

⁶⁰² PMA118.

⁶⁰³ PMA146.

⁶⁰⁴ A palace built by al-Zâhir Baybars outside of the city's western wall; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 36, footnote no. 216.

⁶⁰⁵ On him see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 323-4 and *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 2, p. 367.

⁶⁰⁶ PMA75.

⁶⁰⁷ Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 45.

⁶⁰⁸ This building was probably located just west of the city's walls in an area which included Yalbughâ's mosque, al-Maydân and the Qasr al-Ablaq, from which the Mintâshîs were conducting their siege of the city; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 115, footnote no. 693.

rebels significant enough to lead to their flight from the city, which is one of the claims of the second messenger.⁶⁰⁹ Moreover, according to *Târikh Ibn Hujjî*, Arghûn Shâh al-Ibrâhîmî reached Damascus only on the 13th of Sha‘bân,⁶¹⁰ after a detour through Safad and Irbid.⁶¹¹ Even more surprising is that, as in the case of later reports arriving in Cairo, no mention was made of the defeat⁶¹² at ‘Aqabat al-Tînah,⁶¹³ on the 6th of Rajab, at the hands Mintâshîs and Yamanî tribesmen,⁶¹⁴ of a Barqûqî party from the Biqâ‘ comprising Ibn al-Hanash,⁶¹⁵ Tankizbughâ, the viceroy of Baalbek, and Qaysî tribesmen and others, on their way to help al-Nâsirî.

Even more at odds with events on the ground in Syria are two reports dated at the beginning of Ramadân. On the first of that month, a letter [PMA223] was brought to Cairo by a messenger from the sultan who was on his way to Syria but had not yet reached Qatyâ, at the gates of the Sinai peninsula, the contents of which were that Mintâsh had been defeated and had escaped from Damascus. A few days later, on the 4th, Emir Sûdûn al-Tayyâr al-Zâhirî arrived in Cairo [PMA226] with briefs from the sultan confirming to those in Cairo the veracity of this news, and informing them that Mintâsh

⁶⁰⁹ PMA159 has the same kind of inconsistency: on the 5th of Sha‘bân, the mamluk of the viceroy of Safad reached Cairo with news, yet again, of Mintâsh’s escape from Damascus and his pursuit by Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî. Not only do the Syrian sources *not* mention any flight on the part of Mintâsh and his Turcomans, but they do note that the latter had retaken the building of Bahâdur from the loyalists, thus causing them great loss!

⁶¹⁰ PMA182.

⁶¹¹ PMA139.

⁶¹² PMA120. On the historiographical ramifications of this battle, see below, pp. 173-5.

⁶¹³ A spot probably located halfway between Baalbek and Damascus in the Anti-Lebanon Range; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 112, footnote no. 676.

⁶¹⁴ This party was led by Shukr Ahmad (a.k.a. Ahmad Shukr) and Ibn Hilâl al-Dawlah, a Yamanî leader from al-Zabadânî region west of Damascus; see *ibid.*, p. 106, footnote no. 632; on Shukr Ahmad, see also below, pp. 145, 151, 171 and 174.

⁶¹⁵ Son of Ibn al-Hanash, an important tribal chief from the Biqâ‘ who supported Barqûq during the disturbances of 791-793 and was executed by Mintâsh in Rabî‘ al-Thânî 792; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 16, footnote no. 106, and the sources cited herein, and p. 83; ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn would in his turn meet his maker on the 16th of Sha‘bân at the battle of Dumayr; pp. 80-1; see also PMA187 and 192. On al-Hanash family, see F. Hours and K. Salibi, “Muhammad Ibn al-Hanash, muqaddam de la Biqâ‘, 1499-1518, un épisode peu connu de l’histoire libanaise,” in *Mélanges de l’Université Saint-Joseph*, vol. XLIII (1968), pp. 3-23, but especially, pp. 3-5, for the period being studied here.

was under siege at the citadel of al-Zur‘ah.⁶¹⁶ The most striking aspect of these two reports is that while it was true that Mintâsh had finally fled Damascus⁶¹⁷ on the 16th of Sha‘bân⁶¹⁸ and that Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî had managed to beat a party of Mintâshîs at al-Kiswah⁶¹⁹ on the 27th,⁶²⁰ the sultan and the Cairenes still had not yet been informed about the crushing defeat suffered by Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî at the hands of Nu‘ayr near the village of Dumayr on the 17th of that month!⁶²¹ News concerning this battle in which one of the sons of Manjak al-Yûsufî⁶²² was killed,⁶²³ reached Cairo, according to Ibn al-Furât, during the first decade of Ramadân,⁶²⁴ at a time when Barqûq was in Palestine on his way to Syria.

It is tempting to attribute the inconsistencies pointed out above to the vicissitudes of historical writing or to mere coincidence: that Ibn al-Furât simply included in his work material that was available to him,⁶²⁵ and that news brought to Cairo by messengers simply did not deem it important to mention the defeat at Dumayr. But equally plausible,

⁶¹⁶ A town in the Hawrân region of Syria; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 128 footnote no. 759.

⁶¹⁷ PMA185. News about Mintâsh’s flight was again brought to Cairo on the 6th of Sha‘bân [PMA228] and the 13th of Ramadân [PMA240]

⁶¹⁸ This was caused by the betrayal of one of his right-hand men, Tumântamur; PMA184.

⁶¹⁹ A village located south of Damascus; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 74, footnote no. 453, and the references therein. The name was rendered al-Kuswah by Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 48; see below, pp. 197 and 199.

⁶²⁰ PMA215.

⁶²¹ With regard to PMA223, it is noteworthy that al-Maqrîzî did mention the 16th of Sha‘bân as the date of Mintâsh’s defeat, his flight really, but not the savaging of the loyalists the following day.

⁶²² A former viceroy of Syria and a ‘mentor’ of Barqûq during his youth; see above, chapter one, p. 28. According to Mignanelli, three sons of his, Ibrâhîm, ‘Umar and Faraj, had supported Barqûq’s bid to return to power in 791 after he came out of al-Karak; Walter J. Fischel, “*Ascensus Barcoch* (II): A Latin Biography of the Mamlûk Sultan Barqûq of Egypt (d. 1399) Written by B. de Mignanelli in 1416,” in *Arabica* 6 (1959) p. 155.

⁶²³ The sources are not too clear about the casualties of this battle. Ibn Saqrâ claimed that one thousand two hundred and sixty people were killed on both sides while Ibn Khaldûn mentioned fifteen Syrian emirs dead [PMA192]. The same confusion exists as to which one of Manjak’s sons died at Dumayr: Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Khaldûn and Ibn Hîjjî noted that it was Ibrâhîm, while Ibn Saqrâ stated it was ‘Umar [PMA192]. The only reference in the sources to Faraj, it that of Ibn Hîjjî who noted that on the 12th of Sha‘bân, his house was looted by the populace during the battle of al-Qanawât [PMA179].

⁶²⁴ PMA239.

⁶²⁵ Even if these reports were originally authored by another writer, say Ibn Duqmâq, the inconsistencies pointed out above would still hold, unless it can be shown that Ibn al-Furât falsely claimed that post-riders and the like brought these news to Cairo when in reality it was not the case.

is the view that the contents of the messages arriving in Cairo, at least until the sultan reached Syria, were consciously altered by their senders, either to downplay defeats and to camouflage them as victories for fear of incurring the wrath of the sultan, or as a delaying tactic. Even though Barqûq had strengthened his authority, in the cutthroat environment of Mamluk politics, there were still people who resented his return to power, and many of those were in Syria. In Damascus itself, there were many parties who actually supported Mintâsh during the disturbances of 791-792, and the city did not fall then to the besiegers led by Barqûq because of the steadfastness of its defenders.⁶²⁶ In 793, yet again, the Syrian sources talked about the sympathy felt by certain sections of the population for Mintâsh, notably the *'ammah*, and the inhabitants of the neighbourhoods of al-Shuwaykah and al-Shâghûr,⁶²⁷ and most importantly, the members of the household of Baydamur al-Khawârizmî (d. 789/1386). Baydamur had assumed the viceregalship of Damascus a total of six times⁶²⁸ and had died in custody after Barqûq had ordered him removed from office in 788.⁶²⁹ Contrary to the sons of Manjak al-Yûsufî, that other viceroy of Damascus, who sided with Barqûq during 791-793, Muḥammad Shâh ibn Baydamur (d. 793/1391) and the supporters of his household fought alongside Mintâsh even when the latter moved against Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî in Sha'bân 791.⁶³⁰ He was nominated *atâbak* of Damascus by Mintâsh in Ramadân 791⁶³¹ and took part in numerous

⁶²⁶ The defenders were mostly members of the populace, but they also included prominent citizens such as Ibn al-Qurashî, who was later executed on the orders of Barqûq; on al-Qurashî, see PMA44, 48, 62, 65, 84, 124 and 163 and his obituary in *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 284-5.

⁶²⁷ Two neighbourhoods located just outside the city's southern walls; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 54 footnote no. 350 and p. 65 footnote no. 396.

⁶²⁸ See *I'lâm al-Warâ*, p. 53; *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 498-9.

⁶²⁹ Ibid and *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, p. 201. This was not the first time Baydamur had been removed from this office by Barqûq; see *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, pp. 135 [780AH], 147 [782AH].

⁶³⁰ See *ibid.*, pp. 274ff and *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 292.

⁶³¹ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. 39-40.

confrontations with the forces loyal to Barqûq, until his capture in 792⁶³² and his execution in Cairo by Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî in 793.⁶³³ It was also Shukr Aḥmad, a former Baydamurî emir, who led the raid into Damascus the day of his arrival with Mintâsh on the 1st of Rajab 793, and rode to his *ustâdh*'s home where he was joined by another one of Baydamur's sons, Aḥmad, whose execution by Barqûq on the 21st of Dhû al-Hijjah 793 was movingly described by Ibn Ṣaṣrâ.⁶³⁴ Last but not least, the viceroy of Damascus Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî stands out as the official with the most reasons and with the capability to mislead the sultan and his court back in Egypt. He had often been at odds with Barqûq when the latter was a 'Umarî mamluk,⁶³⁵ then *atâbak*⁶³⁶ and finally sultan when he rebelled against him in Ṣafar 791.⁶³⁷ It would not be surprising then that Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî would have used his powers as the head of the Syrian state apparatus to propagate false news in Egypt. In the sources, rumours about the treachery of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî abound. Thus, with regard to the events of Damascus, al-'Aynî commented that had Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî really wanted to, he could have captured Mintâsh, but he did not because of the enmity he felt towards Barqûq.⁶³⁸ Eventually, when he reached Aleppo, Barqûq became assured about his suspicions when Sâlim al-Dûkârî, who allegedly had captured Mintâsh and had promised to release him into the custody of the sultan, sent him a letter detailing the extent of al-Nâsirî links with Mintâsh.⁶³⁹ This led to the execution of

⁶³² Ibid., p. 91.

⁶³³ On Muḥammad Shâh ibn Baydamur's tribulations in 793, see PMA44, 59, 276 and 277.

⁶³⁴ PMA318.

⁶³⁵ Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî was one of the few emirs not to rebel against al-Ashraf Sha'bân in 'Aqabah during the events of the year 778, whereas Barqûq was, as a former mamluk of Yalbughâ al-'Umarî, very much involved in the coup; see Fischel, "*Ascensus Barchoch* (I)," pp. 67-8.

⁶³⁶ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 11, pp. 129-30.

⁶³⁷ See above, footnote no. 334.

⁶³⁸ PMA104.

⁶³⁹ See PMA294, but especially PMA296.

Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî on the 27th of Dhû al-Hijjah.⁶⁴⁰ The best summary of the situation described here can be found in the words of Mignanelli, an Italian adventurer who knew Barqûq and who, upon his return to Italy, actually wrote a biography of him in Latin, which was translated into English by Fischel. On the events in Syria, he remarked that

[The sultan] was told that Nâsirî was concealing much and so he was inwardly worried. Nâsirî was said to be doing this to avoid being himself slain by Barqûq or becoming of little value when once Mintâsh was destroyed or slain. Of this Nâsirî was very much afraid. Barqûq sent many letters to Nâsirî, but they availed little. Nâsirî excused himself for his weakness against Mintâsh and Nu'ayr. Wherefore, the Sultan girded himself for a journey to Syria. [Upon Barqûq's arrival there] Nâsirî excused himself, claiming he could not do more. Barqûq accepted his excuses [...but inside] he thought that Nâsirî was in collusion with Mintâsh so that they might be able together to usurp control of Syria.⁶⁴¹

Here, as elsewhere, in the light of the available sources, we are dealing with sheer conjecture. As a matter of fact, PMA159 might very well weaken the hypothesis being tested here, because the person who brought the news to Cairo was a mamluk of Iyâs al-Jurjâwî (d. 799/1396),⁶⁴² an emir who throughout the period of 791-793 was a supporter of Barqûq.⁶⁴³ It is thus curious that he would have 'fed' the court in Cairo information that did not correspond to the reality on the ground. Of course, there are ways by means of which one can circumscribe the issue: maybe al-Jurjâwî, who entered Damascus on the 8th of Rajab and participated in the fighting alongside al-Nâsirî,⁶⁴⁴ felt he could not afford to inform Barqûq about the inability of his forces to break the stalemate; maybe he considered the loss of the building of Bahâdur on the part the Mintâshîs as a major setback for the rebels, and a troop movement on their part as a retreat; maybe he was in on the scheme; or maybe, even at the risk of pushing the conspiracy theory to its limits,

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁴¹ "Ascensus Barcoch," p. 160.

⁶⁴² See *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 124-5.

⁶⁴³ See relevant pages in the index of *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah*, under Iyâs al-Jurjâwî.

⁶⁴⁴ PMA122.

the mamluk who brought the news to Cairo was 'briefed' by Yalbughâ's men, etc. However, the fact remains that many of the *akhbâr* reported by *Târikh al-Duwal* as having arrived between the 27th of Rajab and the first decade of Ramadân, some through the sultan who, while on his way to Damascus, was probably still getting his information through post-riders from Syria, simply do not correspond to what was going on according to sources 'on the ground.' Generally, the nature of the reports used by historians depended on such known factors as the format of their work, their own intellectual aptitudes and interests, their geographical location, their sources, etc. In the light of the discussion above, attention ought also to be also paid to the channels through which information transited before it reached the historian, and more importantly to the agenda of those military figures, bureaucrats and others, who controlled its flow and content: a tall order indeed in view of the paucity of data that would allow for such an investigation.

Apart from the issue raised above, structurally and from the point of view of the nature of their contents, there are hardly any differences between the texts of the annals of 778 and 793. Ibn al-Furât stuck to the annalistic format, and as in 778, we encounter in two instances the critical tone, amplified by al-Maqrîzî in his *Kitâb al-Sulûk*,⁶⁴⁵ he adopted when reporting some of the changes that had taken place in the Mamluk system.⁶⁴⁶ But as for the potential sources of *Târikh al-Duwal*, unlike the year 778, the absence of Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm* will not permit us to ascertain the genealogy of Ibn al-Furât's reports. This problem is somewhat alleviated by the fact that the edited text of *Târikh al-Duwal* does contain references to authors, unlike the manuscript of *Al-*

⁶⁴⁵ See chapter one, pp. 120-1.

⁶⁴⁶ For example, after the execution of two emirs on charges of unbelief, Ibn al-Furât remarked that "we had never heard of such a thing happening to any of the emirs in our time;" *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 256, PMA129. Later, with regard to another group of emirs who had been punished, he noted that they emirs were "enchained as if they were thieves," p. 258, PMA181.

Muntaqá from Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's hand, which does not. Ibn Duqmâq is quoted five times by Ibn al-Furât, twice in the main body of *Târikh al-Duwal*,⁶⁴⁷ and three times in the obituaries.⁶⁴⁸ Since, unfortunately, neither of the first two reports are mentioned in *Al-Nafhah*, there is still the possibility of comparing those 'meaty' passages⁶⁴⁹ in the latter work with the corresponding ones in the *Târikh al-Duwal*, as in the following:

Ibn al-Furât: "*Tawajjaha al-Amîr Mintâsh min Mar'ash 'alá al-'Amq 'alá A'záz 'alá Sarmîn ilá qarîb Hamâh; fa-sami'a nâyib Hamâh bi-hudûrihi, fa-akhadha harîmahu wa-tawajjaha ilá Tarâbulus, fa-lammâ wasala Mintâsh ilá Hamâh, lam yajid bi-hâ ahadan yudâfi 'ahu fa-dakhalahâ bi-al-amân wa-al-itmân fa-tazaghratû la-hu al-nisâ' fa-nâdá lahum bi-al-amân wa-lam yushawwish 'alayhim; thumma kharaja minhâ wa-tawajjaha ilá Hims fa-lam yajid bi-hâ man yudâfi 'ahu, wa-kâna nâyibuhâ qad sami'a bi-qudûmihi, fa-tawajjaha ilá Dimashq fa-dakhala Mintâsh ilayhâ wa-lam yushawwish 'alá ahad min ahlihâ; thumma tawajjaha minhâ ilá Ba'albak wa-kâna nâyibuhâ qad sami'a bi-qudûmihi aydân, fa-tawajjaha ilá Dimashq, fa-dakhala Mintâsh ilá Ba'albak, thumma kharaja minhâ wa-qa sada Dimashq; fa-lammâ sami'a al-Nâsirî bi-hudûrihi kharaja ilayhi min tarîq al-Zabadânî.*" [*Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 255]

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Mintâsh hadara min Mar'ash 'alá al-'Amq 'alá Sarmîn ilá qarîb Hamâh; fa-haraba nâyib Hamâh, fa-dakhala Mintâsh fa-lam yushawwish 'alayhim; thumma kharaja minhâ ilá Hims fa-dakhalahâ wa-lam yushawwish 'alayhim; thumma tawajjaha ilá Ba'albak wa-kâna nâyibuhâ qad sami'a bi-qudûmihi aydân, fa-tawajjaha ilá Dimashq; fa-lammâ sami'a al-Nâsirî hudûrahu kharaja ilayhi min al-Zabadânî.*" [*Al-Nafha*, p. 263]⁶⁵⁰

The similarities between the two texts are self evident, and one might safely assume that it was Ibn al-Furât who borrowed from Ibn Duqmâq rather than the other way around.⁶⁵¹

⁶⁴⁷ SHM11 and PMA206.

⁶⁴⁸ *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, pp. 275, 282 and 285.

⁶⁴⁹ See above, p. 139

⁶⁵⁰ PMA87.

⁶⁵¹ In his obituary of Qadi al-Qurashî, where Ibn al-Furât quotes Ibn Duqmâq directly, the contents of the citation appear, edited, in two different reports in the main body of *Târikh al-Duwal*; vol. 9:2, p. 275, PMA65 and 84. In another obituary, Ibn al-Furât quoted Ibn Duqmâq jointly with Ibn al-'Irâqî, but since the latter is not known to have written a history that extended that late in the century, we are probably dealing here with material culled from a work of a biographical nature written by Walî al-Dîn; vol. 9:2, pp. 281-2.

Another possible source for *Tārīkh al-Duwal* is *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk*, which was frequently quoted by Ibn al-Furāt. Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir noted in his narrative of the events leading to the siege of Damascus, that as Yalbughā al-Nāsirī left the city to confront the rebels who were reported in Baalbek, Mintāsh headed to the Syrian capital so that they unknowingly crossed each other's path.⁶⁵² The words he used for that last bit of information, "*fa-takhālafū fī al-tarīq wa-sabaqahu Mintāsh*," are very close to those of Ibn al-Furāt's "*fa-khālafahu fī al-tarīq wa-atá ilá Dimashq*."⁶⁵³ Even though the narratives where Ibn al-Furāt and Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir placed their sentences are clearly not identical, they do appear at more or less the same point of the narration in both *Tārīkh al-Duwal* and *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslāk*. If one discounts the randomness of the appearance of this cluster of words, the issue of the direction of the borrowing, small as it may be, still has to be addressed and it is more likely than not that Ibn al-Furāt borrowed from Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir. Up until the events surrounding the siege of Damascus, the reports concerning Syria reported in *Tārīkh al-Duwal* arrived, as we noted above, with post-riders or with representatives of Syrian military office-holders. It is precisely under the heading '*News about Mintāsh's heading toward Bilād al-Shām...*,' that for the first time in this annal, Ibn al-Furāt took a break from simply presenting dated reports and offered the reader a long unencumbered narrative about the itinerary of Mintāsh from Northern Syria until his arrival in Damascus on the 1st of Rajab. Perhaps he used parts of Zayn al-Dīn Ṭāhir's account along with that of Ibn Duqmāq to construct this particular paragraph.

⁶⁵² PMA91.

⁶⁵³ *Tārīkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 255. Similar wordings can be found in the works of other historians such as Ibn Khaldūn ("*fa-khālafahu Mintāsh ilá Dimashq*"), Ibn Hajar ("*fa-khālafahu Mintāsh ilá Dimashq*") and Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah ("*fa-tafāwatū fī al-tarīq wa-já' Mintāsh bi-'askarihi*"); see page references in PMA91. The reliance of these three authors on Ibn al-Furāt has already been established in the previous chapter. As to the meaning of the verb *khālafā* in this particular context, which can be read as 'preceded,' the sense that was imparted to it here, namely the crossing of paths, is probably the right one since Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah used a synonym, the verb *fāwata*.

After all, as was noted in the case of the year 778, Ibn al-Furât used Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm* as the foundation of his annal without ever citing him, but added to it his own apparently original data. It is thus not impossible that he placed Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's sentence construction and other information in his text and added to it the data he gleaned from *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Last but not least, no mention is made of Ibn al-Furât in *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, whereas between 791 and 796, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir is mentioned in the edited text of *Târikh al-Duwal* eleven times, including nine direct quotations in the obituaries section.⁶⁵⁴

The *Târikh al-Duwal* remains essential reading for those interested in the events of the year 793, but one cannot get a sense of all what happened in the Mamluk realm by relying solely on it

E. Badr al-Dîn al-'Aynî (762-855/1361-1451):

While it is true that the annal of the year 793 in *'Iqd al-Jumân* followed the same general format as that of the year 778, it is however the most significant chronicle written by younger contemporary historians. The text of *'Iqd al-Jumân* is admittedly shorter and more concise than works written by the like of al-Maqrîzî, but *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, as we shall see later, is mostly a summarized version of Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-Duwal*, and does not contain much in terms of original data, unlike al-'Aynî's chronicle which brings to the fore reports or details not found in either Egyptian or Syrian works.

Concerning events in Syria, the manuscripts of *'Iqd al-Jumân*⁶⁵⁵ at our disposal for the year 793 constitute one of three Egypt-based sources⁶⁵⁶ to mention some details

⁶⁵⁴ See references in the index of established by Zurayk and Izzedin, *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 527.

⁶⁵⁵ MSS Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târikh* and Ahmet III 2911/B2.

⁶⁵⁶ The other two being Ibn Khaldûn's *Kitâb al-'Ibar* and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir's *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*.

concerning events taking place there other than the reports arriving from Bilâd al-Shâm and those dealing with the sultan's trip there. These details are not particularly important for our understanding of the overall unfolding of events, and as a matter of fact, it can be argued that in many respects, other historians such as Ibn al-Furât, al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Hajar, thanks to the sheer mass of data they included in their works, end up providing historians with more information than al-'Aynî. For example, beyond the news of Mintâsh's arrival in Damascus and the raid of Shukr Aḥmad into the city at the very beginning of Rajab 793,⁶⁵⁷ al-'Aynî does not deal systematically with events in Syria until the sultan's arrival on the 22nd of Ramadân.⁶⁵⁸ Nevertheless, there are clues in al-'Aynî's narrative that indicate that he not only had access to but also used sources that dealt with Syria. For example, of all the Egyptian historians, al-'Aynî is the only one to mention the burning of Tankiz's mosque in Damascus at the hand of the Barqûqî Sûdûn Bâq in the course of a battle taking place in and around the city.⁶⁵⁹ More importantly though, is the fact that al-'Aynî was the only historian to provide a date as well as details about the circumstances of the killing of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî at the end of Dhû al-Qa'dah,⁶⁶⁰ on top of presenting a more exhaustive list of those who were executed along with him, including Emirs Sulaymân and Aḥmad Jûrak, who had been viceroys of 'Ayntâb,⁶⁶¹ his hometown. In the same vein, al-'Aynî included data about some of the Syrian

⁶⁵⁷ See above, p. 145, and below, pp. 171-2.

⁶⁵⁸ PMA246.

⁶⁵⁹ PMA123; see also PMA54 for a *khavar* in which al-'Aynî provided information not found in either Ibn al-Furât or al-Maqrîzî's works, the two other sources that mention it, specifically the name of the al-Nûrî mosque in Aleppo to which the sultan nominated a *nâzir*.

⁶⁶⁰ PMA296.

⁶⁶¹ PMA297.

appointments made by Barqûq, that no one else, save Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah and Ibn Sasrâ noted.⁶⁶²

Al-‘Aynî also reported in *‘Iqd al-Jumân* data not found elsewhere. For example, in the first before last section of his annal⁶⁶³ which he entitled ‘*Mention of rulings made by Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî the nâ’ib al-ghaybah,*’ he related the decisions taken by the latter in terms of forbidding, in some cases under the threat of death, a number of practices then adopted by the population of Cairo, especially women, namely the visitation of shrines, the sailing in boats on the Nile, and the wearing of shirts with large shifts.⁶⁶⁴ To these policies, which were noted by most historians, al-‘Aynî added one that no one else did: the request by *nâ’ib al-ghaybah* to the *mutawallî al-ṣinâ’ah*,⁶⁶⁵ and *ra’îs al-bahr*⁶⁶⁶ asking them, among other things, not to allow any of the troops to cross the Nile without his permission.⁶⁶⁷ In other instances, al-‘Aynî presented information that offered a different, and not necessarily contradictory, take on a given event. Thus, whereas both Ibn al-Furât and al-Maqrîzî recounted the capture of an Emir Baktamur and his subsequent escape, al-‘Aynî reported rather the arrest of one Badr al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Sarâ’î al-Kalistânî who was accused of having hidden the said Emir Baktamur.⁶⁶⁸ These differences between al-‘Aynî and contemporary historians are significant more on

⁶⁶² PMA298. PMA241 is yet another report elements of which are common to al-‘Aynî and Syrian authors; see above, pp. 131-2.

⁶⁶³ Excluding, of course the obituaries.

⁶⁶⁴ Respectively, PMA20, 21 and 22.

⁶⁶⁵ The person responsible of the shipyard(s); Popper, *The Cairo Nilometer; Studies in Ibn Taghrî Birdî’s Chronicles of Egypt: I*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 12 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951), p. 12. I have not however been able to either locate sources that describe the function of *mutawallî al-ṣinâ’ah*, or to identify which shipyard or shipyards al-‘Aynî might have been referring to.

⁶⁶⁶ Probably the same as *qâdî al-Bahr*, the qadî of the Nile, the person in charge of the nilometer. On this position, see *ibid.*, pp. 57-61; see also PMA251 and SHM18.

⁶⁶⁷ SHM26.

⁶⁶⁸ PMA238; see also PMA65 RL31 for another instance of al-‘Aynî offering a different ‘coverage’ of a given event.

historiographical than historical grounds, despite the intrinsic value, for example, of the report regarding the restrictions imposed by the State on crossing the Nile. They pose the problem of determining the source(s) used by this author in order to elaborate his annal for this year.

One potential clue as to their identity might be had from the very vitae of al-‘Aynî. At age thirty-one, he was already a well-traveled man with connections in both Syria and Egypt, and, moreover, he was directly, but unwillingly, involved in the complex of events leading to the crises of the year 793, as he was living in his hometown of ‘Ayntâb when Mintâsh’s ongoing rebellion against Barqûq caught up with him.⁶⁶⁹ Both he and his brother, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad, described the sack and destruction of the city at the hands of Mintâshîs who had arrived there on the 10th of Shawwâl 792.⁶⁷⁰ But Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad added in a short commentary that, fearing their reprisals on account of his declared support for the sultan, he had fled to the citadel of the city and was accompanied there by his brother Badr al-Dîn, “the author of these lines,”⁶⁷¹ later⁶⁷² they both left for Aleppo, from which al-‘Aynî departed for Egypt.⁶⁷³ The very wording of Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad’s description of his brother’s return to Egypt in the annal of the year 792, is

⁶⁶⁹ After having left his hometown of ‘Ayntâb for Aleppo in 783/1381, al-‘Aynî visited Damascus in 785/1383, went on the *hajj* the following year, then on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and therefrom, in the company and under the guidance of a distinguished Ḥanafî qadi, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Sîrâmî (d. 790/1388), settled as a Sufi in the just built Barqûqiyah *madrasah*; following the death of his mentor, he was the target of a conspiracy that led to his expulsion from this institution and his return, a hurt man, to ‘Ayntâb; al-Qarmûtî’s “Introduction” to his edition of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, pp. 11-14. On al-Sîrâmî, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 172-175.

⁶⁷⁰ The account of Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad in the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* is basically an exact copy of Badr al-Dîn’s in that of Ahmet III 2911/B2; see MSS “‘Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târikh*, fols. 406-11 and Ahmet III 2911/B2, fols. 94a-94b.

⁶⁷¹ “‘Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, fol. 408.

⁶⁷² Probably when the siege of ‘Ayntâb was lifted following the arrival of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî in early Muḥarram; see PMA7, 8 and 9.

⁶⁷³ “‘Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, fol. 408.

almost identical⁶⁷⁴ to that of Badr al-Dîn's account where he stated his arrival in Cairo in early Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah 793 for his second and longest stay there.⁶⁷⁵ Al-'Aynî thus definitively witnessed some of the events taking place in Syria, at least in its northern marches, and/or, like Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, he probably retained contacts there that he used for reports describing events he could not have witnessed.

While this 'takes care' of the possible genealogy of the Syrian sources, what about the original reports concerning Egypt? As was noted earlier, we are in the presence of a mature person who was well aware of the events he was witnessing and who very well might have taken down extensive notes that he relied on when came time to put his book into writing. However, al-'Aynî must have relied on other sources. At a very basic level, one needs to recall that he was not even in Cairo for the first five months of the year, so that it is reasonable to assume that since he was not an eyewitness, he had to garner from somewhere the reports corresponding to this period. Did he borrow from Ibn al-Fûrat, Ibn Duqmâq, or from a source common to all of them? The towering presence of Ibn al-Furât as the author of the overall most copious annal for the year 793 invites comparison of *Iqd al-Jumân* with *Târikh al-Duwal*. At first sight, similarities between the two appear self-evident as can be seen from the following collation:

Ibn al-Furât: "...*wa-rasama al-Sultân al-Zâhir bi-qabd al-mamâlik al-Zaynîyah Barakah wa-al-mamâlik al-ladhîn kânû bi-khidmat Mintâsh fa-sâra al-wâlî yaqbud 'alayhim awwalan fa-awwal...*" [*Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 254]

Al-'Aynî: "...*rasama al-Sultân bi-mask mamâlik Barakah wa-al-mamâlik al-ladhîn kânû fi khidmat Mintâsh fa-ja'alû yumsikûnahum awwalan fa-awwal...*" ["*Iqd al-Jumân*," MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 96b]⁶⁷⁶

⁶⁷⁴ Ahmad ibn Ahmad's account is in the third person.

⁶⁷⁵ SHM9.

⁶⁷⁶ PMA80.

And yet, while not very likely, the similarity might be no more than circumstantial as almost all chronicles share a large body of reports and often common wording of narratives, due no doubt to the complex of borrowing from Ibn al-Furât and al-Maqrîzî. Borrowing from Ibn al-Furât is thus probable but cannot be firmly established especially since despite the closeness of so many of the reports of *'Iqd al-Jumân* to those of *Târikh al-Duwal*, none are identical to a point where one can safely assume that it was direct. We are left with the following hypotheses: First, al-'Aynî relied on *Târikh al-Duwal*; second, he continued to rely on Ibn Duqmâq and, given that Ibn al-Furât *probably* kept depending on *Nuzhat al-Anâm* for the bulk of his *akhbâr*, *'Iqd al-Jumân* ended up sharing a common stock with *Târikh al-Duwal*; third, he used sources peculiar to him, along with Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and/or Ibn al-Furât's *Târikh al-Duwal*. Evidently, an investigation of the *akhbâr* of *'Iqd al-Jumân* will not be undertaken properly, as long as the 793 annal of Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm* is unavailable.

The problem of al-'Aynî's sources is compounded with that of the differences between the two manuscripts of *'Iqd al-Jumân* used here. As was the case with the annal of the year 778,⁶⁷⁷ Ahmad ibn Ahmad's text is closer to the source upon which his and his brother's works are based, namely *Târikh al-Duwal* and/or *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, than Badr al-Dîn's. This can clearly be seen from the following *khavar* describing the arrival of the sultan in Damascus at the beginning of the last decade of Ramaḍân:

Ibn al-Furât: “..waṣala al-sultân al-Malik al-Zâhir Barqûq wa-suhbatuhu al-'asâkir al-Miṣrîyah ilâ Dimashq al-mahrûsah wa-zuyyinât al-balad zînah 'azîmah li-quḍûmihi; wa-dakhala Dimashq sâliman wa-nâdâ munâdîhi bi-al-amân wa-al-iṭmân, wa-tala'a ilâ al-qal'ah al-sharîfah wa-jalasa majlisan 'âmman ḥaḍarahu amîr al-mu'minîn wa-al-'ulamâ' wa-al-quḍât al-Miṣriyyîn wa-al-Shâmiyyîn wa-kâna yawman mashhûdan.” [*Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 265]

⁶⁷⁷ See chapter one, pp. 62-4.

Al-‘Aynî: “*Thumma dakhala al-sultân Dimashq yawm al-khamîs al-thânî wa-al-‘ishrîn min Ramadân wa-tala‘a ilâ al-qal‘ah wa-jalasa majlisan ‘âmmam hadarahu umarâ’ wa-amîr al-mu‘minîn wa-al-‘ulamâ’ wa-quḍât Misr wa-al-Shâm wa-kâna yawman mashhûdan. Wa kâna Yalbughâ, nâ‘ib Dimashq lâqâ al-sultân ‘inda Mastabat al-Sultân amâm al-Jûn*⁶⁷⁸ ...” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh*, fols. 431-2]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Thumma dakhala al-sultân Dimashq yawm al-khamîs al-thânî wa-al-‘ishrîn min Ramadân wa-tala‘a ilâ al-qal‘ah. Wa kâna Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî lâqâ al-sultân ‘inda Mastabat Lajjûn...*” [“Iqd al-Jumân,” MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 97b]⁶⁷⁹

Even though the two manuscripts of *Iqd al-Jumân* have in common a large body of fifty-seven *akhbâr*, that of Ahmet III contains thirty-two more reports, but Dâr al-Kutub six only.⁶⁸⁰ To this one might add the fact that even elements that are common to both works either do not follow the same order of appearance or have varying degrees of emphasis placed on them by the two authors. For example, with regard to the arrival of Aytamish al-Bajâsî in Cairo in early Jumâdá al-Úlá, al-‘Aynî started off with the event itself, then continued with his reception by Barqûq and the description of the presents he and other emirs bestowed upon him; the rewards given by the sultan to couriers involved in the exchange of letters between him and al-Bajâsî; and ended with the names of the prisoners who were brought from Syria. Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad on the other hand, began with the coming of Aytamish to Cairo, and followed it with the list of prisoners he brought with him from Syria, only to continue with the description of the sultan’s reception and a much shorter account of the presents offered. The differences are minor and they do not change much in terms of the general meaning of things, but they do occur often enough to indicate that they are not the result of happenstance or scribal error.⁶⁸¹ In other instances,

⁶⁷⁸ In other sources, it is al-Lajjûn and not Lajûn. On the discrepancies between the sources concerning the location of the meeting between the sultan and Yalbughâ, see above, pp. 132-3.

⁶⁷⁹ PMA246.

⁶⁸⁰ Many of the reports ‘missing’ from the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript, by no means all, deal with appointments and news about religious personnel; see Table II. 1. B. The proportions are reversed in the case of the annal of the year 778; see chapter one, pp. 58-9.

⁶⁸¹ PMA37, 48 and 49. See the discussion of the historiographical ramifications of the differences between the two manuscripts in chapter one, pp. 61-5.

for example the events surrounding the arrival of the sultan in Damascus cited above,⁶⁸² it is the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript that has more information and is more concise. Thus, al-‘Aynî stated that Barqûq entered Damascus after his meeting with Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî at Mastabat Lajjûn, went to the citadel and proclaimed security in the city and an amnesty for what had happened before.⁶⁸³ His brother, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad, used more extensive information that is clearly close to Ibn al-Furât’s: on top of data common to him and, respectively, to his brother⁶⁸⁴ and to the author of *Târiḫ al-Duwal*,⁶⁸⁵ he added a *khavar* unique to him about a Persian man who showered twenty-thousand dirhams on the sultan.⁶⁸⁶

Clearly, comparison of volume eighteen of MS Köprülü Ahmet III 2911 with the two manuscripts used here should go a long way in clarifying some of the historiographical problems alluded to above.

F. Taqî al-Dîn Ahmad al-Maqrîzî (766-845/1364-1441-2):

Perhaps the most evident peculiarity of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* is the sheer extent of its reliance on *Târiḫ al-Duwal*, which plays at two levels. First, a cursory look at Table II. 2. B. i. reveals how close al-Maqrîzî is to Ibn al-Furât in terms of the sequencing of reports: the unfolding of events in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* parallels almost exactly that in *Târiḫ al-Duwal*, and only in four instances⁶⁸⁷ is there a hiatus between the two; second, one

⁶⁸² PMA246, 248 and 249.

⁶⁸³ I.e., during the events of 792.

⁶⁸⁴ The horse given as a present to Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî by Barqûq at their meeting; PMA241.

⁶⁸⁵ Barqûq’s prayer at the Omeyyad mosque and his proclamation of peace and security after it; PMA248 and 249.

⁶⁸⁶ PMA249. From this discussion it should not be assumed that it is the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript that holds more passages found in Ibn al-Furât: other reports, for example PMA296, show that the Istanbul manuscript does contain passages close if not identical to those of *Târiḫ al-Duwal*.

⁶⁸⁷ These are indicated by braces in the al-Maqrîzî column of this table II. 2. B. i.

hundred and sixty-eight of the one hundred and ninety-five reports found in the latter work, are present in the former,⁶⁸⁸ and they mirror each other.

While it is true that al-Maqrîzî, here as in the annal of the year 778,⁶⁸⁹ has subjected Ibn al-Furât's reports to a special treatment, namely rewording them, the closeness is unmistakable, as can be seen in the following passage, one amongst very many:

Ibn al-Furât: "*Wa-fi yawm al-ahad khâmis 'ashar Safar, talaba al-sultân al-Zâhir Hasan ibn Bâkîsh al-ladhî kâna nâyib Ghazzah ilâ bayn yadayh bi-al-Istabl al-Sharîf wa-'arrâhu wa-darabahu bi-al-maqâri' quddâmahu.*" [Târikh al-Duwal, vol. 9:2, p. 248]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fi khâmis 'asharahu, uhdîra al-Amîr Hasan ibn Bâkîsh nâ'ib Ghazzah min al-sijn, wa-duriba bi-al-maqâri' bayna yadayy al-sultân.*" [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:2, p. 734]⁶⁹⁰

As can be seen in the previous example, al-Maqrîzî rewrote the report but also reduced its size by eliminating what appears to be superfluous information.⁶⁹¹ Interestingly, this tendency to 'lighten' the size of certain reports, which can be seen throughout the annal of the year 793, does not appear in the annal of the year 778, where the text of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was in a way closer to that of *Târikh al-Duwal*. Nevertheless, this process often leads to the purging of important circumstantial information, as can be seen in yet another account concerning Ibn Bâkîsh:

Ibn al-Furât: "*Wa-fi yawm al-ahad thâlith 'ashar Rabî' al-Awwal al-madhkûr, rasama al-sultân al-Zâhir lil-Amîr 'Alâ' al-Dîn ibn al-Tablâwî, wâlî al-Qâhirah, bi-an yuhdira Ibn Bâkîsh wa-yudribahu, wa-yastakhrija minhu al-mâl; fa-ahdarahu ilâ baytihi wa-'asarahu. Fa-qâla: 'ba'da thalâthat ayyâm uhdîr al-mâl.*" [Târikh al-Duwal, vol. 9:2, p. 249]

⁶⁸⁸ In total, there one hundred and seventy six reports in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*; the latter work has seven reports [PMA210, 241, 260; RL9, 10, 11; SHM1] that are peculiar to it, but 'lacks' twenty six [PMA3, 18, 25, 62, 91, 175, 202, 203, 207, 211, 218, 237, 239, 240, 242, 251, 253, 258, 261, 274, 285, 303, 323, 324, RL4, 17] of those of *Târikh al-Duwal*.

⁶⁸⁹ See chapter one, pp. 71-3.

⁶⁹⁰ PMA20.

⁶⁹¹ Namely the fact that Ibn Bâkîsh had been a former viceroy of Gaza, that he was beaten at the Royal stables and that he was denuded before being punished.

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fî thâlith ‘asharahu, shuddida al-‘adhâb ‘alâ Ibn Bâkîsh li-ihdâr al-mâl.*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:2, p. 736]⁶⁹²

While the missing data here is hardly pivotal in itself, in other instances where al-Maqrîzî had done heavy editing, the results can be misleading, especially when he compressed different reports into one, as can be seen in the following example. Following Barqûq’s entry into Aleppo either on the 21st or the 22nd of Shawwâl,⁶⁹³ both Ibn al-Furât and al-Maqrîzî signalled the arrival in Cairo, on the 2nd of Dhû al-Qa’dah, of news from Syria about the arrest of Mintâsh,⁶⁹⁴ which the author of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* qualified as having turned out unfounded.⁶⁹⁵ In another undated⁶⁹⁶ *khavar*, Ibn al-Furât tells his readers that when the sultan arrived in Aleppo, he received information that Sâlim al-Dûkârî had captured Mintâsh, as well as a letter from the ruler of Mârdîn informing him that a number of Mintâshîs were in his custody [PMA288]. In reaction to this, the sultan sent out his commanders⁶⁹⁷ throughout the Northern provinces to bring in the prisoners [PMA289]. In a third *khavar* [PMA290] dated the 16th of Dhû al-Qa’dah,⁶⁹⁸ Ibn al-Furât described the arrival of one Tamur al-Khâssakî from Aleppo with news from the sultan informing those in Cairo that the troops that had been sent out by the sultan had not yet managed to capture Mintâsh. Curiously, al-Maqrîzî, and Ibn al-Jawharî after him, compressed all three reports: his narrative, dated the 26th of Dhû al-Qa’dah,⁶⁹⁹ includes the arrival in Cairo of a nameless post messenger [PMA290] with news of the capture of

⁶⁹² PMA39.

⁶⁹³ PMA274 and 278.

⁶⁹⁴ PMA283. In Ibn al-Furât, Sâlim al-Dûkârî is identified as the captor.

⁶⁹⁵ PMA284.

⁶⁹⁶ In *Târikh al-Duwal*, it is however ‘located’ between a report from the 8th of Dhû al-Qa’dah and another from the 16th of the same month.

⁶⁹⁷ Qarâdamurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, al-Nâsirî, the viceroy of Damascus, and Inâl al-Yûsufî, the *atâbak al-‘asâkir*; see PMA289 for differences in the accounts of historians in terms of the locations these senior officers were sent to.

⁶⁹⁸ Or the 18th as he himself commented; *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 270.

⁶⁹⁹ In *Târikh al-Duwal*, both the 16th or the 18th of Dhû al-Qa’dah are given as dates for PMA290.

Mintāsh by Sālim al-Dūkārī and of a group of Mintāshīs by the ruler of Mārdīn [PMA288] and the sultan's dispatching of troops to pick up the prisoners: not only was the entire Aleppan dimension of the affair contained in Ibn al-Furāt's PMA288, notably Barqûq's reception of the letter from the ruler of Mārdīn, simply discarded, but also the main item in Tamur al-Khâssakī's piece of news, the fact that the troops had not yet been successful in capturing Mintāsh, vanished. Of course, one might argue that the date of the 26th of Dhû al-Qa'dah al-Maqrîzî gave to his PMA290 is not the result of a mistaken reading of Ibn al-Furāt's 16th of Dhû al-Qa'dah, and that his is an original report he obtained from a different source than *Târîkh al-Duwal*. There would still however be a problem since, as was shown above, as late as the 16th of that month, it was already known in Cairo that, first Barqûq had sent out his commanders to fetch Mintāsh and the Mintāshīs who were in the custody of, respectively, Sālim al-Dūkārī and the ruler of Mārdīn, and second, that they had come back empty-handed. Then, it is more than probable, that the Maqrîzîan narrative technique of rewriting and, sometimes, summarizing other historians' reports, in this case Ibn al-Furāt's, simply backfired. In the light of what was said above, *Kitâb al-Sulûk* comes across as a pale if not inferior carbon copy of *Kitâb al-Duwal*.

But despite its shortcomings, it does contain some interesting features, notably at the historiographical and historical levels. Sometimes, it provides additional information that contradicts stories reported by Ibn al-Furāt,⁷⁰⁰ as was seen above. In other instances, it complements and/or renders them more precise. In PMA223, for example, both al-Maqrîzî and Ibn al-Furāt dealt with the arrival in Cairo of a message from the sultan who

⁷⁰⁰ See below, the discussion of PMA210; p. 167.

had left for Syria a few days earlier,⁷⁰¹ relating the news of Mintâsh's defeat in Damascus and his escape therefrom;⁷⁰² but the author of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, unlike the author of *Târikh al-Duwal*, did state that the flight of the sultân's nemesis took place on the 16th of Sha'bân, a clear reference to PMA185, an event noted by a number of historians and discussed above.⁷⁰³ In other cases, al-Maqrîzî included reports, very few it is true, that are not mentioned by Ibn al-Furât,⁷⁰⁴ such as PMA241 which recounts the meet at al-Lajjûn between al-Nâsirî and Barqûq upon the latter's entry into Syria.

The above paragraph brings to the fore the issue of al-Maqrîzî's other sources: at age twenty-seven in 793, was he already engaging in taking notes that he used to complement the reports he culled from Ibn al-Furât, and/or did he simply rely on other sources either written or oral when he started elaborating *Kitâb al-Sulûk*? A series of *akhbâr* found in the latter work might instruct us about the relationship of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* to other sources, inform us about al-Maqrîzî writing technique, and ultimately lead us to some conclusions about the overall value of his work. These reports about a series of

⁷⁰¹ PMA217.

⁷⁰² See above, pp. 142-3.

⁷⁰³ Ibid. PMA49 is another instance where al-Maqrîzî added data not found in *Târikh al-Duwal*: he explained that the sultan scolded the prisoners who had arrived in Cairo in early Jumâdâ al-Ûlâ in the train of Aytamish al-Bajâsî, by referring to the involvement of many of them, especially Ibn al-Qurashî's, in leading the resistance of Damascus during his siege of the city from the middle of Dhû al-Qa'dah 791 to the middle of Muharram 792. In the same vein, there is one instance which reflects al-Maqrîzî's tendency to negatively characterize the very person of Barqûq: in PMA21, when commenting on the arrest and imprisonment of an Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî, al-Maqrîzî was alone amongst all the historians of this period to emphasize the sultan's calculating ways: "This is the habit of the sultân that he is patient with his enemies in that he does not take revenge on them until he has the opportunity to discipline them for a punishable crime so that he does not appear to be taking revenge; all of this is due to his self-command and reserve. Follow this and you will realize that it is as I said;" *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:2, p. 767. On the issue of the overall negative assessment by al-Maqrîzî of the sultan and his reign, see Massoud, "al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of Barqûq."

⁷⁰⁴ There is another *khavar* of a political nature not reported by Ibn al-Furât, namely PMA260 in which al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Hajar noted the appointment of Fakhr al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahmân ibn Makânîs to the *wizârah* in Damascus during the month of Shawwâl. Ibn al-Furât did mention Ibn Makânîs in his annal as part of a report, PMA261, dated 8th of Ramadân, recounting the arrival in Egypt of a letter written by him to his son, and in which he is matter-of-factly identified as *wazîr al-Shâm*; see *Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 299, for a *khavar* dated 24th of Rabî' al-Awwal 794, announcing the appointment of Ibn Makânîs to the same position.

appointments to mostly religious positions in Syria, appear in a number of chronicles,⁷⁰⁵ but at least one set of them relating to the Mâlikî chief judgeship in Damascus, namely RL8, 9' and 10, presents a historiographical problem. Three strains of *akhbâr* pertaining to this appointment can be identified:

First: RL9 – Al-Qafsî replaced al-Sanhâjî → RL10 – Al-Sanhâjî replaced al-Qafsî

Second: RL8 – Al-Shâdhilî⁷⁰⁶ replaced al-Qafsî.⁷⁰⁷

Third: RL9' – al-Qafsî replaced al-Sakisîwî.

Al-Maqrîzî used each one of these strains, fully or partially, interspersed with other appointments. He started off with RL9', followed by RL10 and then by RL8: in other words, al-Qafsî replaced al-Sakisîwî [RL9'] but was himself removed from office in favour of al-Sanhâjî [RL10], which is a plausible scenario; the problem lies in the fact that a few reports later, al-Maqrîzî stated that al-Shâdhilî replaced al-Qafsî [RL8] who, we were just told, had already lost his position!

The issue here is one of historiographical filiation but also of chronological consistency. We have already established the relationship between al-Maqrîzî and Ibn al-Furât's work, something that might explain the presence of RL8 in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. As for RL9' and RL10, which also report nominations, since they were not included by Ibn al-Furât in his chronicle, al-Maqrîzî clearly had recourse to a source or sources other than *Târikh al-Duwal*. The fact that he made a reference to PMA185,⁷⁰⁸ might very well indicate that he, like Ibn Khaldûn, borrowed from a Syrian source or sources which were

⁷⁰⁵ RL5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 9bis, 10, PMA54 and 55.

⁷⁰⁶ Written also Tâdilî and Tâdhilî in the sources.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibn Hîjjî noted, first, that news about this appointment reached Damascus in the middle decade of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah while al-Shâdhilî was still in Cairo, second, that al-Qafsî continued in his post by permission of the viceroy, and third, that he remained in it even after the arrival of Barqûq: in other words, al-Shâdhilî never did assume his judgeship; see RL8; *Târikh Ibn Hîjjî*, fols. 94a-b and *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, vol. 1, p. 371.

⁷⁰⁸ See above, p. 143 and footnote no. 617 therein.

the only ones to actually note the day of Mintâsh's departure from Damascus.⁷⁰⁹ The textual evidence that could have allowed us to determine with some degree of certainty which of Ibn Hġijġi and, possibly Ibn Saġrâ's,⁷¹⁰ works he used for this particular report, is thin. However, one can make a better case for his borrowing from Ibn Hġijġi and Zayn al-Dġn Tâhir. As will be shown in chapter three of this dissertation, which deals with the year 804, al-Maqrġzġ did take a few reports either from *Târġkh Ibn Hġijġi* or a source that copied the latter;⁷¹¹ and even though this does not necessarily imply that he did the same for the annal of 793, we might consider the possibility that he might have done so. As for Zayn al-Dġn Tâhir, we have already noted the fact that PMA241 is to be found in both *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, but not in *Târġkh al-Duwal*. This might explain why Zayn al-Dġn Tâhir's RL10 found its way into *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. As for RL9', there are some clues as to its potential Tâhġrian origin. The copyist of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* noted in the margin of folio 265b, where RL9 appears, "*sahh 'an Shams al-Dġn al-Sakyûsġ [?]*," something which might mean two things: first, in the absence of a *renvoi* in the text itself, this might indicate that the said al-Sakyûsġ actually validated the report to him;⁷¹² second, it could also mean that the information in the body of the text is right and that the reference to al-Sakyûsġ was placed in the margin to correct an error in a different, maybe original, manuscript of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*. One could then argue⁷¹³ that al-Maqrġzġ, whose reliance on Zayn al-Dġn Tâhir has been attested above with regard to biographical data, used a manuscript of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* where al-Sakyûsġ was

⁷⁰⁹ In PMA185, Ibn Hġajar did mention the departure of Mintâsh towards Baalbek, but failed to note the date of this event and the battle of Dumayr, which took place either the same or the following day.

⁷¹⁰ See PMA185 for details.

⁷¹¹ See chapter three, pp. 225-6.

⁷¹² A comparison with the other manuscripts of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* would be useful here.

⁷¹³ My argument is based on the assumption that we are dealing here with a case of metathesis or *tahrġf* between al-Sakisġwġ and al-Sakyûsġ; on *tahrġf*, see Adam Gacek, *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), p. 37

given, wrongly, as the person who was replaced by al-Qafsî. A few factors lend credence to this hypothesis: only al-Maqrîzî and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir commented that al-Qafsî's appointment, as a replacement to al-Sakisîwî according to the former [RL9'] and to al-Sanhâjî according to the latter [RL9], was his fifth.

The discussion above, is, of course, pure speculation. One could, of course, dismiss the issue by pointing out to the legions of factual errors, faulty dating and other problems that plagued Mamluk historiography, some of which we have endeavoured to underline and reveal in this study. However, it does bring to the fore the issues of the very nature of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and its mode of elaboration,⁷¹⁴ which have been alluded to but are still deserving of investigation.

G. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalânî (773-852/1372-1449):

The annal of the year 793 in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* offers hardly anything original, so that generally not much is to be added to the observations made in the previous chapter about this chronicle. Ibn Hajar attempted here again at grouping together clusters of events, in order, ostensibly to provide for a narrative free of the pitfalls of the strict chronological format: the first eleven pages of the annal⁷¹⁵ deal with the disturbances in Syria from an Egyptian perspective,⁷¹⁶ followed by an eighteen page-long section entitled '*Mention of the rest of the events which took place during this year,*'⁷¹⁷ then by

⁷¹⁴ See Massoud, "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian," pp. 130-5, and Frédéric Bauden, "Maqriziana I: Discovery of an Autograph Manuscript of al-Maqrîzî: Towards a Better Understanding of His Working Method; Description: Section 1," in *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. VII:2 (2003), pp. 21-68.

⁷¹⁵ *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, pp. 54-65.

⁷¹⁶ Ibn Hajar offered even less details about the unfolding of events in Syria than Ibn al-Furât, and concentrated rather on the actions taken by the sultan as a result thereof: his departure for Damascus; his tribulations in Syria; the execution of people involved in the disturbances or suspected of being Mintâshîs, etc.

⁷¹⁷ *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, pp. 65-83.

obituaries.⁷¹⁸ But whereas the first section, somewhat successfully, provides readers with a complex of reports that cover the events in Syria and end with the mention of the sultan's trip back to Egypt, the second is a medley of reports, some in clusters of related *akhbâr*,⁷¹⁹ whose appearance in the text, as was the case with annal of 778, appears not to follow any type of order, chronological or otherwise.⁷²⁰

Adding to the confusion, is another feature of this annal, possibly the result of the unfinished nature of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* hinted at in the previous chapter,⁷²¹ namely the repetition,⁷²² from two to three times, of a number of reports in the narrative.⁷²³ One could have explained these repetitions of *akhbâr* or portions thereof by means of the division of the annal in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* into two sections, if we exclude obituaries: the reports repeatedly noted would have been connected to the two complexes of reports. However, out of the twenty-one repetitions, only three appear in both sections of the annal, and two of these deal with the names of emirs killed during the disturbances.⁷²⁴ Thus the news centering around the arrival of Mintâsh in the Syrian capital is repeated twice in the course of four pages, with the notable difference that the second time it leads to the resumption of the rest of the narrative. The repetitions neither clarify passages nor help conclude incomplete information: thrice did Ibn Hajar note the appointment of a Yalbughâ al-Ahmadî, a.k.a al-Majnûn, as *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî, but nowhere did he mention whom he replaced or provide any information about his identity, as was done for

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 84-104.

⁷¹⁹ See, for example, the reports about the actions taken by Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî during the absence of Barqûq, namely SHM20, 21, 22 and 25.

⁷²⁰ See chapter one, pp. 78-9.

⁷²¹ Ibid., p. 85, footnote no. 370.

⁷²² Ibid., p. 80.

⁷²³ PMA5, 19, 26, 30, 53, 58, 74, 87, 88, 95, 96, 105, 152, 246, 266, 274, 297, 318, and FA2.

⁷²⁴ PMA266, 297 and 318.

example by Ibn Taghrîbirdî.⁷²⁵ The end result of these repetitions can actually be misleading. For example, Aḥmad, one of the sons of Baydamur al-Khawârizmî, was reported to have been executed in Damascus⁷²⁶ after the arrival of the sultan there on the 13th of Dhû al-Hijjâh, but Ibn Hajar then placed him and his brother Muḥammad, who died in Shawwâl,⁷²⁷ as part of a list of names of people killed in Sha‘bân!⁷²⁸

By and large, when compared to other works, *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* stands out neither at the level of the exactitude of its reports nor at that of their scope and breadth as they are usually summaries of what can be found elsewhere. We indicated earlier that Ibn Hajar had claimed to have used in writing his chronicle a large number of sources, notably Ibn Duqmâq, Ibn al-Furât, al-Maqrîzî, al-‘Aynî, Ibn Hijjî and others.⁷²⁹ In the absence of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* it will not be possible to determine the degree of reliance of *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* on this work.⁷³⁰ It is easier however to establish its filiation with *Târîkh al-Duwal*. The indebtedness of Ibn Hajar to Ibn al-Furât is self-evident, and not even the former’s propensity to rewrite and/or rearrange accounts he borrowed from others can hide it. This can be seen in numerous instances, and in the following report, PMA3, about the punishment of Arab chiefs from Egypt that Ibn Hajar and Ibn al-Furât were the only ones to mention:

Ibn al-Furât: “...*talaba al-sultân Ibn Fudâlah* [?] *shaykh al-Zuhûr ilâ al-istabl al-sultânî, fa-lammâ hadara bayna yadayhi rasama bi-darbihi bi-al-maqâri’*. *Wa-rasama bi-darbi Khâlid ibn Baghdâd bi-al-‘usî, fa-duriba, wa-shafa’a fîhi al-Amîr Bakalmish, amîr akhûr, fa-mâ ajâbahu, fa-râja’ahu, fa-ightâza al-sultân ‘alayhi wa-darabahu bi-al-namjât* [?] *bi-qirâbihâ darbatayn fî wajhihi*.....*Fa-rasama al-sultân bi-akhdhi sayfîhi wa-habasahu*

⁷²⁵ PMA26.

⁷²⁶ PMA318. On Baydamur and his sons, see above, pp. 144-5.

⁷²⁷ PMA277. According to Ibn al-Furât, he died on the 25th of this month.

⁷²⁸ *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, p. 73.

⁷²⁹ See chapter one, pp. 81-3.

⁷³⁰ There is slight evidence for only one possible borrowing from Ibn Duqmâq; see PMA245 in which the latter explained Mintâsh’s flight from Damascus as a result of the sultan’s arrival in Irbid on his way to the Syrian capital. In *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, Mintâsh is made to have left when Barqûq reached Damascus itself.

bi-al-rukkhânah al-sharîfah ilâ âkhir al-nahâr, fa-tala'û al-umarâ' ilâ 'inda al-sultân wa-bâsû al-ard, wa-shafa'û fihî, fa-akhrāju al-sultân.....wa-istaqarra bi-hî amîr akhûr 'alâ 'âdatihî." [Târikh al-Duwal, vol. 9:2, p. 245]

Ibn Hajar: "...wa-ahdara Ibn Fudâlah [?] shaykh 'arab al-Zuhûr, fa-duriba bi-hadratihî bi-al-maqâri'. Wa-ahdara Khâlid ibn Baghdâd, fa-duriba bayna yadayhî bi-al-'usî, fa-shafa'a fihî Bakalmish, amîr akhûr, fa-raddahu, thumma 'âda, fa-ghadiba minhu wa-darabahu bi-al-namjât [?] darbatayn. Wa-amara bi-imsâkihi fa-umsika, thumma shafa'a fihî al-umarâ' âkhir al-nahâr, fa-atlaqahu wa-istamarra 'alâ imratihî." [Inbâ' al-Ghumr, vol. 3, pp. 81-2]

Inbâ' al-Ghumr also owes to *Târikh al-Duwal* the overwhelming majority of the reports it contains, something which leaves only a few of them not traceable to Ibn al-Fûrat's work.

A handful of reports could be Maqrîzîan in origin. In one of them, PMA210, Ibn Hajar followed al-Maqrîzî in emphasizing the harshness of the treatment meted out by al-Tablâwî, the governor of Cairo, to Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, contrary to Ibn al-Furât's contradictory assessment:

Ibn al-Furât: "...fa-ahsana 'Alâ' al-Dîn [al-Tablâwî] ilayhî ihsân kathîr bi-khilâf mâ kâna fî adhhân al-nâs..." [Târikh al-Duwal, vol. 9:2, p. 261]

Al-Maqrîzî: "...fa-shaddada bi-'uqûbatihî..." [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:2, p. 746]

Ibn Hajar: "...fa-bâlagha fî-'uqûbatihî..." [Inbâ' al-Ghumr, vol. 3, p. 82]

In the others, al-Maqrîzî's influence can be felt but not firmly established. In PMA48 and 49, for example, along other historians, Ibn Hajar described the arrival in Cairo of Aytamish al-Bajâsî who was accompanied by emirs, both travel companions and prisoners. In *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, Alâbughâ al-'Uthmânî a.k.a. al-Dawâdâr (d.793/1391),⁷³¹ the *hâjib* of Damascus, was identified as being part of the latter group, while Ibn al-Furât had him part of Aytamish's entourage and the person who actually brought the prisoners in the presence of the sultan. Al-Maqrîzî's take on this event is somewhat misleading: he stated that a number of emirs accompanied Aytamish from Syria and then listed a few names, including that of Alâbughâ and those of prisoners. It is possible however, as can

⁷³¹ On him see *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*, vol. 1, p. 395.

also be seen in Ibn Taghrîbirdî's and al-Jawharî's accounts, that al-Maqrîzî simply placed pell-mell in one category all those who came along with Aytamish from Damascus.

Al-'Aynî might have also been used by Ibn-Hajar: even though unlike *'Iqd al-Jumân*, *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* did not provide an exact location for the meeting between Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and the sultan upon the latter's entry into Syria, the two accounts are very close:

Al-'Aynî: "...wa-kâna Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî lâqâ al-sultân 'inda Mastabat Lajjûn, fa-tarajjala al-sultân wa-mashâ khuṭuwât wa-arkabahu min marâkîbihi al-khâss....." [*Iqd al-Jumân* Ist., fol. 97b]

Ibn Hajar: "...wa-kâna Yalbughâ iltaqâh fa-tarajjala la-hu al-sultân wa-arkabahu min marâkîbihi al-khâssah....." [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, p. 58]⁷³²

Beyond the works and authors mentioned just above, it is difficult to establish with any degree of certainty Ibn Hajar's dependence on other sources. It is likely that he relied on Ibn Hîjjî, as he did in the annal of the year 804;⁷³³ unfortunately, the incompleteness of the annal of the year 793 in *Târikh Ibn Hîjjî*,⁷³⁴ coupled to the fact that *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* is a summary of the larger *dhayl* Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah wrote to his teacher's work, makes comparisons between the latter two chronicles and *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* problematic.⁷³⁵ It is also possible that he used a source or sources still unknown.⁷³⁶

⁷³² PMA241.

⁷³³ See chapter three, p. 233.

⁷³⁴ See below, pp. 180-1.

⁷³⁵ See, for example, RL32, where Ibn Hajar provided details about the events leading to the appointment of Ahmad ibn Nâsir al-Bâ'ûnî (d. 816/1413) as *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus found nowhere else. On al-Bâ'ûnî, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, 238-241.

⁷³⁶ Ibn Hajar might very well have based his accounts on what he himself had witnessed, heard of or memorized back in 793, when he was just starting the second decade of his life. Thus four of the five reports that are unique to his chronicle could be ascribed to some form of recollection on his part: RL37 is a half sentence account of the completion of a *madrasah* called al-Fakhrîyah; PMA152, a report on al-Nâsirî's alleged correspondence with the sultan urging him to come to Syria, probably after the beginning of the battles in Damascus; FA4 and 5 are obituaries really of Qarâ Hasan and Yahyâ, respectively, the Artûqid ruler of Mârdîn and that of Baghdad. For PMA152, Ibn Hajar might have relied on Ibn Hîjjî, since as the editor of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* noted in a footnote, al-Nu'aymî, the author of *Al-Dâris fî Târikh al-Madâris*, quoted him in the entry for al-Fakhrîyah; see *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, p. 77, footnote no. 5. As for the other three reports, I could locate them in none of the sources I consulted.

As a final note, in short, *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* does not add anything dramatically original to our knowledge of the year 793, but it does provide glimpses into the world of Ibn Hajar himself who, at age twenty, was probably well aware of what was going on around him, especially matters that dealt with things religious. Years later when he undertook the writing of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, we thus see him intrude in the narrative of 793 by means of an undated first person account of a trip he said he undertook to Qûs in the Sa'îd and during which he met men of science some of whom he named.⁷³⁷ In other instances, Ibn Hajar complemented reports available in other sources with information peculiar to his work. For example, in PMA42,⁷³⁸ Ibn Hajar noted almost word for word Ibn al-Furât's report about Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî's (d. 811/1408)⁷³⁹ trip to Syria to give Nu'ayr his *taqlîd* as prince of the Arabs, but added that al-Sâlimî met with Abû Hurayrah ibn al-Dhahabî (d. 799/1397),⁷⁴⁰ who read to him forty *ahâdîth* that his father, the famous historian al-Dhahabî (d. 748/1348), had gathered for him.

⁷³⁷ PMA29.

⁷³⁸ See also SHM4 which offered the longest and most detailed account of the remodelling of some of the architectural features of al-Nâsir Hasan's *madrasah* ordered by Barqûq. Ibn Hajar mixed data from Ibn al-Furât's description - the opening words of both *akhbâr* are identical -, with information either taken from al-Maqrîzî or from a source common to both, and with data found nowhere else, for example, the story of the window of a room formerly occupied by teachers at the *madrasah* which was turned into a door to facilitate the movement of people. Ibn Hajar then added that these modifications were done following the use that was made of the *madrasah* by Mintâsh and others during their siege of the Citadel, and concluded that things had gone back to the way they were when al-Ashraf Qâitbây ordered their restoration.

⁷³⁹ Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî was a *Zâhirî* emir who occupied a number of important functions during the lifetime of his *ustâdh* and that of his son Faraj, and who appears to have been very much involved in religious studies and in the persecution of both Copts and Jews; on him see Ibn Hajar, *Dhayl al-Durar al-Kâminah fi A'yân al-Mi'ah al-Tâsi'ah*, edited by Ahmad Farîd al-Mazîdî (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah), p. 139 and "Al-Manhal," Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 846a-847a.

⁷⁴⁰ On him see *Al-Durar al-Kâminah*, vol. 2, p. 341. Ibn Hajar made a reference to him similar to that of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* in, evidently, Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî's obituary in *Dhayl al-Durar al-Kâminah*, p. 139.

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Muhammad ibn Muhammad Ibn Sasrá

Very little if anything is known about Ibn Ṣasrá, one of two Syrian historians who were contemporaries of the events of the year 793, since there is no mention of him or of his works in the available primary sources. All that can be ascertained about him is that he was part of a Damascene scholarly family with long academic and religious credentials, that he lived at the end of the eighth/fourteenth and at the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth centuries, and that he finished his *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah fī al-Dawlah al-Zāhirīyah* sometime between Sha'bān 799 and Shawwāl 801.⁷⁴¹ It is thus not the details of his biography that make him and, more precisely, his work so important to any reconstruction of the events of the year 793: their significance lies elsewhere.

Even though Ibn Ṣasrá claimed in the opening pages of his work that he had abridged the biography of Barqûq in order to produce *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah*, it is not a full biography. However, it provides a detailed first-hand eyewitness descriptions of years 791-799/1389-1397⁷⁴² pivotal in the life and career of the sultan, notably the period running from 791 through 793, and it does so from a purely Syrian, and even Damascene, perspective. This Damascene perspective was reflected at a very basic level, in the myriad references to the topography of Damascus, whether buildings, mosques, neighbourhoods, etc. This mass of information about landmarks, some gone, others still extant, does not appear to have been subjected to any scholarly analysis beyond the rich commentaries and information provided by Brinner in the footnotes of the English translation. This,

⁷⁴¹ Brinner, Preface to the English translation of *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah*, pp. xii, xiv. All of the data contained in this and the following paragraphs were taken from Brinner's comments in his Preface, mainly pp. x-xix.

⁷⁴² According to Brinner, *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* might have actually begun earlier with the accession of Barqûq, but the only extant manuscript deals with the here mentioned years; *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. xv.

when combined with the highly unconventional style and format of this work makes it all the more important for our purposes here.

Even though its basic division is the year and its narrative is arranged according to the *chronological* unfolding of days and months, *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* owes little else to the annalistic format used by most major historians. In Brinner's words, the author's "major concern was not, obviously, the bare recounting of the events of a year, but the dramatization and highlighting of some of these events, using them as the points of departure for moralizing sermons comparing this transient world with the Hereafter, on the duties of rulers and their subjects, and on the evil of the times."⁷⁴³ This moralizing dimension of the text of *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* can be seen at work in the following passage, in which Ibn Ṣaṣrā reflected upon the ephemeral regime set up by Mintāsh in Damascus on the 1st of Rajab, in the absence of Yalbughā al-Nāsirī who would however return that very day:

Aḥmad Shukr immediately summoned Iyās, the mamluk of Ibn al-Ghāwī, and made him governor of the city. Ibn al-Zu'ayfirīnī rode with them, desiring to become chief caḍi of Damascus; for Mintāsh had promised that to him and that Aḥmad Shukr would be viceroy of Damascus. Aḥmad Šukr made a circuit of the city and left by the Bāb al-Farādīs⁷⁴⁴ for the Maydān.⁷⁴⁵ The Mintāshīs followed and had a great feast [celebrating] their entry into the city. God the Exalted erased their hearts, and they did not remember the consequences of deeds, because all of this [happened] so that he might execute [His] judgment and decree. In the Ḥadīṯ it is [written] that when God the Exalted desires to execute His judgment and decree, he deprives wise men of their intelligence. Praise be to him, there no god but He.

Their rule over the city lasted less than half a day, for affairs came into the hands of people not suited to them, and for this reason their term was brief...[Those appointed by Mintāsh] wrote out many letter-patents for emirs and chief officials, for people are covetous, and the love of this world destroys them.⁷⁴⁶

⁷⁴³ Ibid., p. xv.

⁷⁴⁴ A gate in the northern walls of the city; *ibid.*, p. 65, footnote no. 394.

⁷⁴⁵ An area located west of the western walls of Damascus; *ibid.*, p. 36, footnote no. 215.

⁷⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 107-8. This citation 'covers' PMA101, 102, 96 and parts of 103, in that order.

More than one third of the work is made up of non-historical material, stories, anecdotes, etc., such as the commentary quoted above. Moreover, *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* contains almost no biographical and appointment reports,⁷⁴⁷ save for information about people and leaders presented *in* and an *integral* part of a basically uninterrupted narrative. In many ways, this work reads like a historical novel whose reports have a 'right-off-the press' feel to them. This is probably due to the fact that most, if not all, of the narrative in *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* appears to be made up of eyewitness accounts by Ibn Ṣaṣrā of the events he lived through.⁷⁴⁸ This can be seen in the recounting of the events concerning Mīntāsh's dash from the Anatolian marches southward.⁷⁴⁹ Ibn Ṣaṣrā provided glimpses of his descent from the northern districts of Syria to Damascus interspersed with commentaries: the fleeing viceroy of Hama is mentioned by name; Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī is made to swear when news about Mīntāsh's arrival in Hama reached him; and his alleged verbal recommendation to the *nā'ib al-qal'ah* to fortify the citadel was noted and so was his request that lantern men call upon the soldiers to prepare for war; as the viceroy left the city, people reacted with fear and moved *intra-muros*, while news about Mīntāsh and his allies, whose names and whereabouts were dutifully noted, located him nearer and nearer to the provincial capital; and with the arrival of the bulk of the rebel troops in al-

⁷⁴⁷ Very little of the religious life of the city transpires in *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* as opposed to *Tārīkh Ibn Hījī* which contains a fair deal of biographies and of reports about the learned class. Reference to religious figures or religion was made by Ibn Ṣaṣrā only when it was part of his general narrative on political events – see below, the references in the section dealing with the battle of Damascus to the role played in it by religious personnel on either side; PMA102 and 125 – or when it allowed him to sermonize; see PMA157. The only exception to this rule is RL32, where he reported a few appointments made by Barqūq upon his return to Damascus, notably that of al-Bā'ūnī (d. 816/1413) as Shāfi'ī *qādī al-quḍāt*, a man obviously liked by Ibn Ṣaṣrā despite (or because!) what he said about him concerning his mistreatment of his fellow jurists.

⁷⁴⁸ While there are references in *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* to a number of historical works, none of their authors wrote about or lived through the period at hand; *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. xvi-xvii. The only hint as to the use by Ibn Ṣaṣrā of a contemporary source has been alluded to above, pp. 133-4. See also below, footnote no. 785 and pp. 185-7.

⁷⁴⁹ PMA72, 87, 88, 92, 87, 88 and 94, in that order. These *akhbār* correspond to pages 75-76 of the Arabic text and to pages 105-6 of the English translation.

Mizzah⁷⁵⁰ in the evening of the last day of the month, the fear and sense of insecurity of the population increased, worked as it was by rumours and memories of the siege at the hands of Barqûq.

But it is perhaps the details about the military engagements between Mintâsh and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, their locale and what they tell us about Syrian society at the end of the eighth/fourteenth century, that make *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah* essential reading. Here one ought to mention the vivid descriptions⁷⁵¹ Ibn Ṣaṣrâ made of the battles which took place in and around Damascus and their consequences: trench⁷⁵² and siege⁷⁵³ warfare, artillery exchanges,⁷⁵⁴ the strategic placing of artillery pieces,⁷⁵⁵ street fighting,⁷⁵⁶ the state of mind of the fighters and its impact on the prosecution of the war,⁷⁵⁷ etc.

Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah also contains more specific information about the configuration of the forces fighting one another, details that are conspicuously absent from most of the Egyptian sources. For example, in depicting Mintâsh's flight from the city after the defection of Tumântamur,⁷⁵⁸ Ibn Ṣaṣrâ mentioned in detail the names of the different groups (the populace, Turcomans from Tripoli, tribesmen from Jubbat 'Asâl, Turks and soldiers from Ṣafad) and others who were involved in the looting that took

⁷⁵⁰ A village located slightly southwest of the city; *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 44 footnote no. 269.

⁷⁵¹ See Ayalon's comment that these were "perhaps the most vivid picture of artillery in action throughout Mamluk history," in *Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom: A Challenge to a Mediaeval Society* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1956), p. 27. Also quoted in Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. xix.

⁷⁵² PMA108.

⁷⁵³ PMA122.

⁷⁵⁴ PMA113 and 116.

⁷⁵⁵ PMA116.

⁷⁵⁶ PMA108, 138 and 151.

⁷⁵⁷ In PMA187, the long account of the battle of Dumayr alluded to on a number of occasions above, one can clearly see the attention to detail shown by Ibn Ṣaṣrâ: he attributed the crushing defeat of al-Nâsirî to their utter state of fatigue of which Nu'ayr, their foe and victor, was well aware.

⁷⁵⁸ PMA184 and 185.

place in al-Maydân and al-Sâlihîyah.⁷⁵⁹ More important still, are the data concerning the various military forces on the ground during this period. Ibn Ṣagrâ for example, when he talked about the defeat of ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Ibn al-Hanash, the leader of the Qaysîs, at the hands of Aḥmad Shukr and a party of Yamanî tribesmen,⁷⁶⁰ on the 6th of Rajab, at ‘Aqabat al-Tînah, noted that one thousand of the *fallahîn* who accompanied ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Ibn al-Hanash were killed, two hundred Qaysîs and eight soldiers, ostensibly mamluks, from the garrison of Baalbek,⁷⁶¹ were captured, while the Yamanî *‘ushrân* prevailed upon Qaysî *‘ushrân*.⁷⁶² Are we dealing here with four (peasants, Qaysîs, mamluks and Qaysî *‘ushrân*), three (peasants, Qaysîs=Qaysî *‘ushrân* and mamluks) or two (Qaysîs=Qaysî *‘ushrân*= peasants and mamluks) categories of fighters in the loyalist camp? Anyone of the three classifications can be read into the text. Any attempt at clearing the confusion would require to ponder upon the term *‘ushrân* which has been rendered in English in a variety of ways: tribesmen by Brinner;⁷⁶³ Druze tribesmen and/or clansmen living in the highlands of Southern Lebanon and Northern Palestine who sometimes divided along Qays and Yaman lines, by Popper; great agricultural tribes of Syria by Poliak;⁷⁶⁴ etc. Generally, argues Irwin, the term “seems to have been used to describe semi-nomadic or sedentarised tribal groups, in contradistinction to more purely nomadic tribes, such as the

⁷⁵⁹ Jubbat ‘Asâl is a district in the Anti-Lebanon Range; al-Maydân and al-Sâlihîyah are, respectively, a race track west of the citadel of Damascus and a neighbourhood located a few miles to the Northwest of the city below Mount Qâsiyûn; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 124 footnote no. 735, p. 36 footnote no. 215 and p. 117 footnote no. 702.

⁷⁶⁰ For a short but concise overview of the Qays and Yaman tribal mythology as it impinged on Syrian politics during the years 791 to 793, see Robert Irwin, “Tribal Feuding and Mamluk Factions in Medieval Syria,” in *Texts, Documents and Artefacts: Islamic Studies in Honour of D.S. Richards*, edited by Chase Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 253-4.

⁷⁶¹ The viceroy of this city, Tankizbughâ – in the text of *Al-Durrah al-Mudî’ah*, Dankizbughâ – was accompanying Ibn al-Hanash with his men; *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 112 and footnote no. 675 therein.

⁷⁶² PMA120.

⁷⁶³ For example, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 11 and footnote no. 71 therein.

⁷⁶⁴ This sentence, with the exception to the reference to Brinner, is a paraphrase of Irwin, “Tribal Feuding,” pp. 255-6; see references in footnote nos. 11-16 therein.

Banû Fadl.”⁷⁶⁵ With this in mind and with the help of Ibn H̱ijjī’s⁷⁶⁶ and S̱āliẖ ibn Yahyā’s (lived during the first half of the ninth/fifteenth century) chronicles we can argue the following: Ibn al-H̱anash was accompanied by his Qaysī followers who were either mounted or on foot,⁷⁶⁷ a distinction which would *probably* correspond to a division between, respectively, a more sedentarised (peasants) and a less sedentarised nomadic (tribal chieftains) component within this group;⁷⁶⁸ according to S̱āliẖ ibn Yahyā, the Druze feudal chiefs of the Lebanese mountains, his ancestors at least, were also involved in battles around Damascus *after* Yalbughā al-Nāsirī became its viceroy in Sha‘bān 792, including that of Dumayr⁷⁶⁹ and presumably that of ‘Aqabat al-Tīnah;⁷⁷⁰ finally, one finds the mamluks of the viceroy of Baalbek. Evidently, to echo Irwin’s comments, much still needs to be done before a clearer picture of what constituted the Syrian army at the end of the eighth/fourteenth century can be acquired; *Al-Durrah al-Mudī’ah* and *Tārīkh Bayrūt* would be strong starting points for such an endeavour.

Ibn Saṣrā also provides historians with detailed insight into an interesting aspect of warfare in a densely populated urban environment, namely the way various groups fared in extraordinary circumstances. Beyond the description of the fear and suffering

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 256.

⁷⁶⁶ “Tārīkh Ibn H̱ijjī,” Köprülü 1027, fols. 96a-b.

⁷⁶⁷ This distinction was made by Ibn H̱ijjī; *ibid.*, fol. 96a.

⁷⁶⁸ This *could* correspond to the *fallāhīn* and to the Qaysī *‘ushrān* of the first classification of fighters. Hours and Salibi noted with reference, it is true, to Muḥammad, an early tenth/sixteenth century member of the Ibn al-H̱anash family, that his leadership resembled more that of a bedouin chief than that of a Lebanese mountain feudal (read sedentary) lord, because of the little concern he showed for building enduring symbols of attachment to the land, such as roads, bridges and the like; “Muhammad Ibn al-Hanash, muqaddam de la Biqā’,” p. 23. It is probable that on top of his immediate mounted entourage of retainers, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ibn al-H̱anash had armed peasant clients.

⁷⁶⁹ *Tārīkh Bayrūt*, pp. 209-12; 215-6. A member of his family died during this encounter; see pp. 209-10.

⁷⁷⁰ This group of fighting men *could* correspond to the Qaysīs mentioned by Ibn Saṣrā in the text. The Qaysī Druze chieftains of Lebanon and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ibn al-H̱anash *might* have commandeered the same pool of armed peasants of the southern Lebanese highlands, even though I have not come across any evidence for that.

experienced by the civilian population⁷⁷¹ and the sometimes forced mobilization of popular groups in the battles that were fought,⁷⁷² *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* dealt as well with the everyday details of life in a city at war. For example, Ibn Ṣaṣrā noted in a story from the beginning of the siege⁷⁷³ that in the Mintāshī-held areas, located mostly outside the western walls of the city, it was, literally, business as usual as trade in foodstuff went on unhindered, so much so that, Ibn Ṣaṣrā said, “anyone could eat as much meat as he desired.”⁷⁷⁴ In the same vein, he described how the necessity for some inhabitants to shuttle between the areas held by the ‘other side’ and their place of residence had repercussions on the psychology of the fighters in terms of their fear of spies and fifth columns heading into the areas they controlled, and consequently, on the problems the people who went back and forth faced in terms of abuses, unwarranted suspicions, mistaken identities and tragedies. All of these elements can clearly be seen in a story⁷⁷⁵ about a boy placed by al-Nāṣirī on guard duty at Bāb al-Naṣr⁷⁷⁶ in order for him to squeal on those he could identify as pro-Mintāshīs from amongst the people who shuttled between the areas held by Mintāsh and those held by the loyalists. The words of Ibn Ṣaṣrā are worth quoting:

When he said of anyone, ‘seize him!’ they [the Barqūqī police] would seize him immediately and take everything on him and with him. If they had any concern for him, they imprisoned him, otherwise they killed him. Fear overcame the people because of the lad, [both] the one who had gone out and the one who had not, [the latter] fearing that he would identify him as someone else, be burned immediately and perish in the fire...He aroused dread in the hearts of the people who feared him more than they did the viceroy of Syria.⁷⁷⁷

⁷⁷¹ PMA105, 112, etc.

⁷⁷² See, for example, PMA110, 125, 126, 136 and 168.

⁷⁷³ PMA112.

⁷⁷⁴ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 110.

⁷⁷⁵ PMA156.

⁷⁷⁶ A gate located near the citadel, in the western wall; *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 12 footnote no. 74.

⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.

Reading *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* is not however without its problems. From an historical perspective, the dating of its events is dismal in many parts of the text at hand. Whether it is Ibn Ṣaṣrā's fault or that of the copyist of the manuscript, it is impossible to tell, but one still has to rely on both *Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* and *Târîkh Ibn Hījî* in order to set straight the chronological unfolding of events. For example, the last complete date that appears in the narrative before dating becomes erratic for a few pages, is the 12th of Rajab [PMA120, *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah*, p. 80]. The following date to appear is the Monday [PMA122, *ibid.*, p. 81] that follows Friday the 12th of Rajab, which would be the 15th of the month. The report that comes after, the one about the great fires which ravaged numerous neighbourhoods and buildings west of the city [PMA123, *ibid.*, p. 81], is simply introduced with the mention "*wa-rakaba thâni yawm Iyâs wa-al-Nâsirî...*," which would have to correspond to the 16th of Rajab. After the mention of an event taking place on "*thâlith yawm*" [PMA125, *ibid.*, pp. 81-2], the next two dated reports are from Thursday the 15th of Rajab [PMA122, *ibid.*, p. 83], yet another impossibility, and from the 18th of the same month [PMA134, *ibid.*, p. 83]; only then, did Ibn Ṣaṣrā date a *khavar* on Saturday 20th of Rajab [PMA135, p. 83] which does correspond to the actual calendar of the year 793.⁷⁷⁸

This last shortcoming of *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* as well as those associated with the very style of the text,⁷⁷⁹ does not temper in any way its undeniable value for modern historians interested in the history of Damascus during this troubled period. But did this primordial concern with his hometown influence the way Ibn Ṣaṣrā recounted some important events? The question is relevant to at least one report. Ibn Ṣaṣrā described in a

⁷⁷⁸ An even more blatant dating error can be seen in PMA141 where Barqûq was made to have left Cairo in Rajab, while in fact he did not leave Cairo until the 22nd of Sha'bân.

⁷⁷⁹ See Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. xix-xxv.

*khabar*⁷⁸⁰ dated from the first decade of Rabī‘ al-Thâni, the departure to Cairo of a party of emirs and other personalities who had been imprisoned in Damascus as a result of their involvement in anti-Barqûq politics in Damascus during the siege of the city in 792. The leader of this party was an Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî who, according to *Al-Durrah al-Mudî‘ah*, accompanied the group to Gaza. Contemporary historians claimed, contrary to Ibn Ṣaṣrâ, that Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî did indeed reach Cairo with his prisoners, and they also made much of the arrival along with this group of Aytamish al-Bajâsî whose return to Cairo and more than warm reception on the part of Barqûq was dutifully highlighted.⁷⁸¹ Does this mean that the ‘coverage’ available to Ibn Ṣaṣrâ in terms of his sources, did not extend beyond Gaza? It is highly unlikely, since his work does contain reports, few in number, of things Egyptian,⁷⁸² but even then, one still cannot account for the absence of Aytamish from his report.

The same overall ignorance of events which occurred far from Damascus⁷⁸³ is also evident vis-à-vis other Syrian locales. News about Aleppo is sparse in *Al-Durrah al-Mudî‘ah* which contains none of the long narratives found in the other chronicles about what took place thereabouts.⁷⁸⁴ Following the departure of the sultan from Damascus to Northern Syria around the 8th of Shawwâl, only five *akhbâr* dealing with Aleppo are reported by Ibn Ṣaṣrâ:⁷⁸⁵ the news about the sultan’s arrival there which reached Damascus via one of al-Nâsirî’s mamluks;⁷⁸⁶ another about a military expedition to al-

⁷⁸⁰ PMA46.

⁷⁸¹ PMA48 and 49.

⁷⁸² See, for example, PMA48.

⁷⁸³ This was already noted by Popper, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. xv.

⁷⁸⁴ See, for example, PMA289, 294 and 296.

⁷⁸⁵ The fact that one of those reports, PMA280 is similar to one in Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*, poses the issue of Ibn Ṣaṣrâ’s sources: either the two historians had the same sources, or they each used two different ones that related however the same event.

⁷⁸⁶ PMA279.

Bîrah⁷⁸⁷ Barqûq ordered early on in his stay;⁷⁸⁸ a report about the execution of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî as it was communicated to Ibn Ṣasrâ by “one of the prominent people”⁷⁸⁹ and another about his arrest brought by a post messenger.⁷⁹⁰ Maybe the most revealing of Ibn Ṣasrâ’s ‘world view’ is the fifth report: of all the detailed information concerning the appointments made by the sultan to Syrian viceroalties (Damascus, Aleppo, Hama, Tripoli and Ṣafad) after he disposed of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, only the appointee to that of Damascus is mentioned by name.⁷⁹¹

B. Ahmad Ibn Hijjî ibn Mûsâ al-Husbânî (751-816/1350-1413):

The biography of Ibn Hijjî reads like that of his pupil Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah. He was born into a Shâfi‘î scholarly family in Damascus and apparently excelled in a number of fields such as *fiqh*, *hadîth*, etc.⁷⁹² He eschewed the position of chief qadi on a number of occasions, but he did occupy functions related to his field of studies, namely *khatîb* and *nâzir* of the Omeyyad mosque, deputy judge, etc.

Ibn Hijjî is the author of a work, identified throughout this research as *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*, which covered the years 741-747 and 769-815 minus the year 775.⁷⁹³ According to Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, Ibn Hijjî asked him on his deathbed, to fill the chronological gap of 748-768 and 775. However, when he embarked upon this task, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah noticed

⁷⁸⁷ A town located slightly north east of Aleppo; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 135 footnote no. 797.

⁷⁸⁸ PMA280. Ibn Ṣasrâ noted that the emirs sent to al-Bîrah were Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, Aytamish al-Bajâsî, one Kumushbughâ and Buṭâ al-Ṭûlûtamurî. In a footnote, no. 795, in his *A Chronicle of Damascus*, Brinner refers the reader to another footnote, no. 220, which indicates that the Kumushbughâ in question here is no other than Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî. The problem is that according to all other sources, al-Ḥamawî was in Egypt as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah*. Ibn Ṣasrâ might have been referring to Kumushbughâ al-Ṣaghîr whom sources say had been part of the expeditionary force which accompanied the sultan to Syria; see PMA202.

⁷⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 136; PMA296.

⁷⁹⁰ PMA300.

⁷⁹¹ Buṭâ al-Ṭûlûtamurî (d.794/1391); see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 3, pp. 375-80. PMA304.

⁷⁹² The biographical data in this paragraph are from *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 1, pp. 269-71.

⁷⁹³ The data in this and the following paragraph are based on the contents of chapter one, pp. 114ff.

that his master had forgotten to mention a great number of obituaries and events dealing mostly with areas other than Syria. The end result was a *dhayl* to Ibn Hijjî's history identified in this research as *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, which came into existence as a result of a two-stage process. Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah started with an initial recension of his teacher's history by copying it and often annotating it with marginalia, and then later incorporated these annotations as well as passages taken from *Al-Muntaqá* and other sources into a second recension, i.e., *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*. This last work was summarized in its turn to about a third of the size of the original, the work Adnân Darwîsh edited in four volumes, *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*.

Since the sections of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* that are still extant in MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458 cover only the years 796-815, one has no choice but to turn to the two recensions made by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah of Ibn Hijjî's work for a Hijjîian narrative about the year 793. The problem with this endeavour is that there is a plethora of texts, all written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's distinctive and highly unreadable handwriting, scattered in a variety of manuscripts, notably Chester Beatty 4125, 5527 and Köprülü 1027.⁷⁹⁴ Based on my examination of these three manuscripts, only Köprülü 1027 contains an annal of the year 793, part of the first recension made by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*⁷⁹⁵

This annal⁷⁹⁶ is peculiar in a number of respects. First, it does not cover the whole year, as there is a hiatus, with no change in the numbering of the folios, from the third

⁷⁹⁴ These three manuscripts were kindly lent to me by David C. Reisman.

⁷⁹⁵ Based on my own *cursory* exploration of the manuscript and on Reisman's research, Köprülü 1027 appears to contain the following, in that order: 787-788 [fols. 2a-22b]; notes on 789-791 [fols. 47b-51a]; 791-797 [fols. 50b-187a]; notes on 797-799, 801, 803-811, 799-801, 803, 808, 811 [fols. 187b-193a]; 791 [fols. 193b-230b; these correspond to the text of *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn al-Furât* until the month of Ramaḍân]. The emphasis on the uncertainty concerning its contents is warranted because it includes numerous pages of text and notes the identity of which cannot be ascertained; needless to say that this and other manuscripts from the hand of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah await thorough investigation.

⁷⁹⁶ "Târikh Ibn Hijjî" MS Köprülü 1027, fols. 93b-100b.

decade of Sha‘bân⁷⁹⁷ to the last of the obituaries of the Dhû al-Hijjah.⁷⁹⁸ Second, there is no heading for the months of Safar, Rabî‘ al-Thânî and Jumâdâ al-Ûlá, and no reports are to be found under the months of Muḥarram and Rabî‘ al-Awwal, except for obituaries.⁷⁹⁹ Third, the text is marred not only by the difficult handwriting of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, but also by the very bad state of the manuscript itself which often makes it impossible to decipher its contents, especially, but not exclusively, the marginal annotations. Despite these pitfalls, there are many factors that indicate that we are most probably dealing with a text originally authored by Ibn Hijjî. First, there is Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s own declaration in the opening pages of his *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* as to the genealogy of this work. Second, there is the available textual evidence. Compared to that of *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, the annal of 793 in *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* includes none of the passages easily traceable to Ibn al-Furât’s *Târîkh al-Duwal*,⁸⁰⁰ but contains either longer versions of Syrian reports found in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*⁸⁰¹ or, again, Syrian *akhbâr* totally absent from the latter.⁸⁰² This, plus the numerous *hawâshi*⁸⁰³ in the margins, led me to

⁷⁹⁷ Dated Sha‘bân 22nd, the last report mentioned in the text is PMA193, which is to be found at the bottom of fol. 99b.

⁷⁹⁸ Fols. 100a-b.

⁷⁹⁹ Here, one might assume two things: that Ibn Hijjî saw nothing in the first three months of 793 that needed to be recounted, or that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah purposefully decided, when doing his recension of this year, to bypass some of the data in *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*: either one of these views might then explain the fact that for the months of Muḥarram, Safar and Rabî‘ al-Awwal *all* the reports in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* were Furâtian in origin. There is the possibility that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah in the admittedly smaller *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* wanted to emphasize the reports dealing with or originating in Egypt by relying on Ibn al-Furât, but the presence of a very large number of Syrian *akhbâr* in the rest of the annal goes against such a view.

⁸⁰⁰ In both its edited and *Al-Muntaqá* forms.

⁸⁰¹ See, for example, the longer description made by Ibn Hijjî of the aftermath of the battle of Dumayr; PMA187.

⁸⁰² See, for example, PMA128.

⁸⁰³ These annotations are sometimes absent from a large number of folios, and in the annal of the year 793, six out of fifteen are for all intents and purposes devoid of marginalia. However, the question of the nature and origin of these annotations, most of them unreadable, is of great importance. To follow Reisman’s reasoning, we might assume that those that end with h for *hâshiyah* and are embedded in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, were those reports added by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah to the text of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* in order to produce the second recension; “A Holograph MS.,” pp. 31-2. In the case of the annotations which end with s for

conclude that the folios at hand are part of the process of elaboration of the first recension⁸⁰⁴ made by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah of his teacher's history, and thus a fairly exact, even though incomplete,⁸⁰⁵ reproduction of Ibn Hġijġi's work.

Even though its first 'real' reports dealt with the execution of a number of emirs in Egypt,⁸⁰⁶ *Tārġkh Ibn Hġijġi* is very much a chronicle whose entire focus is on Syria and Damascus to be precise, very much like Ibn Sasrā's *Al-Durrah al-Mudġiah* with which it shares many characteristics. The concern for things Syrian can be seen at many levels. All the appointments, religious and political, mentioned in *Tārġkh Ibn Hġijġi* deal specifically with Syria, and more particularly with Damascus. Ibn Hġijġi for example noted in four different reports the whereabouts of Arġhūn Shāh al-Ibrāhġmġ (d. 801/1398),⁸⁰⁷ an emir whose claim to fame, during this part of the year 793, was his appointment to the

sahh, two hypotheses can be advanced: either Ibn Qâdġ Shuhbah was correcting Ibn Hġijġi's reports or he was adding to the text information he simply omitted by mistake from the latter's work. In the absence of the original *Tārġkh Ibn Hġijġi* annal for 793 and of Ibn Qâdġ Shuhbah's second recension for that same year, and in view of the sorry state of the folios being studied, it is not possible to establish with certainty the nature of these annotations. For the purposes of this study, only those marginal annotations that are readable, are long enough to constitute full-fledged *akhbār*, are clearly identified with a *s* for *sahh* and do not appear in the obituaries sections of the text, will be taken into account in the analysis that follows. This amounts to only an addendum to PMA138 located in the margin of a different folio [96b], which provides additional information concerning the battle that allowed the loyalists to remove the Mintāshġs from the house of Bahādur; on this battle, see above, pp. 142 and 147. I have nevertheless included in Tables II. 1. A. and II. 1. B., other marginal reports, namely PMA6, 38, 46 and SHM14, that are readable but that cannot be clearly identified, unlike PMA138 elements of which can be found in *Tārġkh Ibn Qâdġ Shuhbah*. These four reports are identified with an asterisk.

⁸⁰⁴ This categorization will be qualified in chapter three, pp. 240-1.

⁸⁰⁵ It is more than probable that most of the non-Furātian material in *Tārġkh Ibn Qâdġ Shuhbah* from the end of Sha'bān to the obituaries of Dhū al-Hġijjah originated in *Tārġkh Ibn Hġijġi* so well established is Ibn Qâdġ Shuhbah's indebtedness to his teacher; but to be on the safe side, they will not be considered as Hġijġian in origin since there is uncertainty regarding them. To sum up, the extant folios for the year 793 in MS "Tārġkh Ibn Hġijġi," Kōpršlš 1027, will suffice for our purposes here since they cover most of the important events of the siege of Damascus.

⁸⁰⁶ This is if one disregards PMA1, which is basically a list of military, administrative and religious officials in Egypt and Syria. See PMA58, 59, 60, 129 and 143, all *akhbār* of a political nature that deal with the execution of emirs and personalities who were identified with or worked for the Mintāshġ regime in both Syria and Egypt.

⁸⁰⁷ On him, see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 223-4.

hujūbiyah of Damascus at the end of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah.⁸⁰⁸ In the same vein, the two religious nominations noted in *Târikh Ibn Hujjî* for this year, are those of Syrian qadis, one to Tripoli and the other to Damascus.⁸⁰⁹ Interestingly, the attention paid to things religious by Ibn Hujjî, a member of the learned class of Damascus, intersected with the very large body of reports that deal with the battles that took place in his city throughout Rajab and Sha‘bân. On numerous occasions, he noted the role played by the qadis in the fighting,⁸¹⁰ their role as moral authorities in the city,⁸¹¹ and the use of *zakât* money in the war effort.⁸¹² But the war for Damascus was not only the occasion for Ibn Hujjî to talk about his peers: it occupies in its own right a pivotal position in his work.

In this respect, *Târikh Ibn Hujjî* provides very rich data, some of it unique, concerning for example, the exact location of the Mintâshîs,⁸¹³ the movement of troops⁸¹⁴ and actual encounters between the protagonists,⁸¹⁵ etc. However, in most of his reports concerning the war, Ibn Hujjî provides data that either complemented or paralleled those found in *Al-Durrah al-Mudî‘ah*, even though generally the latter is richer in details.⁸¹⁶ all the important military engagements⁸¹⁷ are recorded in both works and some even elicited

⁸⁰⁸ PMA75, 119, 139 and 182. The only other appointment in this annal is that of one Qarâbughâ al-‘Alâ‘î as *shâdd al-awqâf*; PMA82.

⁸⁰⁹ RL7 and 8.

⁸¹⁰ As guardians of those gates located in the western wall of the city that were exposed to Mintâshî attacks; see PMA109, as well as PMA177.

⁸¹¹ On two occasions during the siege of the city, the qadis read letters sent to them from Cairo, one from the caliph and the other from the sultan, respectively, urging the people to fight on in favour of Barqûq and thanking them for their steadfastness; see PMA131 and 158. In two other *akhbâr*, Ibn Hujjî reported the involvement of two religious figures in anti-Barqûqî activities, one as purveyor of fodder to the Mintâshîs, and the other for having corresponded with the sultan’s enemies; see PMA162 and 163.

⁸¹² This, noted Ibn Hujjî, weakened the four *madhhbs* financially especially since they had incurred many losses as a result of the destruction of *waqfs* during the fighting; PMA144.

⁸¹³ PMA111.

⁸¹⁴ PMA140.

⁸¹⁵ PMA166, 171, 172, 177 and 183.

⁸¹⁶ In PMA186 for example, Ibn Sasrá, as was noted above, gave a detailed description of the various groups involved in the looting of al-Maydân, following Mintâsh’s precipitous departure from his encampment, whereas Ibn Hujjî simply stated that it was the populace that was responsible for this deed.

⁸¹⁷ PMA108, 113, 120, 123, 134, 178, 179, 185, 186, 187 and 192.

similar responses on the part of the two authors. The crushing defeat of the loyalists at Dumayr⁸¹⁸ prompted both Ibn Sasrá and Ibn Hijjî to muse, in admittedly different styles,⁸¹⁹ about the humiliation, disarray and physical destruction of the Barqûqîs following this battle. Last but not least, *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*, here again as *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah*, also presented glimpses of a social environment in the grips of a brutal war. Among other things, it sheds light on the crystallization of the population's loyalties around either one of the two warring camps,⁸²⁰ and especially on the deep-rooted antagonisms between Qays and Yaman clearly displayed during the conflict.⁸²¹ The description of the degree of violence, often wholesale slaughter, which accompanied the encounter between the two camps is certainly not peculiar to Ibn Hijjî. Ibn Sasrá gave a much more vivid and dramatic description of the killing of Qaysîs from the Biqâ' valley at the hands of Ibn Hilâl al-Dawlah and his Yamanîs at al-Maydân following the encounter at 'Aqabat al-Tinah,⁸²² than Ibn Hijjî's, but the latter provided for the same incident a more tragic dimension: two of the Qaysîs who had managed to flee and seek refuge in a mosque were caught and killed inside the religious edifice. In another

⁸¹⁸ PMA187. In this particular report, Ibn Hijjî included a small, albeit interesting piece of information concerning warfare: the fact that the Bedouins initiated combat by literally encircling Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî ("fa-dâra 'alayhim al-'Arab halqah").

⁸¹⁹ Ibn Sasrá used a measure of derision ("the troops returned and entered the city after having recovered somewhat from their condition, each two riding one donkey...", *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 125), but let 'Alâ' al-Dîn Aybak (d. 803/1400) speak through his verse; on this poet see references, p. 34 footnote no. 207, and "Al-Manhal," *Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 târikh*, fols. 496a-497a. Ibn Hijjî on the other hand, provided a half a folio long description of the sorry state of the troops as they returned to the city in groups, through mountains, streams and valleys, some "wounded or missing a limb...", etc.; see "Târikh Ibn Hijjî," MS Köprülü 1027, fols. 99a-b.

⁸²⁰ Ibn Hijjî referred specifically to the 'asabiyyah that overtook the population of Damascus: the populace (the people of al-Shuwaykah and al-Shâghûr, and a few of the inhabitants of Maydân al-Ḥasâ) supported Mintâsh ("fa-sâra fî al-'awâm 'asabiyyah ma'a Mintâsh"), while the elite ("jumhûruhum") supported al-Nâsirî; PMA110.

⁸²¹ See Irwin, "Tribal Feuding," pp. 253-4.

⁸²² PMA120.

report,⁸²³ Ibn Hijjî recounted that when Qaysîs arrested a well-respected Yamanî dignitary at Sûq al-Muṭarrizîn,⁸²⁴ the population, presumably of that neighbourhood, released him from custody. Ibn Hijjî cared not only to mention this man's name, Ibn 'Abd al-Dâ'im, but also noted that he lived within the city and that he was one of the grandees of Jubbat 'Asal. What is of interest here is that even though the distribution of groups, sects and communities in the urban setting of Damascus is broadly known⁸²⁵ this 'living' topographical detail and others found in *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* and *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah* might provide us with further sociological data on the interaction of Damascus and its hinterland in terms of population movement and urban settlement. In the same vein, this report echoes, if only obliquely, another by Ibn Saṣrâ,⁸²⁶ that tribesmen from Jubbat 'Asal participated in the sack of al-Sâlihîyah and al-Maydân following Mintâsh's hasty withdrawal therefrom.⁸²⁷

What is one to make of the presence, in both *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* and *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah*, of accounts dealing in common with a large enough number of events? In other words, what is the likelihood of mutual borrowings or interdependence? Beyond the existence of certain minute elements found in the narration of a number of reports common to both authors, one cannot establish a pattern of borrowing between the two. One might then postulate the existence of a common source, either oral or written, which maybe recounted events that neither one of them had lived through and the accounts of

⁸²³ PMA128.

⁸²⁴ There is one reference to this market in H. Sauvaire, "Description de Damas: la Conclusion," in *Journal Asiatique*, novembre-décembre 1895, p. 433. Its location is probably somewhere in the north eastern quarters of the city; see Émilie E. Ouéchék, *Index Général de la "Description de Damas" de Sauvaire* (Damas: Institut Français de Damas, 1954) p. 97.

⁸²⁵ See, for example, Ira M. Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 85-88, 90-1, 93-4.

⁸²⁶ PMA186.

⁸²⁷ In this case, we are probably dealing with Qaysîs hailing from the same region.

which they then reported differently. The similarity might ultimately be no more than circumstantial, and thus the end product of the sheer ‘Syrianness’ of the events of the year and that of the two authors themselves: Ibn Hijjî and Ibn Sasrá, both undoubtedly proud Damascenes, lived through difficult times and wrote, as eyewitnesses, about the ordeal of their city, each in his own style and according to his personal concerns.

To be sure, the two works are dissimilar in many respects. As was noted by Brinner,⁸²⁸ *Al-Durrah al-Mudî’ah* appears to owe nothing to other sources in terms of overall format and style, and it is perhaps this ‘insularity’ of Ibn Sasrá’s work that most distinguishes it from Ibn Hijjî’s. *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*, despite its basic Syrianness, is a typical example of Mamluk historiography, an annalistic chronicle that includes socio-political and religious reports, along with obituaries. Ibn Hijjî himself, unlike Ibn Sasrá whose conspicuous absence in the sources of the period amounts to sheer ‘invisibility,’ was very much part of the mamluk Syro-Egyptian socio-intellectual scene. According to al-Sakhâwî, he visited Cairo on numerous occasions and apparently interacted with people such as Ibn Hajar and al-Maqrîzî.⁸²⁹ Maybe this exposure to Egyptian scholarly circles can account for the possibility that he might have relied on Egyptian sources directly for some of his few Egyptian reports. Thus, we can observe striking similarities between both his and Ibn al-Furât’s accounts of the appointment of Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd ibn Muḥammad al-Qaysarî, as Hanafî qâdî al-quḍât in Cairo after the removal of Majd al-Dîn Ismâ‘îl al-Turukmânî:

Ibn al-Furât: “..wa-nazala qarîb al-maghrib wa-kâna yawman mashhûdan...” [*Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 258-9]

⁸²⁸ *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. xv-xvi.

⁸²⁹ *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 1, pp. 270-1; see also chapter three, p. 245.

Ibn Hiji: "...*wa-nazala qarīb al-maghrib fi haybah 'azīmah.*" ["*Tārīkh Ibn Hiji*," MS Köprülü 1027, fol. 99a]⁸³⁰

One last question needs to be tackled. Beyond a Syrianness born out of circumstance, to what extent, if any, do these two works belong to such a thing as a Syrian school? For the sake of clarification, I shall quote David Reisman who has managed effectively and concisely to summarize the whole question of the dichotomy between "Egyptian" and "Syrian" schools of history writing:

Broadly speaking, [the former] are chiefly political histories while the latter are intellectual histories. Such intellectual histories are by no mean concerned with the history of ideas (which is a distinctly modern concept); rather the primary intention of intellectual histories of the Mamluk period is to produce a record of events and people connected to the institutions and fields of religion, law and education. Moreover, the 'Syrian school' of historians, as distinct from its Egyptian counterpart, produced works which, in terms of their structure, devote much more attention to biographies and specifically to biographies of people from the intellectual class. While the division of historical writing into *hawādith* (reports of events) and *tarājim* (biographies) is common to both genres, the differences that allow us to speak of the 'Egyptian school' and the 'Syrian school' are really those of emphasis.⁸³¹

Notwithstanding its fundamental Syrianness, the factors noted in the above quotation lead one to safely disregard *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah* as belonging to the 'Syrian histories' category. The problem is more serious with regard to *Tārīkh Ibn Hiji*. The nagging uncertainty that obscures its true nature prevents one, at this point at least, from making too many sweeping statements regarding the respective importance of its *hawādith* and *tarājim*. However if the contents of the existing text are any indication, out of its thirteen folios, only a little more than three are comprised of obituaries, compared to the thirty-one pages devoted by Ibn Qādī Shuhbah to obituaries out of a total of fifty-three. In terms of the parameters set out by modern-day scholars, the relatively smaller

⁸³⁰ RL16. A marginal annotation on fol. 99a of *Tārīkh Ibn Hiji* reads "*iwadān 'an Majd al-Dīn Ismā'il.*"

⁸³¹ "A Holograph Manuscript," p. 24.

space *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* devoted to obituaries places it out of the so-called 'Syrian school.' Needless to say that any characterization of Ibn Hījī's work ought to proceed from a sustained examination of the original text of his *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* and its comparison with Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah's recensions, something which will be undertaken in the following chapter.⁸³²

III. Later Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Jamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî (812-874/1409-70):

The overall format of the annal of the year 793 in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* continues that adopted by Ibn Taghrîbirdî for the year 778. First and foremost, his narrative remained one of mostly chronologically consecutive political events, interspersed here and there with a few reports of a social nature, four in all, and one religious appointment.⁸³³ Second, he continued to include in a few places of his text musings about the wretchedness and unpredictability of the world of politics.⁸³⁴ Third, probably still basing himself on his peculiar personal situation and on the knowledge he accumulated as a result thereof,⁸³⁵ he kept on providing, retrospectively, various types of details that clarified or rendered more precise the information found elsewhere.⁸³⁶

⁸³² See chapter three, pp. 264-8.

⁸³³ See Table II. 1. B.

⁸³⁴ In PMA48, after presenting the new seating arrangements at the court of Barqûq following the arrival of Aytamish al-Bajâsî in Cairo, Ibn Taghrîbirdî commented: "*qultu: wa-hâdhâ sha'n al-duniâ, al-raf' wa-al-khafâ;*" *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 19.

⁸³⁵ See chapter one, pp. 86-7, 90-2.

⁸³⁶ This type of details abounds in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*. For example, in PMA129, which recounts the execution of two mamluks accused of having insulted the Prophet, Ibn Taghrîbirdî explained, like al-Maqrîzî, that the judges gathered in "the Sâlihîyah College Mosque in the street 'Between the Two Palaces'" and that the pair were "made to stand on the road below the window grill of the Mosque;" but then he supplied information found nowhere else, that this spot was "near the Slaves' Tent;" Popper, *History of Egypt*, p. 126 and *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 23. In other instances, he simply relied on well-known news to make his point. For example, in RL16, a report noted by most historians, much is made

The true novelty of the narrative of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* lies in the fact that Ibn Taghrîbirdî switched historical ‘blueprints:’ in the annal of 793 the foundation of most of his *akhbâr* is no longer Duqmâqian, but rather Maqrîzîan. Despite changes he made to the wording of some reports or to their size and the omission of others in order to fit the format he chose for his chronicle, the text of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* itself is unmistakably identical to that of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, as can be seen in the following passage and countless others:

Al-Maqrîzî: “...*wa-uhdira Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî wa-duriba ‘alâ aktâfîhi, wa-umira wâlî al-Qâhirah bi-takhlîs huqûq al-nâs minhu.*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:2, p. 734]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: “...*wa-ahdara aydan Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî, nâ’ib al-Wajh al-Qiblî, wa-darabahu ‘alâ aktâfîh, wa-amara wâlî al-Qâhirah bi-takhlîs huqûq al-nâs minhu.*” [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 18]⁸³⁷

There are indications however that *Kitâb al-Sulûk* was not his only source. Within the framework of the *khbar* concerning the killing of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, he cited al-‘Aynî by name and then went on to quote a substantial part of that emir’s obituary in *‘Iqd al-Jumân*.⁸³⁸ In other instances, he appears to have also relied on Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*. In most cases, the relationship is somewhat oblique, and cannot be ascertained. For example, the expression “*‘alâ hîn ghaflah*” used by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir to describe the coming of Mintâsh to the province of Aleppo, was employed by Ibn Taghrîbirdî to explain the speed with which of al-Nâsirî left Damascus to confront the

of the fact that the new Hanafî head judge, Jamâl al-Dîn Mahmûd al-Qaysarî, was called *al-janâb al-‘âlî*, a title given, among men of the pen, to the *wazîr* and to qadî ‘Imâd al-Dîn Ahmad al-Karakî; to this Ibn Taghrîbirdî added that the latter qadî was awarded such a dignified title because of the support he gave to Barqûq when he was in prison at al-Karak.

⁸³⁷ PMA23. While al-Maqrîzî’s account is clearly based on Ibn al-Furât’s, the two are not identical.

⁸³⁸ The passage quoted by Ibn Taghrîbirdî was probably based in part on Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s, and it is closer to the text of the Dâr al-Kutub manuscript of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* than on that of Ahmet III; see *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 28; “*Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*,” MS Marsh 319, fols. 271b-272a; “*‘Iqd al-Jumân*,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*, fols. 436-7; “*‘Iqd al-Jumân*,” MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fol. 99b.

rebel leader when news of his arrival reached him.⁸³⁹ Ibn Taghrîbirdî's short mention of Barqûq's trip to Aleppo, PMA264 and 267, by means of Homs and Hama, also echoes that of *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*:

Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir: “*wasala madînat Hims wa-aqâma bi-hâ wa-al-nâs fî khidmatih.....wa-lammâ wasalû madînat Hamâh...*” [“*Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*,” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fol. 269a]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: “...*ba‘da an aqâma bi-madînat Hims wa-Hamâh ayyâman kathîrah.*” [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 27].

These borrowings, as such, concerned a very limited number of cases and pieces of information that were not too pivotal, so that it does not make a dent in Ibn Taghrîbirdî's massive debt to al-Maqrîzî.

B. ‘Alî ibn Dâwûd al-Jawharî al-Sayrafî (819-900/1416-1494):

One of Ibn Hajar's many disciples, ‘Alî ibn Dâwûd al-Jawharî al-Sayrafî⁸⁴⁰ was a man of the pen who never managed to secure himself a solid career in his own field. He did at some point obtain a position as deputy Hanafî judge in Cairo, but throughout his life he had to earn a living by copying manuscripts and by working, like his father before him, as a money-changer in the jewellery market, thus his name.⁸⁴¹ Al-Jawharî did not have much of an impact on the academic and intellectual scene of Cairo, and the only biographical data about him has to be gleaned from a vitriolic obituary in *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*.⁸⁴² Al-Sakhâwî does not seem to have seen anything redeemable about al-Jawharî, as he faulted him on many accounts. Among other things, he noted that in writing history,

⁸³⁹ PMA87.

⁸⁴⁰ Hereafter, al-Jawharî.

⁸⁴¹ The information in this paragraph was culled from Petry, *Protectors or Praetorians*, p. 6 and Habashî's “Introduction” to *Nuzhat al-Nufûs*, pp. 3-9; see bibliographical reference below, in footnotes nos. 844 and 845.

⁸⁴² *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, vol. 5, pp. 517-9.

nothing but his appearance distinguished him from the populace, a reference, doubtless, to his alleged unsophisticated colloquial writing.⁸⁴³

Al-Jawharî authored two historical works, *Nuzhat al-Nufûs wa-al-Abdân fî Tawârikh al-Zamân*⁸⁴⁴ and *Inbâ' al-Hasr fî Abnâ' al-'Asr*,⁸⁴⁵ and of these, only the first is of interest to us here since the year 793 is part of the period it covers, namely 786-879/1384-1475. Interestingly, his alleged 'ammîyah style does not transpire in the narrative of the year 793, but can be seen, apparently, in *Inbâ' al-Hasr*: according to Habashî, the fact that in *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* al-Jawharî had to rely on other historians' works to produce his annals of years he was not contemporary of, led him to show great attention to his style and vocabulary when copying from them.⁸⁴⁶

And copy he did. A collation of *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* with other chronicles reveals that, first, *all* the accounts⁸⁴⁷ it contains are part of the group of reports common to both al-Maqrîzî and to Ibn al-Furât;⁸⁴⁸ second, consequently, none of the reports found only in, respectively, *Târikh al-Duwal* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, have been used by al-Jawharî; third, it is less copious in terms of sheer number of reports than the other two;⁸⁴⁹ last but not least, it is, simultaneously, close to both *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and to *Târikh al-Duwal*.

At first sight, the text of the *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* appears as close to the former as it is to the latter. However, a more detailed examination of these three sources shows

⁸⁴³ Ibid., p. 518.

⁸⁴⁴ Edited in four volumes by Hasan Habashî (Cairo: Wizârat al-Thaqâfah, Markaz Taḥqîq al-Turâth, 1971-3).

⁸⁴⁵ *Inbâ' al-Hasr*, in Petry's words, "was conceived as a celebration of Qâytbây's reign;" Petry, *Protectors or Praetorians*, p. 6. The extant sections of this work covering 873-877/1468-1473, and parts of 885-886/1480-1, were edited in one volume by Hasan Habashî; (Cairo: 1970).

⁸⁴⁶ Habashî, "Introduction" to *Nuzhat al-Nufûs*, pp. 6-7.

⁸⁴⁷ If one disregards SHM5, 24 and 28 which state the beginning of months.

⁸⁴⁸ See above, p. 157-8.

⁸⁴⁹ As can be seen in Tables II. 1. B. and II. 2. B. i..

unequivocally al-Jawharî's heavier reliance on al-Maqrîzî.⁸⁵⁰ As for the reports that all three works have in common, the overall structure of the narrative of *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* is closer to that of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* than to that of *Târikh al-Duwal*. For example, in recounting the beginning of the events in Syria, both al-Jawharî and al-Maqrîzî presented identical sequences of events, one that is different from Ibn al-Furât's.⁸⁵¹ The differences might appear minute in terms of our understanding of the events described, but historiographically they are significant.⁸⁵² From the point of view of the contents of the reports, things are a little bit trickier. Al-Jawharî's copying from his two sources was neither unidimensional nor word for word. While the available evidence indicates that the very mould of his reports as well as the basic information contained therein are Maqrîzîan, he systematically rewrote all the reports that he borrowed by using at different depths and intensity the material of both *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Târikh al-Duwal*.

This last aspect of his narrative style actually provides interesting insight into the techniques he relied upon to produce a 'remastered' annal for the year 793. In some instances, al-Jawharî simply cut down the amount of information in a given account,⁸⁵³ in others he relied on al-Maqrîzî but nevertheless used pieces of information from Ibn al-Furât, as can be seen below:

Ibn al-Furât: “ *Wa-fi laylat al-ahad khâmis 'ishrî Ramadân al-madhkûr, qadâ' Allâh ta'âlâ amrahu fi qatli 'Alî al-Jaraktamurî al-Qâzânî al-Barîdî al-ladhî kâna mihmandâr*

⁸⁵⁰ The only author al-Jawharî actually cited in his annal was al-Maqrîzî, in PMA60.

⁸⁵¹ Al-Maqrîzî/al-Jawharî: PMA95, PMA87, PMA88, PMA96, PMA95, PMA96, PMA97, PMA105, PMA107; Ibn al-Furât: PMA87; PMA88; PMA96; PMA95; PMA91; PMA95; PMA97; PMA105; PMA107.

⁸⁵² See Table II. 2. B. i., for more instances of parallelism between the two works.

⁸⁵³ PMA269 recounts the arrival on the 17th or 19th of Shawwâl in Cairo, of a letter from the sultan, then on his way from Damascus to Aleppo, concerning a number of items, including Barqûq's reception of a present from Sûlî Dhû al-Ghâdir along with the latter's excuses for having conquered Sîs, and the news about Nu'ayr and Mintâsh's escape towards al-Rahbah; etc. It occupies half a page in *Târikh al-Duwal* and four sentences in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, but is expedited in a sentence and a half by al-Jawharî:

“*Wa-fi tâsi' 'asharahu qadima al-barîd min al-Shâm mukhbiran bi-anna Mintâsh wa-Nu'ayran muqîmân bi-al-Rahbah wa-Ja'bar...*” *Nuzhat al-Nufûs*, vol. 1, p. 334.

fi ayyâm Mintâsh, wa-huwa ahad awsiyâ' al-Amîr Tamurbay al-Damurdâshî." [Târikh al-Duwal, vol. 9:2, p. 265]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fi laylat al-ahad khâmis 'ishrînahû qutila khârij al-Qâhirah Amîr 'Alî al-Jaraktamurî al-Qâzânî, al-mihmandâr fi ayyâm Mintâsh.*" [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:2, p. 748]

Al-Jawharî: "*Wa-fi laylat al-ahad khâmis 'ishrînahû, unfidha qadâ' Allâh wa-qadarahu fi al-Amîr al-Jaraktamurî, al-mihmandâr fi ayyâm Mintâsh, qutila khârij al-Qâhirah.*" [Nuzhat al-Nufûs, vol. 1, p. 334]⁸⁵⁴

But perhaps the most interesting aspect of al-Jawharî's history writing is the particular data he inserted in some of his reports. In some cases, the information was probably added to enliven particular situations: in PMA30, a qadi from Tripoli who had supported Mintâsh is beaten with cudgels in front of the sultan, but not before being denuded,⁸⁵⁵ and in PMA65, Ibn al-Qurashî is brought from prison "terrified" and is also stripped of his clothes before being hit.⁸⁵⁶ In others, it is plain news as none of the contemporary sources made any note of it. For example, in PMA47, al-Maqrîzî stated that Shâhîn, the *amîr akhûr* of the sultan, was exiled to the Sa'îd, while Ibn al-Furât presented the reason behind Barqûq's decision: al-Jawharî followed al-Maqrîzî by simply stating the fact of the exile, but claimed that Shâhîn was accompanied to his destination by "*naqîb al-juyûsh al-mansûrah.*"⁸⁵⁷

In all the cases cited above, one could argue that al-Jawharî had recourse to literary license to enhance the dramatic effect of his narrative, by deducing facts from the events he recounted, particularly in PMA 30 and 65: even though neither Ibn al-Furât nor al-Maqrîzî said the two qadis were stripped, it may be that being beaten with cudgels or with any other device involved the removal of the victims' clothes; it is also possible that

⁸⁵⁴ PMA252.

⁸⁵⁵ "...*fa-lammâ mathila bayn yadayy al-maqâm al-sharif, jurrida min thiyâbihi wa-duriba bi-al-maqârî*;" Nuzhat al-Nufûs, vol. 1, p. 323.

⁸⁵⁶ "...*fa-uhdira min al-sijn mar'ûban,*" *ibid.*, p. 326.

⁸⁵⁷ See also PMA61 in which two emirs charged with unbelief are brought to the presence of a Mâlikî judge by the *wâlî* and the *shâdd al-dawâwin*: while the first portion of the report is attested elsewhere, the part about the accompanying party is peculiar to al-Jawharî.

the data added in PMA47 and 61 about military personnel, was a retrospective attempt on his part to explain events that took place in the past based on practices from his own day and age: thus, it may be the case that emirs who were internally exiled were accompanied by an escort.⁸⁵⁸

To summarize, Ibn al-Jawharī's work offers nothing terribly original in terms of the data it presents, but provides interesting clues as to how later generations of historians proceeded in crafting their own works out of those of their predecessors.

C. 'Abd al-Bâsit ibn Khalīl al-Malaṭī (844-920/1440-1515):

Had it not been for its large number of reports, al-Malaṭī's *Nayl al-Amal* would easily have figured in the Minor Historians section of this chapter. As was the case with the annal of the year 778, its reports are fewer than in the larger chronicles, and al-Malaṭī again based his work mainly on al-Maqrīzī but also on Ibn Ḥajar, both of whose reports he basically rewrote, as can be seen, respectively, below:

Al-Maqrīzī: "...*wa-kânû qad qâtalûh fî muḥâsaratihi li-Dimashq, wa-afḥashû fî amrihi fuḥshan zâ'idan...*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:2, p. 737]

Al-Malaṭī: "...*li-kawnihim kânû qâtalûh 'alâ ḥisâr Dimashq, wa-afḥashû fî amrihi fuḥshan zâ'idan...*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 1, p. 301]⁸⁵⁹

Ibn Ḥajar: "...*khalâ [the sultan] bi-al-Nâsirî, fa-'âtabahu 'alâ dhâlika 'itâban kathîran, thumma afdâ bi-hi al-amr bi-dhabḥihi, fa-dhubiḥa bi-ḥadratîhi...*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 3, p. 63]

Al-Malaṭī: "...*khalâ [the sultan] bi-al-Nâsirî wa-'âtabahu, thumma amara bi-hi fa-dhubiḥa bayna yadayh ...*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 1, p. 301]⁸⁶⁰

⁸⁵⁸ See David Ayalon, "Discharges from service, banishments and imprisonments in Mamluk society," in *Israel Oriental Studies*, vol. 5 (1972), pp. 43-45. Ayalon's research is edifying but would need, for our purposes, to be revisited and reorganized according to chronological periodization.

⁸⁵⁹ PMA49.

⁸⁶⁰ PMA297. In RL31, which dealt with the death of a Mâlikî judge called al-Rakrâkî, al-Malaṭī noted that the qadi died in Homs while accompanying the sultan to Aleppo. This last detail about the place where the death took place is absent from *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, but present in *Târiḥ al-Duwal*. Even though the potential Furâtian origin of this report can be entertained, it is more probable that al-Malaṭī's borrowed this information from the obituary Ibn Ḥajar wrote about the qadi in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*.

Nayl al-Amal is however not without its peculiarities at the level, precisely, of *akhbâr* whose information diverges from that of al-Malaṭī's main sources. For example, in SHM4, which describes the demolition of certain features of the Sultān Ḥasan mosque, al-Malaṭī noted, like others, the opening of a new entrance in one of the *madrasahs* it hosted, but specified that the *madrasah* was Ḥanafī and that the door was known in his own days. We are *probably* dealing here with a retrospective revisiting of past events. Elsewhere, in PMA22, he quoted a *zajal*, allegedly recited by women to protest against the interdiction made by Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawī against them wearing shirts with large shafts. The sources tell us that the banning of these shirts was not apparently enforced, so that women resumed wearing them upon the return of the sultan to Cairo,⁸⁶¹ and Ibn Taghrîbirdî even noted in his *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* that he had seen in his times such shirts incidentally called *Kumushbughâwîyah*: al-Malaṭī's glossing may then very well be the reflection of echoes of events past at his own day and age.

Overall, however, the accounts of *Nayl al-Amal* are meagre and they do not add any new elements to what is already known.

D. Muhammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyâs (852-930/1427-97):

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the annal of the year 793 in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* is the huge extent to which it diverges, in many parts of its narrative, from the general 'consensus' sketched by all the other chronicles. For an annal seven-page long, this amounts to many problems.

Examples of these abound. In the opening *khavar*, PMA5, whereas other historians related that the falling out in Damascus between Aytamish al-Bajâsî and

⁸⁶¹ SHM22 and 25.

Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî in order to attract Mintâshîs out of their hiding places in the city, was feigned, in *Badâ'i' al-Sulûk* the conflict is real and was prevented from escalating only thanks to the intervention of the emirs. Now one might point out the fact that this very report was nowhere noted by any contemporary Syrian authors, so that it is possible that Ibn Iyâs consulted a source that provided a different twist to the encounter between the two emirs than that used by, say, Ibn al-Furât. But other cases of distortion of facts are more straightforward. This can be seen on page four hundred and forty-seven of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* where Ibn Iyâs, literally, confused Sha'bân with Ramadân. First, he claimed that news about the sultan's departure from Damascus to Aleppo reached Cairo in Ramadân, whereas the consensus is that Barqûq left the Syrian capital in Shawwâl; second, notwithstanding the historiographical significance of the mention by Ibn Iyâs of the battle of Dumayr⁸⁶² which witnessed the crushing defeat of al-Nâsirî at the hands of Nu'ayr ibn Hayyâr in the middle of Sha'bân way *before* the sultan's trip to Aleppo, let alone his departure from Cairo, Ibn Iyâs stated that it had occurred *after* Barqûq left the Syrian capital on his way North!! As for the location of the encounter itself, the two available contemporary Syrian sources, Ibn Hijjî and Ibn Sasrâ's chronicles, clearly situated it at 'Adhrâ' and Dumayr, while Ibn Iyâs placed it at al-Kiswah. Is it possible that Ibn Iyâs was simply referring to another battle? After all al-Kiswah is mentioned on a number of occasions by sources in relation to some of the military activities that took as part of the events of the year 793 in Syria.⁸⁶³ There is however textual evidence that indicates that we are indeed dealing with the event reported by PMA187: in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, Nu'ayr was identified as the foe of al-Nâsirî, and mention was made of the death of fifteen emirs

⁸⁶² PMA187.

⁸⁶³ See, for example, PMA72, 178, 215 and 233.

during the encounter [PMA192], a figure advanced by Ibn Khaldûn, from whom Ibn Iyâs might have borrowed this piece of information.

The last point brings to the fore the twin issues of the sources of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* and the strategies adopted by its author in elaborating his annal. Despite the fact that Ibn Iyâs was most certainly aware of the 'historical consensus' sketched by previous historians on whom he had to rely to recount events he was not contemporary of,⁸⁶⁴ it is clear from the examples presented above and many others, that he appears to have consciously chosen to revisit and rewrite the history of this period. The order of appearance, chronological anchoring, circumstantial dimensions, and, more importantly, the dramatic end result of the events they depict, place the *akhbâr* of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* at odds with those of other chronicles, but their *fundamental* narrative elements are generally common to Ibn Iyâs and to most other historians: thus, in PMA181, even though he wrote that the sultan ordered the executions of a number of Mintâshîs in Damascus, whereas in reality these had taken place in Cairo, the names of those killed do correspond to the list provided by, for example, Ibn al-Furât. This certainly makes it all the more arduous to determine with some degree of certainty which of the sources he used and to what degree. This problem is compounded with the fact that in a number of reports, Ibn Iyâs gave what amounts to his own personal 'spin'. Thus, as in the annal of 778, there are a few instances of moralizing or edifying verse ending reports,⁸⁶⁵ of retrospective commentaries,⁸⁶⁶ of original topographical⁸⁶⁷ and biographical details.⁸⁶⁸

⁸⁶⁴ Unless, of course, it can be established that that these 'deviations' are the result of him copying an earlier source that is itself replete with factual problems, something which available evidence does not support.

⁸⁶⁵ See, for example, PMA22, 181 and 296.

⁸⁶⁶ It is well established that sons of mamluks did serve in the *halqah*, a corps of free non-mamluk soldiers in the army. However, the fact that, in PMA229, Ibn Iyâs replaced the term *ajnad al-halqah* found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Târîkh al-Duwal* with *awlâd al-nâs*, i.e., the free-born children of mamluks, does correspond more to the reality of this corps at the end of the Mamluk era than to that of the early Circassian period. Ibn

Despite all this and the fact that the reports in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* are generally small and condensed, where discernible, there is a basic Furâtian/Maqrîzîan substructure to them. Ibn Iyâs appears to have relied equally on both sources because some of his reports or portions thereof are closer to *Târikh al-Duwal* and others to *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, as can be seen in the following example, RL16, which mixes both sources:

Ibn al-Furât: "... wa-nazala Qâdî al-Qudât Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd [al-Qaysarî] min al-Qal'ah ilâ dârihi fî mawkib ḥafl...wa-kâna yawman mashhûdan, wa-kutiba la-hu fî taqlîdihî 'al-janâb al-'âlî' nazîr qâdî al-quḍât al-Shâfi'î, wa-lam yuktab dhâlika li-ghayrihi." [*Târikh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 258-9]

Al-Maqrîzî: "...wa-nazala ma'ahu [i.e., with Qâdî al-Qudât Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Qaysarî] ba'damâ khala'a 'alayhi al-Amîr Butâ al-Dawâdâr, wa-al-Amîr Julbân, ra's nawbah, fî 'iddah min al-umarâ', wa-sâ'ir al-quḍât, fa-kâna yawman mashhûdan. Wa-kutiba la-hu fî tawqî'ihî 'al-janâb al-'âlî'...wa-yuktab lil-quḍât 'al-majlis al-'âlî,' fa-kutiba lil-'Imâd al-Karakî 'al-janâb al-'âlî', wa-tashabbaha bi-hi al-Jamâl Maḥmûd, fa-kutiba la-hu dhâlika, wa-istamarra li-man ba'dahumâ." [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:2, p. 744]

Ibn Iyâs: "... wa-nazala [Qâdî al-Qudât Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Qaysarî] min al-Qal'ah fî mawkib ḥâfil jiddan; wa-kutiba fî tawqî'ihî 'al-janâb al-'âlî', wa-kânat al-'âdah al-jâriyah an yuktab la-hu 'al-majlis al-'âlî', wa-istamarra dhâlika yuktab min ba'dihî lil-Hanafî 'al-janâb al-'âlî' ilâ al-yawm." [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 447-8]

As was alluded to earlier as well as in the previous chapter,⁸⁶⁹ Ibn Iyâs might have also relied on Ibn Khaldûn for some of his data, as the two are the only Egyptian historians to have noted the encounter at 'Adhrâ'/al-Kiswah in some detail. One can hypothesize that Ibn Iyâs did copy from Ibn Khaldûn, but unlike the latter who did not provide the name of a location of the battle, the former did. Then, it is reasonable to

Iyâs was probably trying to emphasize in a later context, the social class to which he himself belonged. Interestingly, whereas the three other historians who mentioned this incident, Ibn al-Furât, al-Maqrîzî and al-Jawharî, noted that the destination of *ajnad al-ḥalqah* was al-Wajh al-Bahrî, Ibn Iyâs had them go to the Sa'id! On aspects of the *ḥalqah* relevant to our purposes here, see Ayalon, "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army," in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 15 (2), p. 204 and vol. 15 (3), pp. 456-8.

⁸⁶⁷ In PMA60, a number of emirs are cut at the waist at al-Mahâyir [Ibn al-Furât], at al-Kawm [al-Maqrîzî] and at Birkat al-Kilâb [Ibn Iyâs]: the variety of topographical designations might in fact reflect the changing appellation of one and the same place.

⁸⁶⁸ In signalling the death of Mâlikî Qadî al-Rakrâkî in RL31, Ibn Iyâs added the names of the two judges who each in his turn replaced him, and this does indeed correspond to the line of succession to the chief judgeship of this *madhhab* in Cairo; see Salibi, "Listes chronologiques," pp. 113-4.

⁸⁶⁹ See above, p. 197 and chapter one, p. 100.

assume that Ibn Iyâs borrowed from Ibn Khaldûn and added al-Kiswah for good measure, or that they both relied on a common source. Finally, there are indications that he borrowed some narrative elements from al-Malaṭī, as can be seen in the following:

Al-Malaṭī: "...wa [-fihī qurrira] Ibn Abī al-Munajjâ fī qadâ' al-Hanâbilah bi-[Halab], wa-'iddah âkharîn wullû 'iddat wazâ'if, wa-nazalû bi-khila'ihim min al-Qal'ah." [Nayl al-Amal, vol. 2, p. 113]

Ibn Iyâs: "...wa-qurrira fī qadâ' al-Hanâbilah [bi-Halab] Muhannâ ibn Abī al-Najâ; fatawallû hâ'ulâ' al-quḍât fī yawm wâhad, wa-nazalû min al-Qal'ah bi-khila'ihim." [Badâ'i', vol. 1, part 2, pp. 447-8]⁸⁷⁰

Beyond these peculiarities which have their own weight at the historiographical level, for all intents and purposes, *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* is worthless as a tool to reconstruct the history of the period at hand.

E. Anonymous; *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fī al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*:

The sources upon which the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* relied to produce his narrative appear to be fairly numerous, especially for an annal four folios long. As was shown in both chapters one and three, the bulk of its reports were taken from Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*,⁸⁷¹ and it is possible that he did so for the annal of the year 793. This might explain the textual similarity between *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* and *Târîkh al-Duwal*, which is due to the closeness of the latter work to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Regardless, when compared to those of Ibn al-Furât's work, the reports of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* appear to be very close to them, even though they were subjected to minor changes, as can be seen below:

Ibn al-Furât: "*Rasama al-sultân li-Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî bi-an yuqîm bi-al-Istabl, fatâla'a ilayhi wa-aqâma bi-hi wa-ja'alahû nâ'ib al-ghaybah.*" [*Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 259]

⁸⁷⁰ RL11.

⁸⁷¹ Chapters one, pp. 107-8, and three, pp. 261-2.

Anonymous: “*Wa-rasama li-Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî bi-an yuqîm bi-al-Istabl al-Sultânî, wa-ja’alahu nâ’ib al-ghaybah.*” [“*Jawâhir al-Sulûk,*” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 300a]⁸⁷²

In these Duqmâqian/Furâtian reports, the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* sometimes inserted details of his own. For example, in the passage just quoted, he continued by noting that the sultan also appointed Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî *atâbak al-’asâkir* and ordered that emirs and mamluks left behind in Cairo give service to him every Monday and Thursday, information that is not available elsewhere.

In PMA246, which describes the arrival of Barqûq in Damascus, we can detect, not one but a number of layers of narratives:

Ibn al-Furât: “...*wa-zuyyinât al-balad la-hu zînah ‘azîmah...*” [*Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 265]

Ibn Khaldûn: “...*wa-al-umarâ’ mushât bayna yadayh wa-al-Nâsirî, râkib ma’ahu yahmil al-khubz ‘alâ ra’sihi.*” [*Kitâb al-’Ibar*, vol. 5, p. 502]

Ibn Saṣrâ: “...*dakhala al-Sultân al-Malik al-Zâhir Barqûq ilâ Dimashq wa-al-Nâsirî hâmil al-Qubbah wa-al-Tayr ‘alâ ra’sihi.*” [*Al-Durrah al-Mudî’ah*, p. 93]

Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir: “...*wa-kâna yawm dukhûlihi ilayhâ yawman mashhûdan, wa-tala’a ilâ al-Qal’ah al-mansûrah wa-aqâma bi-al-Qaṣr....*” [“*Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk,*” MS Bodleian Marsh 319, fol. 268b]

Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah: “...*dakhala al-sultân al-balad wa-nazala al-Qal’ah, wa-hamala nâ’ib al-Shâm al-Qubbah wa-al-Tayr wa-huwa râkib ma’ahu ilâ jânbihî...*” [*Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*, vol.1, p. 382]

Anonymous: “...*wa-dakhala ilâ Dimashq wa-kâna yawm dukhûlihi ilayhâ yawman mashhûdan wa-al-umarâ’ mushât bayna yadayh wa-al-Amîr Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, nâ’ib al-Shâm, hâmil al-Qubbah wa-al-Tayr ‘alâ ra’sihi, wa-zuyyinât la-hu Dimashq, fa-nazala bi-al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq.*” [“*Jawâhir al-Sulûk,*” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 300b]⁸⁷³

It is probable that the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* used concurrently Ibn al-Furât, Ibn Khaldûn, Ibn Saṣrâ, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir and/or Ibn Hujjî’s works, and/or one or a number of (probably Syrian) sources that anyone of these historians might also have relied upon.

⁸⁷² PMA199.

⁸⁷³ PMA246.

We thus find ourselves dealing again with a source or sources ‘lurking’ in the back of many of the reports dealing with Syria.⁸⁷⁴

Textual evidence indicates that the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* also relied on Ibn Iyâs, just as in chapters one and three.⁸⁷⁵ Even though their accounts of the arrest of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî by Barqûq in Aleppo are not exactly identical, their descriptions contain numerous elements in common, and are closer to one another than to any other sources:

Ibn Iyâs: “...*thumma qabada ‘alâ Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, wa-‘alâ jamâ‘ah min al-umarâ’ wa-sajanahum bi-qal‘at Halab...*” [*Badâ‘i‘ al-Zuhûr*, vol.1, p. 446]

Anonymous: “...*thumma amara al-sultân bi-al-qabd ‘alâ Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, wa-ma‘ahu jamâ‘ah min al-umarâ’ mimman kânû min ‘usbatihî wa-sajanahum bi-qal‘at Halab...*” [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*,” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 301b]⁸⁷⁶

But what these two works have in common are more than simple textual parallels: *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* also diverged significantly from historical consensus, in some cases even when *Badâ‘i‘ al-Zuhûr* ‘conformed’ to it. In PMA296, all historians who bothered to describe the events leading to the arrest of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, maintained that Barqûq decided to act against the viceroy of Damascus after, amongst other things, Sâlim al-Dûkârî sent him the letter written to him by al-Nâsirî enjoining him to flee with Mintâsh who was then in his custody, because as long as the latter remained alive, so would they all. In *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, the original recipient of the letter sent to the attention of Barqûq was Mintâsh and its contents were that he ought to flee to Sâlim al-Dûkârî and to seek his help, because “as long as you are alive, we will be alive [!]”

⁸⁷⁴ See above, pp. 133-4. For another case of a possible Syrian influence, see PMA318.

⁸⁷⁵ Chapters one, pp. 108-9, and three, pp. 261-2.

⁸⁷⁶ PMA296 and 297. See also PMA248:

Ibn Iyâs: “...*fa-dajja la-hu al-nâs bi-al-du‘â’...*” [*Badâ‘i‘ al-Zuhûr*, vol.1, p. 447]

Anonymous: “...*fa-dajjû al-nâs la-hu bi-al-du‘â’...*” [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 300b]

Also of interest, is the opening report⁸⁷⁷ of this chronicle in which the author, alone amongst all historians, claimed that the sultan convoked “*al-wuzarâ’ al-ma’zûlîn*,” among others, al-Maqsî, al-Baqarî and Ibn Makânis, and assigned them to new positions. While the appointment of Ibn Makânis to the *wizârah* is attested in other sources,⁸⁷⁸ the only time the other former high functionaries are mentioned is in the context of a report that described their arrest and mulcting by order of the sultan!⁸⁷⁹ Does this piece of information derive from an unknown source with a keen interest in things administrative, say, al-Qalqashandî’s encyclopaedia, or did the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* simply invent this account?

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah (779-851/1377-1448):

For a chronicle that is a summary of another, *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* contains quite a large number of reports, one hundred and sixty-seven, third only to ‘complete’ works such as *Târîkh al-Duwal* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.⁸⁸⁰ While this is telling of the potential magnitude of *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah wrote to his teacher’s *Târîkh*, in the light of the available sources, one cannot study the process of elaboration of *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, since two of its ‘building blocks,’ namely the original text of *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî* and the second recension Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah made of it, *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*,

⁸⁷⁷ PMA10’.

⁸⁷⁸ PMA254, 260 and 261.

⁸⁷⁹ PMA10.

⁸⁸⁰ These two works have, respectively, a total number of one hundred and ninety-five and one hundred and seventy-six reports. *Al-Muntaqá*, which, as we shall argue below, contains much of *Târîkh al-Duwal*, is made up of one hundred and fifty-two reports.

are extant for the year at hand.⁸⁸¹ One can however provide a picture of the interrelations between on the one hand, *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, and on the other, both the first recension of *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*⁸⁸² and *Al-Muntaqá*.

The collation of *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* with the first recension of *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî* is problematic on account of the vary nature of the latter work. Still, basing ourselves on the extant folios of the annal of the year 793 in the manuscript of the first recension, which cover the period from Muharram until the third decade of Sha‘bân when the narrative suddenly ends, it is apparent that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah made extensive use of his teacher’s *akhbâr*. If one discards the marginal annotations that are unclear or unreadable,⁸⁸³ and, for the sake of simplification, its RL, SHM and FA reports, out of the sixty-seven PMAs in *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah made use of slightly more than half, a total of thirty six.⁸⁸⁴ To this figure, one might add from the period not covered by *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*, twenty-seven reports that either are not similar to corresponding ones in *Al-Muntaqá*, or are simply not found therein, and that we might assume to be of Hijiîan origin.⁸⁸⁵ This amounts to sixty-three reports originating with more or less certainty in *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*, out of one hundred and thirty-six PMAs in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, almost forty-seven percent of the total. It is more than probable that *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal* contained more Hijiîan reports than *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, but suffice it

⁸⁸¹ For the year 793, the other foundational sources are: the first recension and *Al-Muntaqá*. On a smaller scale, we find *akhbâr* Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah borrowed from al-Maqrîzî’s *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and whatever data he himself had garnered.

⁸⁸² Within the framework of this chapter, I have systematically referred to the first recension as *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*, even though it is incomplete.

⁸⁸³ With the exception of PMA138; see above, footnote no. 803.

⁸⁸⁴ PMA76, 82, 83, 90, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 120, 121, 123, 138, 144, 151, 156, 162, 163, 164, 170, 178, 179, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189 and 193.

⁸⁸⁵ In bold are the reports found concurrently in both *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* and *Târîkh al-Duwal* and/or *Al-Muntaqá*, but which are dissimilar: PMA213, 214, 215, 220, 225, 232, 236, 241, 243, 244, **246, 248**, 254, 256, **258**, 262, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 273, 314, **316, 318** and 322.

here to say that the accounts of *Târikh Ibn Hījī* that were ignored by Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah, all pertaining to things Syrian, do not generally alter the overall understanding of the year's events in and around Damascus, especially since *Târikh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah* is just that, a summary of a larger work where one ought not expect to find comprehensive details. This particular aspect of *Târikh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah* has had, logically, an impact on the way its author used the reports he borrowed from his teacher: generally, these remained largely intact, thus clearly identifiable, but were reduced in size by eliminating some of the data they contained, as can be seen in the following example:

Ibn Hījī: “*Thumma akhadhû jâmi’ Yalbughâ wa-sârû yarmûn min fawqihî fa-tahawwalû ilâ al-qitâl taht al-Qal’ah bi-al-madâfi’ wa-al-majânîq, wa-al-hijârah tasqut min jâmi’ Yalbughâ.*” [“*Târikh Ibn Hījī*,” MS Köprülü 1027, fol. 96a]
 Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah: “*Thumma akhadhû jâmi’ Yalbughâ.*” [*Târikh Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah*, vol. 1, p. 374]⁸⁸⁶

At this stage of the research, it is fitting to explore the nature of the other major source used by Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah in elaborating his historiography, since, unlike the year 778, we do have at our disposal both *Al-Muntaqâ* and the edited version of *Târikh al-Duwal*. As its name indicates, *Al-Muntaqâ* is ostensibly made up of selected reports culled by Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah from Ibn al-Furât’s *Târikh al-Duwal*. However, from a quantitative point of view, *Al-Muntaqâ* contains a truly large number of data: one hundred and fifty-one⁸⁸⁷ out of the one hundred and ninety-five reports of *Târikh al-Duwal*, around seventy-seven percent of the total. The accounts unreported by *Al-Muntaqâ* cover a large range of topics and they do not appear to belong to any one category, even though

⁸⁸⁶ PMA113. In PMA123, Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah followed Ibn Hījī in noting the torching of four landmarks, Sûq Hikr al-Summâq, the house of al-Sârim, the Khâtûn *khanagâh* and the mosque of Tankiz, all located west of the fortifications, and then added “*wa-mâ sâmat dhâlîka wa-qârabahu wa-hurwa shay’ kathîr.*” In *Târikh Ibn Hījī*, the text of this report is however more copious: the reference to the above mentioned landmarks is followed by more topographical details about areas that also burned down, and it is only then that Ibn Hījī noted “*wa-mâ sâmat dhâlîka, etc....*” See also PMA144, a report about the use of religious funds by al-Nâsirî to sustain the war effort, for yet another instance of size-reduction.

⁸⁸⁷ Only one report, SHM24, can be found in *Al-Muntaqâ* but not in *Târikh al-Duwal*.

some appointments to minor positions such as *wâlî* in the Egyptian countryside⁸⁸⁸ and other stories of a profound local character⁸⁸⁹ were likelier to be omitted by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah than others.

From the point of view of content, however, there are differences between the two sources. Generally, the text of most reports in *Târîkh al-Duwal* is more copious than that in those of *Al-Muntaqâ*; as in the case of *Târîkh Ibn Hiji*, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah simply removed a certain amount of information:

Ibn al-Furât: "...*darrasa al-Shaykh Zayn al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahîm Ibn al-'Irâqî bi-al-Zâhirîyah al-'Atîqah al-Ruknîyah al-latî bayn al-Qasrayn tujâh al-Qubbah al-Mansûriyah 'iwaḍan 'an al-Qâdî Sadr al-Dîn ibn Razîn al-Shâfi 'î, wa-darrasa ayḍan bi-al-madrasah al-Fâdilîyah bi-darb Mulûkhîyâ [?] 'an Ibn Razîn ba'da wafâtîhi.*" [*Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 246]

Ibn al-Furât: "...*darrasa al-Shaykh Zayn al-Dîn Ibn al-'Irâqî bi-al-Zâhirîyah al-'Atîqah 'iwaḍan 'an al-Qâdî Sadr al-Dîn ibn Razîn, wa-darrasa ayḍan bi-al-Fâdilîyah 'an al-madhkûr ba'da wafâtîhi.*" ["*Al-Muntaqâ*," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol.166a]⁸⁹⁰

Whether topographical information, as in the example above or references to first person accounts by Ibn al-Furât,⁸⁹¹ generally then, there are less details in *Al-Muntaqâ* than *Târîkh al-Duwal*, and this is particularly true when some news about Syria is concerned. For example, PMA242, which deals with news about troubles in Baalbek, occupies most of a page in *Târîkh al-Duwal*, but is expedited in less than a sentence in *Al-Muntaqâ*:⁸⁹² this very sentence however was not used in *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, and instead Ibn

⁸⁸⁸ See, for example, PMA2, 27 and 28.

⁸⁸⁹ See, for example, PMA18, 25, and 40.

⁸⁹⁰ RL1.

⁸⁹¹ PMA242. Also, Ibn Duqmâq whom Ibn al-Furât cited in PMA206 and SHM11, disappeared from these reports in *Al-Muntaqâ*.

⁸⁹² Ibn al-Furât presented the long text of a letter that he had read and that was sent by *mutawallî al-biqâ'ayn* to *malik al-umarâ'* [Barqûq on his way to Syria or Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî, *nâi'ib al-ghaybah* in Cairo?] regarding the presence of Mintâsh in and around Baalbek and conflicts between the community there and *al-munâfiqîn* [the Shî'ites?]: in *Al-Muntaqâ*, the whole episode is radically summarized by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah by "*wa-fi al-'ashr al-akhîr min Ramadân, jâ'a al-khabar anna Mintâsh fi Ba'albak;*" MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 175a. That we are dealing here with PMA242 can be ascertained since Ibn al-Furât's report starts with "*wa-fi al-'ashr al-akhîr min Ramadân...*" *Târîkh al-Duwal*, vol. 9:2, p. 264.

Qâdî Shuhbah relied on a longer report⁸⁹³ containing detailed information about names of individuals involved in the incidents there. Thus, the two versions of PMA242, that of *Târikh al-Duwal* and *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, are different, but they both apparently deal with events that took place at the same time, the last decade of Ramadân, and in the same location, the city of Baalbek. Even though we might be dealing with totally different events, it is likelier that we are in the presence of a Syrian and Egyptian treatment of the same incident, with Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah choosing the former over the latter.⁸⁹⁴

This is not to say that none of the Syrian reports of *Al-Muntaqá* have found their way into *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*. As a matter of fact, on a number of occasions Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah appears to have preferred accounts authored by Ibn al-Furât to those by Ibn Hijiî. For example, the version of PMA87, the story of Mintâsh's descent from Northern Syria to Damascus, used in *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* is that of *Al-Muntaqá*, which is slightly shorter than that of *Târikh al-Duwal*. The same can be said about the string of reports dealing with the actions taken by the sultan upon his arrival in Aleppo: PMA294, 296, 297 and 298 are all based on *Al-Muntaqá* and not on any other source. In the case of PMA87, it is possible that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah chose to rely on Ibn al-Furât because his *khavar* was richer and more dramatic than Ibn Hijiî's; as for the 'Aleppan' reports, it might be that *Târikh Ibn Hijiî* did not have data about the capital of Northern Syria, interested as it might well have been exclusively in things Damascene.

Thus far we have illustrated the indebtedness of *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* to both Ibn Hijiî and Ibn al-Furât.⁸⁹⁵ The above discussion should not however lead one to

⁸⁹³ Of possible Hijiîan origin?

⁸⁹⁴ For another similar case, see PMA246, the report that recounts the arrival of Barqûq in Damascus.

⁸⁹⁵ Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah might have used *Târikh al-Duwal* directly because it contains one report, PMA207, that is not to be found in *Al-Muntaqá*.

assume that the copying was static and that reports from these two sources were simply placed alongside one another. Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah refrained from altering too heavily what he borrowed from his two main sources, but he did show some degree of creativity by cleverly fusing, in a number of instances dealing with Syria, reports from *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* and *Al-Muntaqá*. In *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, PMA318, which describes the killing of some of his enemies ordered by the sultan upon his return from Aleppo to Damascus, has two clearly defined components, one Furâtian and the other Syrian.⁸⁹⁶ The first part of the *khbar* is ‘Syrian’ in origin in that it contains details,⁸⁹⁷ about the executions that are absent from *Al-Muntaqá*:⁸⁹⁸ the prisoners are taken out of prison and presented to the sultan who ordered them crucified and put to death; they were then nailed and paraded through the city, then cut at the waist below the Citadel; Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah made sure to note that people were upset at their fate and especially at that of Ahmad ibn Baydamur, a young man who did not escape death despite the attempts of his mother to save him. The first part of the report ends with “*wa-kâna shâbban ṣaghîran*,” and is followed immediately after by a list of others who were killed that day: both this sentence and the list constitute, almost word-for-word,⁸⁹⁹ PMA318 as it appears in *Al-Muntaqá*:

Ibn al-Furât: “*wa-minhum Amîr Ahmad ibn Baydamur al-Khawârizmî, wa-huwa shâb ṣaghîr wa-Amîr Muḥammad ibn Amîr ‘Alî al-Mârdînî....etc.*” [“*Al-Muntaqá*,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol.178a]

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: “*...wa-ḥazina al-nâs ‘alayhim wa-da‘aw ‘alá man fa‘ala dhâlika bi-him, wa-minhum Amîr Ahmad ibn Baydamur, wa-shufi‘a fîhi wa-badhalat ummuhu fîhi mâlan, falam yaqbal, wa-kana shâbban ṣaghîran, wa-Amîr Muḥammad ibn al-Amîr ‘Alî al-Mârdînî....etc.*” [*Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*, vol. 1, p. 388]

⁸⁹⁶ Again, we might assume that this component is Hījīan in origin.

⁸⁹⁷ These details are few when compared to the dramatic and moving account of the same incident to be found in Ibn Saṣrâ’s *Al-Durrah al-Mudî‘ah*.

⁸⁹⁸ These details are absent from all other Egyptian sources, save for al-‘Aynî’s *Iqd al-Jumân*.

⁸⁹⁹ There are slight differences between the list of names in respectively *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* and *Al-Muntaqá*.

IV. Minor Historians:

There are a number of works that contain some data about the events of this year, but whose contents are either too small or unoriginal to warrant any sustained examination. Al-Qalqashandî's *Ma'âthir al-Inâfah* contains one story for 793, the apparition of a comet in the sky.⁹⁰⁰ Al-Sakhâwî, in his *Wajîz al-Kalâm*, presented a one-page long narrative of all major events, mainly the sultan's trip to Syria and its ramifications, and, interestingly, mentioned the killing of Aḥmad ibn Baydamur and the people's sadness as a result thereof.⁹⁰¹ Of the Druze Syro-Lebanese histories, Ṣâlih ibn Yahyâ's *Târikh Bayrût* contains valuable information about the political scene in the Lebanese mountains and, especially, about the participation of members of his own feudal family in some of the engagements in Syria.⁹⁰²

V. Sectional Conclusions:

The systematic examination of the historiography of the year 793 revealed a number of important points. First, in the absence of Ibn Duqmâq's main work for this year and until the discovery of new sources changes these conclusions, Ibn al-Furât and al-Maqrîzî remain the two sources that all other historians ultimately relied upon at varying degrees to write the history of the period at hand. Second, as was made clear in the case of Ibn Taghrîbirdî's *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, the fact that a given author used a particular source as a foundation for one annal, did not necessarily entail that he would do so again for another. Third, while most historians relied on one or two sources as blueprints for their work, they generally displayed a large degree of eclecticism by

⁹⁰⁰ Vol. 2, p. 189. This story corresponds to SHM11.

⁹⁰¹ Vol. 1, pp. 298-9.

⁹⁰² See above, p. 174-5.

borrowing whole stories, but also sometimes minute pieces of information, words and expressions from yet others in order to produce their historical accounts. This, to me, not only confirms that information, books and scholars widely circulated in the Mamluk realm, both in space and time, but also indicates that the writing of history was a conscious act on the part of historians. By that I mean that the aberrations of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, which are evident in the annals of 778 and 793, are not the result of happenstance or of information being manipulated and changed as it was handed down from generation. Ibn Iyâs most probably had access to at least the works of al-Maqrîzî, Ibn al-Furât and al-Malaṭî, but he chose however to reinvent history, either because it was acceptable to do so, or because he could simply get away with it in the absence of peer evaluation, or, still, because this is what the people who read his work, if there was indeed such a thing as a readership beyond the closed circle of the *muta'ammimûn*, expected. Needless to say that answering or dealing with the issues raised above would require a massive and sustained examination of the life and times of Ibn Iyâs, something which the available sources might not allow us to do.

There is yet another important point that derives from the discussion in this chapter: the question of chronological inconsistency we encountered in the works of many authors. For example, consider the issue of Mintâsh's departure from Damascus on the 16th of Sha'bân.⁹⁰³ Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir informed his readers that the sultan arrived in Gaza on the seventh of Ramadân and that when he left the city on his way to Damascus, news reached him that Mintâsh had departed from al-Maydân where he was encamped during the siege, towards al-Kiswah, south of the city, along with a few men. His foe's departure, which put an end to the quasi-siege of the city, was reported by Syrian authors

⁹⁰³ PMA184 and 185.

such as Ibn Sasrá and Ibn Hijjî.⁹⁰⁴ Curiously, in *Târikh al-Duwal*, there is a report that told of the arrival in Cairo on the 4th of Ramaḍân of a messenger sent by the sultan upon reaching the city of Qatyâ⁹⁰⁵ with news that Mintâsh had fled Damascus and headed towards Zur'ah where local peasants besieged him.⁹⁰⁶ So how is it, since the al-Kiswah incident took place *before* that at Zur'ah, that the sultan had been fed already outdated information, if we are to believe Zayn al-Dîn, while Barqûq's own messenger provided the Cairenes with more recent details about the goings-on in Syria?

Beyond the conclusions reached above and which are supported by some body of evidence, one has to take stock of the issues that have not been dealt with too effectively: among other things, Ibn Duqmâq's impact on the historiography of the year 793 could not be established; the relationship between the two versions of *'Iqd al-Jumân*, remains at best nebulous and the process of elaboration of *Târikh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* through the stages explained by Reisman still awaits testing with regard to those two great unknowns, the original text of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* and Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal*.

The following chapter that deals with the 804/1401-2 will hopefully allow us to treat, if not solve, some of the constraints evoked above. In the case of al-'Aynî, we have at our disposal a more copious 'version' of *'Iqd al-Jumân*, namely MS Köprülü Ahmet III 2911/19, as well as the shorter MS Köprülü Ahmet III 2911/B2 that we have used in this and the previous chapter. À propos Ibn Hijjî, not only is the original, but not holograph, annal of 804 preserved in MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, but also the two recensions made of it by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah are also extant. Last but not least, the availability *Al-Muntaqâ min*

⁹⁰⁴ *ibid.*

⁹⁰⁵ An important stop on the way to Syria and a gateway to Palestine; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 47.

⁹⁰⁶ PMA226.

Târîkh Ibn Duqmâq will not only help us properly weigh Ibn Duqmâq as a contributor to early Circassian historiography, but it will also allow us to further clarify the process of elaboration of *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, since for the year 804, the author of the latter work ‘switched’ from *Târîkh al-Duwal* to *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.

CHAPTER THREE
Unfinished business in Syria and the Rebellions of Jakam and Nawrûz
al-Hâfizî in Egypt: the Annal of the Year 804/1401-2

I. Introductory Notes:

At the beginning of 804, less than a year had passed since Tamerlane's devastating onslaught on Syria. On the 11th of Rabî' al-Awwal 803, he had vanquished the viceroys of Syria who had assembled to confront him in Aleppo and utterly destroyed that city.⁹⁰⁷ He would eventually meet out the same treatment to Damascus a couple of months later, starting in Jumâdâ al-Ûlá until early Sha'bân, after extorting from its inhabitants incalculable wealth and property.⁹⁰⁸ Whether it was the news of the trickling in to Damascus of officials, religious or military, who had escaped captivity,⁹⁰⁹ the recurrent stories about the state of ruin of this city⁹¹⁰ and its impact on the life of its population,⁹¹¹ or echoes and rumours concerning Tamerlane, his whereabouts and actions,⁹¹² many of the reports found in the annals of the year 804, quite a few originating in Syria, reflect in numerous ways the aftermath of the devastation suffered by Bilâd al-Shâm and its people.

Still on the historical level, there is yet another phenomenon that intersects with the events in Syria: the ongoing and endemic strife within the governing circles of the Mamluk body politic for control of the state apparatus. The death of Barqûq in 801/1399 was followed by the accession of his son Faraj under the aegis of Aytamish al-Bajâsî, one

⁹⁰⁷ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, pp. 178-80.

⁹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-95.

⁹⁰⁹ See, for example, PMA16, 36, 41, 54, 56 and RL41

⁹¹⁰ See, for example, RL46 and SHM64.

⁹¹¹ See, for example, RL40 and 66.

⁹¹² See, for example, FA2, 5, 6 and 8.

of his father's most faithful companions. However, after requesting from him his official entry into adulthood (*tarshîd*) in 802,⁹¹³ Faraj was confronted by the rebellion of senior Zâhirî⁹¹⁴ emirs led by Aytamish, but was supported by a great number of his father's *ajlâb*, a group that had staked its survival on that of the new sultan, as well as by high-ranking emirs from the days of Barqûq. The Zâhirî old guard would suffer a series of crushing defeats in Cairo in Rabî' al-Awwal,⁹¹⁵ then in Palestine in Rajab and Sha'bân of that year,⁹¹⁶ as a result of which grandees the likes of Aytamish al-Bajâsî and Ahmad, the son of Yalbughâ al-'Umarî, and many more were murdered.⁹¹⁷ Later, it was Faraj's and his handlers' fear that a conspiracy was afoot to enthrone one Lâjîn al-Jarkasî that prompted them, on the 21st of Jumâdá al-Ûlá 803, to abruptly leave Damascus where they had gone to face Tamerlane thus leaving the city to fend for itself with the disastrous consequences alluded to above.⁹¹⁸

The still unfinished settling of accounts amongst factions was to continue throughout 804, first with a showdown in Ṣafar⁹¹⁹ between low-ranking emirs and high-ranking ones, such as Nawrûz al-Hâfizî (d. 817/1414),⁹²⁰ Jakam min 'Awad (d. 809/1407)⁹²¹ and Sûdûn Tâz (d. 806/1404).⁹²² During the first half of Shawwâl, members of the latter group of senior emirs would then turn against one another in a confrontation out of which Sûdûn Tâz, who had the outward support of the sultan, emerged

⁹¹³ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, pp. 144-5.

⁹¹⁴ The appellation of al-Zâhirî, refers to those mamluks who had once belonged to al-Zâhir Barqûq.

⁹¹⁵ *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, pp. 147-51.

⁹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-9.

⁹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 168-9.

⁹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 188-9; see also, Ibn 'Arabshâh's account, in *'Ajâ'ib al-Maqdûr fî Nawâ'ib Taymûr*, edited by Ahmad Fâyiz al-Himsî (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risâlah, 1986), pp. 245-298, and its English translation by J.H. Sanders, *Tamerlane, or Timur the great Emir* (London: Luzac and Co., 1936), pp. 134-163.

⁹¹⁹ PMA27.

⁹²⁰ On him see "Al-Manhal," *Dâr al-Kutub* MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 813b-815a.

⁹²¹ On him see *Al-Manhal*, vol. 4, pp. 313-34.

⁹²² On him see *ibid.*, vol. 6, pp. 132-41.

victorious⁹²³ and brought back from exile in Alexandria, Emir Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî (d. 810/1407).⁹²⁴

In Syria, the viceroy of Damascus, Taghrîbirdî (d. 815/1412),⁹²⁵ the father of the historian, would narrowly escape arrest on orders of the sultan and would join Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî (d.818/1415),⁹²⁶ the viceroy of Aleppo and an old acquaintance of his,⁹²⁷ who had rebelled earlier. News about the pair, their often-lost battles against the sultan’s agents, their alliance with Turcoman elements in Northern Syria, and their ultimate request for amnesty, are also to be found throughout the annal of this year, in both Syrian and Egyptian chronicles.⁹²⁸

On the historiographical level, 804 is highly significant. By that year, even though many of the historians who authored primary sources for the preceding period, the likes of Ibn al-Furât, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Khadûn, were still alive, none, save for Ibn Duqmâq, produced anything substantial about the year 804. Ibn al-Furât’s *Târikh al-Duwal* is reputed to have ended in 803⁹²⁹ and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir’s *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* in 801;⁹³⁰ as for Ibn Khaldûn, his writing on the Mamluks in *Kitâb al-Ibar* stopped with a report on Barqûq’s stay in Damascus in Sha‘bân 796.⁹³¹ The only information somewhat relevant to our purposes by his hand about the early years of the

⁹²³ See PMA133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154 and 157.

⁹²⁴ On him, see “Al-Manhal,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târikh*, fols. 831b-832b. Yashbak had been an opponent of Sûdûn Tâz, Jakam and Nawrûz al-Hâfizî during an *ajlâb* instigated rebellion against the sultan that had taken place in Shawwâl 803; see *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, pp. 212-6. On Yashbak’s return to Cairo, see PMA158 and 159.

⁹²⁵ See *Al-Manhal*, vol. 4, pp. 31-43.

⁹²⁶ See *ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 316-24.

⁹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 317-8.

⁹²⁸ See PMA12, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 38, 48, 49, 69, 72, 81, 92, 112, 212, 197 and 202.

⁹²⁹ Al-Shâmî, *Dirâsah fî Makhtûṭ Târikh al-Duwal*, p. 9; *Al-Daw’ al-Lâmi’*, vol. 8, p. 51.

⁹³⁰ Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir was apparently still active in his usual pursuits, as Ibn Duqmâq has him writing a *fatwâ* regarding the renovation of the Hâram complex in Mecca; see RL26.

⁹³¹ Vol. 5, p. 508.

ninth century A.H. can be gleaned in those parts of his autobiographical tract⁹³² that dealt with his encounter with Tamerlane in Damascus in 803,⁹³³ especially its last couple of pages where he reported his comings and goings in and out of the Mâlikî *qadâ' al-qadâ'* in 804, 806 and 807 following his return to Cairo.⁹³⁴ Thus, of the historians who had witnessed Barqûq's rise and accession to the sultanate, we have at our disposal, again, as far as this student of Mamluk history can determine, only the works of Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Hiji'.⁹³⁵

This however does not mean that there is a dearth of sources for 804, as a new generation of historians was already afoot. Al-'Aynî, al-Maqrîzî, Ibn Hajar and, to a lesser extent, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah, were full-grown adults whose careers were either starting or maturing:⁹³⁶ for example, by 804 both al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî had already been appointed to the *hisbah* of Cairo, respectively, twice and thrice,⁹³⁷ and most sources indicated the appointment and then removal of al-'Aynî from the position of *nâzir al-ahbâs* this very year.⁹³⁸ Also, even though it is in no way indicative of al-Maqrîzî's intellectual standing at the time, it is worth noting that Ibn Duqmâq pointed out in one of his reports that the author of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* had relayed a story to him.⁹³⁹ In the same vein, al-Maqrîzî himself judged it pertinent to note in the obituary he wrote of Ibn Duqmâq that the latter used to borrow "*majâmî'î al-latî bi-khattî,*" and that after his

⁹³² *Al-Ta'rif bi-Ibn Khaldûn wa-Rihlatihi Gharban wa-Sharqan* can be found in a less complete form in volume 7 of the Bulâq edition, pp. 379-455, of which it forms the concluding section. The complete version of *Al-Ta'rif* used in the two previous chapters has been edited by Muḥammad ibn Tâwîṭ al-Tanḥabî.

⁹³³ This is the subject of Fischel's *Ibn Khaldûn and Tamerlane*.

⁹³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8. For the year 804, see RL39 and 65.

⁹³⁵ On both these historians and their works, more below.

⁹³⁶ On the general context of these and other intellectuals' professional faring in the Cairo of the late ninth and tenth centuries, see Broadbridge, "Academic Rivalry."

⁹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

⁹³⁸ See RL13 and 59 and the references therein.

⁹³⁹ SHM47.

death, he had happened upon his own report of Tamerlane's occupation of Aleppo in 803, probably in *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. According to al-Maqrîzî, not only did Ibn Duqmâq copy from him, but the latter's report then also found its way into *Târîkh al-Duwal*, as Ibn al-Furât was a good friend of Ibn Duqmâq and copied extensively from his works.⁹⁴⁰

The annals of al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî for this year are remarkable on at least two levels: first, their very close similarity, which is certainly not accidental,⁹⁴¹ and second, the fact that they constitute in their own right, along with those of Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Hijiî, primary sources for the study of the period at hand, at least for Egypt. Both *'Iqd al-Jumân* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk* provide, concerning events there, accounts that are often parallel but usually clearly different from those of Ibn Duqmâq. Thus, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, in the process of elaborating his *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, used alongside *Târîkh Ibn Hijiî*, both the selections he made of Ibn Duqmâq's work⁹⁴² and a number of reports taken from al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.⁹⁴³

Later authors too are worthy of attention. We have just noted in the previous paragraph the varied sources used by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah to produce the second recension

⁹⁴⁰ See Tadmurî, "Introduction" to *Al-Nafḥah*, p. 9, and al-Maqrîzî's *Durar al-'Uqûd*, vol. 1, p. 163. The incident in question took place in Rabî' al-Awwal 803 and dealt with a trick devised by Tamerlane to divide his opponents then gathered in Aleppo, and to instil suspicion in their hearts concerning the loyalty of Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî, the viceroy of the city: an envoy of his addressed himself to the latter and told him in front of other emirs that his master had come to Aleppo only after receiving word from him that it was undefended. On page 315 of *Al-Nafḥah*, this *khavar* (found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, pp. 1031-2) starts off with an acknowledgement by Ibn Duqmâq of his indebtedness to "a folio written in the hand of a person of virtue" who himself had related the report from another person: this introductory passage in no way corresponds to the sentence al-Maqrîzî claimed Ibn Duqmâq had taken from "*majâmi'î*," a sentence not even found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. However, al-Maqrîzî might very well have been referring to other works written by Ibn Duqmâq, notably *Nuzhat al-Anâm* or *'Iqd al-Jawâhir fî Sirat al-Malik al-Zâhir*, Barqûq's biography. All this obviously brings to the fore the issue of the date of composition of al-Maqrîzî's works, even though the term "*majâmi'î*" might be referring to the notes assembled then by him in order to later produce his historical works; see Massoud, "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian," pp. 133-4 and Bauden, "Maqriziana I."

⁹⁴¹ See below, pp. 227-30.

⁹⁴² *Al-Muntaqâ min Târîkh Ibn Duqmâq*; see below, pp. 268-9.

⁹⁴³ See below, pp. 269-70.

of *Târikh Ibn Hujjî*, *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* that is, a work that provides modern historians with the most copious and complete annal of the year, from a Syrian *and* Egyptian perspective. Ibn Taghrîbirdî's *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* also offers an interesting and original insight with regard to a number of accounts concerning the whereabouts of his father in Northern Syria following his linking up with Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî.⁹⁴⁴

Thus, the year 804 is pivotal on many levels, historical but also especially historiographical, as it heralded quite literally the beginning of a new of generation of self-conscious historians who were old enough to fully comprehend surrounding events that they recorded in the chronicles they would write. And these chronicles, just like Ibn al-Furât's and Ibn Duqmâq's a generation earlier, would provide later historians writing about this period, with the blueprint upon which their works would be founded.

II. Contemporary Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Sârim al-Dîn Ibrâhîm Ibn Duqmâq (745-809/1349-1407-8):

Modern historians owe Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah for having preserved in one of the many manuscripts he left to posterity, parts of now lost annals of Ibn Duqmâq's seminal work *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.⁹⁴⁵ Written in his execrable handwriting, the contents of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*⁹⁴⁶ cover two years only, 804 and 805, and they are marred by the same 'problem' as *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn al-Furât*,

⁹⁴⁴ PMA61, 69, 72 and 81.

⁹⁴⁵ See chapters one and two. It is likely that the work from which Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah selected the reports of his *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq* was indeed *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. However, we are definitely not dealing here with compilations from *Al-Nafḥah* whose contents are dwarfed by the sheer number of the reports found in *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*; see Table III. 1. B. for a comparison of the two works.

⁹⁴⁶ *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*, MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 197b-205b. In this chapter, following this introductory paragraph and unless otherwise specified, the appellation *Al-Muntaqâ* refers specifically to *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*.

namely the fact that the compiler has manipulated the original text by placing obituaries at the end of the events of each month, a clear contrast to the structure of the extant annals of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. However, unlike *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn al-Furât*, which, at least for the year 793, could be compared to the original annal in *Târikh al-Duwal*, the absence of the text of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* for these two years will not allow us, for example, to determine how much data of this chronicle Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah culled to write his *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*. This latter work still has one other major problem: neither annal is complete as the narrative of events in the year 804, ends, thankfully, rather late, on the 22nd of Shawwâl,⁹⁴⁷ but in 805, on the 15th of Safar.⁹⁴⁸

Nevertheless, if one takes into account the proportions found in comparing the contents of *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn al-Furât* with *Târikh al-Duwal*, odds are that the great majority of the reports in *Nuzhat al-Anâm* found their way into *Al-Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*.⁹⁴⁹ As a matter of fact, even when excluding the unavailable last folios of this annal, at the level of the number of PMAs, *Al-Muntaqá* is the second richest of all other chronicles. Thus, in terms of sheer numbers, up until PMA164, the last of the *akhbâr* in *Al-Muntaqá*,⁹⁵⁰ this work contains seventy-five PMAs, versus one hundred and eighteen for the 2nd recension authored by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, sixty-one in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, forty-seven in *'Iqd al-Jumân* and forty-one in *Târikh Ibn Hîjjî*.⁹⁵¹ Also, there are very few

⁹⁴⁷ This corresponds to PMA164.

⁹⁴⁸ "Al-Muntaqá," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 205b. There are two other sections of this manuscript which bear the years 804 and 805, but they are *probably* 1st recensions of Ibn Hîjjî's *Târikh*. MS Chester Beatty 4125 also contains, among other things, the already noted *Al-Muntaqá* and various recensions of Ibn Hîjjî's work; see also, Reisman, "A Holograph MS," pp. 31, 48, and above, chapters one and two.

⁹⁴⁹ See chapter two, pp. 204-5.

⁹⁵⁰ Throughout this section on Ibn Duqmâq, all comparisons with other works will end at PMA164. In other words, in *Al-Muntaqá* and in all other sources used for assessment, only pages or folios including and ending with PMA164 will be considered.

⁹⁵¹ Even though not its strongest suits when compared to *Târikh Ibn Hîjjî*, at the level of RL and SHM reports, *Al-Muntaqá* also favourably measures up to *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *'Iqd al-Jumân*: again, if we stop at

PMA in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *'Iqd al-Jumân* that were unreported in *Al-Muntaqá*: those which are specifically common to al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî,⁹⁵² mostly news about Taghrîbirdî and Damurdâsh and nominations to positions in Syria and Egypt, might be original in that they are not found in *Al-Muntaqá*, but they offer no new perspective on the events of the year.⁹⁵³ Even al-Maqrîzî's use of reports of clearly Hîjjîan origin⁹⁵⁴ fails to convey in any more effective way news about Syria⁹⁵⁵ than *Al-Muntaqá*, which contains numerous *akhbâr* peculiar to it about events there and elsewhere. For example, PmMA81, in which al-Maqrîzî and those who copied from him told of an encounter around Hama between Damurdâsh and Duqmâq, Faraj's nominee as viceroy of Aleppo, was echoed by two reports in *Al-Muntaqá*,⁹⁵⁶ one of them relayed by a messenger from Northern Syria,⁹⁵⁷ where Ibn Duqmâq provided more precisions about the exact location of the battle and its aftermath.

We have noted in the previous paragraph the relative lack of originality of some of the stories exclusive to *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *'Iqd al-Jumân*, and in many respects, the same could have been said about a number of PMA reports originally found only in *Al-Muntaqá*, those dealing for example with commonplace nominations to important and

PMA164, we find in these last three works in terms of, respectively, RL and SHM reports, ten and fourteen, thirteen and seven, seven and three. These figures do not take into account those *akhbâr* in Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's second recension that are beyond PMA164 and which are almost certainly Duqmâqian in origin; these I have identified with an asterisk in Table III. 1. A.

⁹⁵² Such as PMA6, 7, 8, 19, 21, 22, 23, 58, 63, 70 and 133.

⁹⁵³ The same can be said about SHM and RL reports.

⁹⁵⁴ See below.

⁹⁵⁵ With the exception of PMA99 and 101. These two accounts, which detail the clash in Gaza between Surûq, the city's viceroy who had been removed from office by Faraj, and Salâmish, its *hâjib*, are the longest in *Târikh Ibn Hîjjî*, but even al-Maqrîzî's shorter version is still longer than Ibn Duqmâq's which is of a clearly different origin. See also, PMA4, 32, 36, 100, 120, 124, 137, etc., for more news about things Syrian. Also, PMA56 is interesting because Ibn Duqmâq informs his readers that he got the contents of this *khbar* about Tamerlane directly from a man who had escaped captivity.

⁹⁵⁶ PM88 and 92.

⁹⁵⁷ PMA92.

less important positions.⁹⁵⁸ But regarding the central event that took place that year in Egypt, namely the triumph of Sûdûn Tâz over his enemies during the first half of Shawwâl, the superiority of *Al-Muntaqá* is self-evident. Not that *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *'Iqd al-Jumân* are lacking in valuable data. The narrative in PMA134, which records the first and inconclusive clash between the two parties on the 2nd of Shawwâl, is actually more developed in *'Iqd al-Jumân* than in *Al-Muntaqá*, and most of the episodes of this yet another Mamluk civil war are present in all the works mentioned here. But whereas al-'Aynî summarized the events between the 10th and the 13th of Shawwâl, all leading up to the ultimate fight on the 14th of that month,⁹⁵⁹ by saying that whenever they met the two parties clashed,⁹⁶⁰ Ibn Duqmâq provides modern historians with detailed accounts of three separate armed encounters,⁹⁶¹ not counting related stories,⁹⁶² during this same period.

As for *Al-Nafhah* it is but a very pale reflection of *Al-Muntaqá* as it holds only seventeen out of the latter's seventy-one PMAs, all very short summaries of the original. Interestingly, there are three very brief *akhbâr* in it⁹⁶³ that are absent from *Al-Muntaqá*. Either Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah refrained from including these items from *Nuzhat al-Anâm* in his *Al-Muntaqá* because Ibn Hijiî dealt with them more thoroughly from a Syrian perspective, or Ibn Duqmâq added them when he later embarked upon the writing of the shorter *Al-Nafhah*.

⁹⁵⁸ See, for example, PMA10, 15, 29, 43, 109, etc.

⁹⁵⁹ The final clash is described in PMA153.

⁹⁶⁰ PMA147.

⁹⁶¹ PMA150, 151 and 152.

⁹⁶² PMA146, 148 and 149. The last two reports contain a fair deal of topographical data concerning the location of the encounters in close vicinity of the Citadel.

⁹⁶³ PMA12, 20 and 22. These reports deal with Taghrîbirdî's rebellion and with appointments to the viceroalties of Damascus and Aleppo which took place as a result thereof.

Overall then, Ibn Duqmâq's chronicle, at least in the form it assumed in the excerpts Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah made of it in *Al-Muntaqâ*, was probably at the time it was written and still is today the best of all Egypt-based histories. Curiously though, only later historians, like Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, Ibn Iyâs and the anonymous author of the early sixteenth century *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* appear to have made use of it.

B. Badr al-Dîn Al-'Aynî (762-855/1361-1451):

The works of Ibn Duqmâq, al-'Aynî and al-Maqrîzî contain a fairly large number of reports common to all three, and more often than not the similarity of the wording of some of these, as can be seen in the example below, PMA11, might leave the impression that the two authors continued to rely on another contemporary source, here Ibn Duqmâq, to construct their own accounts, just as they did in the annals of 778 and 793.⁹⁶⁴

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-fi yawm al-thalâthâ' tâsi' 'asharahu, khuli'a 'alâ al-Sârim al-ladhî kâna wâlî al-Qâhirah, wa-istaqarra wâlî Misr 'iwadân 'an Muhammad al-Dânî.*" [*Al-Muntaqâ*, MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 197a]

Al-'Aynî: "*Wa-khuli'a fihî aydan 'alâ al-Sârim wa-istaqarra fî wilâyat Misr 'iwadân 'an Nâsir al-Dîn al-Dânî bi-hikmi 'azlihi.*" ["*Iqd al-Jumân*," Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 58a]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa istaqarra al-Sârim fî wilâyat Misr, wa-'uzila al-Dânî.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1076]

But the presence of differences in the narrative of this and myriad other reports,⁹⁶⁵ insignificant as they are, compounded with the possibility that whatever similarities there might be could be attributed to the use, especially for nominations, of stock terminology, could lead one to reassess the hypothesis that al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî continued in their previous *modus operandi*. Such a stance is actually further supported by the fact that in more elaborate reports, the variations between this pair and Ibn Duqmâq are significant.

⁹⁶⁴ Al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî have relied, respectively, on Ibn al-Furât and Ibn Duqmâq. See above, relevant sections in chapters one and two.

⁹⁶⁵ For example, SHM3, which recounted the increase in the amplitude of the Nile at the beginning of the month of Muharram, was reported very differently in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Al-Muntaqâ*; see below, p. 270.

This can clearly be seen, for example, in PMA27, which relates the tensions between senior emirs⁹⁶⁶ and lower-ranking ones at the beginning of Safar: al-‘Aynî and al-Maqrîzî both recorded the names of the senior emirs and provided the same list of junior emirs that the first group wanted expelled to Syria; Ibn Duqmâq’s list of junior emirs is different with regard to one individual, and he provided details, absent in the works of the other two historians, about the tenor of the negotiations which accompanied the resolution of this affair, among other things, Faraj’s favourable bias towards the junior emirs and his unsuccessful attempt at preventing their forceful exile to Syria. The same can be said about the reports surrounding the conflicts of the middle decade of Shawwâl.⁹⁶⁷ Ibn Duqmâq’s accounts of these are more numerous,⁹⁶⁸ and his relation of the whereabouts of the defeated party on the left bank of the Nile⁹⁶⁹ following the victory of Sûdûn Tâz on the 14th of Shawwâl,⁹⁷⁰ is at variance with al-Maqrîzî’s and al-‘Aynî’s, not only in terms of the number of halts the rebels reportedly made, but also in terms of the names of the locations where they stopped.⁹⁷¹ Had the accounts of the pair been shorter or generally less detailed than those of Ibn Duqmâq, one could have posited that they simply summarized his work to produce theirs. Since it is not the case here, one then can assume the possibility that they relied on Ibn Duqmâq and then reworked the text of their narrative by adding to it more information they acquired elsewhere. But based on the findings of the two previous chapters, that al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî, rather than profoundly remodelling the source upon which they founded their chronicle, instead

⁹⁶⁶ Nawrûz al-Hâfîzî, Jakam min ‘Awad, Sûdûn Tâz and others. This same group would eventually split in Shawwâl between Sûdûn Tâz and the rest. See above, pp. 213-4., and below, pp. 231, 270-1.

⁹⁶⁷ See above, p. 220.

⁹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶⁹ PMA154.

⁹⁷⁰ On this battle, see PMA153.

⁹⁷¹ Ibn Duqmâq noted the names of two locations, one unreadable, and the other al-Jîzah. Al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî, on the other hand, mentioned Munyat al-Qâ’id, Tamuw then Mînbâbah.

contented themselves to, respectively, rewrite *Târîkh al-Duwal*⁹⁷² and rely on *Nuzhat al-Anâm*,⁹⁷³ one can arguably maintain that the *bulk* of the reports in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*⁹⁷⁴ and *‘Iqd al-Jumân* are indeed original contributions to the history of the early ninth century A.H., and not borrowings from Ibn Duqmâq or from any other known source.

Other evidence also supports the view concerning the originality of al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî. We have indicated earlier that Ibn Duqmâq did note his indebtedness to al-Maqrîzî for one report;⁹⁷⁵ in another instance, al-‘Aynî tells his readers that an emir personally informed him (“*akhbaranî man athiqu bi-hi min al-umarâ*”) about the conclusion of a given event.⁹⁷⁶ Even though this is no way conclusive proof,⁹⁷⁷ it does however reflect the fact that the two historians were men of their times and then probably engaged in taking down notes that would later be used to produce their annal for this year.

Beyond establishing, with more or less certainty, the originality of these two historians, one still has to determine their relative importance vis-à-vis one another, especially given the assertion made above⁹⁷⁸ concerning the uncanny resemblance between their narratives.

Of the two, al-‘Aynî has written the less copious chronicle, and even MS Ahmet III 2911/19 which has more data than the other manuscript of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* covering the

⁹⁷² ...and in the case of the annal of 793, to summarize it; see chapter two, pp. 158-9.

⁹⁷³ They also sometimes added information peculiar to each one of them. See relevant sections in the two previous chapters.

⁹⁷⁴ See below, the section on al-Maqrîzî where his reliance on a Hijjîan source has been established; pp. 225-6.

⁹⁷⁵ See above, pp. 215-6.

⁹⁷⁶ PMA134.

⁹⁷⁷ Remember Ibn Hajar’s reproach to al-‘Aynî for mentioning “in his description of some events what indicates that he actually witnessed them ...[but] the event would have taken place in Egypt while he was still in ‘Ayntâb...;” *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 1, p. 3.

⁹⁷⁸ See above, p. 216.

year 804 available to me,⁹⁷⁹ contains less reports than *Kitâb al-Sulûk*: this last chronicle has eighty-three PMAs, nineteen RLs, eight SHMs and two FAs, to *'Iqd al-Jumân*'s sixty-one PMAs, twelve RLs, three SHMs and zero FAs. However, what is of interest here is the fact, first, that most of the reports common to both works are consistently 'meatier' in *'Iqd al-Jumân* than in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, and second, that despite this difference in size, they are very similar. PMA11, a short *khavar* that was transliterated above,⁹⁸⁰ is a case in point. But so are longer *akhbâr*: despite the shorter and more to the point nature of al-Maqrîzî's accounts, the texts of the two chronicles are related. This can be seen in the following sections of PMA153 and 154, which recount the major engagement of the civil strife of the month of Shawwâl and the flight of the defeated party:

Al-'Aynî: "*Wa-lammâ kâna al-arba'â' al-râbi' 'ashar min Shawwâl, nazala al-Sultân al-Malik al-Nâsir wa-rakiba ma'ahu sâ'ir al-umarâ' wa-al-mamâlik fa-kharajû min [al-] Qarâfah, wa-kâna al-Nawrûziyah ya'taqidûn anna al-harb yakûn yawm al-khamîs li-anna al-Sultân nâdá bi-al-'ard yawm al-arba'â' fa-i'taqada hâ'ulâ' anna al-'ard wa-al-burûz yawm al-khamis, wa-kâna yawm al-'ard yawm al-khurûj; wa-kâna dhâlika hîlah min Sûdûn Tâz.... Fa-ba'da dhâlika walâ Nawrûz wa-Jakam wa-wallâ kull man ma'ahumâ musri 'în tâlibîn nâhiyat al-Sa'id....Wa-lam yazal Nawrûz wa-Jakam wa-man ma'ahumâ sâ'irîn ilâ an wasalû ilâ Munyat Ibn Qâyid min dhâlika al-barr...Wa-fi hâdhihi al-laylah jâ'at al-akhbâr ilâ al-Qâhirah bi-anna Nawrûz wa-Jakam wa-man ma'ahumâ 'âdû wa-nazalû 'alâ Tamuw, jâ'a al-khabar bi-annahum nazalû 'alâ Jîzah, thumma 'alâ Unbûbah.*" [*'Iqd al-Jumân*, Ahmet III 2911/19, fols. 59b-60a]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Fa-nazala al-sultân min al-Qasr fi laylat al-arba'â' râbi' 'asharahu ilâ al-Istabl 'inda Sûdûn Tâz; wa-rakiba bukrat yawm al-arba'â' fi man ma'ahu, wa-sâra min Bâb al-Qarâfah, ba'damâ nâdá bi-al-'ard, wa-ijtama'a ilayhi al-'askar kulluhu...Wa-farra Nawrûz wa-Jakam fi 'iddah kabîrah yuridûn al-Sa'id...Wa-intahâ Nawrûz wa-Jakam ilâ Munyat al-Qâ'id, wa-'âdû ilâ Tamuw, wa-nazalû 'alâ nâhiyat Minbâbah min barr al-Jîzah tujâh al-Qâhirah.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1084-5]

⁹⁷⁹ In the previous chapters of this dissertation, the shorter MS Ahmet III 2911/B2 was used alongside Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh* of which folios I have in my possession do not extend to 804. MS Ahmet III 2911/B2 does not contain any reports that are not to be found in MS Ahmet III 2911/19, and it is for this reason that even though references to it are made throughout the tables, only MS Ahmet III 2911/19 will be used in this chapter. For a comparison between MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2 and Dâr al-Kutub 1584 *târikh*, see relevant sections in chapters one and two.

⁹⁸⁰ See above, p. 221.

Thus, differences between the two texts do not and cannot hide the fact that they are very similar. Moreover, a cursory look at Table III. 2. B. shows that the order of appearance of reports in both chronicles is identical, save for those extra stories found mostly in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

C. Taqî al-Dîn Ahmad al-Maqrîzî (766-845/1364-1441-2):

What al-Maqrîzî lacks in details, he makes up for in numbers, but also in the fact that his *Kitâb al-Sulûk* contains reports that are distinctly Hijjîan and others that are peculiar to his work. Al-Maqrîzî dealt with Hijjîan⁹⁸¹ reports in the same manner as he 'adapted' *Târikh al-Duwal* in the previous annal we studied: the borrowing is unmistakable, but the text of the narrative in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* is shorter, more concise, and devoid of its Damascene and/or Syrian peculiarities, as for example PMA44:

Ibn Hijjî: "*Wa-yawm al-jumu'ah khâmisihî labisa al-nâ'ib Âqbughâ khil'at al-niyâbah wasalat ma'a al-taqlîd bukrat al-nahâr, wa-qurî'a al-taqlîd wa-huwa mu'arrakh* [blank space] *Safar, qara'ahu Muhyî al-Dîn li-du'fi kâtib al-sirr, wa-khulî'a 'alayhi.*" ["*Târikh Ibn Hijjî,*" MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fol. 131b]

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fi khâmisihî labisa al-Amîr Âqbughâ khil'ah bi-niyâbat al-Shâm, wa-qad wasalat ilayhi min al-Qâhirah ilâ Dimashq, wa-qurî'a taqlîduhu.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk,* vol. 3:3, p. 1079]

In another instance, we see al-Maqrîzî fuse two of Ibn Hijjî's reports, PMA83 and 84, to produce his own, PMA81:

Ibn Hijjî: "*Wa-yawm al-ahad khâmisihî, duribat al-bashâ'ir 'alâ al-Qal'ah bi-sabab anna Damurdâsh inkasara wa-haraba, wa-anna al-waq'ah kânat zâhir Hamâh. Wa-kâna Damurdâsh, hîna kharaja min Halab nahwa Hamâh, istawlâ 'alâ Halab amîr al-Turukmân min Banî Dhî al-Ghâdir wa-akhadhahâ al-Sultân. Fa-lammâ inkasara Damurdâsh, lam yumkinhu al-rujû' ilâ Halab, fa-haraba munkasiran.*" [PMA83/"*Târikh Ibn Hijjî,*" MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fol. 133b]

⁹⁸¹ PMA24, 44, 48, 49, 50, 54, 70, 74, 99, 101, 122, 130, 185, 194 and 197; RL23, 27, 30, 46 and 60; FA6. SHM2, 15, 20 and 77, which are mere statements of the beginning of given months could also be attributed to Ibn Hijjî's *Târikh* where this type of information is more developed. Also, as we shall see just below, al-Maqrîzî's PMA81 is in fact the result of the fusion of Ibn Hijjî's PMA83 and 84.

“*Thumma jā’at al-akhbâr bi-anna al-waq’ah kânat yawm al-khamîs zâhir Halab wa-hadarahâ Asin Bay wa-anna al-qitâl dâma tûl al-nahâr wa-kathurat al-jirâhât thumma inkasara Damurdâsh.*” [PMA84/“*Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*,” MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fols. 133b-134a]

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Fa-sâra Damurdâsh min Halab, wa-laqâ Duqmâq ‘alâ Hamâh fî yawm al-Khamîs thâni Jumâdâ al-Ûlá, fa-inkasara Damurdâsh, ba’da al-qitâl tûl al-nahâr, wa-kathurat fîhi al-jirâhât. Fa-lam yumkin al-‘awd ilâ Halab, min ajli anna al-umarâ’ bi-hâ akhadhûhâ lil-Sultân.*” [PMA81/*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1081]⁹⁸²

Al-Maqrîzî’s account evacuated the regional character of Ibn Hîjjî’s (“...*duribat al-bashâ’ir ‘alâ al-Qal’ah*” and “*thumma jā’at al-akhbâr...*”) and in the same breadth avoided specifying the exact location of the battle indicated in PMA83 by opting for that of PMA84.

As for the other reports not shared with al-‘Aynî, they fall into two categories. Some are peculiar to *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, in that they are simply not found in any of the other available contemporary sources. These are of no particular type and they are not pivotal in nature.⁹⁸³ The second category is a bit more problematic because one can establish the fact that the contents of its stories mirror information in other contemporary chronicles, without however possessing sufficient textual evidence to establish a clear case of ‘kinship’ between them. For example, SHM64, which tells of the state of ruin of Damascus and the use by its inhabitants of stones carted away therefrom to build homes outside of its walls, echoes, in *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*, SHM28 and 84 which relate aspects of the construction spree then taking place, mainly its financial dimension, particularly the increase in the rent being charged for the new properties thus developed; PMA202, yet

⁹⁸² In the citation from *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, passages not in bold correspond to PMA83, and those that are to PMA84.

⁹⁸³ PMA3 relates the departure of an emir on a mission from Egypt to Syria; PMA37, 171, 204 and 205 relate appointments, one in Egypt and the other three to viceroalties in Syria; FA5 describes the sending of a letter to Qarâ Yûsuf in Iraq; RL8 and 28 deal with the conveyance to Syria of a letter of nominations to three religious positions there. *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* does contain a version of RL28, but it is shorter than that of al-Maqrîzî, and it is for this reason, among others, that I am excluding the possibility it was authored by Ibn Hajar.

another report of nomination to a viceroyalty in Syria, namely that of Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî to Tripoli in replacement of Shaykh al-Maḥmûdî, can be found, more elaborated, in *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, and in all probability Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah culled it from Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*. Because of their limited number, their very nature, and the lack of more solid evidence, it could be fairly reasonable to assume that the reports in these two categories are indeed from al-Maqrîzî's own hand.

At this stage, one challenging issue still needs to be addressed: what can account for the existence of such a large body of common and close accounts in the works of al-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî? As a starting point for discussion, one could postulate that it was al-Maqrîzî who was the borrower. Al-'Aynî's accounts are generally longer and, in view of the findings of the preceding chapters, al-Maqrîzî has consistently relied on the works of others, even for periods when he was a full-fledged adult, in which case he made heavy use of *Târîkh al-Duwal*; no methodological or other considerations would have prevented him from relying on *'Iqd al-Jumân*⁹⁸⁴ and then adding to his annal reports that he had garnered himself, as well as *akhbâr* of Hījīan origin.

This last line of argumentation can however just as easily be applied to al-'Aynî who also relied on the works of others; it is not inconceivable that he adopted *Kitâb al-Sulûk* as the foundation of his chronicle for the year 804, that he enhanced the reports found therein and chose consciously to leave aside those that were of no interest to him. As a matter of fact, in his introduction to his edition of al-'Aynî's *'Iqd al-Jumân*, al-Qarmût remarked that "al-'Aynî frequently followed al-Maqrîzî in the *Sulûk* and refutes

⁹⁸⁴ Except maybe the deep animosity that had developed between the two; see Broadbridge, "Academic Rivalry," pp. 89-91, 99-103.

him without mentioning him by name.”⁹⁸⁵ One might also look at external evidence, namely the chronological order of composition of these two works. Al-‘Aynî lived a full ten years longer than al-Maqrîzî who, evidence suggests, probably wrote the first draft of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* sometime around or after 825-827/1421-1423 but no earlier than his return from Damascus following the death of Faraj in 815/1412.⁹⁸⁶ But in the absence of data concerning the date(s) of composition of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, it would be adventuresome to go into unknown territory. Such an endeavour would be problematic, first, because we do not as of yet possess an exhaustive and scientific assessment of the various manuscripts of the *‘Iqd al-Jumân* scattered around the world;⁹⁸⁷ second, as a result of this last point and because the historical data available is either very limited or non-existent,⁹⁸⁸ we cannot establish with any certainty the stages of composition of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and the complex of borrowing which might have taken place between their respective authors *prior* to the completion of their final drafts, if any. In the same vein, Jere L. Bacharach claimed, without unfortunately citing his sources, that al-‘Aynî began writing his *‘Iqd al-Jumân* before 825, therefore earlier than al-Maqrîzî’s *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.⁹⁸⁹

As for internal evidence, it is limited but worthy of consideration: there are reports in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, usually of a modest size, that are more copious in terms of the information they contain than their counterparts in *‘Iqd al-Jumân*. The extra data is not

⁹⁸⁵ Quoted in Little, “A Comparison of al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî,” p. 210. Needless to say that following al-Maqrîzî does not necessarily mean or entail copying him.

⁹⁸⁶ See Massoud, “Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian,” p. 133 and the references in the footnotes therein.

⁹⁸⁷ For example, volume eighteen of the autograph manuscript of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* which precedes MS Ahmet III 2911/19 does not appear to be available in the major manuscript repositories around the world.

⁹⁸⁸ In her “Academic Rivalry,” Broadbridge provided glimpses of the phenomenon of literary reception at the international level, by relating the incident surrounding Shâh Rûkh’s request for al-Maqrîzî’s *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and Ibn Hajar’s *Fath al-Bârî* during a visit by his ambassador to Cairo in 833/1428; pp. 103-4.

⁹⁸⁹ “Circassian Mamluk Historians,” p. 79.

necessarily very significant, as in RL65 where the name of the qadi whom Ibn Khaldûn replaced as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Cairo was given in full by al-Maqrîzî,⁹⁹⁰ or in PMA64 where al-‘Aynî omitted to note the name of the viceroy of al-Karak who had just been replaced by another emir.⁹⁹¹ SHM4 however is significant since it reports a type of data which one assumes to be the forte of al-Maqrîzî. In *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, it appears at the very beginning of the annal and provides monetary data concerning the exchange rate of two currencies⁹⁹² and price information for five products;⁹⁹³ in *Iqd al-Jumân*, it is written in the left margin of the last folio of the annal,⁹⁹⁴ and presents the exchange rate for the same two currencies and price information for three products.⁹⁹⁵ The two versions of SHM4 are almost completely identical, but they present differences some of which are presented below:

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-ammâ al-dhahab, fa-inna al-dînâr al-makhtûm bi-sittah wa-thalâthîn dirhaman...wa-al-aruzz bi-mâ’ah wa-tis ‘în...*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1076]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Fa-inna al-dhahab al-misrî al-makhtûm al-dînâr minhu yusraf bi-mablagh tis ‘ah wa-thalâthîn...wa-al-irdibb min-al-aruzz thamâniyah wa-tis ‘în.*” [“*Iqd al-Jumân*,” Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 61a]

We might be dealing here with a case of metathesis or *tahrîf*, which is stronger for the first figure than for the second.⁹⁹⁶ Thus, we could assume that al-‘Aynî chose from the more complete account in al-Maqrîzî’s chronicle a few items, two of which he ended up miscopying.

⁹⁹⁰ Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fi yawm al-khamîs al-sâdis wa-al-‘ishrîn minhâ âkhir al-nahâr, khuli’a ‘alâ al-Qâdî Walî al-Dîn Ibn Khaldûn wa-istaqarra qâdî al-quḍât al-Mâlikîyah, wa-surifa Jamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf bin Khâlid bin Nu’aym muqaddam Ibn Muhammad bin Hasan Bin Ghânim bin Muhammad bin ‘Alî al-Bisâṭî.*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1088]

Al-‘Aynî: “*Wa-fi sâdis ‘ishrînihi istaqarra Walî al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Rahmân Ibn Khaldûn al-Maghribî fi qâdâ’ al-quḍât al-Mâlikîyah ‘iwadan ‘an Qâdî al-Quḍât Jamâl al-Dîn al-Bisâṭî.*” [“*Iqd al-Jumân*,” MS Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 61a]

⁹⁹¹ See also, RL12 and 57.

⁹⁹² *Dînâr makhtûm* and *dînâr Ifrantî*.

⁹⁹³ Wheat, hay, rice, cotton (*qattân*) and firewood.

⁹⁹⁴ Fol. 61a.

⁹⁹⁵ Wheat, hay and rice.

⁹⁹⁶ On metathesis or *tahrîf*, see chapter two, p. 163 footnote no. 713.

Since both points of view expounded above with regard to the direction of the borrowing between the two authors are equally inconclusive, one might posit the existence of a source common to both, or even mutual borrowing. Evidently, this way out actually raises a number of historiographical issues, mainly about the nature of this common source. There is no evidence in the primary and the secondary works which deal with the early Circassian period of anything that would indicate that there were major and/or minor work(s) not yet accounted for. But perhaps, after all, both al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî *did* have recourse to an as of yet anonymous source; or they *did* rework Ibn Duqmâq’s *Nuzhat al-Anâm* with the very unlikely result that they ended up producing very similar works; or maybe, even if the biographical entries regarding him cannot confirm it, Ibn al-Furât had continued taking down notes without committing them to a full-fledged work, the said notes ending up being used by our two historians. Finally, it is possible that they relied on a common oral source whose information had not yet been consigned to writing. Such a hypothesis is supported by comments made by Bacharach, with regard, it is true, to economic data shared by both authors, that “any duplications on either part would reflect a common source rather than plagiarism.”⁹⁹⁷ The fact remains that we still have not at our disposal definitive or even strong evidence to finally put this issue to rest.

D. Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalânî (773-852/1372-1449):

When considered alongside other contemporary sources, for the year 804, quantitatively speaking, *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, with its fifty-four PMAs, seventeen RLs, ten SHMs and three FAs, compares favourably to *Iqd al-Jumân* which contains, sixty-one

⁹⁹⁷ “Circassian Mamluk Historians,” p. 79.

PMAAs, twelve RLs, three SHMs and zero FAs. Qualitatively however, the same problems outlined in the two previous chapters of this dissertation continue to apply here. Overall, it offers a rather poor account of the year, because it is plagued by numerous structural and narrative problems that either obscure or reduce the historical value of its reports, most of which are summaries of other historians’.

One immediately apparent problem is the nagging issue of chronological incoherence, which makes for the presentation of data according to no clearly discernible timeline. We are referring here not to the inconsistencies that are due to the fact that, on numerous occasions,⁹⁹⁸ Ibn Hajar presented together in the text of *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* clusters of topically related *akhbâr*, but rather to those reports that do not appear to follow any order. Thus, a cluster of reports concerning the first *fitnah* [PMA27, 52, 53], which took place during the months of Safar and Rabî‘ al-Awwal, is separated from yet another cluster dealing with the civil strife of Shawwâl [PMA133, 141, 134, 147, 133, 134, 165, 140, etc.] by varied reports from Syria and Egypt [RL3, 13, 59, PMA73, 31, RL11, PMA57, 36, 96, RL58, 31], which are dated, sequentially, in Muḥarram, Rabî‘ al-Thânî, Safar, Rabî‘ al-Awwal, Safar, Dhû al-Qa‘dah and Safar!

As for the regrouping of reports, here as in the annals of 778 and 793, the process did not necessarily lead to a clarification of the narratives, which is probably its intended purpose. In a few instances, it actually led to distortions in the sequential unfolding of

⁹⁹⁸ On top of the two examples noted in the following sentence, here are the most important other clusters of reports to be found in *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*: PMA12, 20, 5, 12, 23 and 38, all concerning Taghrîbirdî’s flight from Damascus to Aleppo, and covering the months of Muḥarram and Safar; PMA130, 70, 71, 74 and 130, dealing with the clashes of Emir Duqmâq, the newly appointed viceroy of Aleppo, with Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî in Northern Syria in Rabî‘ al-Thânî and culminating in Ramadân; PMA98, 97, 99, 101 and 167 which describe the attempt by the sultan’s agents in Gaza to arrest Surûq, the viceroy of the city; RL36, SHM46, 48, 57, RL46, SHM63, all nominations and events taking place in Syria.

events established by the rest of the historians of the period.⁹⁹⁹ This can be seen in the group of reports regarding the events of Shawwâl. Chronologically, they unfold as follows: the first battle took place on the 2nd of that month but, as a result of the intervention of the caliph and the *qudât al-qadâ'*, fighting stopped that very day [PMA134 and 135]; tensions subsided when Nawrûz al-Hâfizî went up to the citadel and made peace with his foe Sûdûn Tâz [PMA136], but they resumed around the 8th of the month after Jakam refused to wear a robe of honour because his ally Qânîbây al-'Alâ'î was requested to go into exile [PMA138, 140]; with Jakam and later Nawrûz regrouping at Birkat al-Habash, and Sûdûn Tâz at the Citadel [PMA145], from then on each party prepared itself for war and clashed with the other [PMA147, PMA150, 151 and 152] until the final battle took place on the 14th of Shawwâl [PMA153]. In *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, the reports concerning the battle of the 2nd of Shawwâl are interspersed with others clearly connected to that of the 14th: for example, whereas Jakam and his allies did not start congregating at Birkat al-Habash until after the 8th of the month [PMA141], Ibn Hajar placed this event *even before* the clash of the 2nd had taken place; similarly, he reported Qânîbây al-'Alâ'î missing [PMA165] after this initial confrontation, even though contemporary historians say this took place *after* the battle of the 14th. While it is true that events ended up unfolding 'properly' later on,¹⁰⁰⁰ the overall value of Ibn Hajar's account of this complex of incidents was considerably weakened.¹⁰⁰¹

⁹⁹⁹ The process of clustering in and by itself is not necessarily conducive to such a problem.

¹⁰⁰⁰ *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, pp. 12-3.

¹⁰⁰¹ Similarly, in relating the battles between Duqmâq and Damurdâsh in northern Syria, Ibn Hajar said that the former grouped in Hama [PMA70] and then asked the viceroy of Damascus for help *before* he attacked Aleppo; the consensus however is that Duqmâq went straight to Aleppo and only headed to Hama after the defection of the Turcomans who were accompanying him [PMA70].

To these structural and narrative difficulties, we can also mention relatively benign problems such as outright wrong dating of events¹⁰⁰² and the already noted fact that some reports appear in two or more places in the narrative of the annal, for no obvious reason.¹⁰⁰³ Evidently, these might all boil down to the issue of the unfinished nature of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, which could have caused Ibn Hajar to assemble, with the view of later reworking and maybe elaborating upon, a large number of reports.

An analysis of the provenance of the reports in *'Inbâ' al-Ghumr* also reflects the findings arrived at in previous chapters of this study. Save for four stories¹⁰⁰⁴ peculiar to Ibn Hajar's work and data he added to some others,¹⁰⁰⁵ all the accounts therein are to be found, generally more elaborated, in a wide range of contemporary sources. In a number of cases, the origin of the reports is straightforward, and not even Ibn Hajar's substantial reworking of them can conceal it. Thus, regarding events in Syria, he relied on Ibn Hiji or on a source or sources that made extensive use of the Syrian scholar's work.¹⁰⁰⁶ This can be seen in PMA74 where Ibn Hiji related news from Northern Syria concerning Damurdâsh's arrival in al-Ma'arrâh,¹⁰⁰⁷ a location only he and Ibn Hajar noted in their respective accounts:

Ibn Hiji: "...*jâ'a al-khabar bi-anna Damurdâsh baraza ilâ zâhir Halab wa-waṣalat muqaddimatuhu ilâ al-Ma'arrâh...*" ["Târîkh Ibn Hiji," MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fol. 133a]

Ibn Hajar: "...*fa-waṣala Damurdâsh ilâ zâhir Halab wa-waṣala jâlishuhu ilâ al-Ma'arrâh...*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 4]

¹⁰⁰² PMA20 and 57.

¹⁰⁰³ See PMA12, 20, 130, 134, 140, and 141. See also, above chapter two.

¹⁰⁰⁴ PMA28, 123; SHM85 and FA7.

¹⁰⁰⁵ See below, pp. 237-8.

¹⁰⁰⁶ See PMA5, 12, 24, 70, 74, 97, 98, 99, 101, 130, 167 and 197; RL23, 24, 25, 36, 46 and 48; SHM12, 28, 46, 48, 52 and 63; FA6.

¹⁰⁰⁷ A city located between Hama and Aleppo; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 74 map no. 18.

It can also be ascertained that Ibn Hajar, in at least two instances, SHM52 and 54, also made use of the work of Ibn Duqmâq. In *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, SHM52, the account of the appearance of a comet in Egypt, introduces a cluster of reports about Shaykh al-Mahmûdî [PMA171, 202, 194, 181] and is accompanied by a commentary to the effect that this astronomical event had been interpreted by some as sign announcing the rise of this emir, recently nominated to the viceroyalty of Damascus [PMA171], who would later lead the Mamluk sultanate under the title of al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh. From the point of view of its narrative context in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, SHM52 owes nothing to that of *Al-Muntaqâ* where it appears as a result of the purely chronological determinism of the annalistic format, but quite a lot in terms of its textual content:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-fi al-'ashr al-akhîr minhu, tala'a kawkab bi-al-gharb la-hu dhu'âbah, wâ-huwa kawkab kabîr kathîr al-nûr dhu'âbatuhu sâ'idah ilâ al-samâ', fa-aqâma ayyâman yatlu' wa-yaghîb qarîb thuluth al-layl, wa-nûruhu qawî yurâ ma'a kathrat daw' al-qamar, wa-huwa qadr al-thurayyâ zâhir al-nûr.*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 200b]

Ibn Hajar: "*Wa-fi Rajab minhâ zahara kawkab kabîr qadr al-thurayyâ la-hu dhu'âbah zâhirat al-nûr jiddan, fa-istamarra yatlu' wa-yaghîb, wa-nûruhu qawî yurâ ma'a daw' al-qamar...*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 17]

In SHM54, we have an instance of Ibn Hajar grafting on data of Duqmâqian origin, information taken from *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî* in order to relate the drowning of an elephant that had taken place in Old Cairo:¹⁰⁰⁸

Ibn Duqmâq: "...*akhrajû al-fîl li-yusayyirûh, fa-sayyarûh ilâ Bûlâq wa-raja'û ilâ taht qantarat Bâb al-Bahr bi-al-qurb min qantarat al-Fakhr ra's al-sûq....*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 200b]

Ibn Hîjjî: "...*wa-fîhi khasafat qantarah bi-Miṣr bi-al-fîl al-kabîr fa-ishtabaka fîhâ wa-'ajaza 'an al-nuhûd, wa-sâra muta'alliqan lâ yaqdir ahad 'alâ takhlîsihi ilâ an mâṭ.*" ["Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî," MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fol. 137b]

Ibn Hajar: "*Wa-fîhi kânat waq'at al-fîl zâhir al-Qâhirah, wa-dhâlika annahum ijtâzû bi-hi bi-qantarat ba'da qantarat al-Fakhr, fa-inkhasafat fa-ishtabaka fîhâ wa-'ajaza 'an al-nuhûd, wa-sâra mu'allaqan fa-lam yuqdar 'alâ takhlîsihi hattâ mâṭ....*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 16]

¹⁰⁰⁸ On this incident, see below, pp. 259 and 262.

Ibn Hajar probably borrowed the name of the location from Ibn Duqmâq, but relied on a Syrian historian to describe an event that had taken place in Egypt and that Ibn Hiji himself probably received from an Egyptian source.

Ibn Hajar also borrowed from Ibn ‘Arab Shâh¹⁰⁰⁹ in order to produce FA8, the longest single report in *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, his account of Tamerlane’s whereabouts following the sack of Damascus in 803. The inclusion of a report concerning events that had taken place clearly outside of the chronological boundaries of the year 804 is in and by itself interesting, but can be explained away as a mistake due to the possible work in progress nature of this chronicle. Even more relevant to our purposes is the fact that the words used by Ibn Hajar closely parallel those of Ibn ‘Arab Shâh:

Ibn Hajar: “...*wasala ilâ Mârdîn, fa-tahassana ahluhâ bi-al-qal‘ah...*” [*Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 23]

Ibn ‘Arab Shâh: “*Fa-wasalû yawm al-ithnayn ‘âshir Ramadân, wâridîn Mârdîn....waidhâ bi-ahlihâ qad akhlaw al-madînah, wa-intaqalû ilâ qal‘atihâ al-hasînah.*” [*Ajâib al-Maqdûr*, p. 298]¹⁰¹⁰

Beyond this short opening sentence, throughout this report, one sees the influence of Ibn ‘Arab Shâh in the account of Tamerlane’s itinerary to Baghdad, through Nasîbîn, Mosul and Sûr,¹⁰¹¹ but especially in the vivid description of the sack and destruction of Baghdad.¹⁰¹²

Overall, however, Ibn Hajar’s Maqrîzîan propensity to rewrite other people’s *akhbâr* by summarizing them and using his own words, to which one might add the overall disorderliness of *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr*, makes it genuinely difficult to ascertain the

¹⁰⁰⁹ *Ajâ’ib al-Maqdûr fi Nawâ’ib Taymûr*, edited by Ahmad Fâyiz al-Himsî (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risâlah, 1986); *Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir*, translated by J.H. Sanders (London: Luzac & Co., 1936).

¹⁰¹⁰ See also *Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir*, p. 164.

¹⁰¹¹ See *Ajâib al-Maqdûr*, p. 132 for details on this region of Armenia

¹⁰¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 303-6.

genealogy of a very large number of reports. Not that that it is difficult to establish the fact of the borrowing itself, which is obvious, so close is the wording of these reports to those of other contemporary authors'. Rather, as a consequence of what has just been said, the problem lies in properly identifying the author or authors from whose work he culled these reports. This is especially true when Ibn Hajar's accounts are compared to those of al-'Aynî and al-Maqrîzî, as can be seen in PMA23:¹⁰¹³

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Fa-warada al-khabar bi-iltihâq Taghrîbirdî bi-Damurdâsh fi Halab.*" [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, p. 1077]

Al-'Aynî: "*Jâ'a al-khabar al-sahîh bi-anna al-Amîr Taghrîbirdî râha ilâ Halab ilâ jihat al-Amîr Damurdâsh nâ'ib Halab.*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 58a]

Ibn Hajar: "...*fa-haraba ilâ nâhiyat Halab fa-wasala ilâ Damurdâsh.*" [Inbâ' al-Ghumr, vol. 5, p. 2]

In PMA27, as in other reports, one has the distinct impression that Ibn Hajar actually mixed together words and bits of sentences taken from both al-'Aynî and al-Maqrîzî:

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Thumma mashâ al-hâl baynahum wa-bayna al-umarâ', wa-istalahû 'alâ khurûj al-Hamzâwî li-niyâbat Safad, wa-iqâmat al-bâqîn min ghayri hudûrihim al-khidmah...*" [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, p. 1078]

Al-'Aynî: "*Thumma mashâ baynahum ba'd al-umarâ' bi-al-sulh, fa-istalahû 'alâ an yakhrûj Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî ilâ niyâbat Safad, wa-yaq'ud al-bâqûn wa-lâ yatla'ûn ilâ al-khidmah.*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 58b]

Ibn Hajar: "...*fa-'uyyina Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî li-niyâbat Safad wa-mashaw baynahum fi al-sulh, ilâ an istalahû 'alâ dhâlika wa-annahum lâ yahdurûn lil-khidmah hattâ yusâfir al-Hamzâwî wa-anna jamâ'ah min al-mamâlik sammawhum lâ yatla'ûn ilâ al-qal'ah ašlan...*" [Inbâ' al-Ghumr, vol. 5, p. 6]

One thus needs to rely sometimes on minute pieces of evidence, a few words or short sentences really, and on the fact that certain reports are found in one work but not in another, in order to properly identify the origin of a given story. At this level, it is easier to determine the relations Ibn Hajar culled from *'Iqd al-Jumân* than those from *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, because al-'Aynî's words or cluster of words are more numerous and longer in

¹⁰¹³ See also, PMA36, 48, 52, 53, 71, 73, 96, 133, 140, 141, 145, 147, 160, 161, 181, 187, 194 and 199.

Inbâ' al-Ghumr than al-Maqrîzî's. Accordingly, for his Egyptian reports, Ibn Hajar appears to have depended more on al-'Aynî than on either al-Maqrîzî or Ibn Duqmâq. For example, even though they are incoherent and badly articulated, most of the stories surrounding the events of Shawwâl mirror those of *'Iqd al-Jumân*. In PMA134, Ibn Hajar used almost the same terms (“...*ma' anna jihat Nawrûz kânat râjihah, illâ anna Sûdûn Tâz tahayyala...*”) as al-'Aynî (“...*wa-lâkin jihat Nawrûz kânat râjihah, wa-law lam ya'mal Sûdûn Tâz hîlah la-kâna ghuliba...*”).¹⁰¹⁴ In the case of al-Maqrîzî, it is indeed the presence of a word¹⁰¹⁵ and that of reports nowhere else mentioned,¹⁰¹⁶ that indicates borrowing on the part of Ibn Hajar.

If we discount the peculiar turns of phrase that he resorted to in his rewriting of other people's words, the important place occupied by data borrowed from elsewhere is such that modern historians have little original information to glean from *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*. Whatever is to be had is made up either of data he grafted to those of others or of original reports. In terms of the first category, the information is neither crucial nor pivotal, and in all cases it is constituted of mere remarks such as Ibn Hajar's comment in RL48 that Ibn al-Bisâtî, who had replaced Ibn Khaldûn as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Cairo, was a young man.¹⁰¹⁷ As for the reports that are his only, two deal with Egypt [PMA28,

¹⁰¹⁴ See also PMA38, 57, 135, 153, 157, 158, 189, 200 and 201; SHM5.

¹⁰¹⁵ In PMA71, only al-Maqrîzî and al-Malaṭî made use of the verb “*istanjada*” in order to describe Duqmâq's appeal for help to Damascus.

¹⁰¹⁶ See, for example RL8 in which al-Maqrîzî related the signing of the papers nominating Ibn Hîjjî's brother as Shâfi'î *qâdî al-quḍât* in Aleppo, an event dated the 5th of Safar. Ibn Hajar's is also dated in Safar, but mentions no specific date. This is however enough to discount the possibility that he relied on Ibn Hîjjî whose earliest account of his brother's appointment is to be found in RL36, a report which recounted the arrival from Cairo of his brother's and other people's appointment papers on the 29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah.

¹⁰¹⁷ See also the already discussed SHM52 where Ibn Hajar commented about the comet being an omen of al-Mu'ayyad's rise, and SHM54, where he added that the incident of the elephant later became the stuff of stories and songs. In PMA163, we are probably dealing simply with erroneous data, as Ibn Hajar is the only to note that following the failure of his rebellion, Jakam was sent to al-Marqab rather than to Alexandria, the destination mentioned by all the other chronicles; al-Marqab is a fortress located off the Syrian coastal town of Bâniyâs; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, map no. 20.

SHM85] and relate, respectively, the death of a *kāshif* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî at the hands of Bedouins,¹⁰¹⁸ and the termination of meat distribution by one Emir al-Sâlimî; one [PMA123] is about events in Tripoli;¹⁰¹⁹ and one [FA7] about disturbances taking place in the Maghrib.¹⁰²⁰

In terms of originality then, *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* does not really stand out when compared to other contemporary works, such as *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *'Iqd al-Jumân*: the relationship between the latter two might be uncertain and they both might be indebted to another source, but they still outshine, by far, Ibn Hajar's chronicle in terms of their structure, contents and overall coherence. As a matter of fact, only the wealth of sources used by Ibn Hajar makes of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* significant from an historiographical point of view: at age thirty one, he had not yet reached the pinnacle of his fame,¹⁰²¹ and was probably not impressed enough then by the events he was living through, so that, just like al-Maqrîzî, he relied on the works of many others and then added his own data and reports in order to construct a chronicle that he, in all likelihood, intended to rework. However, whatever merit *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* has is dwarfed by the problems that plague it.

¹⁰¹⁸ On page 4 of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, Ibn Hajar reported the clash between one Jântamur al-Turuntây al-'Ajamî and the Hawârâ Arabs, and on page 21, the death of a Jântamur al-Nizâmî, probably one and the same person, as a result of this confrontation. See footnote no. 1, p. 21 in *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*.

¹⁰¹⁹ The story about the defeat of a Turcoman chief, Sûjî, at the hands of the then viceroy of Tripoli, Shaykh al-Mahmûdî.

¹⁰²⁰ FA7 relates the end of the Maznî dynasty in what is now Algeria following the occupation of its capital, the city of Biskrah, by the Hafsîd sultan Abû Fâris 'Abd al-'Azîz. One would have expected to find information about this event in *Kitâb al-'Ibar*, but beyond general information about this dynasty, including an entire section on it, no passage that I could identify deals with the specifics contained in FA7. In the obituary of Abû Fâris 'Abd al-'Azîz in *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, al-Sakhâwî quoted his teacher as saying in his *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* that he had read information about the Hafsîd sultan in the biography written about him by an Abû 'Abdallah Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Tûnisî (“...*fimâ kataba min siratihi*...”); vol. 4, p. 215. This could be the source of FA7, echoes of which can also be found, again in *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'*, in the obituary of the defeated Maznî ruler, Abû al-'Abbâs Aḥmad; vol. 2, p. 251. Both references to these obituaries in *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi'* are to be found in the footnotes of p. 20 of *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*.

¹⁰²¹ See Broadbridge, “Academic Rivalry,” pp. 95, 97ff.

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Ahmad Ibn Hijjî ibn Mûsá al-Husbânî (751-816/1350-1413):

Unlike the year 793 for which we have at our disposal only partial sections of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* that are, to boot, of an uncertain nature,¹⁰²² for the year at hand a complete annal of Ibn Hijjî's chronicle is available. MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, which covers the years 796-804, 806-807 and 809-815,¹⁰²³ is from three different hands, two of which, in the absence of a colophon, are unidentifiable, and the third being the distinguishable script of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah.¹⁰²⁴ One conclusion that can be drawn from the examination of this manuscript is that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah collated MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458¹⁰²⁵ with a holograph manuscript of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*, because his writing appears throughout the manuscript in a large number of marginalia,¹⁰²⁶ in the text proper, as well as in lists bearing the names of those who died during a given year which precede most of the annals.

A few words are in order here about the marginalia. Some are from the hand of the copyists, and of these most are accompanied by a s for sahh, for corrections made by them, so one can conclude that they simply fixed what they could by making these annotations. Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's annotations are usually short and in most cases they are

¹⁰²² See chapter two, pp. 181-2.

¹⁰²³ For a description of the manuscript, see Wilhelm Ahlwardt, *Verzeichnis der Arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Berlin: 1887-99), pp. 65-6, notice no. 9458.

¹⁰²⁴ The breakdown of the manuscript in terms of years according to the handwriting of its copyists is as follows: Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, 796-797, 809-813; first unknown copyist, 798-804, 806-807; second unknown copyist, 813-815. That we are definitely dealing with the work of Ibn Hijjî, can be ascertained for at least two sections of the manuscript, namely those written by the two unknown copyists. Two marginal annotations at the bottom of fols. 168b and 260a, in respectively, the hand of the first unknown copyist and Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, indicate, again respectively, the end of the annal of 807 of Ibn Hijjî's *Târikh* and the conclusion of this work. In the case of the annal of 815, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's comment is followed by two short reports from Dhû al-Hijjâh.

¹⁰²⁵ This is indeed the take of Ahlwardt who does not however identify the collator as being Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah; see *Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften*, p. 66.

¹⁰²⁶ There are also many marginalia from the hand of the other two copyists.

accompanied by the letter ḡ, which probably means that he made corrections to the copyists' text by relying on a holograph manuscript written by Ibn Hijjî. His access to this manuscript could also explain why some reports within the body of the text, such as SHM51, were completed by him. As for the longer marginalia from his hand, they are of two different kinds. Some such as PMA94 and RL36 are probably omissions because they too are accompanied by the letter ḡ; this is further supported by the fact that the text of RL36, which relates the arrival of the appointment papers of, among others, Ibn Hijjî's brother, refers to the latter as "*akhî Najm al-Dîn*." As for those annotations accompanied with the letter h, for *hâshiyah*, we are likely dealing here with addenda to the text of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* to be used in later recensions.¹⁰²⁷ Of these additions, only one, RL41, stands on its own as a self-contained report,¹⁰²⁸ while the others were simply appendages to reports¹⁰²⁹ found in the body of the text.¹⁰³⁰

The analysis of this annal¹⁰³¹ and that of the first recension made of it by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah¹⁰³² seems to indicate that the text of the year 793¹⁰³³ studied in the previous chapter does not qualify as a first recension of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*. Rather, it probably belongs to some intermediate stage of the recension process undertaken by Ibn Qâḍî

¹⁰²⁷ All of the marginalia in both Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's and the copyists' hand were incorporated in either the 1st and/or the 2nd recensions.

¹⁰²⁸ Interestingly, in the first recension of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*, which is supposed to be just that, a recension, not only is RL41 there, but it is also longer! Maybe the first recension is then the stage of the reworking of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah where incomplete or absent data were 'straightened out' before their inclusion in the second recension, i.e. *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*.

¹⁰²⁹ PMA30 and PMA176. The text of the *hâshiyah* in the margin of fol. 139b, an obituary, contains what appear to be commentaries ("*thumma dhakarahu fî Dhî al-Hijjâh min sanat 98 thumma fî Jumâdî al-Ûlá sanat thamân ma'ah*," etc.) by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah as to where Ibn Hijjî noted information about the deceased

¹⁰³⁰ This issue just discussed, and that of the presence of numerous empty spaces in the body of the annal of 804, as for example in fols. 130b, 131a, 132b, 135a, etc., will not be decisively dealt with until a thorough investigation of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's methodology has been undertaken.

¹⁰³¹ MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fols. 129b-140a.

¹⁰³² MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 252b-261a.

¹⁰³³ MS K opr ul  1027, fols. 93b-100b.

Shuhbah. The research carried out so far in this dissertation shows that it generally unwise to generalize to a given annal results obtained from another, since individual historians were unpredictable in building their works, in terms of, say, their choice of sources and the depth and scope of coverage of their *akhbâr*.¹⁰³⁴ In other words, nothing guarantees that the writing of these different texts,¹⁰³⁵ some of which were obviously manipulated,¹⁰³⁶ belonging to one and the same work but to two different annals, took place under identical circumstances.¹⁰³⁷ However, a cursory look at MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458 shows that, at least for this manuscript, Ibn Hijjî was consistent in terms of both writing style, contents and methodology, and one might then *assume* that this was the case for the other annals of his work. On this assumption, the conclusion reached at the beginning of this paragraph regarding the incomplete nature of the annal of 793 in MS Köprülü 1027 then stands, namely that a first recension of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* would have been much more elaborate in terms of its contents, so large are the qualitative and quantitative discrepancies between, on the one hand, the text of the year 793 and on the other, the accounts of the year 804 in the original though not holograph version of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* and the initial recension made of it by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah.

The annal of the year 804 in MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458 constitutes along with the works of Ibn Duqmâq and either al-‘Aynî and/or al-Maqrîzî, one of the most important sources for the year at hand. But not only does Ibn Hijjî surpass these other historians in

¹⁰³⁴ Ibn Taghrîbirdî is a case in point since for 778 he relied on a Duqmâqian source and for 793 (and 804, as will be shown below), he made use of al-Maqrîzî's *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. The same can be said also of Al-Jawharî whose account for 804 is based almost totally on *‘Iqd al-Jumân* while his annal of the year 793 was on *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

¹⁰³⁵ I am referring here to the texts noted in footnotes nos. 1031, 1032 and 1033.

¹⁰³⁶ Namely those revisited by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah in his recension process.

¹⁰³⁷ I am not referring here to the copying of the original manuscript of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* undertaken in MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, but rather to the writing of the original text by Ibn Hijjî himself.

all categories of reports,¹⁰³⁸ his work is also, in the absence of another source that might prove to be more complete, the most comprehensive work available about Syria. The comprehensiveness of *Târîkh Ibn Hıjî* plays out in terms of the sheer number of reports but also their variety. The annal of the year 793 provided modern historians with crucial information about that pivotal period of the history of Damascus then in grips of civil strife,¹⁰³⁹ but it did not, because of its very nature, even come close to encompassing the array of topics covered by that of 804.

In the latter, social and economic data abound. Notwithstanding the SHMs that deal with purely astrological data and the equivalent of Islamic dates in other calendars, which are of no intrinsic value to historians,¹⁰⁴⁰ one finds plentiful data about a wide variety of foodstuffs, their prices and the factors influencing these;¹⁰⁴¹ the value of various currencies;¹⁰⁴² climatic and meteorological events, as well as natural disasters;¹⁰⁴³ details about urban matters, such as reconstruction of buildings and neighbourhoods¹⁰⁴⁴ and criminal activities;¹⁰⁴⁵ etc.

There is as well no shortage of reports concerning political issues whether local, regional or even international, and here also the completeness and superiority of *Târîkh Ibn Hıjî* concerning things Syrian is apparent especially when compared to the annal of 793 in Köprülü 1073, but also, generally, to the historiographical production of Ibn Saṣrâ. For example, Ibn Hıjî provides the usual information about nominations to important

¹⁰³⁸ Eighty-six PMAs; forty-six RLs; seventy SHMs; and three 3 FAs.

¹⁰³⁹ See above, chapter two.

¹⁰⁴⁰ The SHMs which hold this type of data usually appear at the beginning of each month but are also interspersed with other reports in the rest of the text.

¹⁰⁴¹ SHM10, 26, 43, 46, 63, 69, 71, 73, 74 and 76.

¹⁰⁴² SHM10.

¹⁰⁴³ SHM16, 19, 24', 30, 36, 38, 55 and 57.

¹⁰⁴⁴ SHM28,83 and 84.

¹⁰⁴⁵ SHM21, 48, 62 and 155.

state military and administrative positions, in Damascus and elsewhere in Syria,¹⁰⁴⁶ but also many details, which are commonly encountered in Egyptian sources, concerning minor positions with a purely Syrian regional character, such as *wâlî al-barr*, *kâshif al-Wajh al-Qibli*, etc.¹⁰⁴⁷ One also finds information about the relations, often conflictual, between the State and Arab tribes,¹⁰⁴⁸ and news about regions in the periphery of Damascus, whether Palestine,¹⁰⁴⁹ Jordan,¹⁰⁵⁰ Gaza¹⁰⁵¹ or Tripoli.¹⁰⁵² Political events pertaining to the power struggles endemic to the Mamluk polity also receive extensive coverage. For example, while it is true that it is only fitting for a former viceroy of Damascus then in disgrace to receive the attention of a local historian, Ibn Hijjî recounted various aspects of Taghrîbirdî's fall from grace, his defection to Damurdâsh and the methodical stripping of his wealth undertaken by subordinates of Faraj, his son-in-law.¹⁰⁵³

Also, whether it is the matter of the arrival of captives who had escaped from the grip of Tamerlane;¹⁰⁵⁴ the commentaries about those who had served in the administration set up by the latter during his occupation of the city;¹⁰⁵⁵ the news about his

¹⁰⁴⁶ PMA44, 48, 94, 107, 110, 114, 116, 127 181, 185 and 194. These are nominations as viceroys, *hâjibs* and *wazîrs*, etc.

¹⁰⁴⁷ PMA17, 18, 68, 80, 105, 115, 122 and 167.

¹⁰⁴⁸ PMA2, 5, 67, 77, 118, 156 and 206.

¹⁰⁴⁹ PMA174.

¹⁰⁵⁰ PMA121.

¹⁰⁵¹ PMA97, 98, 99, 101, 103 and 104.

¹⁰⁵² PMA24 and 93.

¹⁰⁵³ In PMA12, Ibn Hijjî informs his readers about the arrival from Cairo of orders to arrest the *nâ'ib*, the latter's forewarning concerning what was about to happen and the trick Taghrîbirdî resorted to divert the attention of the *hâjib*, the person in charge of apprehending him; in PMA13, he tells about the meeting of the qadis, held at the house of the *amîr kabîr*, who then wrote a record of what had happened; PMA25 and 49 provide news about the confiscation of his property; etc. See also the reports listed in footnote no. 928 above, which deal with the tribulations of Taghrîbirdî in Northern Syria along with Damurdâsh.

¹⁰⁵⁴ PMA16 and 41.

¹⁰⁵⁵ PMA17 and 80.

whereabouts¹⁰⁵⁶ or the diplomatic activities between those he defeated (Ottomans, Jalâyirids and Qarâ Qoyunlu) and the Mamluks;¹⁰⁵⁷ one finds in *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî* echoes of the turbulent times Syria had just experienced as a result of Tamerlane's onslaught.

Perhaps the most interesting and significant characteristic of the annal of the year 804, and presumably of the other annals of MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, is the way the very persona of Ibn Hîjjî permeates various dimensions of the narrative, and consequently, of a large number of reports. While it is true that Ibn Duqmâq, al-'Aynî and al-Maqrîzî made allusions to themselves in their respective works, when compared to the frequency with which Ibn Hîjjî intruded in his accounts, these are negligible. The instances where Ibn Hîjjî refers to or relates events in the first person singular are abundant throughout the annal. So much so actually, that here in fact, Ibn Hîjjî is as much an actor as a narrator, the centre of a web of connections encompassing the local religious, social and political scene of Damascus, and extending beyond the capital-city to other parts of Syria and to Egypt as well.

At the local level, *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî* reveals the extent to which its author participated in and influenced local affairs, and, consequently the degree of his insertion in the Damascene milieu. In this chronicle, one finds a detailed image of the religious and scholarly environment to which he belonged. Throughout his work, we see Ibn Hîjjî systematically relating nominations taking place in the various *madhhabs* of the city, whether his own Shâfi'î one,¹⁰⁵⁸ or the other three,¹⁰⁵⁹ and often these are reported

¹⁰⁵⁶ FA6 and 8.

¹⁰⁵⁷ FA1 and 3. On the Jalâyirids and the Qara Qoyunlu see, respectively, J.M. Smith Junior, "Djalâyir, Djalâyirid," in *ET*², pp. 411-2, and F. Sümer, "Kara-Qoyunlu," in *ET*², vol. 4, pp. 607-12.

¹⁰⁵⁸ RL6 and 34.

¹⁰⁵⁹ RL34 and 42.

directly from the people involved in them.¹⁰⁶⁰ His own participation in his milieu is also revealed in details. In reporting the saga of the removal of al-Ikhnâ'î as Shâfi'î *qadî al-quḍât* because of alleged ill-behaviour, and his replacement by one al-Ṣaltî,¹⁰⁶¹ Ibn H̱ijjî noted that he had been nominated as his deputy by the latter at his ceremony of investiture, but that he neither attended it, nor saluted the new incumbent, because he did not agree to any of what had happened.¹⁰⁶² In other reports, one gets the sense of the man's own importance in his community and beyond. For example, he informs his readers of his appointment by al-Ṣaltî, of the latter's own volition, as *nâzir al-haramayn*;¹⁰⁶³ he reproduces the letter sent by the *nâzir al-khâss* in Cairo to his deputy in Damascus asking the latter to provide the necessary funding for Ibn H̱ijjî's trip to Egypt;¹⁰⁶⁴ and, in a clear indication of his lofty status in his hometown, while praying at the religious edifice outside of the city walls, he recounted being accosted by Emir Muḥammad ibn Manjak, the scion of a powerful Damascene family,¹⁰⁶⁵ who spoke to him concerning a freak natural occurrence.¹⁰⁶⁶ Members of his own family also figure in his chronicle. In PMA45, he again reproduces a letter, this one from his own brother, apparently a *kâtib al-sirr* in Cairo, to his father, informing him that his eldest son, Najm al-Dîn had been appointed Shâfi'î *qadî al-quḍât* in Hama.¹⁰⁶⁷

¹⁰⁶⁰ See, for example "*Akhbaranî al-qâḍî al-Hanbalî annahu istanâba*," in RL34; see also RL6. In RL42, Ibn H̱ijjî gets wind of the appointment of a new Mâlikî *qadî al-quḍât* from the nominee himself by means of a letter from Cairo.

¹⁰⁶¹ RL23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33; PMA108.

¹⁰⁶² RL29. See also RL7 and RL17 where Ibn H̱ijjî expresses his disagreement concerning the turn taken by the nomination of a Hanafi *qadî al-quḍât* in Damascus.

¹⁰⁶³ RL43.

¹⁰⁶⁴ PMA42 and 60.

¹⁰⁶⁵ See chapter two.

¹⁰⁶⁶ SHM63.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Ibn H̱ijjî reported two other *akhbâr*, RL56 and SHM71, about his brother Najm al-Dîn, both an account of a letter the latter sent to him upon his arrival in Hama.

In the light of what was said above, there is no doubt that *Târikh Ibn Hiji* is the most personal of all the chronicles examined for the year 804: some of its reports are often but a stage upon which the author was the main actor. Whether this chronicle is to be construed as the personal journal of a prominent man imbued with the place he occupied in his environment, or a 'regular' chronicle which just happens to project the sense of self of a public person, the fact remains that *Târikh Ibn Hiji* is the most complete work to deal with that other geographical pole of the Mamluk polity, Syria.¹⁰⁶⁸

III. Later Historians:

1. Egyptian Historians:

A. Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî (812-874/1409-70):

For the annal of the year 804, Ibn Taghrîbirdî did not innovate, and all the features of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* established with reference to the two previous annals studied in this research, are to be found in this one.¹⁰⁶⁹ However, one of these characteristics, namely his peculiar personal situation as a well-connected member of the

¹⁰⁶⁸ Even though the focus of *Târikh Ibn Hiji* is overwhelmingly on Syria and, to be more precise, on Damascus, the fact that its author had numerous connections in Cairo within the administrative and religious establishments, probably explains why his work echoed consistently events taking place in the Mamluk capital. All major events, and even less important ones, find their way into this work. Ibn Hiji thus recounted the news concerning the first clash amongst emirs that took place in the middle of Safar [PMA46], the battles of Shawwâl and their aftermath [PMA162, 173, 176, 177 and 181], along with the story of the drowned elephant [SHM54].

¹⁰⁶⁹ See above, chapters one and two. There are two characteristics of his historical writing that are missing from the year 804. First, we find none of his usual musings about the wretchedness and unpredictability of the world of politics. Second, he broke the chronological continuum of his narrative in one instance. Thus Ibn Taghrîbirdî's account of the year 804 starts off with a series of reports [PMA12, 20, 22, 21, 23, 38] concerning his father, the latter's removal from office, his flight to Aleppo, his replacement by a new viceroy, etc., all of which are chronologically not too distant from one another. However, after he finished reporting the political events in Egypt starting with the rising tensions during Safar all the way until the clashes of the month of Sha'bân and their consequences, he resumed his description of what was going on in Syria, by mentioning yet another series of *akhbâr* [PMA50, 61, 69, 72, 79 and 81] dealing with incidents that had taken place throughout Rabî' al-Awwal and Rabî' al-Thânî; see *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p. 223.

awlâd al-nâs class, assumes a significant dimension in the narrative of the year 804: his father, Taghrîbirdî, played an important role in the events taking place in Northern Syria, following his rebellion against Faraj.

This particular situation has a direct bearing on the very contents of the annal at hand on at least two levels. First, it might very well be that *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is second only to *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî* as the most personal of the available histories written during this period, as Ibn Taghrîbirdî proudly displayed his filial piety for a man he probably did not know. In all the reports pertaining to his father, only once does he use his name, and even this he qualified with “*a’î al-wâlid*,”¹⁰⁷⁰ in all other instances, the man who had been the viceroy of Syria, is referred to, simply, as “*al-wâlid*.” While one might consider this to be a mere detail – how else could he refer to this individual? – in no way indicative of the rapport the son had with the historical memory of his father, other evidence says otherwise. Though it is hard to tell the kind of relationship Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî had with one another, the historical consensus to be gotten from the chronicle of Ibn Hîjjî reveals who amongst the two was the real power player: Taghrîbirdî had lost his power base in the Syrian capital, while Damurdâsh had not, and throughout contemporary chronicles when references were made to the military disturbances in the North of Syria, more often than not it was the name of the rebel viceroy of Aleppo that was mentioned,¹⁰⁷¹ rather than that of Taghrîbirdî.¹⁰⁷² But if one bases him/herself on *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* only, probably at the price of historical truth, it is the author’s father who comes across as the leader. In PMA38, for example, both al-

¹⁰⁷⁰ PMA12.

¹⁰⁷¹ In *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*: PMA48, 54, 66, 74, 83, 130, 131 and 144; in *Al-Muntaqâ*: PMA88 and 137; in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*: PMA81.

¹⁰⁷² In *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*: PMA197; in *Al-Muntaqâ*: PMA92 and 112.

‘Aynî and al-Maqrîzî noted that, at the end of Safar, Damurdâsh had captured one ‘Alibâk ibn Khalîl, a Turcoman emir of the Dulghâdir family, and a number of his men, who were released thanks to the intercession of Taghrîbirdî upon his arrival in Aleppo; according to Ibn Taghrîbirdî though, his father actually ordered Damurdâsh (“*fa-amarahu al-wâlid bi-itlâqihî*”) to free them. In PMA61, admittedly a report peculiar to *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*,¹⁰⁷³ when the duo left Aleppo to meet and fight Duqmâq, Ibn Taghrîbirdî stated “*fa-kharaja ilayhi al-wâlid wa-‘alâ muqaddimatihî Damurdâsh*,” something which clearly indicates that in his eyes, his father was the leader and Damurdâsh his lieutenant.¹⁰⁷⁴

The second impact of the personal dimension of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is historiographical in nature: within an otherwise lacklustre narrative, Ibn Taghrîbirdî presented a few pieces of information about the events in Northern Syria, which not even Ibn Hîjjî could provide, since he probably gleaned them from his father’s *khâssakîyah* some of whom were doubtless still active at the time he wrote his chronicle. These pieces of information appear in two categories of reports.

In the first, we are dealing with a few reports, some of which parallel but also diverge from existing *akhbâr* in other works. For example, in PMA12, Ibn Hîjjî reported in detail the secret arrival in Damascus from Cairo of the orders to arrest Taghrîbirdî, of which the latter had wind through his own *dawâdâr* who had heard about the meeting called at the house of the *hâjib* of the city in order to hear the sultan’s edict; and after his *dawâdâr* tricked his pursuants into looking for him at a false location, he escaped to his

¹⁰⁷³ See below, p. 249.

¹⁰⁷⁴ In the same vein, before the second encounter between the duo and Duqmâq had taken place, Ibn Taghrîbirdî had Damurdâsh try to convince his father to flee to the Turcomans, a proposal he refused arguing in favour of a stand, which only then would give them credibility in the eyes of prospective allies. The pair fought and lost only because of the defection of some of their troops; see PMA81.

friend Damurdâsh with four of his men. Ibn Taghrîbirdî on the other hand claimed that it was a letter of warning sent by a “prominent Egyptian emir” in Cairo that reached Damascus before the sultan’s missive, which triggered his father’s escape along with a few of his mamluks. Here, either the two authors reported the same event from two different perspectives and possibly by means of two different sources, or Ibn Taghrîbirdî simply used Ibn Hîjjî’s account and gave it a particular spin by conjuring up connections his father still had in the capital, all that in order maybe to underline his lofty status as an important emir.¹⁰⁷⁵

In the second category, we have at our disposal a number of reports, four in total,¹⁰⁷⁶ found nowhere except in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, which deal with the tribulations of his father. One, PMA61, is of no great importance because it simply states the departure of Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî from Aleppo on their way to fight Duqmâq in what would turn out to be the first encounter between the two protagonists, sometimes during the first decade of Rabî‘ al-Thânî. The other reports however offer a take on the events in Northern Syria that might help clarify and/or complement those of other historians, Ibn Hîjjî in particular. Thus, in PMA69, Ibn Taghrîbirdî claimed that during their first encounter Damurdâsh crushed Duqmâq, whereas Ibn Hîjjî simply reported second-hand in PMA70 that the new viceroy of Aleppo had had to retreat to Hama because of the defection of some Turcomans to his enemy. Perhaps, as we have argued

¹⁰⁷⁵ The same editorial mechanisms might also be at work in other reports. PMA81, which recounts the second of the clashes to oppose Damurdâsh to Duqmâq, is, as we have stated earlier, the result of the combination by al-Maqrîzî of two *akhbâr* from Ibn Hîjjî’s *Târikh*, namely PMA83 and 84. All of PMA81, 83 and 84, and all three historians mentioned here, noted one key element, the taking over of Aleppo by loyalist Turcomans after Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî had left it. Ibn Taghrîbirdî differs from the other two in that he is the only one to point out, first, the initial defeat of Duqmâq which turned into the rout of his opponents following the defection of some of their forces, and second, the fact that the defeated party headed towards “*bilâd al-Turukmân*.” See also PMA50.

¹⁰⁷⁶ PMA61, 69, 72 and 79.

earlier, Ibn Taghrîbirdî was only trying to boost his father's reputation as a fighter; and then again, maybe Duqmâq was indeed defeated *and* he was abandoned by some of his forces, but chose to relay to those in Damascus only the latter aspect of his misadventure. However, Ibn Taghrîbirdî appears to have blundered when he stated in PMA72 that upon his defeat Duqmâq headed back to Damascus, in clear opposition to consensus: Ibn Hijî, a contemporary to these events, would have most probably noted his return to Damascus had he done so.¹⁰⁷⁷ Was Ibn Taghrîbirdî right on all accounts,¹⁰⁷⁸ but erred on this one or deliberately changed, so to speak, the course of history, to make it fit into the general scheme of his narrative concerning his father?¹⁰⁷⁹ This could in fact be the case, since after all, he had access to *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, where the withdrawal of Duqmâq to Hama was noted in PMA70.

With regard to his other sources, Ibn Taghrîbirdî's reliance on al-Maqrîzî's work is clear: except for the reports analyzed in the previous paragraphs, there are no *akhbâr* that appear in *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* but not in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. Now one might invoke the closeness of al-Maqrîzî's work to al-'Aynî and vice-versa, to argue that Ibn Taghrîbirdî might as well have borrowed from the second rather than the first, especially given what was already established in terms of his reliance on *'Iqd al-Jumân* in writing at least one other annal examined in this research.¹⁰⁸⁰ And there are reports, incidentally very few in number, where some minute elements of al-'Aynî's writing might be detected, as can be seen in the following, PMA133:

¹⁰⁷⁷ There are a couple of *akhbâr* in *Târikh Ibn Hijî*, PMA71 and 74, that clearly convey the fact that Duqmâq was not in the Syrian capital

¹⁰⁷⁸ Including PMA81 with which we dealt with above; see footnote no. 1074.

¹⁰⁷⁹ In this context, maybe by having Duqmâq return to Damascus, Ibn Taghrîbirdî was trying to impress upon his readers the utterness of his defeat, which then left him no recourse but to return to the capital to regroup, etc.

¹⁰⁸⁰ See above, chapter one.

Al-'Aynî: "*Wa-fi awâkhir Ramadân fihâ kathura al-qîl wa-al-qâl bayna arbâb al-dawlah...*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 59a]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: "*Wa-istahalla Shawwâl, fa-qawiyat al-qâlah bayna al-umarâ'...*" [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p.221]¹⁰⁸¹

Generally however, the reliance of *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* on *Kitâb al-Sulûk* is overwhelming, and while allowing for Ibn Taghrîbirdî's natural tendency to rework borrowed reports, the imprint of al-Maqrîzî is unmistakable in almost all reports, save for the few exceptions noted earlier, as can be seen in the following exact sequence of *akhbâr* that have the added advantage of not appearing in '*Iqd al-Jumân*,¹⁰⁸² save for one,

RL66:

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-kutiba bi-istiqrâr al-Amîr Damurdâsh al-Muhammadi fi niyâbat Tarâbulus, wa-al-Amîr 'Alî Bâk ibn Dulghâdir fi niyâbat 'Ayntâb, wa-al-Amîr 'Umar ibn al-Tahhân fi niyâbat Malatyah. Wa-kânat al-akhbâr waradat bi-tajammu' al-Turukmân ma'a Damurdâsh wa-nuzûlihim 'alâ Halab, wa-anna Duqmâq, nâ'ib Halab, ijtama'a huwa wa-nâ'ib Hamâh wa-al-Amîr Nu'ayr, wa-anna Tamurlank nazala 'alâ madînat Sîwâs. Wa-lam yahujja fi hâdhihi al-sanah ahad min al-Shâm wa-lâ al-'Irâq.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1089]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: "*Wa-kataba lil-Amîr Damurdâsh amânan, wa-annahu yastaqirr fi niyâbat Tarâbulus iwadân 'an al-Amîr Shaykh al-Mahmûdî al-muntaqil ilâ niyâbat Dimashq, wa-kutiba lil-Amîr 'Alî Bak ibn Dulghâdir bi-niyâbat 'Ayntâb, wa-lil-Amîr 'Umar ibn al-Tahhân bi-niyâbat Malatyah. Wa-kânat al-akhbâr waradat bi-jam' al-Turukmân wa-nuzûlihim ma'a Damurdâsh ilâ Halab, wa-anna Duqmâq, nâ'ib Halab, ijtama'a ma'ahu nâ'ib Hamâh wa-al-Amîr Nu'ayr, wa-anna Taymûrlank nâzil 'alâ madînat Sîwâs. Wa-lam yahujja fi hâdhihi al-sanah ahad min al-Shâm wa-lâ al-'Irâq.*" [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p.221]

¹⁰⁸¹ No passage equivalent to this is to be found in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. But see also PMA27, where Ibn Taghrîbirdî might have resorted to mixing the two sources to produce his own account:

Al-'Aynî: "...*thumma mashâ baynahum ba'd al-umarâ' bi-al-sulh fa-istalahû 'alâ an yakhruja Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî ilâ niyâbat Safad...*" ["Iqd al-Jumân," Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 58b]

Al-Maqrîzî: "...*thumma mashâ al-hâl baynahum wa-bayna al-umarâ', wa-istalahû 'alâ khurûj al-Hamzâwî ilâ niyâbat Safad...*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1078]

Ibn Taghrîbirdî: "*Wa-lammâ labisa al-Hamzâwî mashat baynahum al-rusul fi al-sulh 'alâ an waqa'a al-ittifâq 'alâ khurûj Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî ilâ niyâbat Safad...*" [*Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*, vol. 12, p.220]

¹⁰⁸² PMA202, 205, 204, 197, FA6 and RL66.

B. ‘Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Jawharī al-Sayrafī (819-900/1416-1494):

The principal characteristic of the annal of the year 804 in *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* is that its author switched foundations: instead of relying on al-Maqrīzī as he had done in the year 793, he relied here on al-‘Aynī’s *‘Iqd al-Jumân*. In fact, so close are the two works, that the only way to decipher two heavily smudged folios of MS Ahmet III 2911/19¹⁰⁸³ is to read through the texts of *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* and the Ahmet III 2911/B2 manuscript. Moreover, all of the reports in *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, save four,¹⁰⁸⁴ appear in *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* in almost exactly the same sequence, and generally they have been subjected to little change, as can be seen in the following, PMA6:

Al-‘Aynī: “*Wa-fi yawm al-sabt al-tâsi‘ min Muharramihâ, khuli‘a ‘alâ al-Amîr Arikmâs al-Zâhirî wa-istaqarra fi niyâbat Malatyah, wa-kâna amîr ‘asharah wa-nâyiban fi madînat ‘Ayntâb.*” [“*‘Iqd al-Jumân*,” Ahmet III 2911/19, fol. 59a]

Al-Maqrīzī: “*Wa-fi tâsi ‘ihi istaqarra al-Amîr Arikmâs al-Zâhirî, nâ‘ib ‘Ayntâb fi niyâbat Malatyah.*” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, p. 1076]

Al-Jawharī: “*Wa-fi yawm al-sabt al-tâsi‘ min Muharramihâ, khuli‘a ‘alâ al-Amîr Arikmâs al-Zâhirî wa-istaqarra fi niyâbat Malatyah, wa-kâna al-madhkûr amîr ‘asharah wa-nâyiban fi ‘Ayntâb.*” [Nuzhat al-Nufūs, vol. 2, p. 133]

Overall, there are only few exceptions to the parallelism between *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* and *‘Iqd al-Jumân*. In two instances, al-Jawharī relied on *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, once by lifting a report about a nomination,¹⁰⁸⁵ and the second by filling an empty space in al-‘Aynī’s PMA64, with a bit of information from al-Maqrīzī’s.¹⁰⁸⁶ Yet another departure from the rule is PMA134, a report which recounts the beginning in Cairo of the cycle of violence

¹⁰⁸³ Fols. 60a-b.

¹⁰⁸⁴ PMA11, 135, 140 and SHM4.

¹⁰⁸⁵ PMA37. The text of this *khavar* is slightly meatier in *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* but only on account of the inclusion in it by al-Jawharī of data easily inferred from the context:

Al-Maqrīzī: “...*istaqarra Hasan ibn Qarâjâ fi wilâyat al-Jizah, wa-‘uzila ‘Umar ibn al-Kûrânî.*” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, p. 1078]

Al-Jawharī: “...*khuli‘a ‘alâ al-Amîr Hasan ibn Qarâjâ wa-istaqarra fi wilâyat al-Jizah, ‘iwadan ‘an ‘Umar ibn al-Kûrânî bi-hikmi ‘azlihi.*” [Nuzhat al-Nufūs, vol. 2, p. 136]

¹⁰⁸⁶ Interestingly, the whole report in *Nuzhat al-Nufūs* is identical to that of *‘Iqd al-Jumân*, and only the qualifier describing a Jarkass, the nominee to the *niyâbah* of al-Karak, as “*wâlid Tanam*” is from *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

during the month of Shawwâl: here, al-Jawharî's account is much shorter than al-Aynî's,¹⁰⁸⁷ and the long passage where the latter described the events of the day and the trick Sûdûn Tâz resorted to in order to avoid defeat, he expedited in four words, "*wa-haṣala sharr kabîr.*"¹⁰⁸⁸ This cluster turns out to be almost the exact same words used by Ibn Duqmâq in the same context, something that might indicate that he either used *Nuzhat al-Anâm* or a source that relied on it.

C. 'Abd al-Bâsit ibn Khalîl al-Malaṭî (844-920/1440-1515):

'Abd al-Bâsit al-Malaṭî's *Nayl al-Amal* does not in any way stand out when compared to many other sources: it might be more precise than the works of people such as Ibn Ḥajar, Ibn Iyâs and the anonymous author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*,¹⁰⁸⁹ but it pales in comparison with those of other authors. *Nayl al-Amal* is composed of reports, which are fewer in number,¹⁰⁹⁰ and, especially, shorter than in all other works.¹⁰⁹¹ This last characteristic makes of this chronicle one of the least original¹⁰⁹² and hardest to analyse at the historiographical level, where its real significance lies.

The condensed nature of the *akhbâr* found in al-Malaṭî's work, as well as his tendency to slightly rework borrowed material, makes it particularly hard to establish

¹⁰⁸⁷ Al-'Aynî's is in its turn much longer than al-Maqrîzî's. See also, PMA138, in which other historians described the tensions amongst Cairene emirs, which al-Jawharî chose to ignore by simply saying that things got better!

¹⁰⁸⁸ However, many components of this report are definitely from al-'Aynî such as the sentence "*waqa'at al-harb al-'azîmah*" which is paralleled by al-Jawharî's "*waqa'at hurûb 'azîmah.*"

¹⁰⁸⁹ See following sections for an analysis of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* and *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Save for *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*.

¹⁰⁹¹ Save for *Al-Nafhah* and *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*.

¹⁰⁹² There is only one report that is peculiar to al-Malaṭî, RL55, which relates the completion of the dome Nawrûz al-Ḥâfiẓî had built over the *madrakah* al-Shaykhûnîyah. I have not been able to establish the origin of this *khbar*, but it might very well be that it was culled from a *khîṭâṭ* book. Other original data, rather meagre, can be found in information he added to some of the reports taken from other authors: in PMA122, for example, he makes Surûq to be the viceroy of Jerusalem, a position that did not even exist, and in PMA130, Ibn Ramadân, Damurdâsh's Turcoman ally, is presented as that of Adanah, something which I have not been able to confirm.

their genealogy since they share with those of numerous other works a basic vocabulary. This in its turn impedes the identification of those distinctive elements needed to ascertain filiation between authors. One can still however manage to reveal the overall reliance of the author of *Nayl al-Amal* on al-Maqrîzî and Ibn Hajar, by means of the same methodology used in the case of Ibn Hajar: by looking sometimes for minute pieces of evidence, such as a few words or short sentences. Such an approach allows the trained eye to uncover the Maqrîzîan origin of very many, if not most, of al-Malaṭî's reports. This can be seen in a string of *akhbâr*, namely PMA70, 71 and 74, which can be found in their original longer format in *Târîkh Ibn Hîjî*, but to which they bear less resemblance than to those of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*:

Al-Maqrîzî: "*Wa-fi hâdhâ al-shahr farra man kâna ma'a al-Amîr Duqmâq min al-Turâkmîn, wa-qad qaruba Duqmâq min Halab, fa-'âda bi-man baqiya' ma'ahu ilâ Hamâh, wa-istanjada al-Amîr Âqbughâ, nâ'ib al-Shâm, fa-amaddahu bi-tâ'ifah.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1081]

Al-Malaṭî: "...*fa-farra man kâna ma'ahu min al-Turukmân, fa-'âda ilâ Hamâh, wa-istanjada bi-nâ'ib al-Shâm, fa-amaddahu bi-jamâ'ah hattâ istaqâm.*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 3, p. 69]

The same can be said about the reports that were culled from *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, such as the following, SHM52:

Ibn Hajar: "*Wa-fi Rajab minhâ zahara kawkab kabîr qadr al-thurayyâ, lahu dhu'âbah zâhirat al-nûr jiddan, fa-istamarra yatlu' wa-yaghîb wa-nûruhu qawî yurâ ma'a daw' al-qamar hattâ ru'iyâ bi-al-nahâr fi awâ'il Sha'bân; fa-awwalahu ba'd al-nâs bi-zuhûr al-Malik Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, fa-innahu nuqila fi hâdhihi al-sanah ba'da khalâs Yashbak ilâ niyâbat Dimashq 'iwadan 'an Âqbughâ al-Jamalî fi Dhî al-Qa'dah...*" [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 17]

Al-Malaṭî: "*Wa-fîhi zahara fî al-samâ' kawkab kabîr qadr al-thurayyâ, bi-dhu'âbah zâhirat al-nûr, yakâd yaqrub min nûr al-qamar fî sutû'îhi, wa-kâna yurâ nahâran, wa-istamarra yatlu' wa-yaghîb hattâ ghâba aslan. Wa-ittafaqa anna ba'd al-nâs bi-zuhûr Malik Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, wa-kâna nâ'iban bi-Tarâbulus, wa-kâna mâ qâla hâdhâ al-qâ'il, wa-al-ghayb 'inda Allâh.*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 3, p. 74]

An even more noteworthy historiographical characteristic is the fact that al-Malaṭī has, in this annal at least, indulged in the trick, established above in the case of other writers, of fusing elements of narrative from different sources to elaborate a single report. This can be seen in the following, RL31, where he borrowed the opening segment of the *khbar* from al-Maqrīzī, and the rest from Ibn Ḥajar:

Al-Maqrīzī: “*Wa-fi al-ithnayn khâmis Jumâdá al-Âkhirah, surifa Qâdī al-Qudât Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn al-Sâlihî ‘an qadâ’ al-quḍât bi-diyâr Miṣr. Wa-istaqarra al-Qâdī Jalâl al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn Shaykh al-Islâm Sirâj al-Dîn ‘Umar al-Bulqînî qâdī al-‘askar fi qadâ’ al-quḍât bi-diyâr Miṣr.*” [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, pp. 1082-3]

Ibn Ḥajar: “*Wa-fi Râbi’ Jumâdá al-Âkhirah, ‘uzila Nâsir al-Dîn al-Sâlihî ‘an qadâ’ al-Shâfi‘iyah, wa-istaqarra al-Imâm Jalâl al-Dîn ibn Shaykh al-Islâm al-Bulqînî ‘iwadân ‘anhu bi-mâl kathîr badhalahu bi-‘inâyat Sûdûn Tâz. Wa-ghadiba Jakam min dhâlika wa-asâ’a lahu al-qawl lammâ jâ’a ilâ baytihi, fa-lâtafahu Shaykh al-Islâm wâliduhu, wa-kharaja huwa wa-waladuhu.*” [Inbâ’ al-Ghumr, vol. 5, pp. 8-9]

Al-Malaṭī: “*Wa-fi Jumâdá al-Âkhirah, surifa al-Nâsir al-Sâlihî ‘an qadâ’ al-Shâfi‘iyah, wa-qurrira al-Jalâl ‘Abd al-Rahmân ibn Shaykh al-Islâm al-Sirâj al-Bulqînî bi-mâl kathîr badhalahu fi dhâlika, wa-sâ’adahu Sûdûn Tâz. Wa-mâ sahula dhâlika bi-Jakam wa-ghadiba, wa-lammâ dakhala ‘alayhi al-Jalâl asâ’a lahu fi al-qawl hattâ lâtafahu wâliduhu.*” [Nayl al-Amal, vol. 3, p. 73]¹⁰⁹³

D. Muhammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyâs (852-930/1427-97):

Almost nineteen pages long, with eighty-seven PMAs, eighteen RLs, twelve SHMs and two FAs, for a total of one hundred and nineteen reports, the annal of the year 804 in *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* is third only to *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* and Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah’s *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal*. Interestingly, when compared to Ibn Iyâs’s annals of the year 793, it

¹⁰⁹³ Another notable example is the case of reports PMA133 and 134. The first is from al-Maqrīzī as can be ascertained from the presence of the word *tanâfur* from *Kitâb al-Sulûk* [Al-Malaṭī: “...li-kathrat al-tanâfur baynahum...”; al-Maqrīzī: “...kathura tanâfur al-umarâ’...”]; as for PMA134, a report we have discussed earlier in this chapter, its first segment is from *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* because it does mention that a group of people was dispatched by Sûdûn Tâz to arrest Nawrûz al-Hâfizî during the opening episode of the crises of Shawwâl, an element lacking in al-Maqrīzī’s work; al-Malaṭī then completed his account by means of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, from which he borrowed the story of the trick used by Sûdûn Tâz to get his opponents, who were winning the fight against him, to relent. Interestingly, even though al-Malaṭī did not fall for the chronological inconsistencies of Ibn Ḥajar’s account of the events of Shawwâl, he did err like him by saying that one Sûdûn min Zâdah had been wounded during the first of the string of engagements that took place during this month while most other sources say that he got hurt later; on PMA134 and the events it described, see above, pp. 220, 232, 236-7, and below, pp. 252-3, 258 and 260.

is more than double its size. And this is not due to the paucity of the sources available that particular year. On the contrary, for the year 793, the annal in *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, the work Ibn Iyâs relied the most on, contained one hundred and seventy six reports to the forty-eight of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*. For reasons unknown, Ibn Iyâs decided to produce a well garnered annal for 804. Beyond these considerations about size, it is vintage Ibn Iyâs, as we shall see below.

From the point of view of its overall structure, the order of appearance of reports in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* follows very closely that of *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. The only 'irregularities' to this arrangement consist, first, of *akhbâr* Ibn Iyâs borrowed from other authors and which he interspersed with those of al-Maqrîzî, and second, of two instances where he simply broke off following the latter author's narration sequencing.¹⁰⁹⁴

With regard to contents, Ibn Iyâs stuck to the method he had employed in the other annals so far examined: as a historian who reached maturity at least three quarters of a century after the events of 804, he had no alternative but to have recourse to the works of others in order to build his narrative. As a result, none of the reports in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* are original and all can be accounted for in other sources.¹⁰⁹⁵ Amongst these, al-Maqrîzî is undoubtedly the most important, and there are so many reports in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* that are *identical* to those of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* that collating them would really serve

¹⁰⁹⁴ The pages where Ibn Iyâs stopped sticking to al-Maqrîzî's exact sequencing of reports are the following: 645-50 and 652-653. However, even in these pages, most reports are from *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and some clusters of these conform to the order found in this source. As for al-Malaṭī, the other author Ibn Iyâs relied the most on, his impact on this level can be seen in the inclusion by Ibn Iyâs throughout his narrative of obituaries most of them were culled from *Nayl al-Amal*. Also, on page 640, there is one group of reports, namely PMA20, 21, 22 and 48, which, contrary to those before and after them, were arranged in that order, according to *Nayl al-Amal* and not *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

¹⁰⁹⁵ One way for a later author to produce original data is to have preserved for posterity the work of an earlier historian whose work is now unavailable. But this is not the case with *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*.

no purpose.¹⁰⁹⁶ One can also notice the presence of stories from Al-Malaṭī's *Nayl al-Amal*, and, a novelty, from Ibn Duqmâq's *Nuzhat al-Anâm*.¹⁰⁹⁷ Some were lightly retouched or summarized, as can be seen in the following two reports, PMA106 and SHM57, respectively Ibn Duqmâq's and al-Malaṭī's:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Wa-yawm al-thalâthâ' tâsi' 'asharahu hadara Tughaytamur al-Barîdî, muqaddam al-barîdiyâh, wa-suhbatuhu sayf Surûq al-Zâhirî, nâ'ib Ghazzah.*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 200a]

Ibn Iyâs: "*Wa-fîhi hadara muqaddam al-barîd wa-ma'ahu sayf Suruq.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 647]¹⁰⁹⁸

Al-Malaṭī: "*Wa-fîhi nazalat sâ'iqah bi-Dimashq 'alâ rajul tahta qal'atihâ, fa-qatalathu khâssah.*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 3, p. 75]

Ibn Iyâs: "*Wa-fîhi jâ'at al-akhbâr min Dimashq bi-anna sâ'iqah nazalat min al-samâ' 'alâ rajul kâna wâqifan tahta qal'atihâ, fa-qatalathu, khâssah dûna al-nâs.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 647]¹⁰⁹⁹

The most interesting feature of Ibn Iyâs's annal however is his tendency, by no means peculiar to him as we have seen in this and previous chapters, of fusing elements of narrative taken from a number of sources, not only the now familiar trio made up of al-Maqrîzî, al-Malaṭī and Ibn Duqmâq, but also al-'Aynî and Ibn Hajar as well. PMA133 and 134 are typical of this phenomenon. In PMA133, Ibn Iyâs borrowed from Ibn Hajar,¹¹⁰⁰ al-'Aynî,¹¹⁰¹ and al-Maqrîzî,¹¹⁰² and then added his data which is absent from

¹⁰⁹⁶ Compare for example SHM2, 3 and 4 in both *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*.

¹⁰⁹⁷ This at least is what can be argued in the absence of a historical work by Ibn Duqmâq other than *Al-Nafḥah* and *Nuzhat al-Anâm*; the fact remains that those Duqmâqian reports in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* can readily be found in *Al-Muntaqâ*.

¹⁰⁹⁸ See also SHM8.

¹⁰⁹⁹ In the same vein, see also SHM8, SHM63 and RL55.

¹¹⁰⁰ Ibn Hajar: "...dabbat al-'adâwah bayna Jakam wa-Sûdûn Tâz..." [*Inbâ' al-Ghumr*, vol. 5, p. 19]

Ibn Iyâs: "...dabbat 'aqârib al-fitan bayna al-umarâ'..." [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

¹¹⁰¹ Al-'Aynî: "...wa-kathura al-qîl wa-al-qâl bayna arbâb al-dawlah..." ["Iqd al-Jumân," MS Ahmet III/19, fol. 59a]

Ibn Iyâs: "...wa-kathura bayna al-nâs, al-qâl wa-al-qîl..." [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

¹¹⁰² Al-Maqrîzî: "...fa-lam yahdurû lil-hanâ' bi-al-'îd, wa-lâ ṣallow ṣalât al-'îd ma'a al-sultân ..." [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1083]

Ibn Iyâs: "...fa-lam yahdurû lil-hanâ' bi-al-'îd, wa-lâ ṣallow ṣalât al-'îd ma'a al-Sultân ..." [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

the others' works;¹¹⁰³ in PMA134, he used information from al-Malaṭī,¹¹⁰⁴ al-Maqrīzī,¹¹⁰⁵ and al-'Aynī,¹¹⁰⁶ on top of the cluster of words he added here and there.¹¹⁰⁷

In other instances, however, while many of the reports of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* were left literally unaltered, most of those originally authored by al-Malaṭī and Ibn Duqmâq, and quite a few by al-Maqrīzī, were subjected to varying degrees of transformation. Ibn Iyâs so profoundly reworked accounts, that not only does identifying their genealogy become difficult, but also, in the process, he ended up imparting to events a whole new significance, which, time and again, flew in the face of the consensus established by other authors.

The process of transformation used by Ibn Iyâs took many forms. In a few cases, he simply rewrote a *khbar* using his own words, but gave it a new twist that does not correspond to the original. Consider PMA9 and 10, two reports found in *Al-Muntaqâ*, which dealt with the depredations of Bedouins:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Waṣala kitâb al-sultân ilâ Quṭlûbak, amîr al-hajj, bi-mask Munjid ibn Khâtir, amîr Banî 'Uqaybah. Fa-lammâ masakahu takâthar al-'urbân 'alâ al-hujjâj, wa-nahabûhum wa-nahabû al-tujjâr, wa-akhadhû amwâlan kathîrah.*" [PMA9/"Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 197b]

"*Wa-fîhi, uhdîra Munjid ibn Khâtir, fa-khulî 'a 'alayhi wa-istaqarra 'alâ 'âdatihi fî imrat Banî 'Uqaybah.*" [PMA10/"Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 197b]

¹¹⁰³ Here also we have an element whose purpose is to add a dramatic effect to the rising tensions in Cairo: "*wa-wazza 'û al-nâs qumâshahum fî al-hawâsil, wa-gârat al-durûb tughlaq min al-maghrib.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

¹¹⁰⁴ Al-Malaṭī: "...*wa-waqa 'at ma 'rakah qutila fihâ jamâ'ah, wa-juriha Sûdûn min Zâdah wa-usir.*" [*Nayl al-Amal*, vol. 3, p. 77]

Ibn Iyâs: "...*wa-qutila min al-'askar jamâ'ah kathîrah, wa-juriha al-Amîr Sûdûn min Zâdah.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

¹¹⁰⁵ Al-Maqrīzī: "...*wa-waqa 'at al-harb min bukrat al-nahâr ilâ al-'asr, wa-ra's al-umarâ' Nawrûz wa-Jakam, wa-khasmuhum Sûdûn Tâz.*" [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1083]

Ibn Iyâs: Ibid. [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 651]

¹¹⁰⁶ Al-'Aynī: "...*fa-nazala al-sultân ilâ al-Istabl wa-qa'ada 'alâ al-maq'ad al-ladhî 'alâ al-sûr al-muṭill 'alâ al-Rumaylah...*" [*Iqd al-Jumân*, fol. 59a]

Ibn Iyâs: "...*wa-nazala al-sultân min al-Qasr ilâ al-Istabl, wa-jalasa bi-al-maq'ad al-muṭill 'alâ al-Ramlah... ..*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650]

¹¹⁰⁷ For other examples of fusing of narrative elements in a single report, see PMA27, 99, 101, 154; SHM52 and RL31.

According to Ibn Duqmâq, the leader of the Bedouins ended being reconfirmed in his position, probably as an attempt on the part of the sultan to placate him and his people. Through Ibn Iyâs, the events depicted here take a totally different turn, with Munjid, far from receiving a reward, being condemned to death by hanging:

Ibn Iyâs: “*Wa-fihî jâ’at al-akhbâr, bi-anna ‘Arab Banî Sâlim kharajû ‘alâ al-hujjâj, fa-tahâraba ma’ahum amîr al-hajj, wa-kasarahum, wa-qabada ‘alâ shaykhihim Munjid ibn Khâtir.*” [PMA9/*Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 639]

“*Wa-ahdarahu fi al-hadîd ilâ Misr; fa-lammâ mathala bayna yadayy al-sultân, amara bi-shanqihi, fa-iltazama bi-radd mâ nahaba lil-hujjâj jamî’ihi, fa-sujina hattâ yuhdir dhâlika.*” [PMA10/*Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 639]

Since it is unlikely that *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* might have preserved passages from a now lost source, it is more likely that, as he has done before, Ibn Iyâs played around with the basic elements of the story by injecting into it a dramatic ingredient.¹¹⁰⁸

In SHM54, Ibn Iyâs used yet another editorial technique, that of adding information of unrecognizable origin. Thus to the story of the drowning of the elephant which he took from Ibn Duqmâq, he added the equivalent of a page and a half of *zajal* concerning the hapless animal, either lore composed at earlier times that he resuscitated, or traditional folk poetry that had survived to his day.¹¹⁰⁹

But perhaps the most vexing problem one encounters in *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* is when Ibn Iyâs resorted not to one, but to a few of the editorial techniques outlined above,

¹¹⁰⁸ In PMA101, one of a few reports dealing with the rebellion of Surûq, the viceroy of Gaza, Ibn Iyâs reported that the latter had been defeated by Bedouin loyalist forces led ‘Umar ibn Faḍl and then killed. *Al-Muntaqâ* and other sources confirm the defeat of Surûq and his capture, but also noted that he ended up being promoted as *kâshif* of the Wajh al-Qiblî in Syria and *shâdd* of the Aghwâr, both of which amounted to an emirate of one thousand; see PMA122.

¹¹⁰⁹ In PMA56, a report concerning the arrival in Cairo of an escapee from Tamerlane, Ibn Iyâs rewrote the original text from Ibn Duqmâq, altered many of its meanings and added data not found elsewhere. The escapee, one ‘Abd al-Latîf al-Ashrafi al-Sâqî, had personally informed Ibn Duqmâq about his flight and about the drowning of Qadi al-Mannâwî in the Zâb river in Iraq. Ibn Iyâs embellished the narrative of the escape (“*fa-farra min ‘indihi ba ‘damâ qâsâ shadâ’id ‘azîmah wa-mihanan*”) and had Tamerlane personally oversee the drowning of al-Mannâwî. He also reported that al-Sâqî had told of the death in Tamerlane’s train, probably after the sack of Damascus, of countless people and of seven persons whom he named, but whose identity I could not attest.

especially those which present definite problems to modern-day historians. Consider the complex of events that took place during the middle of Shawwâl. PMA153 is the logical culmination of a series of reports¹¹¹⁰ that Ibn Iyâs borrowed from al-Maqrîzî. However, before he dealt with PMA153, Ibn Iyâs took a break in the narrative and used, or recycled rather, elements that had to do with the events depicted in PMA134, taken from a variety of sources. Thus, at the beginning of what should have been PMA153 but turned out to be PMA134, he used a short sentence, taken from al-‘Aynî, to describe the sultan’s ascent to the fortifications of the Citadel.¹¹¹¹ This is followed by two Duqmâqian reports: one, PMA149, which dealt with a battle that took place on the 13th of Shawwâl, still before that of the 14th, the event Ibn Iyâs should have dealt with; and the second, PMA150, which recounted the arrival of yet another batch of emirs to the camp of Jakam and Nawrûz. Only after all this does Ibn Iyâs finally introduce PMA153, a report, Maqrîzîan in origin, which he dressed up by adding unattested dramatic elements to it.¹¹¹² This, added to the already examined issue of the historical distortions *within* given reports, basically disqualifies *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* as a repository for reliable historical facts.

E. *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ’ wa-al-Mulûk*:

Jawâhir al-Sulûk is the least copious of all the sources for the year 804: it contains a total of thirty-three reports, all of which can be accounted for in other works.

¹¹¹⁰ PMA133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141 and 145.

¹¹¹¹ See above, footnote no. 1106. This short sentence appears, in its proper place, as part of PMA134, two pages earlier; *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 650.

¹¹¹² To get an idea of the embellishments made by Ibn Iyâs to the narrative of the battle of the 14th of Shawwâl, one needs only to compare it to that of al-Maqrîzî:

Al-Maqrîzî: “...*wa-ijtama’a ilayhi* [i.e. Sûdûn Tâz] *al-’askar kulluhu, wa-wâqa’a Jakam wa-Nawrûz, wa-kasarahumâ...*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1084]

Ibn Iyâs: “*Fa-baynamâ hum fî al-ma’rakah, wa-idhâ bi-al-Sultân qad aqbala, wa-ma’ahu al-sawâd al-a’zam min al-’asâkir, wa-al-zu’ar, wa-al-’iyyâq, fa-wâqa’a al-ru’b fî qulûb al-umarâ’ al-ladhîn kanû fî Birkat al-Ḥabash min al-Malik al-Nâsir Faraj.*” [*Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 653]

Contrary to what he had done for the years 778 and 793, the author appears to have reduced the number of the sources he relied upon to produce the annal of 804. I have been able to identify only two, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Iyâs, a far cry from the half a dozen he *might* have used for the year 793.¹¹¹³

Beyond this historiographical difference, the style and the format of his *akhbâr* are the same: while there are always clues that give away their origin, the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* reworked a large percentage of reports often by adding information of his own. Consider the following, FA2 and RL57, where the influence of, respectively, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Iyâs, can be detected, along with original data added by the author:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-fi al-‘ashr al-awsat min Shawwâl, jâ’a al-khabar ilâ Misr bi-anna Tamurlank qad mât, wa-tawajjaha al-Qân Ahmad ibn Uways wa-Qarâ Yûsuf ibn Qarâ Ahmad ilâ bilâdihimâ. Wa-jâ’a kitâb Ibn ‘Uthmân wa-al-Qân Ahmad wa-nâ’ib al-Shâm. Wa-qîla innahu mât min al-humrah al-latî tala‘at la-hu bi-al-Shâm wa-innahâ mashat fi sâ’ir jasadhi ilâ an ahlakathu.*” [“Al-Muntaqâ,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 203a]

Anonymous: “*Wa-fi al-ithnayn tâsi ‘ashar Shawwâl, jâ’at al-khabar min ‘inda Ibn ‘Uthmân bi-anna Tamurlank mât. Wa-kadhâlika arsala al-Qân Ahmad ibn Uways bi-khabar dhâlika wa-anna al-humrah al-latî tala‘at fihi lâ zâlat tar‘â fi jasadhi hattâ halaka. Wa-qîla, lammâ dufina kâna yusma‘ la-hu ‘awî fi qabrihi mithl ‘awî al-kilab, wa-dhakara ba‘d al-sawwâhîn annahu shâhada al-dukkhân yatlu‘ min qabrihi (Verse).*” [“Jawâhir al-Sulûk,” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fols. 339a-b]

Ibn Iyâs: “*Wa-fihi, fi yawm al-khamîs hâdhâ, kharaja al-Mahmil, wa-amîr al-hajj Nakbây al-Azdamurî, ahad umarâ’ al-‘ablkhânât; wa-qad ta’akhhara khurûj al-Mahmil min al-Qâhirah ilâ thâni ‘ishrîn Shawwâl, wa-hâdhâ shay’ lam yu‘had qat.*” [Badâ’i‘ al-Zuhûr, vol. 1:2, pp. 654-5]

Anonymous: “*Wa-fi hâdhihi al-sanah, ta’akhhara khurûj al-Mahmil al-Sharîf, wa-lam yakhruj min al-Qâhirah ilâ yawm al-thâni wa-al-‘ishrîn min Shawwâl, wa-lam yu‘had bi-anna al-Mahmil ta’akhhara mithla hâdhihi al-sanah, wa-kâna amîr al-Mahmil fi tilka al-sanah Nakbây al-Azdamurî, ihdâ al-umarâ’ al-muqaddamîn.*” [“Jawâhir al-Sulûk,” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fol. 339b]

Both these reports deviate from their original in that they were rewritten, and in the sense that they contain data not found elsewhere. In the case of RL57, the difference is minor: despite the reshuffling of sentences in this *khabar*, the basic Iyâsian elements are there

¹¹¹³ See chapter two, pp. 199-201.

and the substitution in the rank of Nakbâý al-Azdamurî does not change anything in the overall meaning. As for FA2, while there are other more distinctly Duqmâqian reports in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*,¹¹¹⁴ it was chosen precisely for its inclusion of apparently original data absent in *Al-Muntaqá*. Here, the following hypotheses might be advanced: *Nuzhat al-Anâm* contained the unique story about the tomb of Tamerlane, but the latter did not make it to *Al-Muntaqá*; the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* used an unidentified written missing source; or the story survived to his day as part of the traditional lore of Egypt. This last hypothesis could arguably be supported by the fact that SHM54, as it appears in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, contains a very long *zajal* poem which can also be found in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*. However, despite the fact that the two poems are for all intents and purposes identical, there are notable differences with regard to some of the words used by both Ibn Iyâs and the anonymous author. All this could then mean either that the latter simply made use of a written or oral source different from that of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* to compile his poem, or that he modified it on his own.¹¹¹⁵

Another interesting aspect of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* is the presence of a couple of characteristics that parallel those found in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*. First, its anonymous author fused narrative elements he obtained from both his principal sources,¹¹¹⁶ even when the information borrowed from *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* had originally been taken by Ibn Iyâs from Ibn Duqmâq's work. This can be seen in the following, PMA100:

Ibn Duqmâq: “*Wa-fi al-'ashr al-awsaṭ minhu arsala nâ'ib al-Shâm yukhbir bi-anna Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, nâ'ib Tarâbulus, istakh dama Turukmânan kathîran wa-annahû masaka al-Hâjib Uljaybughâ [?] al-Jamâlî, sahib al-hujjâb bi-Tarâbulus, wa-al-hâjib al-*

¹¹¹⁴ See, for example, PMA95, 113, 141, 142, 145, 146, etc.

¹¹¹⁵ The poem appears in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, pp. 648-650, and “*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*,” MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fols. 336b-337b.

¹¹¹⁶ This characteristic is not peculiar to Ibn Iyâs, as we have established at numerous points above.

thânî, wa-thalâth umarâ' min umarâ' Tarâbulus, wa-habasahum bi-al-Marqab wa-kharaja 'an al-tâ'ah." ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 200a]

Ibn Iyâs: "*Wa-fîhi, jâ'at al-akhbâr bi-anna Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, lammâ tawajjaha ilâ Tarâbulus, azhara al-'isyân, wa-kharaja 'an al-tâ'ah, wa-qabada 'alâ hâjib Tarâbulus, wa-'alâ jamâ'ah min umarâ' Tarâbulus, wa-sajanahum bi-sijn al-Marqab.*" [*Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, vol. 1:2, p. 647]

Anonymous: "*Wa-fîhâ, jâ'at al-akhbâr bi-anna Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, nâ'ib Tarâbulus, azhara al-'isyân wa-istakhdama jamâ'ah kathîrah min al-Turukmân wa-al-'ashîr.*" [*Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, fols. 336a-b]

The second parallel with Ibn Iyâs, by no means accidental, is that the author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, though borrowing from *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*, retained and even embroidered information that textual evidence has proven not to correspond to historical consensus. For example, as was stated above, Ibn Iyâs reported in PMA101 that Surûq, the viceroy of Gaza, had been killed by Bedouins who then sent his sword to the sultan in Cairo.¹¹¹⁷ In *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*, the Bedouin chief killed Surûq and sent to Cairo not his sword, but his severed head! Furthermore, the same chronological dissonance in the sequencing of the narration of events noted above in the case of Ibn Iyâs's account of the events of Shawwâl, can be seen at work in this chronicle as well.¹¹¹⁸

Overall then, while the myriad changes made by the author of this annal are deserving, in their own right, of attention, the annal of the year 804 in *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* has truly nothing to offer, unless it can be proven that those data added by the author were indeed from a now lost source.

¹¹¹⁷ See above, p. 257, and 259 footnote no. 1108.

¹¹¹⁸ See above, p. 260.

2. Syrian Historians:

A. Taqî al-Dîn Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah (779-851/1377-1448):

The available¹¹¹⁹ historical output in the hand of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah for the year 804 consists of three different works, two manuscripts and an edited text. MSS Chester Beatty 4125¹¹²⁰ and 5527¹¹²¹ contain, respectively, the first and the second recension made by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah of Ibn Hîjjî's *Târîkh*. As for the edited text, it is that work which we have designated throughout this dissertation as *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*.¹¹²²

The analysis of these three sources for the purposes of this dissertation has been the easiest: for the year at hand, almost all the reports they contain can be traced back in a rather precise manner, in the following order of importance, to either Ibn Hîjjî, Ibn Duqmâq, al-Maqrîzî, or to the information Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah added to the text of his teacher's chronicle. With regard to that last category of data, as was pointed out earlier in the section about Ibn Hîjjî,¹¹²³ we are dealing with a minute percentage of original data, which is literally dwarfed by the magnitude of borrowed material. Thus the significance of these sources is to be found especially at the historiographical level: even though the picture is far from complete, these three works can be used to provide a glimpse into the processes involved in the production of a chronicle from the hand of a major figure of the beginnings of the Circassian Mamluk Sultanate.¹¹²⁴

In some ways, the first recension is the work that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah manipulated the least. The collation of its text with that of *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî* confirms the conclusions

¹¹¹⁹ Available to this researcher, that is.

¹¹²⁰ For more information on this manuscript, see, above, chapters one and two.

¹¹²¹ See Reisman, "A Holograph MS," especially pp. 19-29, 32-37, 38-49.

¹¹²² See above, chapters one and two.

¹¹²³ See above pp. 239-40, and the footnotes therein.

¹¹²⁴ The study of this process was begun by Reisman in his "A Holograph MS."

reached by Reisman, that it is a copy of Ibn Hijjî's work.¹¹²⁵ Even though a number of longer reports in the original text were reduced in size¹¹²⁶ and some others simply did not make it into the 1st recension,¹¹²⁷ by and large the latter conforms, despite these minor changes, to the text of *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*. For example, the local dimension of some events was kept intact: in PMA12, the report which relates the escape of Taghrîbirdî from Damascus, all the dialogues that allegedly took place between the viceroy of Damascus and his *dawâdâr* and the details about the trickery the pair resorted to, were kept intact. Furthermore, the instances in *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* where Ibn Hijjî expressed himself in the first person singular also appear as such in the first recension.¹¹²⁸

On the other hand, in the second recension of the annal of 804, in fact *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah has done more than simply recopy his master's text: we are dealing here with a source which has been painstakingly elaborated from three foundational works, and as such it is as much deserving of the seal of originality as all other works which have been thus constructed. And this originality does not lie in its contents, which can all be traced back to three sources: rather it is to be found in the fact that it not only delivered a mass of data on Syria, the home base of its author, and *also* on Egypt, but it did so within a coherent narrative framework generally devoid of the pitfalls outlined in the works of others.

¹¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 32.

¹¹²⁶ PMA45 relates the arrival in Damascus from Cairo, of letters including that of Ibn Hijjî's brother informing their father that another of his sons, Najm al-Dîn, the eldest, had been appointed *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Hama. In *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî* this report is substantial and includes a copy of the said letter, while in the 1st recension it is expedited in the equivalent of one sentence.

¹¹²⁷ Generally, these *akhbâr* are not of truly pivotal importance, such as the thirty-one SHMs [SHM9, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 31, 32, etc.] and one RL [RL2] dealing with calendar equivalents, as well as astrological and meteorological data. As for the others [PMA42 60; RL35, RL38 and RL53], they are a bit more significant; and of these, three [PMA42, 60; RL38] deal directly and indirectly with the person of Ibn Hijjî himself; one, RL38, made its way into the 2nd recension.

¹¹²⁸ See, for example, SHM11 ("*akhbaranî*"), PMA76 ("*balaghanî*") and RL36 ("*akhi Najm al-Dîn*"). Even in PMA45, which is a short summary of a longer text in *Târîkh Ibn Hijjî*, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah referred to Ibn Hijjî's brother as "*akhi Najm al-Dîn*."

With its one hundred and fifty-four PMAs, fifty RLs, forty-four SHMs and four FAs, all amounting to two hundred and fifty-two reports, the annal of the year 804 in the 2nd recension eclipses all other sources in terms of sheer numbers. The closest is Ibn Hijjî's work with a total of two hundred and three *akhbâr*, but it does not come even close to the 2nd recension in terms of providing a comprehensive coverage of Egypt. The reason why this source is so imposing has to do with the very mandate Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah has given himself, one that went beyond that bestowed upon him by his teacher Ibn Hijjî, namely to write the annals missing from his history: to enrich the biographies of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî* both by expanding those present and by including new ones, and by adding data about areas other than Syria.¹¹²⁹

For his home region, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah relied primarily on the 1st recension he made of *Târikh Ibn Hijjî*, from which he took sixty-seven out of eighty-two PMAs, thirty-eight out of a forty-two RLs, thirty out of thirty-seven SHMs and three out of three FAs. An analysis of the reports he did leave out provides us with further clues as to the nature and finality of his project. These *akhbâr* can be divided into two groups. The first includes a number of reports that dealt with purely Syrian matters,¹¹³⁰ such as the authorities' handling of Bedouins;¹¹³¹ appointments to various positions;¹¹³² regional events;¹¹³³ local affairs¹¹³⁴ and typical Hijjîan items such as climatic and meteorological events, etc.¹¹³⁵ The second group is made up of reports that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah has ignored in favour of others which at the same time provided an Egyptian perspective on

¹¹²⁹ See chapter one, pp. 114ff and Reisman, "A Holograph MS," pp. 28-9.

¹¹³⁰ Obviously, I mean here geographical Syria that includes Palestine, Trans-Jordan and Syria proper.

¹¹³¹ PMA2, 118, 105, 174 and 206

¹¹³² PMA18, 68, 127; RL4.

¹¹³³ PMA66 and 93.

¹¹³⁴ PMA82, 155; RL52; SHM21.

¹¹³⁵ SHM16, 24', 29, 30.

events *and/or* allowed him to lighten the narrative by avoiding redundancy. For example, probably because Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah wanted to circumvent mentioning twice information about the appointment of Ibn Hījī's brother as *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Hama, he let aside PMA45 and resorted to RL8, a Maqrīzīan *khbar* dated earlier, about the sending off from Cairo to Syria of Najm al-Dīn's appointment papers. PMA46, which recounted the arrival in Damascus of news about the clashes that had taken place in the middle decade of Safar, was also ignored because Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah had systematically dealt with these events in an account he had lifted from Ibn Duqmâq.¹¹³⁶

What does the identification of these two groups of discarded reports signify? Globally, evidence suggests that in constructing this and probably other annals, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's aim was to write a chronicle of no definable geographical origin, a truly all-Mamluk work catering to both poles of the Sultanate, within the framework of the improvement of his teacher's historical oeuvre. The Syrianness of the 2nd recension is readily palpable through the massive borrowings he made from *Târīkh Ibn Hījī* and one must not assume that the fact that he did not use those reports of the first of the two groups of reports mentioned in the previous paragraph meant that his annal is, literally, devoid of accounts of a local dimension. Far from this, and a look at Table III. 1. A. shows just that. For example, *Târīkh Ibn Hījī* and the 1st recension contain, respectively six¹¹³⁷ and five¹¹³⁸ stories that echo news about expeditions against the Bedouins, to the four¹¹³⁹ in the 2nd recension. And while in his 2nd recension, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah did not

¹¹³⁶ In the same vein, see how RL27 was substituted for RL22, RL31 for RL35, and RL39 for RL48

¹¹³⁷ PMA2, 5, 28, 67, 77 and 122.

¹¹³⁸ PMA2, 5, 67, 77 and 122.

¹¹³⁹ PMA5, 67, 77 and 122

deal with appointments to the *wilâyat al-barr*,¹¹⁴⁰ he did deal with that other local position, the *wilâyat al-madīnah*.¹¹⁴¹ What he probably did was to reduce the number of stories about Syria¹¹⁴² in order to give to his work an Egyptian scope that, save for reports about the arrival of correspondence from Cairo, was almost absent from *Târīkh Ibn Hījī*.

Thus the Syrian foundation of the 2nd recension was complemented by reports from Egyptian sources. The nature of these reports and their number are significant in that they confirm what Reisman had already established with regard to Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah's project, namely his concern for reaching some kind of an equilibrium between its various components.¹¹⁴³ When we compare the numbers of Hījīan reports in *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal*¹¹⁴⁴ with those from Egyptian sources,¹¹⁴⁵ we obtain the following figures: sixty-seven to eighty-seven PMAs; thirty-nine to eleven RLs; thirty-four to ten SHMs; three to zero FAs. Thus, while in the narrative of political events the balance tilts, not too abruptly though, towards Egypt, the centre of gravity of the Mamluk state, for the other categories, especially the religious domain, the Syrian reports are more prevalent.

The great merit of Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah is to have fused *on a large scale* two considerable separate bodies of reports in a coherent whole, an endeavour never undertaken before. As a matter of fact, we are dealing with three groups of reports since those we described as being Egyptian originate in *Nuzhat al-Anâm* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk*.

¹¹⁴⁰ PMA18, 68 and 105.

¹¹⁴¹ PMA17 and 80. The same can be said about other topics of local interest.

¹¹⁴² In keeping with my stated objective, I have refrained from examining the obituaries of this and other annals. An analysis of these might yield interesting results in terms of Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah's balancing act between Egyptian and Syrian reports.

¹¹⁴³ "A Holograph MS," pp. 27-29.

¹¹⁴⁴ I include here reports Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah, for reasons unknown, culled directly from *Târīkh Ibn Hījī*, namely RL38, SHM77, 78, 79 and 80.

¹¹⁴⁵ I have included with the Egyptian sources PMA102, which cannot be accounted for and appears to be exclusive to the 2nd recension, because it deals with Egypt. Either Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah lifted it directly from Ibn Duqmâq's original text or it is from an unknown source, written or oral.

The presence of Ibn Duqmâq is not surprising considering Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's predilection for choosing the most original sources for the periods he wrote about. His reliance on Ibn al-Furât has already been established, and in the absence of any annals from this author past 803, it would have been only natural for him to turn to Ibn Duqmâq, whose work was and still is the most complete of the Egyptian chronicles for the year at hand.¹¹⁴⁶ The Duqmâqian *akhbar* were as a rule kept intact by Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah or were very superficially retouched by him. However, even when altered more than the usual, as in the case of PMA145, they are still easily recognizable:

Ibn Duqmâq: "*Fa-lammâ kâna 'ashâ' al-âkhirah min laylat al-sabt, ijtama'a al-Amîr Nawrûz huwa wa-al-Amîr Tamurbughâ al-Mashṭûb, wa-al-Amîr Sûdûn min Zâdah, wa-al-Amîr Arghûn, aḥad al-umarâ' al-'ashrâwât, wa-jamâ'ah min ikhwatihim, wa-tawajjahû taht al-layl ilâ al-Amîr Jakam bi-Birkat al-Habash. Wa-'inda khurûjihim ramaw 'alayhim bi-al-naft wa-al-nashshâb.*" ["Al-Muntaqâ," MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 202a]

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: "*Fa-lammâ kâna 'ashâ' al-âkhirah laylat al-sabt, kharaja al-Amîr Nawrûz wa-ma'ahu al-Amîr Tamurbughâ al-Mashṭûb, wa-al-Amîr Sûdûn min Zâdah, wa-al-Amîr Arghûn, wa-huwa amîr 'asharah, wa-jamâ'ah min ikhwatihim, wa-dhahabû ilâ al-Amîr Jakam.*" [2nd recension of "Târîkh Ibn Hījî," Chester Beatty MS 5527, fol. 247b]

The reports from *Kitâb al-Sulûk* are much fewer in number. I have been able to ascertain the Maqrîzîan identity of only nine¹¹⁴⁷ out of a total of eighty-seven Egyptian reports,¹¹⁴⁸ and these have the interesting peculiarity that they all, save one,¹¹⁴⁹ appear entirely in the text as marginalia. This is the case of SHM5, a *khbar* about the reception held by Nawrûz al-Hâfizî to celebrate his wedding to one of Barqûq's daughters, which is

¹¹⁴⁶ It would not be surprising that Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah would have been informed about the fact that *Târîkh al-Duwal* incorporated a substantial percentage of the reports of *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, something which would have allowed him to kill two birds with one stone by relying solely on Ibn al-Furât for the period before 803.

¹¹⁴⁷ PMA6, 38, 57, 171, 178, 181; RL8 and 58; SHM5.

¹¹⁴⁸ Out of this number, there are a few *akhbâr*, namely PMA187, 193, 199, 204, RL31 and 62, usually shorter than the others, which are simultaneously similar to their equivalents in *Kitâb al-Sulûk* and *Al-Muntaqâ*, so that it is difficult to establish their filiation to either source. See also below, those Duqmâqian reports to which Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah added Maqrîzîan elements.

¹¹⁴⁹ Parts of PMA178 appear in the margin of MS Chester Beatty 5527, fol. 250a.

identical to that of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* but is accompanied by the marker “*wa-fi tawârîkh al-Miṣriyyîn...*” One has the distinct impression that the author of the 2nd recension only added Maqrîzîan material to *complement* a decidedly Duqmâqian foundation. This peripheral use of *Kitâb al-Sulûk* is further supported by the fact that there are a number of instances where material culled from this source was added to reports from Ibn Duqmâq¹¹⁵⁰ and placed, yet again in the margins. In the case of SHM3, a report about the amplitude of the Nile, the addition consists of three words:¹¹⁵¹

Ibn Duqmâq: “...*wafâ al-Nîl al-mubârak wa-zâda isba‘ayn ba‘da al-wafâ’.*” [“Al-Muntaqâ,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 197b]

Al-Maqrîzî: “*Wa-fîhi kâna wafâ’ al-Nîl sittat ‘ashar dhirâ’an, fa-futiha al-khalîj ‘alâ al-‘âdah.*” [*Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:3, p. 1076]

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: “*Wa-fi mustahall [missing word] wafâ al-Nîl al-mubârak wa-zâda isba‘ayn, sittat ‘ashar dhirâ’an.*” [2nd recension of “Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî,” Chester Beatty MS 5527, fol. 236a]

PMA27, the report about rising tensions between senior and junior emirs during the middle decade of Safar, is more interesting because the way it was constructed reflects an apparent concern for consistency on the part of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah. Ibn Duqmâq had noted that the senior emirs had requested the departure of eight emirs of forty and of ten, and four simple mamluks, but he then proceeded to name only six out of supposedly eight. In the text of the 2nd recension, the word eight is absent, and a *signe de renvoi* refers the reader to a *tashîh* in the margin, the word “*sittat.*” Then, Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah simply fused elements from *Kitâb al-Sulûk* in the text itself and by means of marginalia:

Ibn Duqmâq: “...*wa-hum, Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî, wa-Sûdûn al-Nawrûzî Baqjah, wa-Sûdûn al-Qâsimî Bashtaw, wa-Sûdûn al-Wâhî, wa-Azbak al-Dawâdâr, wa-Qânîbây al-Khâzindâr, sittat umarâ’, wa-arba’ mamâlik hum, Tughaytamur al-‘Inâ’î [?] al-Dawâdâr, wa-Înâl al-Muhammadi al-Sâqî, wa-Âqbughâ al-Faqîh al-Dawâdâr, wa-âkhar...*” [“Al-Muntaqâ,” MS Chester Beatty 4125, fol. 198a]

¹¹⁵⁰ PMA27, 62 and 160; SHM3.

¹¹⁵¹ This is also the case with PMA62.

Al-Maqrîzî: "...*wa-hum, al-Hamzâwî, Sûdûn Baqjah, wa-humâ min umarâ' al-ṭablkhânât wa-ru'ûs nawb, wa-Azbak al-Dawâdâr wa-Sûdûn Bashtâ, wa-humâ min umarâ' al-'ashrâwât, wa-Qânîbây al-Khâzindâr wa-Birdî Bâk, wa-humâ min al-Khâssakîyah...*" [Kitâb al-Sulûk, vol. 3:3, p. 1078]

Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah: "*wa-hum, Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî wa-Sûdûn al-Nawrûzî Baqjah, wa-humâ min umarâ' al-ṭablkhânât wa-ru'ûs al-nawb, wa-Sûdûn al-Qâsimî Bashtaw wa-Sûdûn al-Wâhî,*¹¹⁵² *wa-Azbak al-Dawâdâr, wa-humâ min umarâ' al-'asharât, wa-Qânîbây al-Khâzindâr wa-Birdî Bak, wa-humâ min al-Khâssakîyah, wa-mamâlik hum, Tughaytamur al-'Inâ'î [?] al-Dawâdâr, wa-Înâl al-Muhammadî al-Sâqî, wa-Âqbughâ al-Faqîh al-Dawâdâr, wa-âkhar.*" [2nd recension of "Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî," Chester Beatty MS 5527, fol. 237a]¹¹⁵³

Even though Ibn Duqmâq did note in the passage from *Al-Muntaqâ* just quoted, that the emirs who were to be sent away were six, Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah chose instead to use the names that were in al-Maqrîzî's account instead, because they numbered six, and they were accompanied by commentaries about their specific ranks.

The last of the works written by Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah to be considered here is *Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* that we have had the opportunity to examine within the framework of the previous chapters. Since this source originates in *Al-Dhayl al-Mutawwal*, i.e. the 2nd recension, it contains stories from the works of Ibn Hîjjî, Ibn Duqmâq and al-Maqrîzî, and even though it is an abridgement, in terms of sheer number of reports, it ranks third after the 2nd recension and *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*. Overall, nothing peculiar can be established with regard to it, beyond what was said above, except maybe for the fact that some reports were kept intact, while others, such as the pivotal PMA27, were drastically reduced in size.

Probably the best way to conclude this discussion about the oeuvre of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah is to ponder upon the relationships between the three works just examined. While the general pattern of filiations is clear, the multifaceted factors that have presided

¹¹⁵² This name is struck through in the text.

¹¹⁵³ The passages that were not italicized are from al-Maqrîzî and all appear in the margins of this folio.

over the author's endeavour will for now remain a mystery. This comment is warranted because there are a number of variations in the borrowings amongst these three works. For example, sometimes the 2nd recension is closer to *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* than to the 1st. This is the case of SHM11, where the text of the 2nd recension follows more closely that of *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* than that of the 1st recension.¹¹⁵⁴ To this one might add the presence of reports absent from the 1st but present in the 2nd.¹¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, RL37 is longer in the 1st than in either the 2nd recension or *Târîkh Ibn Hījī*. Finally, there are reports common to *Târîkh Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah* and *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, such as PMA20, 22, and FA5, but not to the other two. What are we to make of this? Even at the risk of shoving this problem in front of someone else's doorstep, in the light of what was said above concerning the incomplete nature of the annal of 793 in MS Köprülü 1027, one still needs to assess, to the extent possible, the entirety of Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah's historical production before any further conclusions can be reached regarding his methodology.

IV. Minor Historians:

For 804, there are a number of chronicles and works with some kind of historical content, but they do not offer anything new on the events of the year. Amongst Egyptian

¹¹⁵⁴ In the 2nd recension, SHM11 contains pieces of information absent from the other two sources: it mentions the location of the mausoleum where Taghrîbirdî's son was buried as being the mosque of Karîm al-Dîn, and the qadi who transmitted the story to Ibn Hījī is mentioned by name and not by his *laqab*. The presence of this additional information is not surprising since the 2nd recension is the culmination of the historical works of Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah and thus contains more detailed and precise information than the others.

¹¹⁵⁵ See above, footnote no. 1144.

writers, only al-Qalqashandî's *Ma'âthir al-Inâfah*¹¹⁵⁶ and al-Sakhâwî's *Wajîz al-Kalâm*¹¹⁵⁷ contain some, but very meagre, data on 804.

As for the Syro-Lebanese histories, Sâlih ibn Yahyâ's *Târîkh Bayrût* contains one report about the appointment of al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh as viceroy of Damascus¹¹⁵⁸ and so does *Târîkh Ibn Sibât* whose author recounts the same information as well as the nomination of Duqmâq to Aleppo.¹¹⁵⁹

V. Sectional Conclusions:

One of the most important conclusions that can be derived from this chapter, is the confirmation of the importance of Ibn Duqmâq as a major source for the early Circassian period. Authors who wrote about the year 804 would have probably relied on Ibn al-Furât had something he had produced been available to them. After all, his work had the added convenience of incorporating his own original material into that of Ibn Duqmâq. But in the absence of any known texts from his hand, Mamluk historians resorted to Ibn Duqmâq: Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah, Ibn Hajar, al-Jawharî, Ibn Iyâs and the anonymous author of *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* did so, but to varying degrees.

Also of interest, is the breakthrough made by al-'Aynî in the league of important historians, those whose works were considered worthy of copying. Al-Maqrîzî had long been part of that group as his reports were massively borrowed by contemporaries, near contemporaries and later authors, but not al-'Aynî. The fact that al-Jawharî 'abandoned' *Kitâb al-Sulûk* for *'Iqd al-Jumân* might then be a reflection of the rising star of al-'Aynî

¹¹⁵⁶ In *Ma'âthir al-Inâfah*, there a story about a disaster brought about by the arrival of a swarm of locusts in Egypt, as well as SHM52, a report mentioned by other sources; vol. 2, p. 193.

¹¹⁵⁷ The annal of the year 804 in *Wajîz al-Kalâm* is a page and half long. As for its contents, they were taken from *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* and offer nothing new; see vol. 1, pp. 361-2.

¹¹⁵⁸ p. 235.

¹¹⁵⁹ Vol. 2, p. 769. Al-Duwayhî's *Târîkh al-Azminah* then reproduced, almost word for word, Ibn Sibât's account, p. 341.

in Mamluk circles at a time when that of al-Maqrîzî was dimming. This, of course, cannot be ascertained in the absence of sources and, consequently, of research that can establish with some degree of certainty the nature of the relations between al-Jawharî and these two authors.

Finally, throughout this chapter, we have encountered numerous instances of authors borrowing from others elements of narrative, on various scales, and using them to create their own. This only reinforces the conclusion reached at the end of the previous chapter, that far from being a random and disorganized endeavour, the writing of history was a demanding craft which led authors to exacting lengths, in search of *le bon mot* in order to produce the right sentence or to convey the proper effect.

CONCLUSION:

What are we to make of the data amassed in the previous sections of this dissertation? In keeping with the objectives outlined in the introduction, and in the light of the well-established tradition of Mamluk historiography for authors to borrow their data, often on a massive scale, from the works of others, it is fitting to start off by pinpointing the sources which were most relied upon by those who, at different times during the course of about a century and a half, chose to write about the early Circassian Sultanate. With regard to Syria, notwithstanding the possibility that another or other sources might have been in circulation there amongst the learned elite but were never given proper credit, notwithstanding also the originality of Ibn Saṣrā's *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah*, no work rivals *Tārīkh Ibn Hījī*, both in terms of its more diversified contents and its diffusion in the two poles of the Mamluk realm, thanks no doubt to its author's connections. As for Egypt, Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn al-Furât are undoubtedly the two figures whose historical writing appears to have been the most influential: without exception, all authors, their contemporaries and those who were born long after they vanished, relied on them at varying degrees, whether directly or indirectly. According to the research undertaken here, Ibn Duqmâq turned out to be the penultimate historian behind Ibn al-Furât, but his *Nuzhat al-Anâm* was the building block upon which *Tārīkh al-Duwal* was built, thus turning this latter work into the most complete and comprehensive source for the period at hand. Later, al-Maqrîzî would make massive use of Ibn al-Furât's work, largely by editing it, in order to write the annals of his *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, until he was mature enough in the early parts of the ninth/fifteenth century to produce his own primary

material. *Kitâb al-Sulûk* would perpetuate for generations to come the historical legacy of the Egyptian pair, due to the sheer fact that it was used in its turn as the foundation, or one amongst other sources, of the chronicles of later historians, the likes of ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ al-Malaṭî and Ibn Iyâs, and contemporaries such as Ibn Ḥajar and maybe even al-‘Aynî. This latter competitor of al-Maqrîzî also figures prominently not only by transmitting Duqmâqian reports – witness Ibn Taghrîbirdî’s possible reliance on *‘Iqd al-Jumân* for the annal of 778, but especially al-Jawharî’s for the year 804 –, but also, alongside al-Maqrîzî, as an original source for the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century.

Other historians would contribute, in their own way, to the production of historical data just like the five noted above, but none could be considered to have generated primary data *the same way* they have. This evidently does not disqualify their works from consideration. As a matter of fact, when it comes to originality, the tables can be turned, and works of supposedly secondary importance turn out to be more interesting, in some respects, than the five ‘classical’ sources, all of the latter, despite their particularities, traditional by-products of Mamluk historiography. Actually, on a superficial level, within that last group, both al-Maqrîzî and al-‘Aynî, could be construed to be, in the eyes of modern-day scholars, more important than Ibn al-Furât and Ibn Duqmâq, because, precisely, they have helped preserve – to what chronological or other extents still needs to be ascertained – the works of the latter pair. But beyond this skin-deep realization, when it comes to the mass of data present in the sources as a whole, only *a fraction* of which was used for analytical purposes here but which constitutes the bread and butter, so to speak, of modern historians trying to recreate the world of the early Circassian period, each of the works deemed of a secondary nature plays an important role in terms not only of reflecting major historiographical issues, but also in terms of preserving for posterity

snapshots and vivid images of this particular past. Thus *Kitâb al-'Ibar* stands out because, unlike *Nuzhat al-Anâm* or even *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, it is unfettered by the annalistic format, something that allowed Ibn Khaldûn to provide his fine analysis of the deep causes of the events of 778. Ibn Hajar made, modestly it is true, his own contribution to the history of the period by mentioning events taking place outside the Mamluk realm, while Ibn Taghrîbirdî introduced into some of his reports information born out of his close contacts with Mamluk society. Ibn Hîjjî's *Târîkh* turned out to be a richer depository of economic data regarding prices and commerce than any of the Egyptian sources, including *Kitâb al-Sulûk*. This author and Ibn Saṣrâ have also provided a lively, detailed and intimate portrait of their city in the throes of war and unrest, unparalleled by any of the descriptions made by their Egyptian counterparts of civil unrest in Cairo.

Now with regard to this last issue, what are the reasons, if any, behind the difference in the way Syrian and Egyptian historians reported the internal strife endemic to Mamluk society? One could evoke happenstance, the fact that the two Syrian historians simply chose to do so, or particularly extraordinary circumstances not obtaining in Egypt: the distance of Damascus from the capital; the presence on its borders of powerful foreign states; the long duration of the fighting, encouraged no doubt by the existence of numerous regional political actors, such as the various martial groups in the mountains of Lebanon, the Turcomans in the North, Arab tribal nomadic formations; etc. Or one could still bring to the fore the requirements of a particular historiographical tradition: Damascus was then a provincial city compared to the sprawling metropolis that Cairo was and still is, and it this provinciality, with all that comes with it in terms, among other things, of one's familiarity with his or her surroundings, that might have led Ibn Saṣrâ and Ibn Hîjjî to be so much more prone to providing details concerning local issues.

This trait is actually the only one that these two authors have in common, and only in the case of the latter does it intersect with one of the characteristics of the so-called ‘Syrian school,’ namely the fact that in *Târîkh Ibn Hījī*, as an intellectual history, to quote Reisman yet again, one finds “a record of events and people connected to the institutions and fields of religion, law and education.”¹¹⁶⁰ As to the other feature of the Syrian school, the attention shown to the biographies of the intellectual elite especially in *tarâjim* sections, it characterizes none of the Syrian histories, save one, considered in this research. The most complete annal of *Târîkh Ibn Hījī* studied here, that of the year 804, did document, and well, the intellectual scene of Damascus, but it did so generally as it *related* to the person of Ibn Hījī himself, and its author apparently did not see fit to infuse into it a substantial biographical dimension: the obituaries are few in number and they are simply anaemic compared to what can be found elsewhere, *even* in Egyptian sources. In the case of Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah’s *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, one sees the same mechanisms at work: in the annal of the year 804, out of a total of thirty-eight folios only around eight and a half are devoted to obituaries. Strangely, *Târîkh Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah*, the summary of the last mentioned work, is the lone source to conform to a certain extent to a ‘Syrian model,’ as its pages are almost equally divided between *hawâdith* and *tarâjim*. Was *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal* intended, as was argued above, for a wider Syro-Egyptian audience, and *Târîkh Ibn Qâdī Shuhbah* for a different one? A comparison of the extent of the space occupied by obituaries of, respectively, Syrian and Egyptian personalities in the *tarâjim* sections of these two works might provide one with leads as to the solution of the riddle posed by the dearth of information concerning the whole issue of the readership of historical works in this and other periods of Islamic history.

¹¹⁶⁰ “A Holograph Manuscript,” p. 24.

This last question is of great importance because it overlaps with features of historiographical production that were alluded to throughout the previous sections of this dissertation. What prompted the likes of Ibn Taghrîbirdî and al-Jawharî to switch, respectively, from al-‘Aynî/Ibn Duqmâq to al-Maqrîzî and from al-Maqrîzî to al-‘Aynî? What caused a historian to fuse different reports into one, or to borrow elements, sometimes a few words, from one *khabar* and to incorporate it into another? In other words, what might have been the factors that led authors to rely on this rather than that work as the foundation of theirs, or what caused them to use this rather than that word or series of words in order to build their narratives? These will remain open-ended questions until modern historians manage to accumulate a large number of data about subjects as varied as the reception phenomenon; the extent of the personal relations between authors; the setting in which the writing process took place; the conception the authors we studied had of what constituted ‘good’ text in the circles they evolved in; the understanding they had of what amounted to a ‘good’ report.

These are then some of the avenues open for future research on the historiography of the early Circassian period, but they are not the only ones. First, a number of works, some of which are still in manuscript form, urgently require scientific editing. On top of this list, one ought to place *Kitâb al-‘Ibar*, the Bulâq edition of which does not do justice to a source that could yield still more significant data. Those sections of *Nuzhat al-Anâm* that are still extant and that deal with years during which Ibn Duqmâq was a full-fledged adult, are also deserving of scholars’ attention, but *Târîkh al-Duwal* is more so, because, precisely, it includes so much of the former work. As a matter of fact, the edition of *Târîkh al-Duwal* by means of *Al-Muntaqâ min Târîkh Ibn al-Furât*, a work which covers the years 773-793, when considered alongside those existing annals of *Al-Dhayl al-*

Muṭawwal running from 797 to 810, would provide continuous historical coverage by means of original primary sources of all the early Circassian period, save for a hiatus of only three years, 794-796, not covered by either work, but adequately dealt with by other authors such as al-Maqrīzī.

Reconstructing *Tārīkh al-Duwal* would be a worthy enterprise and it would benefit greatly from an endeavour the necessity of which I noted in the Introduction, namely an assessment of the biographical data contained in various sources. As a result of the analysis undertaken in chapter three above, we now understand the basic premises of the method used by Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah to produce the non-prosopographical data of his *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, but not the process leading to the elaboration of its obituaries. In view of the web of relations that link together the works authored by and/or from the pen of Ibn Qâḍī Shuhbah, among others *Al-Muntaqá min Tārīkh Ibn al-Furât*, *Al-Muntaqá min Tārīkh Ibn Duqmâq* and *Al-Dhayl al-Muṭawwal*, and *Tārīkh Ibn Hījī*, a collation of the obituaries sections found in these sources would help to reconstitute Ibn al-Furât's opus and to complete with some degree of exactitude the picture of the complex of interrelationships amongst these and other historians.

Individual productions also deserve to be studied. On his own Ibn Iyâs presents a formidable opportunity for prospective Mamlukologists. Notwithstanding the late Ulrich Haarmann's comments about the failings of literary theories that consider historical narratives as belonging to the realm of literary production,¹¹⁶¹ one ought to take a serious look at those sections of *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* dealing with the period under study, not necessarily as a repository of reliable historical data – which they are not –, but rather as,

¹¹⁶¹ "Al-Maqrīzī, the Master, and Abû Hamīd al-Qudṣī, the Disciple – Whose Historical Writing Can Claim More Topicality and Modernity?," in *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt*, edited by Hugh Kennedy (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 149-150.

yes, literary constructs: their subject matter might very well be historical in nature, but their narrative offers such blatant departures from consensus, that one might want to consider analysing the logic underlying them in terms of the tools not of historical but of literary inquiry. In the same vein, one needs to re-evaluate some of the conclusions concerning features of the early Mamluk sultanate that were based on data contained in *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*.¹¹⁶²

This research constitutes, it is hoped, yet another step in the overall effort to fully understand one of the richest historiographical traditions the Islamic world has ever known. Aspiring Mamlukologists need not despair when comes the time to chose a topic for their dissertation: as was seen just above, much still needs to be done, and there are myriad topics awaiting exploration.

¹¹⁶² See footnote no. 9 in the introduction of this dissertation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources:

Anonymous. *Jawâhir al-Sulûk fî al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*. MS British Museum, Or. 6854

Al-'Asqalânî, Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hajar. *Al-Durar al-Kâminah fî A'yân al-Mi'ah al-Thâminah*. Edited by Sâlim al-Karnakawî. Vols. 1-5. Beirut: Dâr al-Jîl, 1993.

_____. *Dhayl al-Durar al-Kâminah fî A'yân al-Mi'ah al-Thâminah*. Edited by Ahmad Farîd al-Mazîdî. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmîyah, 1998.

_____. *Inbâ' al-Ghumr fî Abnâ' al-'Umr*. Edited by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Mu'îd Khân. Vols. 1-14. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmîyah, 1986.

_____. Edited by Hasan Habashî. Vols. 1-3. Cairo: Lajnat Ihyâ' al-Turâth al-Islamî, 1969-.

_____. *Raf' al-Isr 'an Qudât Misr*. Edited by Hâmid 'Abd al-Majîd et al.. Vols 1-2. Cairo: Al-Amîriyah, 1957-61.

_____. *Al-Majma' al-Mu'assis lil-Mu'jam al-Mufahras*. Edited by Yûsuf 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Mir'ashlî. Beirut: Dâr al-Ma'rifah, 1992.

Al-'Aynî, Badr al-Dîn. *Iqd al-Jumân fî Târikh Ahl al-Zamân*. Edited by 'Abd al-Râziq al-Tantâwî al-Qarmût. Beirut: Al-Zahrâ' lil-I'lâm al-'Arabî, 1989.

_____. MSS Ahmet III 2911/B2; Ahmet III 2911/19; Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târikh*.

Baybars al-Mansûrî, Rukn al-Dîn. *Zubdat al-Fikrah fî Târikh al-Hijrah*. Cairo University Library, MS 24-28.

Al-Dhahabî, Shams al-Dîn. *Al-'Ibar fî Khabar man 'Abar*. Kuwait: Maṭba'at Hukûmat al-Kuwayt, 1966.

Al-Duwayhî, Isṭfân. *Târikh al-Azminah*. Beirut: Dâr Lahad Khâtir, n.d.

Al-Fâsî, Taqî al-Dîn. *Shifâ' al-Gharâm bi-Akhhâr al-Balad al-Harâm*. Edited by 'Abd al-Salâm al-Tadmurî. Vols. 1-2. Beirut: Dâr al-Kitâb al-'Arabî, 1985.

_____. *Al-'Iqd al-Thamîn fî Târikh al-Balad al-Amîn*. Edited by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qâdir 'Atâ. Vols. 1-7. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmîyah, 1998.

Ibn 'Arab Shâh. *'Ajâ'ib al-Maqdûr fî Nawâ'ib Taymûr*. Edited by Ahmad Fâyiz al-Himsî. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risâlah, 1986.

_____. *Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir*. Translated by J.H. Sanders. London: Luzac & Co., 1936.

Ibn Duqmâq. *Al-Jawhar al-Thamîn fi Siyar al-Khulafâ' wa-al-Mulûk*. Edited by Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn 'Izz al-Dîn 'Alî. Vols. 1-2. Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1985.

_____. Edited by Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattâḥ 'Âshûr. Al-Madinah: Jâmi'at Umm al-Qurâ, 1982.

_____. *Al-Nafḥah al-Miskîyah fi al-Dawlah al-Turkîyah*. Edited by 'Umar 'Abd al-Salâm Tadmurî. Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-'Asrîyah, 1999.

_____. *Nuzhat al-Anâm fi Târîkh al-Islâm*. Edited by Samîr Tabbârah. Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-'Asrîyah, 1999.

_____. *Nuzhat al-Anâm fi Târîkh al-Islâm*. Gotha MS Orient A 1572.

Ibn al-Furât, Nâsir al-Dîn. *Târîkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk*. Edited by Costi K. Zurayk and Najla Izzeddin. Vols. 9.1 & 9.2. Beirut : The American University of Beirut, 1936-38.

_____. *Al-Muntaqâ min Târîkh Ibn al-Furât*. Chester Beatty MS 4125.

Ibn Ḥabîb, Badr al-Dîn Abû Muḥammad al-Ḥalabî. *Tadhkirat al-Nabîh fi Ayyâm al-Mansûr wa-Banîh*. Edited by Muḥammad Muḥammad Amîn. Vols. 1-3. Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Misrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1976-86.

_____. *Durrat al-Aslâk fi Mulk Dawlat al-Atrâk*. Bodleian Marsh 319.

Al-Ḥalabî, Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir Ibn Badr al-Dîn Ibn Ḥabîb. *Durrat al-Aslâk fi Mulk Dawlat al-Atrâk*. Bodleian MS Marsh 319.

Ibn Hîjjî, Shihâb al-Dîn. *Târîkh Ibn Hîjjî*. Berlin MS Ahlwardt 9458.

_____. Edited by Abû Yahyâ 'Abd Allâh al-Kandarî. Vols 1-2. Beirut: Dâr Ibn Ḥazm, 2003.

Ibn al-'Imâd. *Shadharât al-Dhahab fi Akhbâr man Dhahab*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Quds, 1932-33.

Ibn al-'Irâqî, Walî al-Dîn Abû Zur'ah. *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar fi Khabar man 'Abar*. Edited by Sâlih Mahdî 'Abbâs. Vols. 1-3. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risâlah, 1989.

Ibn Iyâs, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr fi Waqâ'i' al-Duhûr*. Edited by Muḥammad Muṣṭafâ. Vols. 1-6. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974-75.

Ibn Kathîr. *Al-Bidâyah wa-al-Nihâyah*. Edited by Aḥmad Abû Mulḥim et al. Vols. 1-14. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1987.

Ibn Khaldûn, ‘Abd al-Raḥmân. *Kitâb al-‘Ibar wa-al-Mubtada’ wa-al-Khabar*. Vols. 1-7. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-A‘lamî lil-Maṭbû‘ât, 1971.

_____. *Al-Ta’rîf bi-Ibn Khaldûn wa-Rihlatihi Gharban wa-Sharqan*. Edited by Muḥammad bin Tâwîṭ al-Tanḥabî. Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta’lîf wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Nashr, 1951.

Ibn Khalîl al-Malâṭî, ‘Abd al-Bâsîṭ. *Nuzhat al-Asâṭîn fi man Waliya Misr min al-Salâṭîn*. Edited by Muḥammad Kâmil ‘Izz al-Dîn. Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqâfah al-Dîniyah, 1987.

_____. *Nayl al-Amal fi Dhayl al-Duwal*. Vols. 1-9. Edited by ‘Umar Tadmurî. Sidon and Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-‘Aṣrîyah, 2002.

Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah. *Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah*. Edited by ‘Adnân Darwîsh. Vols. 1-4. Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1977-97.

Ibn Râfi‘ Sallâmî, Muḥammad. *Wafayât*. Edited by ‘Abd al-Jabbâr Zakkâr. Damascus: Manshûrât Wizârat al-Thaqâfah fi al-Jumhûriyah al-‘Arabîyah al-Sûriyah, 1985.

Ibn Sibât al-Gharbî. *Târîkh Ibn Sibât*. Edited by ‘Umar Tadmurî. Vols 1-2. Tripoli: Jarrûs Press, 1993.

Ibn Saṣrâ, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad. *Al-Durra al-Mudî‘a fi l-Dawla al-Zâhiriyya: A Chronicle of Damascus, 1389-1397*. Translated, edited and annotated by William M. Brinner. Vols. 1-2. Berkeley: University of California, 1963.

Ibn Taghrîbirdî, Jamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf. *Extracts from Abû l-Maḥâsin ibn Taghrî Birdî’s Chronicle Entitled Hawâdith ad-Duhûr fi Madâ’l-Ayyâm wash-Shuhûr*. Edited by William Popper. Parts 1-4. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 8. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1930-1942.

_____. *Al-Manhal al-Sâfi wa-al-Mustawfi ba’d al-Wâfi*. Edited by Muḥammad Muḥammad Amîn. Vols. 1-7. Cairo: Al-Hay’ah al-Miṣriyah al-‘Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1985-1994.

_____.
Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *târîkh*.

_____. *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah fi Mulûk Misr wa-al-Qâhirah*. Edited by Muḥammad Husayn Shams al-Dîn. Vols. 1-16. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1992.

The History of Egypt 1382-1467 A.D. (Part I, 1382-1399). Translated and edited by William Popper, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 15. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.

Abū'l-Mahâsin Ibn Taghrî Birdî's Annals. Edited by William Popper. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 5, part 1-3 (746-800 A.H.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932-5.

Ibn Yahyâ, Sâlih. *Akhhâr al-Salaf min Dhurrîyat Buhtur bin 'Alî Amîr al-Gharb bi-Bayrût*, a.k.a. *Târîkh Bayrût*, edited by Kamal S. Salibi et al. Beirut: Dâr al-Mashriq, 1969.

Al-Jazarî, Shams al-Dîn. *Hawâdith al-Zamân wa-Anbâ'uhu wa-Wafâyât al-Akâbir wa-al-A'yân*. Dâr al-Kutub MS 995 *târîkh*.

Al-Jawharî al-Sayrafi. *Nuzhat al-Nufus wa-al-Abdan fi Tawarikh al-Zaman*. Edited by Hasan Habashî. Vols. 1-4. Cairo: Wizârat al-Thaqâfah, Markaz Tahqîq al-Turâth, 1970-3.

Laoust, Henri. *Les Gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamlouks et les premiers Ottomans*. Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1952.

Al-Maqrîzî, Taqî al-Dîn Ahmad. *Durar al-'Uqûd al-Farîdah fi Tarâjim al-A'yân al-Mufîda*. Edited by Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn 'Izz al-Dîn 'Alî. Vol. 1. Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1992.

Kitâb al-Mawâ'iz wa-al-I'tibâr bi-Dhikr al-Khitat wa-al-Âthâr a.k.a. *Al-Khitat*. Vols. 1-2. Beirut: Dâr Sâdir, n.d.; reprint of the Bûlâq edition.

Kitâb al-Sulûk li-Ma'rifat al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk. Edited by Sa'îd 'Abd al-Fattâh 'Âshûr. Vols. 1-4. Cairo: Dâr-Kutub, 1970.

Edited by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qâdir 'Aṭâ. Vols. 1-14. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1997.

Mamluk Economics: a Study and Translation of al-Maqrîzî's Ighâthah. Translated by Adel Allouche. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1994.

Al-Muqrî, Ahmad ibn Muḥammad. *Naṭr al-Jûmân fi Tarâjim al-A'yân*. Chester Beatty MS 4113.

Al-Nu'aymî, 'Abd al-Qâdir. *Al-Dâris fi Târîkh al-Madâris*. Edited by Ibrâhîm Shams al-Dîn. Vols 1-2. Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1990.

Al-Nuwayrî al-Iskandarî. *Kitâb al-Ilmâm bi-al-I'lâm fi mâ Jarat bi-hi al-Ahkâm wa-al-Umûr al-Maqdiyyah fi Wâq'at al-Iskandariyah*. Edited by 'Azîz Suriâl 'Atîyah. Vols. 1-7. Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Majlis Dâ'irat al-Ma'ârif al-'Uthmânîyah, 1968-76.

Al-Qalqashandî, Shihâb al-Dîn. *Subḥ al-A'shâ fi Sinâ'at al-Inshâ'*. Vols. 1-14. Cairo: Dâr al-Kutub al-Khidawîyah 1913-18.

_____. *Ma'âthir al-Inâfah fi Ma'âlim al-Khilâfah*. Edited by 'Abd al-Sattâr Aḥmad Farrâj. Vols. 1-2. Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1980.

Al-Qirmânî, Aḥmad Ibn Yûsuf. *Akhbâr al-Duwal wa Âthâr al-Uwal fi al-Târikh*. Edited by Aḥmad Huṭayt and Fahmî Sa'd. Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1992.

Al-Ṣafadî, Ṣalâh al-Dîn. *Al-Wâfi bi-al-Wafâyât*. Edited by Ahmad al-Arna'ût et al. Vols. 1-29. Beirut: Dâr Ihyâ' al-Turâth al-'Arabî, 2000.

Al-Sakhâwî, Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad. *Al-Daw' al-Lâmi' li-Ahl al-Qarn al-Tâsi'*. Vols. 1-12. Beirut: Dâr al-Jil, 1992.

_____. *Al-I'lân bi al-Tawbîkh li-man Dhamma Ahl al-Târikh*. Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqî, 1930-1931.

_____. *Al-Tibr al-Masbuk fi Dhayl al-Suluk*. Edited by Aḥmad Zakî. Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyat al-Azharîyah, 1972.

_____. *Wajîz al-Kalâm fi al-Dhayl 'ala Duwal al-Islâm*. Vols. 1-4. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risâlah, 1995.

Sauvaire, H. "Description de Damas: Chapitres III, IV, VI, VIII et la Conclusion." *Journal Asiatique*, mai-juin 1894, pp. 385-501; septembre-octobre 1894, pp. 242-331; novembre-décembre 1894, pp. 465-96; mars-avril 1895, pp. 269-376; novembre-décembre 1895, pp. 409-84.

Shukrî, Imân 'Umar, editor. *Al-Sultân Barqûq, Mu'assis Dawlat al-Mamâlik al-Jarâkisah, 784-801 1382-1398: min Khilâl Makhtûṭ Iqd al-Jumân fi Târikh Ahl al-Zamân li-Badr al-Dîn al-'Aynî*. Cairo: Maktabat Madbûlî, 2002.

Al-Suyûtî, Jalâl al-Dîn. *Târikh al-Khulafâ'*. Cairo: 1305AH.

_____. *Husn al-Muhâdarah fi Akhbâr Misr wa-al-Qâhirah*. Vols. 1-2. Cairo? Beirut?: nd.

_____. *Al-Shamârikh fi 'Ilm al-Târikh*. Leiden: Brill, 1894.

Al-Zâhirî, Ghars al-Dîn Khalîl. *Zubdat Kashf al-Mamâlik wa-Bayân al-Turuq wa-al-Masâlik*. Edited by Paul Ravaise. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1891.

_____. *La Zubda Kachf al-Mamâlik*. Jean Gaulmier's edition of Venture de Paradis' translation the *Zubda*. Beirut : Institut Français de Damas, 1950.

II. Secondary Sources:

'Abd al-Râziq, Maḥmūd Ismâ'îl. "Manhaj Ibn Taghrîbirdî fi Kitâbihi 'al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah'." In *Al-Mu'arrikh Ibn Taghrîbirdî Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf*, 813-874, pp. 107-122. Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1974.

Ahlwardt, Wilhelm. *Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin: 1887-99.

'Alî, Muḥammad Kamâl al-Dîn 'Izz al-Dîn. *Arba'at Mu'arrikhîn wa-Arba' Mu'allifât min Dawlat al-Mamâlik al-Jarâkisah*. Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1992

Al-Azmeh, Aziz. *Ibn Khaldûn, An Essay in Reinterpretation*. London: Frank Cass, 1982

Amitai, Reuven. "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of the Early Mamluk Sultanate (or: Is al-Maqrîzî an Unrecognized Historiographical Villain?)." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 7:2, pp. 99-118.

Ashtor, E. "Makâyil, Mawâzîn." *EF²*, vol. 6, pp. 117-121.

_____. "Some Unpublished Sources for the Bahrî Period." In *Studies in Islamic History and Civilization*, edited by U. Heyd, pp. 11-30. Jerusalem : 1961.

_____. "Études sur quelques chroniques mamloukes." *Israel Oriental Society*, vol. 1 (1971), pp. 272-97.

'Âshûr, 'Abd al-Fattâḥ. "Makânât Ibn Taghrîbirdî Bayna Mu'arrikhî Miṣr fi al-Qarn al-Tâsi' al-Hijrî." In *Al-Mu'arrikh Ibn Taghrîbirdî Jamâl al-Dîn Abû al-Mahâsin Yûsuf*, 813-874, pp. 87-105. Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Kitâb, 1974.

Ayalon, D. *Studies on the Mamluks of Egypt (1250-1517)*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1979.

_____. "Bahrî Mamlûks, Burjî Mamlûks – Inadequate Names for the Two Reigns of the Mamluk Sultanate." *Târikh*, vol. 1 (1990), pp. 3-53

_____. "Discharges from service, banishments and imprisonments in Mamluk society." *Israel Oriental Studies*, vol. 5 (1972), pp. 25-50.

_____. "The Circassians in the Mamluk Kingdom." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 69, 3 (1949), pp.135-147.

_____. "Egypt as a Dominant Factor in Syria and Palestine during the Islamic Period." In *Egypt and Palestine: A Millennium of Association (868-1948)*, edited by A. Cohen and Gabriel Baer, pp. 17-47. New York: St. Martin's, 1984.

_____. *Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom: A Challenge to a Mediaeval Society*. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1956.

_____. "Mamlûkiyyât: (B) Ibn Khaldûn's View of the Mamlûk Phenomenon." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 2 (1980), pp. 340-49.

_____. "Studies on the structure of the Mamluk Army." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vols. XV/2 and 3 (1953) and XVI/2 (1954), pp. 203-228, 448-476, 57-90.

Bacharach, Jere L. "Circassian Mamluk Historians and their Quantitative Economic Data." *Journal of the American Research Center in Cairo*, vol. 11-12, 1974-5, pp. 75-87.

Bauden, Frédéric. "Maqriziana I: Discovery of an Autograph Manuscript of al-Maqrîzî: Towards a Better Understanding of His Working Method; Description: Section 1." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. VII:2 (2003), pp. 21-68.

Ben Cheneb, Mohammad and de Somogyi, J. "Al-Dhahabi. *EF*², vol. 2, pp. 214-6.

Blachère, Régis. "Quelques réflexions sur les formes de l'encyclopédisme en Égypte et en Syrie du VIII^e/XIX^e siècle à la fin du IX^e/XV^e siècle." *Bulletin d'Études Orientales*, vol. XXIII (1970), pp. 7-19.

Brinner, W.M. "Ibn Iyâs." *EF*², vol. 2, pp. 835-7

Broadbridge, Anne F. "Academic Rivalry and the Patronage System in Fifteenth-Century Egypt: Al-'Aynî, al-Maqrîzî, and Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalânî." *Mamluk Studies Review*. Vol. 3 (1999), pp. 85-107.

Cahen, Claude. "Editing Arabic Chronicles: A Few Suggestions." *Islamic Studies*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September, 1962), p. 1-25.

_____. "Ibn al-Furât." *EF*², vol. 3, p. 792.

Cohen, Amnon and Baer, Gabriel. *Egypt and Palestine: A Millennium of Association, 868-1948*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

Dahan, Sami. "The Origin and Development of the Local Histories of Syria." In *Historians of the Middle-East*, edited by Bernard Lewis and P.M. Holt, pp. 108-125. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Dahmân, Muḥammad Aḥmad. "Madâris Dimashq wa-Hammâmâtuhâ." *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmi al-'Arabi*, vol. 22 (1947), pp. 232-246, 320-333

Darrag, Ahmad. *L'Acte du Waqf de Barsbay*. Cairo : Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1969.

_____. *L'Égypte sous le règne de Barsbay, 825-841/1422-1438*. Damas: Institut Français de Damas, 1961.

Elham, Shah Morad. *Kitbugâ und Lâgîn: Studien zur Mamluken-Geschichte nach Baibars al-Mansurî und al-Nuwairî*. Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz, 1977.

Farah, Caesar E. *The Dhayl in Medieval Arabic Historiography*. New Haven, CT: The American Oriental Society, 1967.

Fernandes, Leonor. *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khanqah*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1988.

Fischel, Walter J. "Ascensus Barcoch (I) and (II): A Latin Biography of the Mamluk Sultan Barqûq of Egypt (d. 1399) Written by B. de Mignanelli in 1416." *Arabica*, vol. 6 (1959), pp. 57-74, 152-172.

_____. *Ibn Khaldûn and Tamerlane: Their Historic Meeting in Damascus, 1401 A.D. (803 A.H.); A Study of Ibn Khaldûn's "Autobiography," with a Translation into English, and a Commentary*. Berkeley: University of California University Press, 1952.

_____. *Ibn Khaldûn in Egypt: His Public Functions and His Historical Research (1382-1404) – A Study in Islamic History*. Berkeley: University of California University Press, 1967.

Gacek, Adam. *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Maurice. *La Syrie à l'Époque des Mamelouks*. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1923.

Geoffroy, Éric. *Le Soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans: Orientations spirituelles et enjeux culturels*. Damas: Institut Français de Damas, 1995.

Gilbert, Joan E. "Institutionalisation of Muslim Scholarship and Professionalization of the 'Ulamâ' in Medieval Damascus." *Studia Islamica*, LII (1980), pp. 105-134.

Glubb, John. *Soldiers of Fortune: The Story of the Mamlukes*. New York: Stein and Day, 1973.

Guo, Li. *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yûnîni's Dhayl Mir'ât al-Zamân*, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

_____. "Mamluk Historiographic Studies: The State of the Art." *Mamlûk Studies Review*. Vol. 1 (1997), pp. 15-43.

Haarmann, Ulrich. "Ideology and History, Identity and Alterity: The Arab Image of the Turk from the 'Abbasids to Modern Egypt." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 20 (1988), pp. 175-196.

_____. "Arabic in Speech, Turkish in Lineage: Mamluks and Their Sons in the Intellectual Life of Fourteenth-Century Egypt and Syria." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 33, no. 1 (1988), pp. 81-114.

_____. "Mamluk Endowment Deeds as a Source for the History of Education in Late Medieval Egypt." *Al-Abhâth*, vol. 28 (1980), pp. 31-47.

_____. "Al-Maqrîzî, the Master, and Abû Hamîd al-Qudsî, the Disciple – Whose Historical Writing Can Claim More Topicality and Modernity?" In *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt*, edited by Hugh Kennedy, pp. 149-165. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

_____. *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit*. Islamkundliche Untersuchungen; 1. Freiburg: Robischon, 1969.

_____. "Rather the Injustice of the Turks than the Righteousness of the Arabs -- Changing 'Ulama' Attitudes towards Mamluk Rule in the Late Fifteenth Century." *Studia Islamica*, vol. 68 (1988), pp. 61-77.

_____. "The Sons of Mamluks as Fief-holders in Late Medieval Egypt." In *Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East*, edited by Tarif Khâlîdî, pp. 141-168. Beirut: American University in Beirut, 1984.

_____. "Turkish Legends in the Popular Historiography of Medieval Egypt." In *Proceedings of the VIth Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, edited by Frithiof Rundgren, pp. 97-107. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

Al-Hajji, Hayat Nasser. *The Internal Affairs in Egypt during the Third Reign of Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad b. Qalâwûn, 709-741/1309-1341*. Kuwait: Jâmi'at al-Kuwayt, 1995

Hiyari, M.A. "The origins and Development of the Amîrate of the Arabs During the Seventh/Thirteenth and Eighth/Fourteenth Centuries." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 38:3 (1975), pp. 508-24.

Holt, P.M. *The Age of the Crusades: The Near East from the Eleventh Century to 1517*. London: Longman, 1986.

_____. "Mamlûk." *EP*, vol. 6, pp. 305-315.

_____. "The Structure of Government in the Mamluk Sultanate." In *The Eastern Mediterranean in the Period of the Crusades*, edited by P.M. Holt, pp. 44-61. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1977.

Hours, F. and Salibi, K. "Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanash, muqaddam de la Biqâ', 1499-1518, un épisode peu connu de l'histoire libanaise." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, vol. XLIII (1968), pp. 3-23

Humphreys, Steven. "The Emergence of the Mamluk Army." *Studia Islamica*, vol. 45 (1977), pp. 67-99 & vol. 46 (1977), pp. 147-182.

Khalidi, T. *Arabic Historical Thought in the Classical Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Irwin, R. *The Middle East in the Middle Ages: The Early Mamluk Sultanate*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

_____. "Factions in Medieval Egypt." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1986), pp. 228-246.

_____. "Tribal Feuding and Mamluk Factions in Medieval Syria." In *Texts, Documents and Artefacts: Islamic Studies in Honour of D.S. Richards*, edited by Chase Robinson, pp. 251-64. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

'Izz al-Dîn, Muḥammad Kamâl. "Al-'Alâqah Bayn al-Tarâjim wa-al-Ḥawâdith fi Ḥawliyyât Inbâ' al-Ghumr bi-Abnâ' al-'Umr." *Majallat Ma'had al-Makhtûât al-'Arabîyah* (1985), vol. 29, part 2, pp. 631-646.

_____. *Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalânî Mu'arrikhan*. Beirut: 'Âlam al-Kutub, 1987.

Al-Jalîlî, Maḥmud. "Tarjamat Ibn Khaldun lil-Maqrîzî." *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmî al-'Iraqî*, vol. 13 (1966), pp. 215-242.

Lapidus, Ira M. "The Evolution of Muslim Urban Society." *Comparative Studies in Societies and History*, vol. 15 (1973), pp. 21-50.

_____. *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Lemercier-Quelquejay, Chantale. "La Structure sociale du Caucase du Nord au XVIe." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, vol. XXV, nos. 2&3 (April -September 1984), pp. 125-148.

Levanoni, Amalia. "The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate". *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 26 (1994), pp. 373-392.

_____. "Al-Maqrîzî's account of the Transition from Turkish to Circassian Mamluk Sultanate: History in the Service of Faith." In *The Historiography of Islamic Egypt (C. 950-1800)*, edited by Hugh Kennedy, pp. 93-105. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 2001.

Levanoni, Amalia. "Rank-and-File Mamluks versus Amirs: New Norms in the Mamluk Military Institutions." In *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*, edited Thomas Philipp and Ulrich Haarman, pp. 17-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

_____. *A Turning Point in Mamlûk History: The Third Reign of al-Nâsir Muḥammad Ibn Qalâwûn (1310-1341)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Little, Donald P. "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Four Mamluk Chronicles for 737-45." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 19 (1974), pp. 252-268.

_____. "A Comparison of a-Maqrîzî and al-'Aynî as Historians of Contemporary Events." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 7, no. 2 (2003), pp. 205-215.

_____. "Historiography of the Ayyûbid and Mamluk Epochs." In *The Cambridge History of Egypt 640-1517*, vol. I, edited by Carl Petry, pp. 412-444. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

_____. *An Introduction to Mamlûk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of an-Malik al-Nâsir Muḥammad ibn Qalâ'ûn*. Freiburger Islamstudien; 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1970.

_____. "The Use of Documents for the Study of Mamluk History." *Mamluk Studies*, vol. 1 (1997), pp. 1-13.

_____. "Relations between Jerusalem and Egypt during the Mamluk Period According to Literary and Documentary Sources." In *Egypt and Palestine: A Millennium of Association (868-1948)*, edited by A. Cohen and Gabriel Baer, pp. 73-93. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.

Marçais. W. "Al-'Aynî." *EF*² vol. 1, p. 814.

Martel-Thoumian, Bernadette. "L'administration d'Alep sous les Mamluks circassiens (IXe-XVe siècle): Le cas des Banu Saffah." In *Revue du Monde musulman et de la Méditerranée*. Vol. 62 (1991), pp. 72-80.

_____. *Les Civils et l'Administration dans l'état militaire mamlûk (IXe/XVe siècle)*. Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1992.

Massoud, Sami G. "Al-Maqrîzî as a Historian of the Reign of Barqûq." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 7:2 (2003), pp. 119-35.

_____. "Notes on the Contemporary Sources of the Year 793." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 9:1 (2005), pp. 163-205.

Mordtmann, J.H. and Ménage, V.L. "Dhû'l-Kadr." *EI*², vol. 2, pp. 246-7.

Muir, William. *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt, 1260-1517 A.D.* London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1896.

Northrup, Linda S. *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of al-Mansûr Qalâwûn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678-689A.H./1279-1290A.D.)*. Freiburger Islamstudien; 18. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998.

Ouéchek, Émilie E. *Index général de la "Description de Damas" de Sauvaire*. Damas: Institut Français de Dams, 1954.

Petry, Carl F. *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

_____. *Protectors or Praetorians? The Last Mamluk Sultans and Egypt's Waning as a Great Power*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

_____. "Al-Sakhâwî." *EI*², vol. 8, pp. 881-2.

_____. *Twilight of Majesty: The Reigns of Mamluk Sultans Al-Ashraf Qâytbây and Qansûh al-Ghawrî in Egypt*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1993.

Popper, William. "Abû al-Mahâsin, Djamâl al-Dîn Yûsuf Ibn Taghrîbirdî." In *EI*², vol. 1, p. 142.

_____. *The Cairo Nilometer; Studies in Ibn Taghrî Birdî's Chronicles of Egypt: I*. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 12. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951.

_____. *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans, 1382-1468: Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghrîbirdî's Chronicle of Egypt*. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vol. 13. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955.

Pouzet, Louis. *Damas au VII^e/XIII^e, vie et structures religieuses dans une métropole islamique*. Beirut : Dâr al-Machreq, 1991.

Rabî', Hasanayn Muḥammad. *The Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564-741/A.D. 1169-1341*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Rahmani, Aftab Ahmad. "The Life and Works of Ibn Hajar al-'Ashqalânî." *Islamic Culture*, vol. 46 (1972) pp. 75-81, 171-8, vol. 47 (1973), pp. 57-74, 159-174.

Reisman, David C. "A Holograph MS of Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's 'Dhayl.'" *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 2 (1998), pp. 19-49.

_____. "Review of Adnan Darwish's edition of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's *Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah*." *Mamlûk Studies Review*, vol. 5 (2001), pp. 175-80.

Rosenthal, Franz. *A History of Muslim Historiography*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.

_____. "Al-Fâsî." *EI²*, vol. 8, pp. 828-9.

Sadeque, Syedah Fatima. *Baybars I of Egypt*. Dacca: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Salibi, Kamal S. "Listes Chronologiques des Grands Cadis de l'Égypte sous les mamelouks." *Revue des Études Islamiques*, vol. 25 (1957), pp. 81-125.

_____. *Maronite Historians of Mediæval Lebanon*. Beirut: The American Univesrity of Beirut, 1959.

Sauvaget, Jean. "Esquisse d'une histoire de la ville de Damas." *Revue des études Islamiques*. VIII (1934), pp. 421-480.

_____. "Noms et surnoms de Mamelouks." *Journal Asiatique*, vol. CCXXXVIII (1950), pp. 31-58.

Schacht, Joseph. "Ibn Kâdî Shuhba." *EI²*, vol. 3, p. 814.

Al-Shâmî, Ahmad 'Abd al-Majîd. *Dirâsah fî Makhtûât Târîkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulûk, al-ma'rûf bi-Târîkh Ibn al-Furât al-Hanafî*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Anjilû al-Misrîyah, 1983.

Smith, M. "Al-Bistâmî." *EI²*, vol. 1, p. 1248.

Smith, J.M. Jr. "Djalâyir, Djalâyirid." *EI²*, vol. 2, pp. 401-2.

Strauss, E. "L'Inquisition dans l'état Mamlouk." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*. Vol. XXV, 1950, pp. 11-26.

Sümer, F. "Kara-Koyunlu." *EI²*, vol. 4, pp. 607-12

Thorau, Peter. *The Lion of Egypt: Sultan Baybars I and the Near East in the Thirteenth Century*. London and New York: Longman, 1992.

Tritton, A. S. "The Tribes of Syria in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and Asiatic Studies*, vol. 12 (1947), pp. 567-573.

Udovitch, A.L. "Fals." *EI²*, vol. 2, pp. 786-8.

Van Arendonk, C. and Schacht, Joseph. "Ibn Hadjar al-'Asqalânî." *EI²*, vol. 2, pp. 776-778.

Wansbrough, John. "Faradj, al-Malik al-Nâsir Zayn al-Dîn Abu'l-Sa'âdat." *EI*², vol. 2, pp. 781-782. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Weil, Gustav. *Geschichte des Abbasidenchalifats in Egypten*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1860, 1862.

Wiet, Gaston. "Barkuk, al-Malik al-Zâhir Sayf al-Dîn." *EI*², vol. 1, pp. 1082-83. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.

Wiet, Gaston. *Les biographies du Manhal Safi*. Cairo: Institut Français d'archéologie orientale, 1932.

Ziyâdah, Muḥammad Mustafâ. *Al-Mu'arrikhun fî Misr fî al-Qarn al-Khamis 'Ashar al-Miladi*. Cairo: Matba'at Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa-al-Tarjamah wa-al-Nashr, 1949.

_____. "Târîkh Hayât al-Maqrîzî." In *Dirâsât 'an al-Maqrîzî*, pp. 13-22. Cairo: Al-Hay'ah al-Misrîyah al-'Âmmah lil-Ta'lif wa-al-Nashr, 1971.

Ziadeh, Nicola A. *Urban Life in Syria under the Early Mamluks*. Beirut: American University Publications, 1953.

Ziadeh, Nicola A. "Town Administration in Syria under the Early Mamluks." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Congress of Orientalists*, pp. 206-227. Edited by Zeki Velidi Togan. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.

An Analysis of the Annalistic Sources of the Early Mamluk Circassian Period

Volume Two

by

Sami Gabriel Massoud
Institute of Islamic Studies
McGill University
October 2005
Montreal, Canada

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at
McGill University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.

© Sami G. Massoud, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME TWO

General remarks	1
TABLES OF CHAPTER ONE: The Annal of the Year 778/1376-7	
The Sources	3
Table I. 1. A.	
Political, Military and Administrative Affairs [PMA]	4
Religious Life [RL]	40
Social History/Miscellany [SHM]	45
Foreign Affairs [FA]	48
Table I. 1. B.	49
Table I. 2. A.	
i. Ibn Khaldûn: <i>Kitâb al- 'Ibar</i>	55
ii. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir: <i>Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk</i>	56
iii. Ibn Duqmâq: a. <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	57
b. <i>Nuzhat al-Anâm</i>	58
iv. Ibn al-Furât: <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	59
v. Al-'Aynî: <i>'Iqd al-Jumân</i> : a. Ist.B2	60
b. DK	61
vi. Ibn al-'Irâqî: <i>Al-Dhayl 'alá al- 'Ibar</i>	62
vii. Al-Maqrîzî: <i>Kitâb al-Sulûk</i>	63
viii. Ibn Hajar: <i>Inbâ' al-Ghumr</i>	64
ix. Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: <i>Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: TIQS</i>	65
x. Ibn Taghrîbirdî: <i>Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah</i>	66
xi. Al-Sakhâwî: <i>Wajîz al-Kalâm</i>	67
xii. 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ al-Malaṭî: <i>Nayl al-Amal</i>	68
xiii. Ibn Iyâs: <i>Badâ' i ' al-Zuhûr</i>	69
xiv. Anonymous: <i>Jawâhir al-Sulûk</i>	70
TABLES OF CHAPTER TWO: The Annal of the Year 793/1390-1	
The Sources	71
Table II. 1. A.	
Political, Military and Administrative Affairs [PMA]	72
Religious Life [RL]	133
Social History/Miscellany [SHM]	139
Foreign Affairs [FA]	143

vi. Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: a. 2 nd . Recension of Ibn Hjjî's <i>Târîkh</i>	258
b. <i>Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah: TIQS</i>	259
c. 1 st . Recension of Ibn Hjjî's <i>Târîkh</i>	260
vii. Ibn Taghrîbirdî: <i>Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah</i>	261
viii. Al-Jawharî: <i>Nuzhat al-Nufus</i>	262
ix. 'Abd al-Bâsit al-Malaṭî: <i>Nayl al-Amal</i>	263
x. Ibn Iyâs: <i>Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr</i>	264
x. Anonymous: <i>Jawâhir al-Sulûk</i>	265

Table III. 2. B.

i. Al-'Aynî and al-Maqrîzî	266
----------------------------	-----

General remarks:

The logic behind the overall composition of the appendices to my work has been thoroughly explained in the introduction of volume one,¹ but a few points are worth mentioning again concerning Tables **I. 1. A.**, **II. 1. A.** and **III. 1. A.**² These contain, it should be stressed, the *rendering and not the translating* into English of much of the contents of the three annals analyzed within the framework of this dissertation. I have endeavoured however, to the extent possible, to convey as precisely and as completely as possible the meaning intended by the authors whose works were surveyed.

Since my intention, then, was not to translate these works, the editorial commentaries that accompany the text of these tables have been kept to a minimum: had I provided footnoted information concerning every single person or location mentioned in the sources, or commented about the latter's linguistic characteristics, all to be sure worthy endeavours, my research would have gone in a direction that I never intended it to take.

Thus the commentaries consigned in the footnotes do not cover all people and places, but concentrate rather on those mentioned in the three chapters of volume one. As a matter of fact, my remarks in the three tables mentioned above are intended to complement those, quite numerous, to be found in the text of volume one.

A few comments are in order here concerning the symbols and editorial techniques I have utilized:

- In a given report, I have placed between brackets [] information which is essential to our understanding of this report but is not however present in it, or made commentaries of an editorial nature.
- Braces {} allowed me to summarize usually longer reports that would have been too arduous or simply unnecessary to render completely into English.
- Parentheses () appear when I have chosen to include in an entry transliterated Arabic words or sentences found in a report, in order to make or to clarify a point.
- The plus sign + at the beginning of a secondary entry indicates that the data that follows it constitutes additional information to a body common to this secondary entry and to the primary one.
- In a secondary entry, suspension points that appear on either or both sides of usually a few words or a short sentence – for example, ...Barqûq... – signify that information thus framed is a variation of a theme, name or idea found usually in the main entry.
- A hyphen between two brackets [-] within the body of a primary or secondary entry indicates the presence in the original text, of a report other than the one being dealt with in the entry.

¹ See pp. 17-20.

² These are the only tables in this volume that contain text.

- In those primary and secondary entries that deal with two or three works from one author,³ a page or folio number(s) written in bold implies that the text of the entry was taken from one source rather than the other(s). Consequently, when more than one page or folio number(s) appear in bold, this means that material from more than one source was used in the text of the entry, in which case a front slash / acts as a separator.
- When in a primary or secondary entry I have had recourse to English translations authored by individuals other than me,⁴ suspension points between two brackets [...] mean that I have omitted certain parts of the English text.
- The symbol [?] that follows usually a given word or short series of words denotes uncertainty as to their spelling in the Arabic original, or, when transliterated, as to their meaning. In the case of uncertainty concerning spelling, I have provided a rendering of the Arabic based on my personal deciphering of the text.
- The symbol [...?] indicates that a word or a short series of words are missing either because I simply could not figure out the way they were written or the manuscript was too degraded.
- When the letter c in the word citadel is capitalized, I am referring to the citadel of Cairo.
- The following pairs of words have been used interchangeably throughout the tables and the text of the dissertation: *nâ'ib* and viceroy; *niyâbah* and viceroyalty; appointment and nomination; qadi and judge; *tawâshî* and eunuch; etc.
- In **The Sources** section at the beginning of the tables of each chapter, when three page or folio numbers appear after a title, the last two indicate that the obituaries are enclosed within.

³ For example, the likes of Ibn Duqmâq and Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah from whom we have, respectively, *Nuzhat al-Anâm*, *Al-Nafḥah* and *Al-Muntaqâ min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq*, and *Târikh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* and the two recensions of *Târikh Ibn Hijiî*.

⁴ Mostly from Brinner and Popper. See footnote no. 74 in the Introduction of volume one.

TABLES OF CHAPTER ONE
778/1376-7

The Sources

- [IK] = Ibn Khaldûn = *Kitâb al-'Ibar* = vol. 5, pp. 462-5
= *Al-Ta'rif* = pp. 321-2.
- [ZDT] = Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir = *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* = MS Marsh 319, fols.133b-139a-148a
- [ID]⁵ = Ibn Duqmâq = *Nuzhat al-Anâm* = MS orient. A 1572, fols. 109a-117a-127a
= *Al-Nafhah* = pp. 216-22
- [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] = Ibn al-Furât = *Al-Muntaqâ* = MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 28a-41a-45b
- [IS] = Ibn Saṣrâ = *Al-Durrah al-Muḍî'ah* = p. 189
- ['Aynî] = Al-'Aynî = *'Iqd al-Jumân* = Ist.B2 = MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fols. 58b-60b-61a
= DK = Dâr al-Kutub MS 1584 *târîkh* 1584, fols. 199-214-221
- [II] = Ibn al-'Irâqî = *Al-Dhayl 'alâ al-'Ibar* = vol. 2, 427-431-459
- [Maq.] = Al-Maqrîzî = *Kitâb al-Sulûk* = vol. 3:1, pp. 264-295-302.
- [IH] = Ibn Hajar = *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* = vol.1, pp. 191-199-230.
- [IQS] = Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah = *Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* = *TIQS* = vol. 3, pp. 505-517-539
- [IT] = Ibn Taghrîbirdî = *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* = vol. 11, pp. 55-94, 118-123
- [Sakh.] = Al-Sakhâwî = *Wajîz al-Kalâm* = vol. 1, pp. 221-225-230
- [ABM] = 'Abd al-Bâsiṭ al-Malaṭî = *Nayl al-Amal* = vol. 2, pp. 109-122
- [IY] = Ibn Iyâs = *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* = vol. 1:2, pp. 164-196-199
- [Anon.] = Anonymous = *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* = MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fols. 265b-271b

⁵ Within the brackets found at the end of entries, I have consigned non-textual data: the date of the report, its page or folio number(s) and, in the case of authors with multiple works, the abbreviation of pertinent titles. In the case of Duqmâqian entries [ID], when no abbreviation of a title is given before a folio number(s), we are dealing with *Nuzhat al-Anâm*; when an entry contains material from the latter work and from *Al-Nafhah*, the folio number(s) is followed by a front slash then by the title *Al-Nafhah* and a page number; if only *Al-Nafhah* is used, only this title and a page number appear. See, for example, PMA25 and 26, below.

TABLE I. 1. A.

Political, Military and Administrative Affairs [PMA]

PMA1. – [**‘Aynî**] {Long list of military, administrative and religious officials in Egypt and Syria, and of foreign rulers} [Ist.B2 **58b**/DK 199-200]

– Shakh.: The year begins and the *nâ’ib* of Egypt is Âqtamur al-Hanbalî. [221]

PMA2. – [**ID**] The *wazîr* Tâj al-Dîn al-Nashû was removed from power and exiled to al-Karak [First decade of Muḥarram; 109a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [28a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 200]

– Maq.: [264]

– IH: [192]

– IQS: [505]

– ABM: [109]

– IY: The sultan changed his mind about al-Nashû, and issued an edict exiling him to al-Karak. One of the emirs went to the citadel and interceded in his favour [164]

PMA3. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] News arrived in Cairo about what had happened to the pilgrims in terms of killing and looting [First decade of Muḥarram; 28a]

PMA4. – [**Maq.**] Qadi Ibn Jamâ‘ah summoned the *dawâdâr* of Âqtamur al-Hanbalî, the *nâ’ib al-saltanah*, rebuked him in his court and criticized his master because of the iniquities of his rulings. The cause of this was that the qadi had learned that the *dawâdâr* had hit a creditor in front of his debtor. The *dawâdâr* made himself agreeable to the qadi and tried to win his favour until he escaped from his court, his heart full of fear [During Muḥarram; 264]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: Qadi Ibn Jamâ‘ah summoned the *dawâdâr* of Âqtamur al-Hanbalî, the *nâ’ib al-saltanah*, rebuked him in his court and criticized his master because of the iniquities of his rulings. {Verse by al-‘Attâr} [Last decade of Muḥarram; 28a]

– ABM: + “Now consider that age and ours: would a *qâdî al-quḍât* dare to summon Azbak the *atâbak*’s *dawâdâr*, let alone a lowly mamluk (*ghulâm*) of his?” [109]

– IY: + when Âqtamur al-Hanbalî heard this, he went to the qadi, made himself agreeable to him until he pardoned him and spared him a rebuke [165]

PMA5. – [**IY**] Al-Maqsî grew restless in the position of *wazîr* and resigned [n.d.; 164]

PMA6. – [**ID**] The sultan issued an edict summoning Karîm al-Dîn ibn al-Ghannâm who had been in Mecca to come therefrom to assume the *wizârah*. Two messengers were sent to him [During Safar; 109a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [28a]

– ‘Aynî: [DK 200]

– Maq.: [First of Safar; 264]

- IH: [192]
- ABM: [109]
- IY: [164]

PMA7. – **[ID]** Removal of ‘Alî Khân, the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî [Last decade of Safar; 109a]

- Maq.: [28th of Safar; 265]
- IY: [164]

PMA8. – **[ID]** Removal of Aḥmad ibn Ghurlû, the *mutawallî* of al-Gharbîyah [During the year; 109a]

PMA9. – **[ID]** Removal of Ḥusayn ibn al-Kûrânî, the *wâlî* of Cairo, and his replacement by Baktamur al-Sayfî Tumântamur [During the year; 109 a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [28a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist 58b/DK 200]
- Maq.: [265]
- IH: Al-Sharîf Baktamur was nominated as *wâlî* of Cairo [192]
- IY: [164]

PMA10. – **[ID]** Bestowal of an emirate of forty in Aleppo upon Arûs al-Nizâmî [During the year; 109a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [28a]
- Maq.: [265]
- ‘Aynî: [DK 200]
- IY: ...of an emirate of ten... [164]

PMA11. – **[ID]** Nomination of al-Sayyid Baktamur al-Sharîf as *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî [28th of Safar; 109a]

- Maq.: [265]
- IY: [164]

PMA12. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** Reinstatement of Ḥusayn ibn al-Kûrânî as a *wâlî* after the death of Baktamur [18th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 28a]

- Maq.: [265]
- IH: Al-Sharîf Baktamur was removed as *wâlî* and was replaced by Ḥusayn ibn al-Kûrânî [192]
- IY: [165]

PMA13. – **[ID]** Arrival of Ibn al-Ghannâm [11th or 12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 109a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [28a]
- ‘Aynî: [DK 200]
- Maq.: [266]
- IY: [166]

- PMA14. – **[ID]** {Nomination of a new roster of *khâssakîyah* to be housed in the household of Anûk, al-Ashraf's brother, under the guidance of the *tawâshî* Sharaf al-Dîn Mukhtass al-Ashrafî} [Last decade of Rabî' al-Thânî; 109b]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [28b]
 – Maq.: [266]
 – IY: [166]
- PMA15. – **[ID]** {Emir Anûk begot a son from his cousin, the daughter of al-Nâsir Hasan, while the sultan was in Siryâqûs} [During this year; 109b]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29a]
- PMA16. – **[ID]** Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî, the *nâ'ib* of Safad, was summoned to Cairo where he was given an emirate of one hundred [During this year; 109b]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29a-b]
 – Maq.: [268]
 – 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/ DK 200]
 – IQS: [507]
 – IT: [55]
 – IY: [167]
- PMA17. – **[ID]** Nomination of Emir Ibn Aydughmish to an emirate of forty in Aleppo [During this year; 109b]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29b]
 – Maq.: [268]
 – 'Aynî: [DK 200]
- PMA18. – **[ID]** Nomination of Maliktamur min Barakah as *nâ'ib* of al-Karak instead of Tamurbây al-Damurdâshî [Beginning of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 109b-110a]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29b]
 – 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 200]
 – Maq.: [268]
 – IQS: [507]
 – IY: [168]
- PMA19. – **[Maq.]** Tamurbây al-Damurdâshî was nominated *nâ'ib* of Safad instead of Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî and entered that city on Monday the 5th [Beginning of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 268]
 – IQS: [507]
 – IY: [168]
- PMA20. – **[IK]** {Detailed description of the competition between Tashtamur, al-Ashraf's *dawâdâr*, and Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, his *ustâdâr*, which ended with the exile of the latter to Jerusalem. The crisis between the two allowed Tashtamur to implement his plan of gathering the mamluks of Yalbughâ al-'Umarî at court, a move opposed by Âqbughâ Âs} [Middle of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 462]
 – IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, the *ustâdâr*, was arrested, had his property confiscated, and was ordered exiled to Tarsus along with his son

Muhammad. Thanks to the intercession of a member of the *khâssakîyah*, he was exiled to Jerusalem “*battâlan*.” The sultan used to call his son Muhammad, “Sîdî Muhammad.” [12th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 29b]

– ID: Muhammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, the *ustâdâr*, was arrested and exiled to Jerusalem, and was followed by his son Muhammad one day later [110a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 58B /DK 200-1]

– II: [427]

– Maq.: [268]

– IH: [191]

– IQS: [508]

– IT: [55]

– Sakh.: [221]

– ABM: [112]

– IY: [168]

PMA21. – [ID] Tâj al-Dîn al-Nashû was appointed to the *wizârah* for the third time [12th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 110a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29b]

– ‘Aynî: [DK 201]

– Maq.: [268]

– IH: [192]

– IQS: [508]

– ABM: [113]

– IY: [168]

PMA22. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Arrest of Qadi Amîn al-Dîn Mîn, *nâzir al-dawlah*, who was released after a few days [12th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 29b]

– ID: Arrest of Qadi Amîn al-Dîn Mîn who was kept in the *Sâhib*’s hall⁶ then released after a few days [110a]

– Maq.: [268]

– IY: [168]

PMA23. – [ID] Exile of Emir Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Aybak al-Fâfâ, the *amîr akhûr*, to Damascus; his emirate was given to Qarâbughâ, the father of Jariktamur al-Ahmadî al-Khâssakî. [During this year; 110a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29b]

– ‘Aynî: Exile of Emir Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Aybak al-Fâfâ, the *amîr akhûr*, to Damascus [Ist.B2 58b]

– Maq.: [268]

– IY: [168]

PMA24. – [IQS] Arrest of Ibn Qafjaq, the deputy of Ibn Âqbughâ Âs in Damascus [n.d.; 508]

⁶ *Qâ’at al-Sâhib* was located in the northeast areas of the Citadel in Cairo; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 23.

PMA25. – **[IK]** {As the sultan's rule became well established, he decided to perform the pilgrimage} [n.d.; 463]

– ZDT: [139a]

– ID: [*Al-Nafḥah* 216]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: The sultan ordered the emirs to prepare to go to the Hijáz as he decided to perform the pilgrimage [n.d.; 30a]

– Maq.: [269]

– IQS: [508]

– IT: [55]

– ABM: [113, 116]

– IY: [169]

– Anon.: [266a]

PMA26. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** {While preparations for the sultan's *hajj* went apace, al-Ashraf fell sick and experienced many relapses. It was rumoured that some of his doctors and some of the emirs conspired to kill him by trying to convince those medicating him to go along with the plot and to withhold care. Among those who refused to acquiesce to the conspiracy were Qadis Zakî al-Dîn Abû al-Barakât al-Málikî and Jâr Allâh al-Ḥanafî} [n.d.; 30a-b]

– ZDT: {The sickness of the sultan, whose origin was unknown, lasted three months} [138b]

– ID: The Sultan al-Ashraf Sha'bân weakened because of disease [During this year; **110a**/*Al-Nafḥah* 216]

– 'Aynî: [DK 201]

– Maq.: [269]

– IH: [191]

– IQS: [508]

– ABM: [113]

– IY: + Jâr Allâh was knowledgeable in medicine [169]

– Anon.: [266a]

PMA27. – **[Maq.]** {An emir asked the Ḥanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* to allow an exchange in *waqf* property in accordance with his *madhhab*, something that was not common in Egypt and Syria because of the complications inherent to it. Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Mansûr refused. Upon the emir's insistence to acquiesce, he resigned} [n.d.; 269]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: An emir asked the Ḥanafî *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Mansûr to either dissolve some *waqfs* or to allow for an exchange, but he refused to acquiesce. During all this he experienced some weakness, so he resigned for fear of dying in office (“*khishyatan an yamût qâḍiyan*”). People thanked him for doing so [19th of Rajab; 30b]

– IH: [191]

– IQS: [508]

– ABM: + The Ḥanafî *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Mansûr resigned from his office [114]

– IY: [169]

PMA28. – **[ID]** The sultan recovered from his illness, went to the bathhouse, then to Friday prayer. Tidings were sounded for three days and an edict was issued for the city to be decorated. When the sultan came out of Friday prayer, gold and silver were thrown on him. Two days later, he relapsed. [29th of Rajab; **110a**/*Al-Nafhah* 216]

– ZDT: [138b-139a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [30b]

– ‘Aynî: [DK201]

– II: Cairo was decorated because of the recovery of the sultan, but the latter then relapsed [27th of Rajab; 428]

– Maq: [270]

– IH: [191]

– IQS: [508]

– Sakh.: [222]

– ABM: [114]

– IY: [169]

PMA29. – **[IQS]** Appointment of Shams al-Dîn ibn Tâj al-Dîn ibn Mashkûr as *nâzir al-jaysh* in Damascus upon the death of his father [During Rajab; 509]

PMA30. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** Al-Ashraf Sha‘bân sent his brothers, al-Malik al-Mansûr ibn Hajjî,⁷ and all his cousins to al-Karak accompanied by Sûdun al-Shaykhûnî for the duration of his absence at the *hajj*. All this while, the sultan was weak [19th of Sha‘bân; 31a]

– IK: [463]

– ID: [110a-b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 201]

– II: [428]

– Maq.: + The weather was rainy and cold, so that people felt sorry for them [270]

– IH: [192]

– IQS: [509]

– IT: [19th of Ramadân; 56]

– Sakh.: [222]

– ABM: [114]

– IY: [170]

PMA31. – **[ID]** The *tawâshî* Zuhayr al-Dîn Mukhtâr al-Husâmî was appointed *muqaddam al-mamâlik al-sultânîyah* instead of Mukhtâr al-Damanhûrî Shâdhrawân, after having been in charge of the sultan’s children [26th of Sha‘bân; 110b]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [27th of Sha‘bân; 31a-b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 201]

– Maq.: [270]

– IY: [170]

⁷ This person could be al-Mansûr Muhammad ibn al-Muzaffar Hajjî, al-Ashraf’s cousin whom he replaced as sultan in 764/1363.

PMA32. – **[ID]** The *tawâshî* Naṣr al-Bâlisî became an emir of ten and *muqaddam* of the sultan's children, instead of Mukhtâr al-Husâmî [26th of Sha'bân; 110b]

PMA33. – **[ID]** Iyâs al-Sarghitmishî, the *dawâdâr* of the sultan's children, received an emirate of forty and was made *dawâdâr ṣaghîr* by the sultan [26th of Sha'bân; 110b]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [27th of Sha'bân; 31b]

– 'Aynî: [DK 201]

– Maq.: ... was made by the sultan *dawâdâr thâni* [270]

– IY: [170]

PMA34. – **[ID]** Nomination of Yalbughâ al-Manjakî and Mughultây al-Badrî Husayn to emirates of forty, and of Quṭlûbughâ al-Buzlârî, Tashtamur al-Muḥammadî al-Laffâf and Alṭunbughâ al-'Alâ'î, to emirates of ten [26th of Sha'bân; 110b-111a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 202]

– Maq.: [270]

– IY: [170]

PMA35. – **[IQS]** Emir Nâsir al-Dîn the son of *nâzir al-haramayn*, became *hâjib* in Damascus instead of Ibn Qafjaq [During Sha'bân; 509]

PMA36. – **[ID]** Emir Sayf al-Dîn Âqtamur al-Sâhibî al-Hanbalî was removed from the *niyâbat al-saltanah*, was nominated *amîr kabîr barrânî*⁸ and sat in the Îwân⁹ [11th of Ramadân; 110b]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31b]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 199-200]

– II: [428]

– Maq.: + The position of *niyâbat al-saltanah* was abolished [271]

– IQS: Emir Sayf al-Dîn Âqtamur al-Sâhibî was removed from the *niyâbat al-saltanah* and became jobless [–] The position of *niyâbat al-saltanah* was abolished [509]

– IT: The sultan removed Âqtamur al-Sâhibî al-Hanbalî from the *niyâbat al-saltanah* and nominated him *atâbak al-'asâkir* [55]

– Sakh.: [222]

– ABM: [115]

– IY: [170]

PMA37. – **[ID]** Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî became *hâjib al-hujjâb* [11th of Ramadân; 110b]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31b]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 201]

– II: [428]

– Maq.: [271]

⁸ The term *barrânî* refers to the fact that an emir was no longer part of the sultan's inner circle, his *khâssakîyah*.

⁹ The large portico hall located in the Royal areas of the Citadel of Cairo; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 20.

- IQS: [509]
- ABM: [115]
- IY: [170]

PMA38. – **[ID]** Nomination of Ballût al-Şarghitmishî, the *amîr mashwî*, as *shâdd al-sharâbkhânâh* [11th of Ramadân; 110b]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31b]
- Maq.: [271]
- IY: [170]

PMA39. – **[ID]** ‘Alamdâr al-Muḥammadî was summoned by the sultan from Damascus and upon his arrival during the last decade of the month, he was given an emirate of one hundred [11th of Ramadân; 110b]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 58b/DK 201-2]
- Maq.: [271]
- IQS: [509]
- IY: [170]

PMA40. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** The sultan recovered and headed to Barr al-Jîzah and back. People rejoiced at this [During Ramadân; 31b]

- Maq.: [271]
- IT: The sultan went to Siryâqûs as was his habit every year, and then came back to Cairo after having recovered [56]

PMA41. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** As a result of his recovery, the sultan firmly resumed preparations for the *hajj* by ordering his *khâssakîyah* ready and provisions sent to the stations along the route to Mecca [During Ramadân; 31b]

- Maq.: [271]
- ABM: + The soldiers’ restlessness increased because of the preparations to accompany the sultan to the *hajj* [115]
- IY: [Sha‘bân, Shawwâl; 170, 171]

PMA41’ – **[IY]** Nomination of al-Sharîf ‘Âṣim as *kâshif* al-Wajh al-Qiblî [During Ramadân; 171]

PMA42. – **[ID]** Nomination of Mughultây al-Jamâlî as *jâshnakîr* in replacement of Jurjî al-Bâlisî because of the latter’s death [4th of Shawwâl; 111a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [31b]
- Maq.: [271]
- IY: ...as *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Baḥrî... [171]

PMA43. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** The sultan ordered Âqtamur al-Hanbalî along with a number of emirs and troops to go to al-Wajh al-Qiblî and to stay there until his return, in order to protect it from Arab tribesmen [During Shawwâl; 32a]

- Maq.: [272]
- IH: [192]

- IQS: [510]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: [171]

PMA44. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan sent emirs and troops to the Alexandria, Damietta and other coastal forts to protect them from the Franks [During Shawwâl; 32a]

- Maq.: [272]
- IH: [192]
- IQS: [510]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: [171]

PMA45. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan ordered emirs and troops housed in locations in Cairo, the Old City and outside of them, in order to protect the population [During Shawwâl; 32a]

- Maq.: [272]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: The sultan nominated a number of *hâjibs* and spread them in various neighbourhoods and quarters to protect Cairo and the Old City [171]

PMA46. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan nominated Aydamur al-Shamsî as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* in the Citadel and Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî as *nâ'ib al-saltanah* [During Shawwâl; 32a]

- ID: [112a]
- IF: [32a]
- 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 204]
- II: [429]
- Maq.: [272]
- IQS: [510]
- IT: + The sultan nominated Aydamur al-Shamsî as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* in the Citadel along with two other emirs [57-58]
- Sakh.: [223]
- ABM: The sultan made Âqtamur 'Abd al-Ghanî his *nâ'ib* in Cairo [116]
- IY: [171]

PMA47. – **[ID]** {Prescription by the sultan of a ceremonial to honour his family to be followed by the emirs remaining behind in Cairo} [During Shawwâl; 112a]

- IK: [463]
- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [32a]
- Maq.: [272]
- IT: [58]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: [171]
- Anon.: [266b]

PMA48. – **[ZDT]** {While the sultan was firm in his decision to go to the Hijâz, people of good will and members of the elite (“*al-sulahâ’ wa-al-a’yân*”) tried, in vain, to persuade him not to because of bad omen} [n.d.; 139a]

- ID: [112a]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [32a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 204]
- Maq.: [272]
- IT: [56, 58]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: + {Quotation by Ibn Hajar in which he reported the dream of a Malîkî shaykh who saw the Prophet in a dream in which he predicted the demise of al-Ashraf} [171-2]
- Anon.: [266a]

PMA49. – **[ID]** Departure of the emirs’ contingents for the Hijâz [12th of Shawwâl; **111a/Al-Nafhah** 216]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [32 a]
- ‘Aynî: 22nd of Shawwâl; [Ist.B2 59a/DK 202]
- Maq.: [272]
- IT: [56]
- ABM: [116]
- IY: [172]
- Anon.: The emirs’s contingents departed one after the other and headed towards Birkat al-Hajj [266a]

PMA50. – **[Maq.]** {Detailed description of the departure of the sultan’s contingents, and especially the appearance of the trains of provisions and their contents. People frowned upon the entertainers who were part of the convoy, as their presence was unbecoming for a train headed for the hajj} [13th of Shawwâl; 272-3]

- IK: [463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: + {Verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr} [32a-b]
- ID: [111a/*Al-Nafhah* 216]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 52 a/DK 202]
- II: [428]
- Maq.: [272-3]
- IS: [189]
- IT: [56]
- Sakh.: [222]
- ABM: [116, 117]
- IY: + It was reported that the sultan’s train also carried wine from Gaza, something which prompted people to say: “How can a person heading to the hajj bring such things with him?” [172, **174**]
- Anon.: The sultan’s contingents departed first [266a]

PMA51. – **[Maq.]** The sultan entrusted to their mamluks the care of his two children and the protection of the Citadel, and designated Emir ‘Alî as his successor in case he died [n.d.; 274]

- IK: [463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: “The sultan said: ‘If I die, bestow the sultanate upon Emir ‘Alí’” [32a]
- IY: When the sultan headed to the *khânaqâh* of Siryâqûs, he wrote his testament, and appointed his son, Emir ‘Alî, as heir to the throne, and after him, his brother [174]

PMA52. – **[ID]** Departure of the sultan for Mecca by means of Siryâqûs where he remained one day [14th of Shawwâl; **111a-b**/*Al-Nafhah* 216]

- IK: [12th of Shawwâl; 463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: The sultan stayed one day at Siryâqûs [32b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 202]
- II: [428]
- Maq.: [274]
- IH: [193]
- IQS: The sultan left for the *hajj* [13th of Shawwâl; 510]
- IT: The sultan left for the *hajj* in great pomp [13th of Shawwâl; 56]
- Sakh.: [222]
- ABM: When he left Cairo, he remained in Siryâqûs for the night of the 15th of Shawwâl [117]
- IY: That day, when the sultan came down from the Citadel, he headed towards the *khânaqâh* where he remained [–] one day and one night [172, **174**]
- Anon.: The sultan headed for Siryâqûs where he remained until the 22nd of Shawwâl [12th and 14th of Shawwâl; 266a]

PMA53. – **[ID]** From Siryâqûs, the sultan headed towards Birkat al-Hajj where he remained until the 22nd of Shawwâl [15th of Shawwâl; **111b**/*Al-Nafhah* 216]

- IK: [463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [32b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 203]
- II: [428-9]
- Maq.: [274]
- IT: [57]
- Sakh.: [222]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [174]
- Anon.: [266b]

PMA54. – **[ID]** The sultan departed from Birkat al-Hajj towards the Hijâz [22nd of Shawwâl; **111b**/*Al-Nafhah* 216]

- IK: [463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [32b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 203]
- II: [429]
- Maq.: [274]
- IH: [193]
- IT: [57]

- ABM: [117]
- IY: [174]
- Anon.: [266b]

PMA55. – **[ID]** {List of the military personnel accompanying the sultan: emirs of one hundred, forty and ten} [111b-112a]

- IK: [463]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [32b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 203-4]
- II: The sultan was accompanied by a number of emirs of one hundred, forty and ten [428]
- Maq.: [274-5]
- IQS: [510]
- IT: [57]
- Sakh.: [222]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [173-4]
- Anon.: [266a]

PMA56. – **[IY]** {The sultan brought with him those he feared and left behind those he trusted but fate had it otherwise. Verse} [n.d.; 171]

- Anon.: [266b]

PMA57. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** {List of the religious and civilian personnel accompanying the sultan} [32b]

- IK: [463]
- Maq.: [275]
- IQS: [510]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [172-3]

PMA58. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** {Arrival and stay of the sultan’s party in ‘Aqabat Aylâ as was the habit of pilgrims. His harem and the emirs’ contingents arrived the following day} [Tuesday, the 28th of Shawwâl; 32b]

- ID: [113a]
- IK: The sultan stayed at ‘Aqabah as was the habit of the pilgrims [463]
- Maq.: [275]

PMA59. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** At ‘Aqabah, the sultan’s mamluks asked al-Ashraf to provide them with fodder, but he told them to wait until al-Azlam. To their request for a money payment for them to spend on their soldiers (“*ghulmân*”), the sultan responded that he had only fodder. When they insisted, he told them off. They then went to Arghûn Shâh al-Ashrafî, the *ra’s nawbah*, informed him about what had happened between them and the sultan, and they told him that if al-Ashraf did not acquiesce, they would kill him. Arghûn Shâh told the mamluks to wait until he spoke to the sultan. They then went to Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Dawâdâr and told him about what had happened to them and said that they would kill the sultan if he did not provide them with their payment. Tashtamur

told them to hold back until he spoke to al-Ashraf. But when he did meet with him, he was rebuked and was told: “You boss me around in Cairo and here as well?” He then told the mamluks what had happened. These were mostly young men the most senior of whom had been Yalbughâ al-‘Umari’s mamluks, and they decided to kill the sultan and those who were part of his entourage. They went to see Tashtamur after they had armed themselves and surrounded his tent, and told him: “Ride along with us, or we will kill you.” He had no choice but to join them along with his mamluks and Emirs Mubârak al-Tâzî, Sarâytamur al-Muhammadî and Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Tawîl. A clash took place between them and the sultan and his entourage, namely Arghûn Shâh, Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî, Bashtak al-Khâssakî, Arghûn al-‘Izzî and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, during which the latter were defeated. It was said that when the mamluks rebelled, they went to the sultan’s tent where he was in conversation with his entourage. When the sultan’s party heard the movement of horses outside the tent, they sent somebody to check it out; upon his return he told the sultan that the mamluks were war-ready. Al-Ashraf ordered his emirs to arm themselves and to ride out with him as the mamluks attacked his tent and cut off its ropes. The emirs put off the candles and the lights and fled along with the sultan [Wednesday, the 29th of Shawwâl; 34a-b]

– IK: At ‘Aqabah, the mamluks, especially the Yalbughâwîs who were the most numerous, were eager to take power, so they went to extreme of ill-behaviour in their pursuit of gain, while officials (“*al-mubâshirûn*”) did their best to placate them. The mamluks thus requested the rations of fodder due to them at al-Azlam, but the officials excused themselves from doing so by arguing that these had already been sent ahead. The mamluks did not acquiesce and they remained mobilized during that night. Al-Ashraf convoked Tashtamur al-Dawâdâr, the most senior amongst them, and spoke with him about diminishing the mamluks’ resolve. Tashtamur then went out and spoke to them. The following day the mamluks, who were led by Mubârak al-Tâzî, Sarâytamur al-Muhammadî and Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î, lined up, made Tashtamur ride along with them and prevented him from meeting with the sultan. The sultan rode out with his retinue thinking that the mamluks would back off from their plan or that some of them would join him, but to no avail as they had decided to fight him. When they saw his train, they showered it with arrows, so the sultan took to the sea along with his emirs, namely Arghûn Shâh, the *atâbak*, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and Muhammad ibn ‘Îsâ, one of the Arabs of the Dâhiyah, and on his heels, the very young men he had raised to be loyal to him and whom he prepared to occupy positions in his administration [463/*Al-Ta’rîf* 321-2]

– ID: The mamluks asked for fodder, but were told to wait until al-Azlam. Wednesday night, they refused to eat. Thursday evening [the 1st of Dhû al-Qa’dah], Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î, Mubârak al-Tâzî, Sarâytamur al-Muhammadî and Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Tawîl, and most of the sultan’s and the emirs’ mamluks, rode out and fought against al-Ashraf who was defeated along with Arghûn Shâh, Sarghitmish, Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî, Bashtak al-Khâssakî, Arghûn al-‘Izzî and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî [Wednesday, the 29th of Shawwâl-Thursday, the 1st of Dhû al-Qa’dah; 113a/*Al-Nafhah* 216]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 206]

– II: [429]

– Maq.: [279-80]

– IH: When the sultan reached ‘Aqabah, the emirs plotted against him along with most of his mamluks. They asked him for a money payment they had invented. The sultan refused their request, and whomever they spoke to from amongst the emirs they forced to join them under the threat of death. The mamluks then rode out suddenly and skirmished with the *khâssakîyah* during the night, and when al-Ashraf heard about this, he fled back to Cairo [193]

– IQS: [512]

– IT: [59-60]

– Sakh.: [223]

– ABM: [117-8]

– IY: + The sultan staggered out of the tent, not knowing in which direction to head, and under the cover of darkness fled along with a group of emirs, namely Bashtak al-Karîmî, a.k.a al-Khâssakî, Arghûn al-‘Izzî, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, Alṭunbughâ Farfûr, and Tashbughâ, each with only one mamluk; all this took place during the night of Thursday the 8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 177-8]

– Anon.: + The sultan fled along with a number of senior emirs and other emirs of forty and of ten, and *sultânî* mamluks [267a-b]

PMA60. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {Qâzân, the *amîr akhûr*, had prepared mounts for the fleeing sultan and his party, and so they headed towards Cairo until they reached Saḥ al-‘Aqabah¹⁰ where they happened upon Ibn ‘Îsá, *muqaddam al-hajjânah al-sultânîyah*. The sultan and his party then mounted the camels and headed towards Cairo} [1st of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34b-35a]

– Maq.: [280]

– IY: [178]

PMA61. – [ID] When the sultan fled, those emirs who had plotted against him assembled at ‘Aqabah, and they offered the sultanate to the caliph, but the latter refused despite their insistence over the course of two days [1st of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 113b]

– IK: [465]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [36b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 208]

– II: [430]

– Maq.: [285]

– IT: + All this and the ‘Aqabah rebels had no knowledge of what had happened in Egypt in terms of the rebellion there and the raising of Emir ‘Alî to the sultanate. The fact is that each group rebelled against the sultan without one knowing about the intentions of the other, as there was no coordination between them about that. It is a strange coincidence, that the sultan would be defeated in ‘Aqabah, and that three days later or less, a rebellion would occur in Cairo and lead to his removal from power and his replacement by his son [62-3]

– Sakh.: [223-4]

– ABM: [118]

– IY: [183]

¹⁰ A station on the pilgrimage route to Mecca located outside of ‘Aqabah; *ibid.* p. 53.

– Anon.: [268b]

PMA62. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] After the flight of the sultan, some of the mamluks wanted to pursue and capture him, but Tashtamur prevented them from doing so. He and the rest of the emirs decide to return to Cairo with the pilgrims for fear of the depredations of the Arab tribesmen. When the populace heard this, they were upset and threw stones at him [1st of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 36a]

– Maq.: + the market was looted [284]

– IH: After the sultan’s flight from ‘Aqabah, people were perturbed [196]

– ABM: [118]

PMA63. – [Maq.] Emir Bahâdur, the *amîr akhûr*, had stocked victuals and fodder at the *khân* of ‘Aqabah, and the mamluks looted as much of the supplies they could [n.d.; 285]

PMA64. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] The emirs, the mamluks and a number of pilgrims headed towards Cairo and climbed to the *Sath* [al-‘Aqabah?] where the forced purchase of most of the victuals and supplies took place [n.d.; 36a]

– Maq.: [285]

PMA65. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] When Tashtamur and his party arrived in *Abyâr al-‘Alâ’î*, the emirs decided to let the *mahmil*, and whoever wanted, to continue to Mecca, and they ordered Emir Bahâdur al-Mushrif, the *amîr akhûr*, to lead them there. The latter refused to do so out of fear of the sultan and out of concern for the latter’s harem. The emirs rewarded him, so he finally acquiesced [n.d.; 36a]

– IK: [465]

– ID: As for the pilgrims, they were taken to Mecca by Emir Bahâdur al-Jamâlî [114a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a, 60b/DK 208, 214]

– II: The rest of the pilgrims headed towards *Bi’r al-‘Alâ’î* and therefrom Emir Bahâdur al-Jamâlî led them on the *hajj* [430]

– Maq.: [285]

– IH: [197]

– IQS: [513]

– IT: [63]

– Sakh.: [224]

– ABM: [118]

– IY: The pilgrims wished to go back to Cairo, but the emirs did not agree to this. They thus appointed Bahâdur al-Jamâlî, the *amîr akhûr kabîr*, to accompany the pilgrims and the *mahmil* to Mecca, and all then left at once [184]

– Anon.: [268b]

PMA66. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {When the mamluks arrived in *Nikh*, they inquired about the sultan and were told that he and his party had passed by on their way to Cairo. When they heard this they feared that the sultan had managed to get to Cairo and to re-establish himself in power. Some of them argued that if they went back to Cairo they would be nailed, as had happened to other people before them. They then looted the sultan’s train and some headed to Syria} [n.d.; 36a-b]

- Maq.: + The mamluks feared that the same fate that befell the *ajlâb* following the demise of Asandamur al-Nâsir¹¹ [in 769], would happen to them [285]
- IH: The sultan's train was looted [197]
- ABM: The monies of the sultan, whose treasury was carried by twenty camels, were looted [118]
- IY: After the sultan's defeat, the mamluks looted all of his belongings, whether money, weapons, horses, camels, provisions, etc. It was said that he had with him twenty Bactrian camels loaded with gold, to be distributed as payment to the soldiers. The mamluks looted all this [183]

PMA67. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Tashtamur al-Dawâdâr headed towards Cairo and was accompanied by some of the mamluks, the Mâlikî *qâdî al-qudât*, the *kâtib al-sirr*, Qadi Taqî al-Dîn ibn al-Qâdî Muḥibb al-Dîn, the *nâzir al-jaysh*, the sultan's harem, and some of those who had wanted to go to the Hijâz but had relented [n.d.; 36b]

- ID: The emirs and the princes' and the sultan's mamluks headed back towards Egypt [114a]
- 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 208]
- II: [430]
- Maq.: [285]
- IH: {The 'Aqabah rebels, and those who were with them travelled all the way back to Cairo} [197]
- IQS: [513]
- IT: [63]
- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: [184]
- Anon.: [268b]

PMA68. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Some historian reported that *ru'ûs al-nawb* and some of the grandees amongst the mamluks [who were later involved in the rebellion in Cairo] had asked from al-Maqsî, the *nâzir al-khâss*, that their due in salary, meat rations, etc., be given to them. He procrastinated and when the wait became too long, they asked with insistence, so he told them: "I have nothing for you, when your *ustâdh* comes back take it from him." [n.d.; 33b]

- IK: [464]
- Maq.: [276]
- IY: [176]

PMA69. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** The sultan's and his sons' mamluks agreed to start a rebellion and to use rumours of al-Ashraf's death to place his son Emir 'Alî [the sultan's heir] on the throne. Those of the sultan's mamluks who remained behind in Cairo made an agreement with those who left for the Hijâz, and with the royal princes' mamluks and most of the emirs' mamluks, that they kill the sultan and his *khâssakîyah* on their way to Mecca. On Saturday the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah, Emirs Tashtamur al-Laffâf, Qaratây al-Tâzî, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî and Aynabak al-Badrî, gathered and promised the mamluks in Cairo, some of the unemployed mamluks and the enlisted troops ("*ajnâd al-*

¹¹ *Al-Manhal*, vol. 2, pp. 440-3.

halqah”) that they would give them a payment of money, either ten thousand dirhams or five hundred dinars. They all agreed upon this, and so the mamluks who were in the Citadel barracks and those who were in the city met at the Sitârah gate [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 33a]

– IK: [463-4]

– ID: On Saturday the 3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah, Emirs Tashtamur al-Laffâf, Qaratây al-Tâzî, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî and Aynabak al-Badrî agreed with the sultan’s mamluks, those of the princes and of the emirs travelling with the sultan, to rebel. So they war-readied themselves, and those who were in the Citadel barracks and those who were in the city met at the Sitârah gate [**112a**/*Al-Nafḥah* 216]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a/DK 204]

– II: [429]

– Maq.: [275-6]

– IH: [193]

– IQS: [511]

– IT: [58]

– Sakh.: [222]

– ABM: [117]

– IY: [174-5]

– Anon.: [266b]

PMA70. – **[ID]** {Mithqâl al-Zimâm, the eunuch, and other officials responsible of the sultan’s children, closed the gates to their quarter. The rebels tried to get a hold of Emir ‘Alî arguing that they wanted to place him on the throne because his father had died. When Mithqâl refused to acquiesce, they forced their way through, looted his quarters and got a hold of the prince} [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; **112a-b**/*Al-Nafḥah* 216-7]

– IK: [464]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [33a-b]

– ‘Aynî: + Al-Zimâm entered the princes’ quarters and brought Emir ‘Alî out to the rebels [Ist.B2 59a/DK **204-5**]

– II: [429]

– Maq.: [276]

– IH: [193]

– IQS: [511]

– IT: [58-9]

– Sakh.: [222]

– ABM: [117]

– IY: + {Verse} [175]

– Anon.: [266b-267a]

PMA71. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** The rebels sat the prince at Bâb al-Sitârah, brought Aydamur al-Shamsî and made him kiss the ground in front of him. They then placed Emir ‘Alî on a horse and headed towards the Great Îwân where he remained for an hour, after which he was anointed al-Malik al-‘Âdil [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 33b]

– IK: [464]

- ID: The rebels sat the prince at Bâb al-Sitârah, brought Aydamur al-Shamsî and made him kiss the ground in front of him. They then placed Emir ‘Alî on a horse and headed towards the Great Îwân where he remained for an hour [112b/*Al-Nafḥah* 217]
- ‘Aynî: + Mithqâl al-Zimâm sat Emir ‘Alî at Bâb al-Sitârah [Ist.B2 59a/DK 205]
- II: They sat him in the Îwân [429]
- Maq.: [276]
- IH: [193]
- IQS: They sat him [on the throne] and made him sultan [511]
- IT: [59]
- Sakh.: They sat him in the Îwân [222]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [175]
- Anon.: [267a]

PMA72. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] When the mamluks rebelled as was said before, it was rumoured that the Turks wore their arms and waited for [al-Maqsî], the *nâzir al-khâss*, to go up to the Citadel, but to no avail. So they rode out to below the Citadel and sent some of their numbers to his house in order to get him, but he was not found. This was because he had vanished since he feared the rebellion of the mamluks on the 5th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah. They went and informed their leaders about this [3rd or 5th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 33b]

- Maq.: [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 276, 277]
- IY: [176]

PMA73. – [Maq.] When *nâzir al-dawlah* Amîn al-Dîn Mîn along with *muqaddam al-dawlah*, al-Ḥâj Sayf, and the rest of the functionaries went to the citadel, they were mistaken for the al-Maqsî and were captured by the mamluks who then locked the Citadel’s gate and put those captured under surveillance [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 277]

- IY: A number of high functionaries went up to the citadel [176]

PMA74. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The rebels summoned the emirs of one hundred, namely Aydamur al-Shamsî, Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, ‘Alamdâr and the rest of the emirs of forty and ten, all of whom then came to Sûq al-Khayl.¹² Emir ‘Alî was brought down to the Stables and settled there, and then most emirs came up to pledge allegiance to him, except Tashtamur al-Ṣâliḥî, Bulât al-Sayfî Uljây a.k.a. Bulât al-Kabîr and Ḥataṭ, the *ra’s nawbah*, who were arrested. Both Altunbughâ Abû Qûrah, the *amîr silâh*, and Emir Tâz, were also summoned, but they did not acquiesce because of illness, and so they were asked to send their mamluks. Before all this, news had reached Aydamur al-Shamsî, Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî, ‘Alamdâr, Tashtamur al-Ṣâliḥî, Sûdun, the *amîr akhûr*, ‘Alî ibn Qashtamur al-Ḥâjib, Abu Bakr ibn Tâz and others, that the sultan’s mamluks and those of his children had agreed to rebel; so the emirs feigned not to take notice of what was going on out of fear for their persons. After things had happened the way the rebels wanted them to, they deprived the emirs of their mamluks [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 33b-34a]

¹² The horse market was located below the western side of the Citadel, just outside the *sultânî* Stables; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 23.

- IK: [246]
- ID: The rebels sent after the emirs who were in the city. These went to Sûq al-Khayl but refused to go up to the Citadel. Emir ‘Alî was brought down to the Stables and settled there, and most emirs then went up and pledged allegiance to him, except Tashtamur al-Sâlihî, Bulât al-Sayfî Uljây aka Bulât al-Kabîr and Hatat, the *ra’s nawbah*, who were arrested. [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 112b/*Al-Nafḥah* 217]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59a-b/DK 205]
- II: [429]
- Maq.: [277]
- IH: [193]
- IQS: [511]
- IT: [59]
- Sakh.: [222-3]
- IY: [175, 176]
- Anon.: [267a]

PMA75. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] {Fearing the restlessness of the populace, the leaders of the rebels, Tashtamur al-Laffâf, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî and Qaratây, and their chief Aynabak, ordered the *wâlî* to proclaim peace and security and for the people to open their shops, to pray for the soul of al-Ashraf, and to wish well to his son and to his *nâ’ib*, Âqtamur al-Hanbalî. When the populace heard this, they gathered in fear and confusion, all this and the mamluks were in a state of war-readiness} [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34a]

- Maq.: [277-8]
- IQS: [511]
- IT: [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 59]
- Sakh.: [223]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [176]

PMA76. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] {The rebels changed Emir ‘Alî’s title from al-‘Âdil to al-Mansûr, an action for which they received the signature of most of the emirs residing in Egypt. They again proclaimed peace and security and then sent after Âqtamur al-Hanbalî to appoint him *nâ’ib al-saltanah* [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34a]

- IK: [464]
- ID: [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 112b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 205]
- II: [429]
- Maq.: [278]
- IH: [193, 195]
- IQS: [511]
- IT: [59]
- Sakh.: They made him a sultan and called him al-Malik al-Mansûr, and he was a boy of eight years [223]
- ABM: [117]
- IY: [175, 176]
- Anon.: [267a]

PMA77. – [IH] [After the proclamation of Emir ‘Alî as al-Mansûr], Akmal al-Dîn [Muḥammad Bâbartî al-Rûmî]¹³ and Diyâ’ al-Dîn al-Qirimî were brought up to the Citadel where they pledged allegiance to the sultan. The new rulers, Tashtamur al-Laffâf, Qaratây al-Tâzî, Asandamur and Aynabak, imprisoned them [–] When the rebels had wanted to make a sultan out of Emir ‘Alî, al-Qirimî had opposed them and scolded them: “Al-Ashraf is your *ustâdh* who was good to you, freed you from jail and gave you money, so why would this be his reward?” They did not heed what he said and wanted to kill him, had it not been for Qaratây who prevented them from doing so [n.d.; 193-4]

PMA78. – [IK] After his defeat at ‘Aqabah, the sultan rode for two nights until he arrived in Birkat al-Hajj at the end of the second. There he got wind of the rebellion in Cairo and what Qaratây had done. Muḥammad ibn ‘Îsâ proposed to go to Damascus, but others said to head to Cairo, something to which the sultan acquiesced [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 464]

– IY: {As for the sultan, when he fled from ‘Aqabah, Muḥammad ibn ‘Îsâ proposed to him to go to Syria where he would have been able to regroup his forces and the Arab tribesmen and thus regain strength in order to win back power. The sultan agreed to this, but not Arghûn Shâh who prevented him from doing so} [179]

– Anon.: {As for the sultan, after the killing of the *khâssakîyah*, Muḥammad ibn ‘Îsâ came to him and proposed to him to go to Syria and to settle in Gaza where he would be able to regroup his forces and the Arab tribesmen and thus regain strength in order to win back power. The sultan wanted to head to Gaza from Nikhl, but the emirs did not agree to that} [267b-268a]

PMA79. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] {The rebels in Cairo divided amongst themselves the positions, money and mamluks of the emirs accompanying the sultan so that all received something. Qaratây al-Tâzî became *atâbak al-‘asâkir*. [As will be noted later, it was Tashtamur al-Laffâf who became *atâbak al-‘asâkir* and Qaratây, *ra’s nawbah*¹⁴]} [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34a]

– IK: He [?] made Aynabak his deputy [464]

– Maq.: [278]

– IH: [196]

– IQS: [511]

– IY: [176-7]

PMA80. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] {A new caliph from the ‘Abbasid family was appointed, and so was a new *kâtib al-sirr*, ‘Izz al-Dîn Hamzah, brother of the incumbent Badr al-Dîn ibn Fadlallah} [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34a]

– Maq.: [278]

– IH: [196]

– IQS: [511-2]

– ABM: A new caliph from the ‘Abbasid family was appointed [117]

¹³ Like al-Qirimî, he was the head of a *khânaqâh*, namely that of Saykhûn; see “Al-Manhal,” Dâr al-Kutub MS 13475 *Târikh*, fols. 736b-737b.

¹⁴ The sentence in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 34a.

– IY: [177]

PMA81. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Al-Maqsî resurfaced and after opening the treasury arranged all matters of state (paying salaries, bestowing robes of investiture, etc.) All this and the rebels were war-ready and eagerly awaiting news} [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 34a]

– IK: The rebels started inquiring about the sultan from caravanners [464]

– Maq.: + since they had promised their colleagues [who were with the sultan] that they would also instigate a rebellion [278-9]

– IQS: [512]

– IY: [177]

PMA82. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan and his party rode until they arrived close to Qubbat al-Naṣr on Sunday the 4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah, the second day of the rebellion in Cairo. There they heard the sound of battle drums, so they send someone to inquire the matter. While the rest of the emirs went into Qubbat al-Naṣr and slept, the sultan and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî headed towards the Citadel [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 35a]

– IK: {The sultan headed toward Cairo until he reached Qubbat al-Naṣr. From there the sultan’s party sent a mamluk to Cairo to inquire about the situation there. As his companions were sleeping out of exhaustion, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî approached the sultan and advised him to go to Cairo in his company and to hide there until matters cleared up} [464]

– ID: As for the sultan, when he arrived in Qubbat al-Naṣr, he headed with Yalbughâ towards Cairo [113a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 207]

– Maq.: [280]

– IH: The emirs who had fled with the sultan and had arrived with him on camelback in Qubbat al-Naṣr, were overwhelmed by sleep [194]

– IQS: [512]

– IT: [60]

PMA83. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** While the rebels were still in arms, news reached them that a person who had been travelling with the sultan had been found disguised and was arrested. He was brought to the leaders of the coup who interrogated him about the whereabouts of the sultan, but he refused to talk. When threatened to be cut at the waist, he told them the news [about what had happened in ‘Aqabah] [–] It was also said that on Sunday afternoon, a great disturbance occurred amongst the people and the shops that were still opened closed down. It was rumoured that a camel driver accompanied by a mamluk had arrived on behalf of the sultan and told of his return. People got all excited and when the mamluks heard this they went wild until they caught the two men one of whom was Qâzân, the *amîr akhûr* of Sarghitmish al-Ashrafî. When he was brought to the leaders of the coup and was asked about the whereabouts of the sultan and his party, he said he knew nothing of them since they parted ways at ‘Aqabah. They did not believe him and they thus beat him and threatened to cut him at the waist, until he told them where they were [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 35a, 35b]

– IK: [464]

– ID: {The rebels found Qâzân al-Yarqashî who told them in detail what had happened in ‘Aqabah and that the sultan was at ‘Ajrûd, but they did not believe

him. When threatened to be cut at the waist, he said that the sultan's party was not too far [112b-113a/*Al-Nafḥah* 217]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b¹⁵/DK 206]

– II: [429]

– Maq.: A disguised man called Qâzân who had been with the sultan, was arrested and brought to the coup leaders. He told them about what had happened in ‘Aqabah and where the sultan was [280]

– IH: A man called Qâzân al-Sarghitmishî arrived and told about the incident in Aqabah [194]

– IQS: [512]

– IT: [59, 60]

– Sakh.: [223]

– ABM: [117]

– IY: [177, 178]

– Anon.: [267a]

PMA84. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] When the sultan and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî reached the vicinity of the Citadel, they heard some movement of people therefrom towards Qubbat al-Naṣr, so they hid there until it was dark [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 35a]

– Maq.: [281]

– IY: The sultan remained lying on the sand behind the Red Hill until the end of the evening, when he left by himself leaving Arghûn Shâh behind [179]

PMA85. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Both Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî and Tûlû al-Sarghitmishî went with Qâzân al-Yarqashî to Qubbat al-Naṣr where they found Emirs Arghûn Shâh, Sarghitmish and Baybughâ al-Sâbiqî, etc. These were slaughtered like sheep and their heads brought to Sûq al-Khayl, with their killers saying: “Pray upon Muḥammad.” {Verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr} [–] Some said that when they came upon the companions of the sultan, these were asleep, others that they were sitting. They were barely alive as they were sleeping from exhaustion, fear, hunger, etc., and when asked about the sultan, they said they did not know his whereabouts. They complained to their captors about their sorry state, and those empathised with them. The rebels went out of Qubbat al-Naṣr to their colleagues and told them about the situation. Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî told them: “[...?] they nailed two *ajlâb* on two camels, but this group nailed two *ajlâb* on a single camel. If you let them go the Citadel and re-establish themselves, they will annihilate you.” When they heard this, the mamluks killed their captives like sheep. The murderer of Arghûn Shâh held his severed head from the beard in one hand, and in the other his unsheathed sword, while saying: “Pray upon Muḥammad, this is Arghûn Shâh’s head.” The other executioners held the head of their victims in a handkerchief, because they had no beard to grab on [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 35a, 35b-36a]

– IK: [464-5]

– ID: [113a/*Al-Nafḥah* 217-8]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 206-7]

¹⁵ Part of this report is written in a hand other than al-‘Aynî’s in the margin of this folio. It corresponds to that section of Ibn Duqmâq’s report where al-Yarqashî acknowledges parting ways with the sultan and his party at ‘Ajrud, etc. The part of this report that is in the main body of the text is struck through.

- II: [429, 430]
- Maq.: + The heads of the victims were then given to their relatives for burial [280-1]
- IH: The rebel leaders sent people to Qubbat al-Naṣr where they found Arghûn Shâh, Ṣarghitmish, Yalbughâ and others [–] [When Qubbat al-Naṣr was raided by those sent from Cairo], the sultan and Yalbughâ managed to escape, but the other emirs were killed [194]
- IQS: [512]
- IT: + The rest of the emirs who were behind the rebellion rejoiced at the slaughter of the *khâssakîyah*, because they knew that al-Ashraf's rule had withered [60]
- Sakh.: [223]
- ABM: [118-9]
- IY: [178-9]
- Anon.: + This took place close to 'Ajrûd [267b]

PMA86. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The rebels threatened with death whoever hid the sultan, and promised, by proclamation, a reward to whoever turned him in [4th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 35a]

- IK: [465]
- Maq.: + People were in a state of restlessness and those shops that were still open closed down, as talk about the sultan and the new holders of power increased [281]
- IQS: [512]
- IY: [179]

PMA87. – [Maq.] Muḥammad ibn 'Îsâ was captured and interrogated about the whereabouts of the sultan. He said that last he heard, he and Yalbughâ had parted with the *khâssakîyah* emirs [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 281]

- IK: [465]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [35a]

PMA88. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {The sultan had left Qubbat al-Naṣr in the company of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and went to hide at the house of Yalbughâ's *ustâdâr*. The latter informed them about all that had happened at the Citadel, notably the warning issued by the rebels for people not to hide the sultan, something that only increased the sultan's fear} [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 35a-b]

- ID: They hid at house of Yalbughâ's *ustâdâr* [113a/*Al-Nafḥah* 218]
- 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 207]
- II: [429, 430]
- Maq.: [281]
- IT: [60]
- Sakh.: Yalbughâ went and hid al-Ashraf at the house of his *ustâdâr* [223]
- IY: ... The sultan and Arghûn Shâh... [179]
- Anon.: The sultan headed to the house of Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, Yalbughâ al-'Umarî's *ustâdâr*. When he entered his house, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî would not divulge anything [268a]

PMA89. – **[Maq.]** [After hearing what Yalbughâ's *ustâdâr* said], the sultan left the latter's house alone and headed towards the house of Âminah, the wife of al-Mashtûlî [?], at al-Mahmûdîyah quarter in Cairo. There he remained the rest of the night of Monday the 5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah and the morning of the following day [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 281]

– IK: The sultan hid at the house of a female acquaintance of his, thinking that he had found salvation, while Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî left him in search of a tunnel in the ground [?][464]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Al-Ashraf parted with Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and vanished into the city [35b]

– ID: During the night [of the 5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah], the sultan headed to the house of Âminah, the wife of Ibn al-Mashtûlî at al-Jawdarîyah quarter and hid there [**113a-b**/*Al-Nafḥah* 218]

– ‘Aynî: During the night [of the 5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah], the sultan headed alone to the house of Âminah, the wife of Ibn al-Mashtûlî and hid there. [He heard the news, and fell asleep from fatigue. His was the object of a raid (“*fa-kubisa*”) and fled¹⁶] [Ist.B2 **59b**/DK 207]

– II: [430]

– IH: The sultan then hid at the house of Âminah, the singer, ‘Abdallâh's daughter, the wife of Ibn al-Mustawfî, whom he knew from before [194]

– IT: [60-1]

– Sakh.: [223]

– IY: He went on foot from the Red Hill until he arrived in al-Jawdarîyah quarter where he hid at the house of a woman called Âminah, the wife of Ibn al-Mashtûlî, who was from his mother Khawand Barakah's family. It was said that she had been his wet nurse [179-80]

– Anon.: [268a]

PMA90. – **[IY]** It was then rumoured that the sultan had entered and vanished into the city. So the *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* proclaimed: “Whoever knows about the sultan's place of hiding and does not inform the authorities will be hanged at his doorstep, and whoever indicates his place of hiding will receive five hundred dinars” [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 180]

PMA91. – **[IT]** The rebel leaders, Qaratây al-Tâzî, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî, etc., feared the consequences of al-Ashraf's reappearance, so they became increasingly worried [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 61]

– IY: The sultan remained at the house of Âminah at al-Jawdarîyah quarter for days, without anyone knowing about him. Cairo was tense as the *wâlî* conducted raids in houses and neighbourhoods [n.d.; 180]

PMA92. – **[Maq.]** A woman went and informed those in charge about the whereabouts of the sultan. Then Qaratây al-Tâzî headed with a large group of mamluks to Âminah's house, caught her and terrorized her. As a result, she indicated the *bâdhanj*¹⁷ of the house

¹⁶ The sentence in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 59b in a hand other than al-‘Aynî's.

¹⁷ A duct located in the middle of the house for ventilation purposes; *Kitâb al-Sulûk*, vol. 3:1, p. 281 footnote no. 4.

where they found the sultan dressed in a woman's attire. They took him out therefrom, made him bear arms, covered his face and then spirited him out of Cairo through one of its gates, Bâb al-Sa'âdah,¹⁸ and took him to the Citadel [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 281-2]

– IK: Then a woman came to Aynabak al-Badrî and told him of the sultan's hiding place at her neighbour's house, wherefrom the rebels caught him [465]

– ID: In the meantime, the leaders residing in Cairo, namely Tashtamur al-Muhammadî al-Laffâf, Qaratây al-Tâzî, Qutlûbughâ al-Badrî, Altunbughâ al-Sultânî, Bulât al-Saghîr al-Sayfî Uljây, Damurdâsh al-Yûsufî, Yalbughâ al-Nizâmî, Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî, Aynbak al-Badrî and Tûlû al-Sarghitmishî, the very day they killed the emirs at Qubbat al-Naṣr, received the visit of a woman who told them about the sultan's hiding place at the house of Âminah, Ibn al-Mashtûlî's wife, at al-Jawdarîyah neighbourhood. Altunbughâ al-Sultânî and others raided the house and found the sultan dressed as a woman hiding in the *bâdhanj*. He was caught, dressed in military attire and brought to the citadel [4th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 113b/*Al-Nafḥah* 218]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [4th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 35a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b/DK 207]

– II: [430]

– IH: [194]

– IQS: [512]

– IT: [61]

– Sakh.: [223]

– IY: [180]

– Anon.: [268a]

PMA93. – [Maq.] The sultan was released into the hands of Aynabak who beat him, in the presence of al-Maqsî, into giving up the location of his possessions. On the 6th of Dhû al-Qa'dah, Qadi Sadr al-Dîn al-Minâwî, one of the deputy judges, was brought in to attest the will of the sultan. The qadi said that it was essential to officially establish his death. Thus Jarkas al-Sayfî, one of the mamluks of Uljây al-Yûsufî, strangled him. He was then presented to people who testified to his death in front of the qadi and that he had entrusted his will to Aynabak al-Badrî. This Jarkas al-Sayfî was given an emirate of ten and became *shâdd 'amâ'ir*. The body of the sultan was disposed off in a bag that was sown shut and thrown in a pit. After a few days, when the body started to smell, neighbours took it out and buried him at al-Kîmân near the shrine of Sayyidah Nafîsah. Later, some of his attendants dug him out and buried him in his mother's shrine [6th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 282]

– IK: [465]

– ID: [5th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 113b/*Al-Nafḥah* 218]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [35a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b¹⁹/DK 207-8]

– II: [430]

¹⁸ A gate in the western wall of the north-eastern quarter of Cairo facing the Amîr Husâm bridge; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. xv, p. 24 and map no. 9.

¹⁹ Part of this report is written in a hand other than al-'Aynî's in the margin of this folio. It corresponds to a section of this report in Ibn Duqmâq's *Al-Nafḥah* where Aynabak al-Badrî is said to have hit the sultan seventy times with a stick to get him to divulge the location of his monies.

- IH: [194]
- IQS: [512]
- IT: [61-2]
- Sakh.: [223]
- IY: [181]
- Anon.: + {Verse} [268a-b, 269a]

PMA94. – [**Maq.**] {Biographical sketch of the sultan} [282-3]

- ID: [*Al-Nafḥah* 219]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 59b-60a]
- IH: [194-5]
- IT: [64-6]
- Sakh.: [224-5]
- ABM: [118]
- IY: [181-183]
- Anon.: {Long biographical sketch constituted mostly of verse written by poets about the sultan} [269a-271b]

PMA95. – [**ID**] Upon their arrival in ‘Ajrûd, the ‘Aqabah rebels got the news about the death of the sultan and the emirs, something which allayed their fear. They then went to Birkat al-Ḥajj. Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Ṭawîl, was head of the vanguard of Ṭashtamur’s forces [n.d.; 114a]

- IK: [465]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [36b]
- ‘Aynî: [DK 208]
- Maq.: [6th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 285-6]
- IQS: [513]
- IT: + some regretted what they had done [63]
- IY: + It is a strange coincidence, that the day the mamluks rebelled in Cairo and made Emir ‘Alî sultan, was the very day during which the mamluks rebelled against the sultan in ‘Aqabah and defeated him, a cursed day indeed. This was considered to be an unusual coincidence {Long verse}[184-7]
- Anon.: [268b-269a]

PMA96. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] When the emirs and the mamluks who were in Cairo heard about the arrival of Ṭashtamur and his forces in Birkat al-Ḥajj, they sent there a group of *ajlâb*, led by Aḥmad ibn Humuz, who were defeated by Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î al-Ṭawîl. The latter rode after them until they reached the citadel where he was overwhelmed and captured [6th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 36b]

- IK: [465]
- ID: [114a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 208]
- Maq.: + Ṭashtamur sent out Qutlûbughâ al-Sha‘bânî to check out what had happened to Qutluqtamur [286]
- IT: [63]

PMA97. – [**ID**] In the meantime, Âqtamur al-Ḥanbalî returned to Cairo from the Ṣa‘îd

where al-Ashraf had dispatched him. The Cairene rebels welcomed him, placed themselves under his authority and asked him to be in charge. He accepted and his troops joined those of the rebels below the citadel [7th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 114a]

– IK: [465]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [36a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 208-9]

– Maq.: [284]

– IQS: [513]

– IT: + [The rebel emirs in Cairo placed themselves under the authority of Âqtamur al-Hanbalî] because they feared those emirs and members of the *khâssakîyah* arriving from ‘Aqabah [63]

PMA98. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] To confront Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î, those in charge in Cairo sent out emirs, mamluks, *ajlâb* and robbers (“*nahhâbah*”), who divided into two groups. One group went out and looted the provisions of the sultan, his harem’s and those of the emirs and whoever had come back from the *hajj*. The looting they embarked upon was unbecoming of Muslims [7th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 36b]

– Maq.: {The *ajlâb* who were sent to fight Tashtamur divided into two groups. One went out and looted the provisions of the sultan’s harem and those of the pilgrims. This was a very ugly episode, as great amounts of monies were lost. The sultan’s trip was the cause of the withering of the house of Qalawûn} [286]

– IQS: [513]

PMA99. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] As for the second group, a great battle took place between them and Tashtamur, Qutluqtamur al-‘Alâ’î [sic] and Sarâytamur, during the eve of the 8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah. The Cairenes were defeated by the party from ‘Aqabah which followed them below the citadel. There, arrows rained upon Tashtamur and his men, and his enemies fought him until he was defeated and most of his people left him [7th to 8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 36b-37a]

– IK: [465]

– ID: + The two forces met at al-Suwwah. After his defeat, Tashtamur and the remnants of his forces fled towards al-Kîmân [114a/*Al-Nafhah* 220]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 209]

– II: [430]

– Maq.: [286]

– IQS: [513]

– IT: + Tashtamur and those Ashrafî emirs and mamluks who were with him were defeated and fled towards al-Kîmân [63-4]

– IY: [189]

– Anon.: + {Verse}[268b-269a]

PMA100. – [IH] [When Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î and those who accompanied him from ‘Aqabah] entered Cairo, he decried (“*ankara*”) what had happened and left for Qubbat al-Naṣr. There he sought to make the caliph sultan, but the former refused. His foes fought against him and defeated him [n.d.; 197]

– Sakh.: [224]

PMA101. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** After his defeat, some emirs gave Tashtamur the option of staying in Cairo or choosing the *niyâbah* of his choice. He chose Damascus and they allowed him to return to his home [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37a]

- IK: [465]
- Maq.: [286]
- IH: Tashtamur was then given the *niyâbah* of Damascus [197]
- IQS: [513]
- IY: [189]

PMA102. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {It was said that Tashtamur asked for a safe-conduct, which was granted to him by his enemies; but when he showed up they arrested and imprisoned him in the Citadel along with a number of his emirs, Ballût al-Sarghitmishî and others. Verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr about the fate of Tashtamur} [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37a]

- ID: + {Different verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr}[114a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 209]
- II: [430]
- Maq.: [286-7]
- IQS: [513-4]
- IT: + {Long diatribe about the inequities of this-world}[64]
- IY: [189]
- Anon.: Emirs Qutluqtamur and Tashtamur were arrested and imprisoned at the citadel [269a]

PMA103. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Description of the accession of al-Mansûr ‘Alî, the son of al-Ashraf, to the sultanate in the presence of the caliph, who had just arrived, and those qadis still present in Cairo} [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37a]

- IK: [465]
- ZDT: [133b-134a]
- ID: [114b/*Al-Nafhah* 220]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 209-10]
- II: [430]
- Maq.: [287]
- IH: [197]
- IQS: [514]
- IT: + {Recap of the events leading to the new sultan’s accession}[118-9]
- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: When the Caliph al-Mutawakkil arrived in Cairo in the company of the other emirs who had been with the sultan at ‘Aqabah, a number of the latter group were arrested, shackled and sent to prison in Alexandria [184, 188, 188-9]
- Anon.: [271b-272a]

PMA104. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nominations to the head of the new regime: Tashtamur al-Laffâf, an emir of ten, became *atâbak* and took over all that had been Arghûn Shâh al-Ashrafî’s; Qaratây al-Tâzî, a simple soldier, became an emir of one hundred and *ra’s nawbah kabîr*, and took over all that had been Sarghitmish al-Ashrafî’s; Asandamur al-Sarghitmishî, a simple soldier, became an emir of one hundred; Qutlûbughâ al-Badrî

became *amîr majlis*; Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î was nominated *nâ’ib* of Damascus and ordered to leave that very day; Iyâs al-Sarghitmishî became *dawâdâr* with an emirate of forty [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37a-b]

- IK: Qaratây divided the positions [–] Tashtamur was released from prison [465]
- ZDT: Tashtamur al-‘Alâ’î was nominated *nâ’ib* of Damascus in replacement of Baydamur al-Khawârizmî. {Laudatory statement about Tashtamur} [134b-135a]
- ID: [114b-115a/*Al-Nafḥah* 220]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 210]
- II: [430]
- Maq.: [287-8]
- IH: Tashtamur al-Dawâdâr was given the *niyâbah* of Damascus and left thereto on the 10th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah [196, 197]
- IQS: [514]
- IT: [119-20]
- Sakh.: [224]
- ABM: [120]
- IY: [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 189-90]
- Anon.: [272a]

PMA105. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] {Nominations to emirates of one hundred: Damurdâsh al-Yûsufî, as *muqaddam* and *ra’s nawbah thâni*; Bulât al-Saghîr Uljây; Alṭunbughâ al-Sultânî; Yalbughâ al-Nizâmî; and Aynabak al-Badrî, as *amîr akhûr*. All these were simple soldiers except Aynabak who had been emir of forty} [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37b]

- IK: + Aynabak became *amîr akhûr* and Sudûn Jarkas *ustâdâr* [465]
- ID: + Qaratây [**115a**/*Al-Nafḥah* 220, 221]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 210]
- II: Aynabak al-Badrî, as well as other emirs, were appointed to emirates of one hundred [430-1]
- Maq.: [288]
- IQS: [514]
- IT: [120]
- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 190-1]
- Anon.: [272a]

PMA106. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] {Nominations to emirates of forty} [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37b]

- ID: [115a/*Al-Nafḥah* 221]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 210-1]
- II: The sultan nominated emirs of forty [431]
- Maq.: [288]
- IQS: [514]
- IT: [120]
- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: [191]
- Anon.: [272a]

PMA107. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {Nominations to emirates of ten}[8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 37b-38a]

- ID: [115a-b/*Al-Nafḥah* 221-2]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 211]
- II: The sultan nominated emirs of ten [431]
- Maq.: [289]
- IQS: [514]
- IT: [120-1]
- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: [191]
- Anon.: [272a]

PMA108. – [ID] The sultan’s harem arrived in the Maydân²⁰ through Sûq al-Khayl and entered the Citadel by means of Bâb al-Sirr,²¹ after the sultan’s train was looted at al-Raydânîyah²² [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 115a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: The sultan’s harem arrived from Birkat al-Ḥajj and went up to the citadel. Some said that the sultan’s train was looted at al-Raydânîyah [38a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/ DK 214]
- Maq.: The sultan’s harem arrived from Birkat al-Ḥajj, and went up to the Citadel through Bâb al-Sirr, after that the sultan’s train had been looted at al-Raydânîyah outside of Cairo [289]
- IQS: [514]
- IY: [192]

PMA109. – [Maq.] “The elevation of the lowlives became the matter of proverbs as the mamluk recruits who yesterday had been unknown quantities, by means of murder, banishment and various forms of torture, had become kings to whom the bounties of all things are brought and who ruled the kingdoms of the world according to their wants. From then on, the situation of the land changed with the change of its rulers.” [n.d.; 289]

- ABM: [118]
- IY: + {Verse}[191-2]

PMA110. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] Qutlûbughâ Jarkas was sent to Damascus with the news of Tashtamur’s nomination to the *niyâbah* there, and with orders to arrest Baydamur, the incumbent, and to send him to prison in Safad [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

- Maq.: [289]
- IH: Baydamur was removed from office [196]
- IY: [192]

PMA111. – [IQS] News about what had happened to the sultan reached Damascus [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 515]

²⁰ The racecourse was located below the western wall of the Citadel, south of the horse market; Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. xv, p. 24 and map no. 9.

²¹ A gate that gave access to the Citadel by means of its northern wall; *ibid.*, p. 20.

²² An area located northeast of Cairo; *ibid.*, p. 33.

PMA112. – **[ID]** {A number of emirs were released from prison, among other Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî, ‘Alamdâr al-Muhammadi, Aydamur al-Shamsî, Sûdun Jarkas, etc.} [10th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 115b]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [38a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60a-b/DK 211-2]
- Maq.: [290]
- IQS: [515]
- IT: [121]
- IY: The *nâ‘ib al-saltanah* ordered the release of emirs who had been imprisoned in the citadel; a group of them was freed [192]

PMA113. – **[ID]** All emirs who were released were rearrested and sent to prison in Alexandria, except Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî and Sûdun Jarkas [11th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 115b]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [38a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 212]
- Maq.: [290]
- IQS: [515]
- IT: [121]
- IY: [Some of the emirs who had been released by the *nâ‘ib al-saltanah*] were rearrested and sent to prison in Alexandria [192]

PMA114. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** Departure of Tashtamur for Damascus [11th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

- Maq.: [289]
- IH.: [10th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 197]
- Sakh.: [224]
- ABM: [120]
- IY: [190]

PMA115. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** {The emirs looted the gold set aside by the sultan for his children, reported to have consisted of twenty-eight loads,} [11th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

- Maq.: [290]
- IQS: [514]
- ABM: [120]

PMA116. – **[IQS]** A messenger arrived in Damascus with details about what had happened in Cairo and with the news that Emir Tashtamur had become *nâ‘ib* of the city in replacement of Baydamur, who was to head to Safad as an unemployed emir [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 515]

PMA117. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** Reading of the sultan’s *taqlîd* by the caliph in the presence of the qadis; a monetary reward was given to the caliph and robes of investiture were bestowed upon the qadis and high officials. [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

- ID: [116a]
- Maq.: [290]
- IT: [12th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 123]

– IY: [192]

PMA118. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** Nominations to administrative positions: al-Nashû to the *wizârah* and Karîm al-Dîn ibn al-Ruwayhib as *nâzir al-dawlah* instead of Amîn al-Dîn Mîn [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

– ID: [116a]

– ‘Aynî: Tâj al-Dîn al-Mâlikî was nominated to the *wizârah*, his fourth stint/Tâj al-Dîn al-Mâlikî was nominated to the *wizârah*, his fourth stint, and Karîm al-Dîn ibn al-Ruwayhib as *nâzir al-dawlah* [Ist.B2 **60b/DK 212**]

– Maq.: [290]

– IQS: [515]

– IT: [122]

– IY: [192]

PMA119. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** Nominations to political positions: Taydamur al-Bâlisî became *hâjib al-hujjâb* instead of Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî and ‘Alî ibn Qashtamur, *hâjib thâni* instead of ‘Alamdâr [12th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38a]

– Maq.: [290]

– IQS: [515]

– IY: [192]

PMA120. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** The emirs who plotted against al-Ashraf had promised each of the mamluks who participated in the rebellion five hundred dinars or its equivalent, ten thousand dirhams. Once the emirs had reached their goal, the mamluks reminded them of their promise, but the former decided to pay them one hundred dinars each instead. A revolt erupted and the mamluks captured Tashtamur al-Laffâf whose life was threatened had it not been Qaratây who promised to pay them their due [13th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah 38a-b]

– Maq.: [290-1]

– IH: [197]

– IY: [192-3]

PMA121. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** {In order to meet the mamluks’ demand, the emirs summoned the representative of the Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* and told him to lend them two hundred thousand dinars from the orphans’ fund, or else they would loot it} [13th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38b]

– Maq.: + The orphans’ fund was looted, and was never recovered to this day [291]

– IH: [197]

– IY: [193]

PMA122. – **[IQS]** Baydamur left for Safad [Middle of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 515]

PMA123. – **[ID]** {Arrest and mulcting of senior civilian administrators, among others, al-Maqṣî, Amîn al-Dîn Mîn, etc.} [18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 115b]

– IF/Al-Muntaqā: [38b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b²³/DK 212]
- Maq.: [291]
- IH: [197]
- IT: [121]
- IY: [193]

PMA124. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Mulcting of Coptic junior civilian administrators, to pay for the *nafaqah*} [18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38b]

- Maq.: [291]
- IH: [197]
- ABM: Many were mulcted to pay for this *nafaqah* [124]
- IY: [193]

PMA125. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Mulcting of the *muhtasib*, Shams al-Dîn al-Dumayrî, to pay for the *nafaqah*} [18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38b]

- Maq.: + And his bother’s house was looted [291]
- IY: [193]

PMA126. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** A number of merchants were arrested to pay for the *nafaqah* [18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38b]

- Maq.: [291]
- IY: [193]

PMA127. – **[ID]** Asandamur al-Ṣarghitmishî and Damurdâsh al-Yûsufî went to the castle and distributed the sultan’s maids among the emirs [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116a]

- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [38b]
- Maq.: [292]
- IT: [Third decade of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 123]
- IY: [194]

PMA128. – **[ID]** The eunuch Mithqâl al-Jamâlî was mulcted and was required to pay three hundred thousand dirhams, an amount that was brought down to one hundred thousand dirhams on the 21st of this month [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116a]

- IF/Al-Muntaqá: The amount of one hundred thousand dirhams was taken from Mithqâl al-Jamâlî [38b]
- Maq.: [292]
- IH: [197]
- IT: [122]
- IY: [194]

PMA129. – **[ID]** Arrest and mulcting of three eunuchs, Mukhtass al-Ashrafî, Jawhar al-Iskandarî and Sunbul, the *ra’s nawbah* [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116a]

- Maq.: [292]
- IT: [121-2]
- IY: [193-4]

²³ This report is written in the top margin of this folio.

PMA130. – **[ID]** Arrest and mulcting of three eunuchs, Dînâr al-Lâlâ al-Sâlihî, Shâhîn Dust and Sunbul al-Laffâf [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116a]

– Maq.: [20th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 292]

– IT: [122]

– IY: [194]

PMA131. – **[ID]** Emir Salâh al-Dîn ibn ‘Arrâm was mulcted upon his arrival from Alexandria and made to pay a million dirhams. He was then released and confirmed in his position [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [38b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b²⁴/DK 212]

– Maq.: [292]

– IH: [197]

– IT: [121]

– IY: [194]

PMA132. – **[ID]** {Nomination of Âqtamur al-Hanbalî al-Sâhibî as *nâ‘ib al-saltanah* with the power to distribute *iqtâ*‘s to the emirs, the soldiers and the viceroys. His nomination took place after that those in charge asked the permission of the *khâssakî* emirs, as well as that of the *barrâniyyîn* emirs and the *sultânî* mamluks [19th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 115b-116a]

– IK: [465]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [39a]

– ‘Aynî: [29th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.B2 60b/DK 212]

– II: [431]

– Maq.: [292]

– IH: [The Cairene rebels] nominated Âqtamur ‘Abd al-Ghanî *nâ‘ib al-saltanah*/Âqtamur al-Hanbalî became *nâ‘ib al-saltanah* [193, 196]

– IQS: [514]

– IT: [122]

– Sakh: [222]

– ABM: [120]

– IY: Âqtamur al-Hanbalî, the *nâ‘ib al-saltanah*, distributed the *iqtâ*‘s, the positions, houses, material and pools, of those who had been killed during these events to the soldiers (“*al-jund*”), and issued an edict summoning them to marry their womenfolk and daughters [189, 191, 194]

– Anon.: [272a]

PMA133. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** Release of al-Maqṣî who is confirmed in his position as head of the *nazar al-khâss* and *wikâlat al-khâss* [26th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 38b]

– ID: [115b]

– Maq.: [293]

– IY: [194]

²⁴ This report is written in the top margin of this folio.

PMA134. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Story about Aynabak al-Badrî wanting to make a sultan out of Aḥmad ibn Yalbughâ because he was really the son of al-Nâsir Hasan. In a long marginal annotation containing more details about it, this incident is said to have occurred during the month of Rabî‘ al-Awwal of the following year} [Rabî‘ al-Awwal 779; 39a²⁵]

PMA135. – **[Maq.]** The *nafaqah* was paid to the mamluks who numbered three thousands, to each five hundred dinars or ten thousand dirhams, for a total of one million five hundred thousand dinars. To gather this amount, most junior administrators, the chiefs of the eunuchs, were mulcted, and purchases of goods belonging to the *dîwân al-khâss* were forced upon the merchants, something that caused great harm. A *nafaqah* the like of this one was unheard of in the Mamluk state [During the month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 295]

- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [39a-b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 211]
- II: Each mamluk received a ten thousand dirhams payment [431]
- IH: + Qaratây spent all that was in the treasury in generous money payments [197-8]
- IQS: [515]
- IT: [123]
- Sakh.: [224]
- ABM: [120]
- IY: [196]

PMA136. – **[ID]** Nomination of Arghûn al-As‘ardî as *nâ‘ib* of Tripoli, in replacement of Mankalîbughâ al-Aḥmadî al-Baladî [During this year; 116b]

- ZDT: [135a]
- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [During the month of Dhû al-Hijjah; 41a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213]
- Maq.: [During the month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 294]
- IQS: [517]
- IT: [122]
- IY: [195]

PMA137. – **[IQS]** Arrival of Tashtamur in Damascus as its *nâ‘ib* [During the month of Dhû al-Hijjah; 515]

PMA138. – **[ID]** Nomination of Qadi Taqî al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Misrî al-Shâfi‘î as the new *nâzir al-jaysh*, in replacement of his father [During this year; 116b]

- ZDT: [137a]
- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [During the month of Dhû al-Hijjah; 41a]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213]
- Maq.: [14th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 295]
- IH: [199]
- IQS: [516]
- IT: [122]

²⁵ A part of this report is written in the margin of this folio.

– IY: [195]

PMA139. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of a new *kâtib al-sirr*, Qadi Taqî al-Dîn Abû Hafṣ ibn Abû al-Ṭabîb [or al-Ṭayyib] al-Dimashqî al-Shâfi‘î, in Aleppo, in replacement of Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn Muhâjir al-Ḥanafî [During the month of Dhû al-Ḥijjah; 138b]

– ID: [117a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [During the month of Dhû al-Ḥijjah; 41a]

– IF: [41a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 214]

– Maq.: [294]

– IH: [199]

– IY: [195]

PMA140. – **[IQS]** Emir Hâj ibn Asandamur, whose father had been *nâ‘ib* of Damascus, became the *hâjib* of Ibn al-Sârim [During the month of Dhû al-Ḥijjah; 516]

PMA141. – **[IT]** Confirmation of Badr al-Dîn ibn Fadlallah as *kâtib al-sirr* [n.d.; 122]

PMA142. – **[IK]** The offspring of al-Nâsir Ḥasan who had been exiled to al-Karak returned to Cairo along with Sûdun al-Shaykhûnî, who was nominated *hâjib* [n.d.; 465]

PMA143. – **[IK]** Ballûṭ al-Sarghitmishî was appointed *hâjib* [n.d.; 465]

PMA144. – **[ABM]** The year ended as civil strife was rife [n.d.; 122]

– IY: {The year witnessed the death of al-Ashraf and many emirs, as well as civil strife and many other ugly events}[196]

PMA145. – **[IH]** The people of Baalbek complained about their *nâ‘ib*. The viceroy of Damascus sent a replacement who arrived from Cairo. The inhabitants of Baalbek were told he was the brother of the previous incumbent and that he held a grudge against them. The new viceroy died however before he even arrived, and consequently, they were saved [During this year; 196]

Religious Life [RL]

RL1. – [IQS] Zayn al-Dîn al-Qurashî taught at the Masrûriyah *madrasah* [During Muharram; 505]

RL2. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Shaykh Jalâl al-Dîn Jâr Allâh al-Hanafî was removed from the headship of the mosque of the Sa'îd al-Su'adâ' *khânaqâh* following the protest of the Sufis there against him, and was replaced by 'Alâ' al-Dîn al-Sarrânî who was in the Hijâz [First decade of Muharram; 28a]

- Maq: [1st of the Muharram; 264]
- IH: [191]
- IQS: ... 'Alâ' al-Dîn al-Sîrâmî... [505]
- Sakh.: [221]
- IY: [164]

RL3. – [IQS] Ibn 'Atâ' taught at the Asadîyah *madrasah* in Damascus instead of Sadr al-Dîn ibn Mansûr [During Muharram; 507]

RL4. – [IQS] Al-Badr Muḥammad, the son of Sadr al-Dîn ibn Mansûr, taught at the Balkhîyah *madrasah* in Damascus [During Muharram; 507]

RL5. – [ID] Death of al-Sharîf Fakhr al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Sharaf al-Dîn who was the head of the corporation of the Ashrâf and *muwaqqi* 'al-dast' [29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 110a]

RL6. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Nomination of Sharaf al-Dîn 'Alî, the son of Fakhr al-Dîn Ahmad as the new head of the corporation of the Ashrâf after his father's death. {Verse by al-'Attâr} [3rd of Rajab; 30a]

- Maq.: [269]
- IQS: [508]
- IY: [169]

RL7. – [Maq.] The procession of the *mahmil* took place in Cairo and in the old city ("Misr") on the 6th of Rajab, while in the past, the procession never took place before the middle of that month. People were kept occupied by the diseases that were rampant [6th of Rajab; 269]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [30a]

RL8. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {Following the resignation of Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Mansûr al-Hanafî, Qadi Zakî al-Dîn ibn al-Barakât interceded with the sultan in favour of Qadi Jalâl al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Nîsâbûrî, a.k.a. as Jâr Allâh, especially since the latter had taken care of al-Ashraf during his sickness. On the 25th of Rajab, he was appointed *qâdî al-quḍât* of the Hanafis. Verse by Ibn al-'Attâr} [25th of Rajab; 30b]

- ZDT: {A three folio long laudatory passage which does not mention any controversy. Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir even notes that he himself was the author of Jâr Allâh's *tafwîd*} [135a-136b]

- ID: Qaḍī Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Nisābūrī, a.k.a as Jār Allāh, was appointed *qāḍī al-quḍāt* of the Ḥanafīs instead of Sharaf al-Dīn ibn Mansūr al-Ḥanafī [26th of Rajab; 110a]
- ‘Aynī: [26th of Rajab; Ist.B2 58b/DK 201]
- II: [427-428]
- Maq.: [269-270]
- IH: [191]
- IQS: [508]
- Sakh.: [221, 222]
- ABM: [114]
- IY: + When the sultan lost hope of Sharaf al-Dīn ibn Mansūr al-Ḥanafī’s return, he appointed Jār Allāh [169]

RL9. – **[ID]** Nomination of al-Sharīf ‘Āṣim as *muhtasib* of Cairo instead the Qaḍī Shams al-Dīn ibn Abī Ruqaybah after his death [First decade of Shawwāl; 111a]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [31b-32a]
- Maq.: [271]
- IQS: [510]

RL10. – **[IQS]** Jalāl al-Dīn ibn Shamaryūkh replaced his uncle Fakhr al-Dīn as *qāḍī al-quḍāt* in Aleppo after the latter’s death [13th of Shawwāl; 510]

RL11. – **[Maq.]** The sultan nominated al-Shaykh Diyā’ al-Dīn al-Qirimī as *shaykh al-shuyūkh* of the *khānaqāh* al-Ashrafīyah that he was having built below the Citadel, and he annulled that title for the headship of the Siryāqūs *khānaqāh*. Al-Qirimī resided and taught there before its completion. [14th of Shawwāl; 273-4]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [32b]
- ID: [111a]
- ‘Aynī: [Ist 59 b/DK 202-3]
- II: [428]
- IQS: [510]
- IT: [56-7]
- Sakh.: [222]
- IY: ...Diyā’ al-Dīn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Qanawī... [174]
- Anon.: + This *madrāsah*, which was a wonder of decoration and architecture, was demolished during the reign of al-Nāsir Faraj, Barqūq’s son [266a-b]

RL12. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqá*]** The Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanafī qadis, Ibn Jamā‘ah and Jār Allāh, left from Aqabah to Jerusalem along with a number of pilgrims [1st of Dhū al-Qa‘dah; 36a]

- IK: [465]
- ‘Aynī: [Ist.B2 60a/DK 208]
- II: [430]
- Maq.: [284]
- IH: [196-7]
- IQS: + They were accompanied by a number of pilgrims because the latter feared the depredations of the Arabs [513]
- IT: [63]

- Sakh.: [224]
- IY: [184, 188]
- Anon.: [268b]

RL13. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** Nomination of a new *muhtasib*, Jamāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Qaysarī,²⁶ the *khatīb* of the Uljāy's *madrasah* in replacement of Muḥammad al-Dumayrī [20th of Dhū al-Qa'dah; 39a]

- Maq.: + The populace poked fun at al-Qaysarī, a Persian *faqīr*, because only yesterday he sold dates by the gate of the Māristān. Since he did not have a house of his own, he had to stay at the home of Ibn al-Zarīf until one could be found for him [292]
- IH: [198-9]
- IQS: [515]
- ABM: [120]
- IY: [194]

RL14. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** {Arrival of the two *quḍāt al-qadā'*, Ibn Jamā'ah, the Shāfi'ī, and Jār Allāh, the Ḥanafī, from their pilgrimage to Jerusalem after they endured much hardship as a result of the 'Aqabah rebellion and its aftermath}[26th or 27th of Dhū al-Qa'dah; 38b]

- Maq.: [293]
- IH: [197]
- IQS: [515]
- IY: [194]

RL15. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of Badr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Akhnā'ī as Mālikī *qāḍī al-quḍāt* in replacement of his uncle Burhān al-Dīn Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm al-Akhnā'ī al-Mālikī [During this year; 136b-137a]

RL16. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** {Nomination of a new Mālikī *qāḍī al-quḍāt*, 'Alam al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn Khālid al-Bisāṭī in replacement of Badr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Akhnā'ī, thanks to the intercession of one Ibn al-Labbān, a client of Qaratāy al-Tāzī. Three sets of verses by Ibn al-'Attār} [27th or 28th of Dhū al-Qa'dah; 38b-39a]

- ID: Nomination of a new Mālikī *qāḍī al-quḍāt*, 'Alam al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn Khālid al-Bisāṭī in replacement of Badr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Akhnā'ī [116a-b]
- 'Aynī: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213]
- II: [431]
- Maq.: + {Negative comments about the incident and those Mālikīs who were also promoted thanks to Ibn al-Labbān's intercession} [293]
- IH: [198]
- IQS: [515]
- ABM: [120]
- IY: [194-5]

²⁶ On him see *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, vol. 4, p. 335.

RL17. – **[IH]** Badr al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Abû al-Baqâ' [al-Subkî] visited his brother, Walî al-Dîn, in Damascus when the sultan headed to the *hajj*. He replaced Walî al-Dîn [as deputy Shâfi'î qadî] for ten days. Upon hearing what had happened to the sultan, he returned to Cairo and eventually became *qâdî al-quḍât* there [199]

RL18. – **[ID]** Nomination of Najm al-Dîn Abû al-'Abbâs ibn 'Imâd al-Dîn Ismâ'il ibn Abû al-'Izz al-Ḥanafî as Ḥanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus instead of his cousin Ṣadr al-Dîn Abû al-Ḥasan [n.d.; 116b]

– ZDT: [137a-b]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213]

RL19. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of Burhân al-Dîn al-Sanhâjî al-Mâlikî, an Aleppan judge, as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* of Damascus instead of Zayn al-Dîn Abû Bakr al-Mâzûnî²⁷ al-Mâlikî [n.d., 137b-138a]

– ID: [116b-117a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [41a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213]

– Maq.: [294]

– IH: [199]

– IQS: Zayn al-Dîn al-Mâzûnî was removed from office [as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* of Damascus] and given the judgeship of Aleppo, and was replaced by Burhân al-Dîn al-Shâdhilî²⁸ [During the month of Ramadân; 509]

– IY: Burhân al-Dîn al-Sanhâjî was appointed Mâlikî judge in Aleppo + [195]

RL20. – **[IQS]** Arrival in Damascus of Nâsir al-Dîn, the son of *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Sarî al-Dîn, the new Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* of Aleppo, a position Zayn al-Dîn al-Mâzûnî had been appointed to in 776 for a period of about two months; before even arriving there, he was replaced by Ibn al-Qafṣî [During the month of Dhû al-Ḥijjâh; 515-6]

– IH: [196]

RL21. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** Departure of Ḥanafî *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Sharaf al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Mansûr al-Ḥanafî from Cairo to Damascus; he was sickly ever since he was removed from that position in Cairo [At the end of the month of Dhû al-Ḥijjâh; 41a]

– Maq.: [295]

– IQS: [516]

– IY: *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Sharaf al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Mansûr al-Ḥanafî was removed from office following his own request, and then headed to Damascus [195]

RL22. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of Jalâl al-Dîn al-Zar'î as Shâfi'î *qâdî al-quḍât* in Aleppo, instead of his cousin Fakhr al-Dîn 'Uthmân [n.d.; 138a]

– ID: [117a]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [41a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 60b/DK 213-4]

²⁷ Written also Mâzînî and Mârûnî in the sources.

²⁸ Written also Tâdilî and Tâdhilî in the sources.

- Maq.: [294]
- ABM: [121]
- IY: [195]

RL23. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of Muḥibb al-Dîn Abû al-Ma‘âlî ibn al-Shihnah as Hanafi qâdî al-quḍât in Aleppo instead of Jamâl al-Dîn Ibrâhîm ibn al-‘Adîm. The latter was then reinstated [n.d.; 138a²⁹]

- Maq.: [294]
- IH: [196]
- ABM: [121]
- IY: [195]

RL24. – **[IQS]** {Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn took over al-‘Âdilîyah al-Sughrah *madrasah* from Taqî al-Dîn ibn al-Zâhirî} [During the month of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 516]

²⁹ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

Social History/Miscellany [SHM]

SHM1. – [IQS] {Citation by Ibn H̱ijjī (“*Qāla Ibn H̱ijjī...*”) concerning the sporting feat of a Damascene youth in a mosque} [During Muḥarram; 505]

SHM2. – [IH] {*Khabar* about a meteor that appeared over Damascus} [During this year; 195]

– IQS: [During Ṣafar; 505]

SHM3. – [IQS] {Capture of a Ḥasan al-Nawāwī who said he was capable of finding lost items, but turned out to be a crook} [During Ṣafar; 505-6]

– IH: [195]

SHM4. – [IY] {*Khabar* about a solar and lunar eclipses} [During Rabī‘ al-Awwal; 164]

SHM5. – [Maq.] {Flooding of al-Ḥusaynīyah neighbourhood brought about by Ibn Qāyṡāz, the *dawādār* of Muḥammad ibn Āqbughā Āṡ who wanted to gather fish in a pool by letting in the waters of the Nile. This caused a lot of property damage and the *wālī* spent a lot of money and effort trying to avoid the flooding of the entire neighbourhood. The houses of this neighbourhood remained destroyed to al-Maqrīzī’s days, with fruit tree groves as well as water pools replacing some of them} [Beginning of Rabī‘ al-Thānī; 265]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqā*: [28b]

– ID: [First decade of Rabī‘ al-Thānī; 109a-b]

– ‘Aynī: [Ist.B2 58b-59a/DK 200]

– II: [427]

– IH: [192]

– IQS: [506]

– IT: [20th of Rabī‘ al-Thānī; 55]

– Sakh.: [221]

– ABM: [During Sha‘bān; 110]

– IY: [165-6]

SHM6. – [Maq.] {Detailed description of the taxes on singers (“*al-maghānī*”), marriages (“*afrāh*”) and property transactions (“*qarārīt al-amlāk*”) and the abolition of their farming decided by al-Ashraf Sha‘bān} [Beginning of Jumādā al-Ūlá; 266-7]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqā*: [28b-29a]

– ID: The sultan issued an edict abolishing the farming of the taxes on singers and marriages in all areas of Egypt from Aswān to al-‘Arīsh [Beginning of Jumādā al-Ūlá; 109b/*Al-Nafha* 216]

– ‘Aynī: + This amounted to one million dirhams that were spent on the *jāmakīyah* of the sultan’s mamluks [Ist.B2 58b/DK 200]

– II: [427]

– IH: [191-2]

– IQS: [506-7]

- Sakh.: [221]
- ABM: [111-2]
- IY: [166-7]
- Anon.: [265b-266a]

SHM7. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Because of the increase in the amplitude of the Nile, the *mughl* [?] of the year 777 was transferred to 778 [n.d.; 29a]

- Maq.: [During Jumádá al-Úlá; 267]
- IQS: [507]

SHM8. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {News about the Nile. Verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr} [6th of Jumádá al-Úlá; 29a]

- ID: {News about the Nile} [During this year; 109b]
- Maq.: [267]
- IQS: [507]
- IY: [167]

SHM9. – **[Maq.]** {It was reported that Násir al-Dîn ibn Âqbughâ Âs wanted to resume the tax farming of the *maghâni*. When *Qâdî al-Qudât* Ibn Jamâ‘ah heard about this, he refused to rule and to attend the court, so the sultan called upon him to explain his behaviour. Ibn Jamâ‘ah said that he had heard that tax farming had resumed, something that the sultan denied knowing about. Ibn Âqbughâ Âs was made to abolish it again, and the sultan held a grudge against him [n.d.; 267]

- IF/al-Muntaqá: [29a]
- IH: [191]
- ABM: [112]
- IY: [169]

SHM10. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Disease (“*al-bâridah*”) killed many emirs and other people. Verse by Ibn al-‘Attâr} [During Jumádá al-Âkhirah, Rajab and Sha‘bân; 29b]

- Maq.: [268]
- IQS: [508]
- ABM: [112]
- IY: [168]

SHM11. – **[IQS]** {It was rumoured that neighbourhoods being built in Damascus near the river Baradâ under the citadel were owned by the sultan} [During Ramadân; 509]

SHM12. – **[IH]** {*Khabar* about a lunar and solar eclipses which took place respectively on the 14th and 28th of Sha‘bân} [14th and 28th of Sha‘bân; 196]

- ABM: [115]
- IY: [28th of Safar, during this year; 164, 196]

SHM13. – **[Maq.]** {A fire in the sultan’s *madrasah* then under construction below the Citadel led to the destruction of many building implements. The people perceived the incident as a bad omen. The *madrasah* remained vacant for years until it was demolished by al-Násir Faraj, Barqûq’s son} [15th of Ramadân; 271]

- ABM: [115]
- IY: [170]

SHM14. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** Extension of the epidemic (“*irtafa‘a al-wabā‘*”) [During Ramadān; 31b]

- Maq.: [271]

SHM15. – **[IH]** {Direct citation of Ibn H̱ijjī (“*Qāla Ibn H̱ijjī...*”) concerning the crescent of Shawwāl, which was seen all over Syria except Damascus} [n.d.; 198]

SHM16. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqā]** The sultan ordered the obstruction of the Qarâfah gate with stones [14th of Shawwāl; 32b]

- Maq.: [274]
- IY: Two days before his departure for the *hajj*, the sultan ordered the obstruction of the Darfil gate, the one that follows (“*mimmâ yalī‘*”) the Qarâfah gate, something that was done that very day [174]

SHM17. – **[Maq.]** The plague that began in Dhû al-Qa‘dah continued into the new year [During the month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 295]

- IK: [465]
- ABM: [122]

SHM18. – **[IQS]** {On his way to visit Emir Qaratây in Cairo, Qadi Kamâl al-Dîn al-Ma‘arrî arrived in Damascus and told about the price increases in Northern Syria, its frightful human and fiscal consequences, and the crisis that followed} [During the month of Dhû al-Hijjah; 516]

- IH: [196]

SHM19. – **[IH]** Old *fulûs*³⁰ stopped being used in Damascus [During this year; 196]

³⁰ “*Fals s’applique à toute pièce de cuivre ou de bronze quel que soit son volume ou son poids;*” A.L. Udovitch, “Fals,” *El²*, vol. 2, p. 787.

Foreign Affairs [FA]

FA1. – [IY] {News arrived about the death of the sultan of Yemen, al-Malik al-Afdal, a man of great knowledge who had built a mosque in Mecca} [During Safar; 164]

FA2. – [IY] {News arrived about the death of the ruler of Mârdîn, al-Muzaffar Dâwûd}[During Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 164-5]

FA3. – [ID] {Al-Zâhir Majd al-Dîn ‘Îsá became the new Artûqid ruler of Mârdîn after his father’s death} [During Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 116b]

- ZDT: [134a-b]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [41a]
- Maq.: [294]
- IH: [199]
- IQS: [517]
- ABM: [121]
- IY: [195]

FA4. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Al-Ashraf Ismâ‘îl became the new sultan of Yemen, after his father’s death [During Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 41a]

- Maq.: [294]
- IH: [199]
- IQS: [517]
- ABM: [121]
- IY: [195]

FA5. – [IH] Bayram Khujâ took over Mosul peacefully after a siege of four months; he married his son to Emir Bayram who had taken over the city, and deputized his brother Bard Khujâ to Mosul [During this year; 199]

- ABM: [122]
- IY: [196]

FA6. – [IH] {Fighting in North Africa in Tlemcen} [During this year; 195]

- ABM: [122]
- IY: [196]

TABLE I. 1. B

IK	ZDT	ID	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.
PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:
		PMA2		PMA2 PMA3 PMA4	PMA1 PMA2	PMA1 PMA2		PMA2	PMA2	PMA2		PMA1	PMA2	PMA2	
		PMA6 PMA7 PMA8 PMA9 PMA10 PMA11		PMA6		PMA6		PMA6 PMA7	PMA6				PMA4 PMA6	PMA4 PMA5 PMA6 PMA7	
		PMA13 PMA14 PMA15 PMA16 PMA17 PMA18		PMA9 PMA10	PMA9	PMA9 PMA10		PMA9	PMA9					PMA9 PMA10 PMA11 PMA12 PMA13 PMA14	
		PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23		PMA12 PMA13 PMA14 PMA15 PMA16 PMA17 PMA18		PMA13		PMA11 PMA12 PMA13 PMA14	PMA12					PMA16	
PMA20				PMA16 PMA17 PMA18	PMA16 PMA17 PMA18	PMA16 PMA17 PMA18		PMA16 PMA17 PMA18 PMA19		PMA16	PMA16			PMA16	
		PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23		PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA20	PMA20 PMA21	PMA20	PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA20 PMA21	PMA20 PMA21	PMA20	PMA20	PMA20 PMA21	PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	
PMA25	PMA25 PMA26	PMA26	PMA25 PMA26	PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28		PMA26		PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28	PMA26 PMA27 PMA28	PMA24 PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28 PMA29 PMA30	PMA25		PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28	PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28	PMA25 PMA26
	PMA28	PMA28	PMA28			PMA28	PMA28					PMA28			
PMA30		PMA30 PMA31		PMA30 PMA31	PMA30 PMA31	PMA30 PMA31	PMA30	PMA30 PMA31	PMA30		PMA30	PMA30	PMA30	PMA30 PMA31	

IK	ZDT	ID	ID Al- Nafhah	IF Al- Muntaqá	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS TIQS	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.		
PMA47	PMA48	PMA32		PMA33		PMA33		PMA33						PMA33			
		PMA33		PMA34		PMA34		PMA34						PMA34			
		PMA36		PMA36	PMA36	PMA36	PMA36	PMA36	PMA36		PMA35	PMA36	PMA36	PMA36	PMA36		
		PMA37		PMA37	PMA37	PMA37	PMA37	PMA37	PMA37		PMA36		PMA36	PMA37	PMA37		
		PMA38		PMA38				PMA38							PMA38		
		PMA39		PMA39	PMA39	PMA39	PMA39	PMA39	PMA39		PMA37				PMA39		
				PMA40		PMA40			PMA40			PMA39	PMA40				
				PMA41		PMA41			PMA41						PMA41	PMA41	
				PMA42		PMA42			PMA42							PMA41'	
						PMA43			PMA43	PMA43	PMA43				PMA43	PMA42	
						PMA44			PMA44	PMA44	PMA44				PMA44	PMA43	
						PMA45			PMA45						PMA45	PMA44	
				PMA46		PMA46	PMA46	PMA46	PMA46	PMA46		PMA46	PMA46	PMA46	PMA46	PMA45	
				PMA47		PMA47			PMA47				PMA47		PMA47	PMA46	PMA47
				PMA48		PMA48	PMA48	PMA48	PMA48	PMA48	PMA43	PMA43	PMA48		PMA48	PMA47	PMA48
				PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA44	PMA44	PMA49		PMA49	PMA48	PMA49
PMA50		PMA50	PMA50	PMA50	PMA50	PMA50	PMA50	PMA50			PMA50	PMA50	PMA50	PMA49	PMA50		
PMA51				PMA51			PMA51							PMA50			
PMA52		PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	PMA51	PMA52		
PMA53		PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	PMA53			PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	PMA52	PMA53		
PMA54		PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA54		PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	PMA53	PMA54		
PMA55		PMA55		PMA55	PMA55	PMA55	PMA55	PMA55		PMA55	PMA55	PMA55	PMA55	PMA54	PMA55		
														PMA55			
														PMA56			
PMA57				PMA57				PMA57		PMA57				PMA57			
PMA58		PMA58		PMA58				PMA58									
PMA59		PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA52	PMA52	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA57	PMA59		
				PMA60				PMA60									
PMA61		PMA61		PMA61	PMA61	PMA61	PMA61	PMA61	PMA54		PMA61	PMA61	PMA61	PMA59	PMA61		
				PMA62				PMA62						PMA60			
				PMA63				PMA63	PMA62					PMA61			
				PMA64				PMA64						PMA62			

IK	ZDT	ID	ID Al- Nafhah	IF Al- Muntaqá	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS TIQS	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.
PMA65		PMA65		PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65
		PMA67		PMA66	PMA67	PMA67	PMA67	PMA66	PMA66	PMA67	PMA67	PMA67	PMA66	PMA66	PMA67
PMA68				PMA67				PMA67	PMA67					PMA67	
PMA69		PMA69	PMA69	PMA68	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA68	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69
PMA70		PMA70	PMA70	PMA69	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA69	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70
PMA71		PMA71	PMA71	PMA70	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA70	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71
				PMA71				PMA71						PMA71	
				PMA72				PMA72						PMA72	
				PMA73				PMA73						PMA73	
PMA74		PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74
				PMA75				PMA75						PMA75	
PMA76		PMA76		PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76
								PMA77						PMA77	
PMA78														PMA78	PMA78
PMA79				PMA79				PMA79	PMA79	PMA79				PMA79	
				PMA80				PMA80	PMA80	PMA80			PMA80	PMA80	
				PMA81				PMA81		PMA81				PMA81	
PMA81				PMA82	PMA82	PMA82		PMA82	PMA82	PMA82	PMA82			PMA82	
PMA82		PMA82		PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83	PMA83		PMA83	PMA83
PMA83		PMA83	PMA83	PMA84				PMA84		PMA84				PMA84	
				PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85	PMA85
PMA85		PMA85	PMA85	PMA86				PMA86		PMA86				PMA86	
PMA86				PMA87				PMA87		PMA87				PMA87	
PMA87				PMA88	PMA88	PMA88	PMA88	PMA88		PMA88				PMA88	PMA88
				PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89	PMA89
PMA89		PMA89	PMA89											PMA90	
														PMA91	
														PMA92	PMA92
PMA92		PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92	PMA92
PMA93		PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93	PMA93
				PMA94	PMA94			PMA94	PMA94	PMA94	PMA94	PMA94	PMA94	PMA94	PMA94
														PMA95	PMA95
PMA95		PMA95		PMA95		PMA95	PMA95	PMA95		PMA95				PMA95	
PMA96		PMA96		PMA96	PMA96	PMA96		PMA96		PMA96				PMA96	
PMA97		PMA97		PMA97	PMA97	PMA97		PMA97		PMA97				PMA97	
				PMA98				PMA98		PMA98				PMA98	

IK	ZDT	ID	ID Al- Nafhah	IF Al- Muntagá	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS TIQS	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.
PMA99		PMA99	PMA99	PMA99	PMA99	PMA99	PMA99	PMA99	PMA100	PMA99	PMA99	PMA100		PMA99	PMA99
PMA101				PMA101				PMA101		PMA101				PMA101	
PMA103	PMA103	PMA102		PMA102	PMA102	PMA102	PMA102	PMA102		PMA102	PMA102			PMA102	PMA102
PMA104	PMA104	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103	PMA103		PMA103	PMA103
PMA105		PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104	PMA104
		PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105		PMA105	PMA105
		PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106	PMA106		PMA106	PMA106
		PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107		PMA107	PMA107
		PMA108		PMA108	PMA108	PMA108	PMA108	PMA108		PMA108				PMA108	PMA108
				PMA110				PMA110	PMA110				PMA109	PMA109	PMA110
		PMA112		PMA112	PMA112	PMA112		PMA112		PMA111				PMA112	
		PMA113		PMA113	PMA113	PMA113		PMA113		PMA112	PMA112			PMA113	
				PMA114				PMA114	PMA114	PMA113	PMA113			PMA114	
				PMA115				PMA115		PMA115		PMA114	PMA114	PMA114	
				PMA117				PMA117		PMA116				PMA117	
		PMA118		PMA118	PMA118	PMA118		PMA118		PMA117	PMA117			PMA118	
				PMA119				PMA119		PMA118	PMA118			PMA119	
				PMA120				PMA120	PMA120	PMA119				PMA120	
				PMA121				PMA121	PMA121					PMA121	
		PMA123		PMA123	PMA123	PMA123		PMA123	PMA123	PMA122				PMA123	
				PMA124				PMA124	PMA124		PMA123			PMA124	
				PMA125				PMA125						PMA125	
				PMA126				PMA126	PMA126					PMA126	
		PMA127		PMA127				PMA127			PMA127			PMA127	
		PMA128		PMA128				PMA128	PMA128		PMA128			PMA128	
		PMA129						PMA129			PMA129			PMA129	
		PMA130						PMA130			PMA130			PMA130	
		PMA131		PMA131	PMA131	PMA131		PMA131	PMA131		PMA131			PMA131	
		PMA132		PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132	PMA132

IK	ZDT	ID	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.
PMA132		PMA133		PMA133 PMA134 PMA135 PMA136	PMA135 PMA136	PMA135 PMA136	PMA135	PMA133 PMA135 PMA136	PMA135	PMA135 PMA136 PMA137 PMA138 PMA139 PMA140	PMA135 PMA136 PMA138 PMA141	PMA135	PMA135	PMA133 PMA135 PMA136 PMA138 PMA139	
PMA142 PMA143													PMA144	PMA144	
RL:	RL:	RL:	RL:	RL: RL2	RL:	RL:	RL:	RL: RL2	RL: RL2	RL: RL1 RL2 RL3 RL4	RL:	RL: RL2	RL:	RL: RL2	RL:
		RL5		RL6 RL7 RL8 RL9	RL8	RL8	RL8	RL6 RL7 RL8 RL9	RL8	RL6 RL8 RL9 RL10 RL11 RL12 RL13 RL14		RL8	RL8	RL8 RL9	
RL12		RL11 RL12		RL11 RL12 RL13 RL14	RL11 RL12	RL11 RL12	RL11 RL12	RL11 RL12 RL13 RL14	RL12 RL13 RL14	RL11 RL12 RL13 RL14	RL11 RL12	RL11 RL12	RL13	RL11 RL12 RL13 RL14	RL11 RL12
		RL15													
		RL16		RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16			RL16	RL16	
		RL18 RL19		RL18 RL19	RL18 RL19	RL18 RL19		RL16 RL17 RL18 RL19	RL16 RL17 RL18 RL19	RL16 RL17 RL18 RL19				RL16 RL19	

IK	ZDT	ID	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf DK	II	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	Sakh.	ABM	IY	Anony.
SHM:	RL22 RL23	RL22		RL21 RL22	RL22	RL22		RL21 RL22 RL23	RL20 RL23	RL20 RL21 RL24			RL22 RL23	RL22 RL23	
SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	SHM:
		SHM5 SHM6	SHM6	SHM5 SHM6 SHM7 SHM8 SHM9 SHM10	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6 SHM7 SHM8 SHM9 SHM10	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6 SHM7 SHM8 SHM9 SHM10 SHM11	SHM5	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6	SHM4 SHM5 SHM6	SHM6
SHM17		SHM8		SHM14 SHM16				SHM13 SHM14 SHM16 SHM17	SHM12 SHM15	SHM18 SHM19			SHM9 SHM10 SHM12 SHM13 SHM17	SHM8 SHM9 SHM10 SHM12 SHM13 SHM14 SHM16	
FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA: FA1 FA2 FA3 FA4 FA5 FA6	FA:
	FA3	FA3		FA3 FA4				FA3 FA4 FA5 FA6	FA3 FA4 FA5 FA6	FA3 FA4			FA3 FA4 FA5 FA6	FA3 FA4 FA5 FA6	

TABLE I. 2. A.

I. 2. A. i.

Ibn Khaldûn – <i>Kitâb al-'Ibar</i>	
PMA20	PMA103
PMA25	PMA104
PMA50	PMA105
PMA51	PMA132
PMA47	PMA104
PMA30	PMA142
PMA57	PMA143
PMA55	SHM17
PMA52	
PMA50	
PMA53	
PMA54	
PMA58	
PMA59	
PMA69	
PMA68	
PMA69	
PMA70	
PMA71	
PMA74	
PMA76	
PMA79	
PMA81	
PMA78	
PMA82	
PMA89	
PMA82	
PMA83	
PMA85	
PMA86	
PMA87	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA103	
PMA61	
PMA65	
RL12	
PMA95	
PMA96	
PMA76	
PMA97	
PMA99	
PMA101	

I. 2. A. ii

Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir – *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*

PMA103
FA3
PMA104
PMA136
RL8
RL15
PMA138
RL18
RL19
RL23
RL22
PMA139
PMA26
PMA28
PMA25
PMA48
Obituaries

I. 2. A. iii. a

Ibn Duqmâq – *Al-Nafhah*

SHM6
PMA26
PMA28
PMA25
PMA49
PMA50
PMA52
PMA53
PMA54
PMA69
PMA70
PMA71
PMA74
PMA69
PMA83
PMA59
PMA83
PMA85
PMA88
PMA92
PMA89
PMA92
PMA93
PMA94
PMA103
PMA104
PMA105
PMA99
PMA104
PMA105
PMA106
PMA107
Obituaries

I. 2. A. iii. b.

Ibn Duqmâq – *Nuzhat al-Anâm*

PMA2	PMA47	PMA117
PMA6	PMA48	RL16
PMA13	PMA69	FA3
PMA7	PMA70	PMA136
PMA8	PMA71	PMA138
PMA9	PMA74	RL18
PMA10	PMA76	RL19
PMA11	PMA83	RL22
SHM5	PMA58	PMA139
PMA14	PMA59	Obituaries
SHM8	PMA83	
SHM6	PMA85	
PMA15	PMA82	
PMA16	PMA88	
PMA17	PMA89	
PMA18	PMA92	
PMA20	PMA93	
PMA21	PMA61	
PMA22	RL12	
PMA23	PMA65	
RL5	PMA67	
PMA26	PMA95	
RL8	PMA96	
PMA28	PMA97	
PMA30	PMA99	
PMA31	PMA102	
PMA32	PMA103	
PMA33	PMA104	
PMA36	PMA108	
PMA37	PMA105	
PMA38	PMA106	
PMA39	PMA107	
PMA34	PMA112	
PMA42	PMA113	
RL9	PMA123	
PMA49	PMA133	
PMA50	PMA132	
RL11	PMA128	
PMA52	PMA131	
PMA53	PMA127	
PMA54	PMA129	
PMA55	PMA130	
PMA46	PMA118	

I. 2. A. iv.

Ibn al-Furât – *Al-Muntaqá*

RL2	PMA38	PMA86	PMA126
PMA3	PMA39	PMA87	PMA127
PMA4	SHM14	PMA84	PMA128
PMA2	PMA40	PMA88	PMA131
PMA6	PMA41	PMA89	PMA133
PMA13	Obituaries	PMA92	RL14
PMA9	PMA42	PMA93	RL16
PMA10	RL9	PMA83	PMA132
PMA12	PMA43	PMA85	RL13
Obituaries	PMA44	PMA97	PMA134
SHM5	PMA45	PMA62	PMA135
PMA14	PMA46	RL12	Obituaries
Obituaries	PMA47	PMA64	PMA138
SHM6	PMA51	PMA65	RL21
SHM7	PMA48	PMA66	FA3
SHM8	PMA49	PMA67	PMA136
SHM9	PMA50	PMA61	RL19
PMA15	RL11	PMA95	RL22
PMA16	SHM16	PMA96	PMA139
PMA17	PMA52	PMA98	FA4
PMA18	PMA53	PMA99	Obituaries
PMA20	PMA54	PMA101	
PMA21	PMA55	PMA102	
PMA22	PMA57	PMA103	
PMA23	PMA58	PMA104	
SHM10	Obituaries	PMA105	
Obituaries	PMA69	PMA106	
RL6	PMA70	PMA107	
RL7	PMA71	PMA108	
PMA25	PMA68	PMA110	
PMA26	PMA72	PMA112	
PMA27	PMA74	PMA114	
RL8	PMA75	PMA113	
PMA28	PMA76	PMA115	
Obituaries	PMA79	PMA117	
PMA30	PMA80	PMA118	
PMA34	PMA81	PMA119	
PMA31	PMA59	PMA120	
PMA33	PMA60	PMA121	
Obituaries	PMA82	PMA123	
PMA36	PMA83	PMA124	
PMA37	PMA85	PMA125	

I. 2. A. v. a.

Al-'Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – Ist.B2

PMA1	PMA61
PMA36	RL12
PMA1	PMA65
PMA2	PMA67
PMA20	PMA96
PMA23	PMA97
PMA9	PMA99
PMA16	PMA102
PMA18	PMA103
RL8	PMA104
PMA31	PMA105
PMA37	PMA106
PMA39	PMA107
PMA34	PMA112
SHM6	PMA113
SHM5	PMA123
PMA30	PMA131
PMA49	PMA132
PMA50	PMA136
PMA52	PMA118
RL11	RL16
PMA53	PMA138
PMA54	RL18
PMA55	RL19
PMA46	RL22
PMA48	PMA139
PMA69	PMA135
PMA70	PMA108
PMA71	PMA65
PMA74	Obituaries
PMA76	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA82	
PMA88	
PMA83	
PMA85	
PMA92	
PMA89	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA94	

I. 2. A. v. b.

Al-'Aynî – *Iqd al-Jumân* – DK

PMA1	PMA89
PMA36	PMA92
PMA2	PMA93
PMA6	PMA61
PMA13	RL12
PMA9	PMA65
PMA10	PMA67
SHM5	PMA95
SHM6	PMA96
PMA16	PMA97
PMA17	PMA99
PMA18	PMA102
PMA20	PMA103
PMA21	PMA104
PMA26	PMA105
PMA28	PMA106
RL8	PMA107
PMA30	PMA112
PMA31	PMA113
PMA33	PMA123
PMA37	PMA132
PMA39	PMA131
PMA34	PMA135
PMA49	PMA118
PMA50	RL16
PMA52	PMA136
RL11	PMA138
PMA53	RL18
PMA54	RL19
PMA55	RL22
PMA46	PMA139
PMA48	PMA108
PMA69	PM65
PMA70	Obituaries
PMA71	
PMA74	
PMA76	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA83	
PMA85	
PMA82	
PMA88	

I. 2. A. vi.

Ibn al-'Irâqî – *Al-Dhayl 'alá al-'Ibar*

SHM5	PMA132
SHM6	RL16
PMA20	Obituaries
RL8	
PMA28	
PMA30	
PMA36	
PMA37	
PMA52	
PMA55	
PMA50	
PMA52	
RL11	
PMA52	
PMA53	
PMA54	
PMA46	
PMA69	
PMA70	
PMA71	
PMA74	
PMA76	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA85	
PMA88	
PMA85	
PMA88	
PMA89	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA61	
RL12	
PMA65	
PMA67	
PMA99	
PMA102	
PMA103	
PMA104	
PMA105	
PMA106	
PMA107	
PMA135	

I. 2. A. vii.

Al-Maqrîzî – Kitâb al-Sulûk

RL2	PMA41	PMA92	PMA132
PMA4	PMA42	PMA93	PMA130
PMA2	RL9	PMA94	RL13
PMA6	PMA43	PMA97	PMA133
PMA11	PMA44	PMA62	RL14
PMA7	PMA45	RL12	RL16
PMA9	PMA46	PMA63	FA3
PMA12	PMA47	PMA64	PMA136
SHM5	PMA48	PMA65	RL19
PMA13	PMA49	PMA66	RL22
PMA14	PMA50	PMA67	RL23
SHM6	RL11	PMA61	PMA139
SHM7	SHM16	PMA95	FA4
SHM8	PMA51	PMA96	PMA135
SHM9	PMA52	PMA98	PMA138
PMA16	PMA53	PMA99	RL21
PMA17	PMA54	PMA101	SHM17
PMA18	PMA55	PMA102	Obituaries
PMA19	PMA57	PMA103	
PMA20	PMA58	PMA104	
PMA21	PMA69	PMA105	
PMA22	PMA70	PMA106	
PMA23	PMA71	PMA107	
SHM10	PMA72	PMA109	
RL6	PMA68	PMA108	
RL7	PMA73	PMA110	
PMA25	PMA72	PMA114	
PMA26	PMA74	PMA112	
PMA27	PMA75	PMA113	
RL8	PMA76	PMA115	
PMA28	PMA79	PMA117	
PMA30	PMA80	PMA118	
PMA34	PMA81	PMA119	
PMA31	PMA59	PMA120	
PMA33	PMA60	PMA121	
PMA36	PMA82	PMA123	
PMA37	PMA83	PMA124	
PMA36	PMA85	PMA125	
PMA38	PMA86	PMA126	
PMA39	PMA87	PMA127	
SHM13	PMA84	PMA129	
SHM14	PMA88	PMA128	
PMA40	PMA89	PMA131	

I. 2. A. viii.

Ibn Hajar – *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*

PMA26	PMA132
PMA28	PMA79
RL18	PMA105
PMA27	PMA79
RL2	PMA80
RL8	PMA104
SHM9	PMA110
PMA20	SHM12
SHM6	SHM19
PMA2	RL23
PMA21	RL20
PMA6	SHM18
PMA9	PMA62
PMA12	RL12
SHM5	RL14
PMA30	PMA65
PMA43	PMA66
PMA44	PMA67
PMA52	PMA100
PMA54	PMA104
PMA59	PMA114
PMA69	PMA103
PMA70	PMA120
PMA71	PMA123
PMA74	PMA126
PMA71	PMA121
PMA76	PMA128
PMA77	PMA131
PMA132	PMA123
PMA77	PMA124
PMA83	PMA135
PMA85	SHM15
PMA82	RL16
PMA85	RL13
PMA89	RL17
PMA92	FA5
PMA93	PMA138
PMA94	FA4
SHM3	RL19
SHM2	PMA139
PMA145	FA3
FA6	Obituaries
PMA76	

I. 2. A. ix.

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah – Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah (TIQS)

RL1	PMA69	RL13
RL2	PMA70	PMA111
SHM1	PMA71	PMA116
PMA2	PMA74	PMA122
SHM2	PMA75	PMA137
SHM3	PMA76	RL20
SHM5	PMA79	SHM18
SHM6	PMA80	RL24
SHM7	PMA81	PMA140
SHM8	PMA59	PMA138
RL3	PMA82	RL21
PMA16	PMA83	FA3
PMA19	PMA85	FA5
PMA18	PMA86	PMA136
RL4	PMA92	Obituaries
PMA20	PMA93	
PMA21	PMA97	
PMA24	PMA65	
SHM10	RL12	
RL6	PMA67	
PMA25	PMA95	
PMA26	PMA98	
PMA28	PMA99	
PMA27	PMA101	
RL8	PMA102	
PMA29	PMA103	
PMA30	PMA104	
PMA35	PMA105	
SHM11	PMA104	
PMA36	PMA105	
PMA37	PMA106	
PMA36	PMA107	
PMA39	PMA132	
RL19	PMA104	
RL9	PMA108	
PMA43	PMA115	
PMA44	PMA112	
PMA46	PMA113	
RL11	PMA119	
PMA52	PMA118	
PMA57	PMA135	
PMA55	RL14	
RL10	RL16	

I. 2. A. x.

Ibn Taghrîbirdî – *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*

PMA36	PMA99
PMA16	PMA102
SHM5	PMA94
PMA20	PMA103
PMA25	PMA104
PMA30	PMA105
PMA48	PMA106
PMA40	PMA107
PMA49	PMA112
PMA52	PMA113
PMA50	PMA123
PMA52	PMA131
RL11	PMA129
PMA53	PMA130
PMA54	PMA128
PMA55	PMA132
PMA46	PMA136
PMA48	PMA141
PMA47	PMA118
PMA69	PMA138
PMA70	PMA135
PMA71	PMA117
PMA74	PMA127
PMA76	
PMA75	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA83	
PMA85	
PMA82	
PMA85	
PMA88	
PMA89	
PMA91	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA61	
RL12	
PMA65	
PMA67	
PMA95	
PMA96	
PMA97	

I. 2. A. xi.

Al-Sakhâwî – *Wajîz al-Kalam*

PMA1	PMA106
SHM5	PMA107
SHM6	PMA135
PMA20	PMA94
RL8	Obituaries
RL2	
RL8	
PMA28	
PMA30	
PMA36	
PMA46	
PMA132	
RL11	
PMA52	
PMA55	
PMA50	
PMA52	
PMA53	
PMA46	
PMA69	
PMA70	
PMA71	
PMA74	
PMA76	
PMA75	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA85	
PMA88	
PMA85	
PMA89	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA61	
RL12	
PMA67	
PMA65	
PMA103	
PMA104	
PMA100	
PMA114	
PMA104	
PMA105	

I. 2. A. xii.

'Abd al-Bâsit al-Malâtî – *Nayl al-Amal*

PMA4	PMA83
PMA2	PMA69
PMA6	PMA70
Obituaries	PMA71
SHM5	PMA76
Obituaries	PMA75
SHM6	PMA80
SHM9	PMA59
PMA20	PMA94
SHM10	PMA62
Obituaries	PMA65
PMA21	PMA66
Obituaries	PMA61
PMA25	PMA109
PMA26	PMA85
PMA27	Obituaries
RL8	PMA104
PMA28	PMA114
Obituaries	PMA135
PMA30	PMA124
SHM12	PMA115
Obituaries	PMA132
PMA36	RL13
PMA37	RL16
PMA36	FA4
SHM13	RL22
PMA41	RL23
PMA43	FA4
PMA44	Obituaries
PMA45	FA6
PMA46	FA5
PMA47	PMA144
PMA25	SHM17
PMA48	
PMA50	
PMA49	
PMA50	
PMA52	
PMA53	
PMA54	
PMA57	
PMA55	
PMA69	

I. 2. A. xiii.

Ibn Iyâs – *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*

RL2	PMA41	PMA80	PMA113
PMA2	PMA36	PMA81	PMA117
PMA5	PMA37	PMA83	PMA118
PMA6	SHM13	PMA59	PMA119
PMA11	PMA42	PMA83	PMA120
PMA7	PMA41'	PMA59	PMA121
PMA9	PMA41	PMA60	PMA123
PMA10	PMA43	PMA85	PMA124
FA1	PMA46	PMA86	PMA125
SHM12	PMA47	PMA78	PMA126
SHM14	PMA44	PMA88	PMA129
FA2	PMA46	PMA84	PMA128
Obituaries	PMA45	PMA89	PMA131
PMA4	PMA56	PMA90	PMA130
PMA12	PMA48	PMA91	RL13
SHM5	PMA49	PMA92	PMA133
PMA13	PMA50	PMA93	PMA127
PMA14	PMA52	PMA94	PMA132
SHM6	PMA57	PMA66	RL14
SHM8	PMA55	PMA61	RL16
PMA16	PMA52	PMA65	FA3
PMA18	PMA50	RL12	PMA136
PMA19	SHM16	PMA67	RL19
PMA20	PMA52	PMA95	RL22
SHM9	RL11	PMA103	RL23
PMA21	PMA51	PMA95	PMA139
PMA22	PMA52	PMA103	FA4
PMA23	PMA53	RL12	PMA138
SHM10	PMA54	PMA103	RL21
PMA26	PMA69	PMA132	PMA135
PMA25	PMA70	PMA99	PMA144
PMA26	PMA71	PMA101	FA6
PMA28	PMA74	PMA102	FA5
Obituaries	PMA76	PMA104	SHM12
RL6	PMA74	PMA114	PMA144
PMA27	PMA75	PMA105	Obituaries
RL8	PMA73	PMA106	
PMA30	PMA72	PMA107	
PMA31	PMA68	PMA132	
PMA34	PMA72	PMA109	
PMA33	PMA76	PMA108	
PMA38	PMA74	PMA110	
PMA39	PMA79	PMA112	

I. 2. A. xiv.

Anonymous – *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*

SHM6	PMA106
PMA25	PMA107
PMA26	
PMA48	
PMA52	
PMA50	
PMA52	
PMA55	
PMA50	
PMA49	
PMA52	
RL11	
PMA53	
PMA56	
PMA47	
PMA54	
PMA69	
PMA70	
PMA71	
PMA74	
PMA76	
PMA83	
PMA59	
PMA85	
PMA78	
PMA88	
PMA89	
PMA92	
PMA93	
PMA61	
RL12	
PMA61	
PMA65	
PMA67	
PMA95	
PMA99	
PMA102	
PMA93	
PMA94	
PMA103	
PMA132	
PMA104	
PMA105	

TABLES OF CHAPTER TWO
793/1390–91

The Sources

[IK] = Ibn Khaldûn = *Kitâb al-'Ibar* = vol. 5, pp. 499-503

[ZDT] = Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir = *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk* = MS Marsh 319, fols. 263a-270b-275b

[ID] = Ibn Duqmâq = *Al-Nafḥah* = pp. 262-4

[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]³¹ = Ibn al-Furât = *Al-Muntaqâ* = MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 166a-178b

[IF] = Ibn al-Furât = *Târiḫ al-Duwal* = vol. 9:2, pp. 245-273-393

[IS] = Ibn Saṣrâ = *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah* = pp. 71-110

[HI] = Ibn Hījî = *Târiḫ Ibn Hījî* = MS Köprülü 1027, fols. 93b-99b-100b

['Aynî] = Al-'Aynî = *'Iqd al-Jumân* = Ist.B2 = MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fols. 95b-99a-99b
= DK = MS Dâr al-Kutub *Târiḫ* 1584, fols. 425-436-438

[Maq.] = Al-Maqrîzî = *Kitâb al-Sulûk* = vol. 3:2, pp. 732-754-759

[IH] = Ibn Hajar = *Inbâ' al-Ghumr* = vol.3, pp. 54-83-104

[IQS] = Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah = *Târiḫ Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah* = *TIQS* = vol. 1, pp. 368-390-420

[SIY] = Sâlih ibn Yahyâ = *Târiḫ Bayrût* = pp. 209-10; 215-216; 217; 233

[IT] = Ibn Taghrîbirdî = *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* = vol. 12, pp. 17-29

[AJ] = Al-Jawharî al-Sayrafî = *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* = vol. 1, pp. 321-338-340

[ABM] = 'Abd al-Bâsît al-Malaṭî = *Nayl al-Amal* = vol. 1, pp. 299-312

[IY] = Ibn Iyâs = *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr* = vol. 1:2, pp. 442-449

[Anon.] = Anonymous = *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* = MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fols. 299b-301b

Those marginal reports found in *Târiḫ Ibn Hījî* that are readable, long enough to constitute full-fledged *akhbâr*, accompanied by a s for *ṣahḥ*, and do *not* appear in an obituaries section of the text have been identified with an asterisk.

³¹ The presence of [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] at the beginning of a report, indicates that either *Al-Muntaqâ* alone or both *Târiḫ al-Duwal* and *Al-Muntaqâ* were referred to in the entry, in which case both page and folio numbers – with the latter preceded by the title *Al-Muntaqâ* – appear at the end, separated by a back slash. As for [IF], it means that only *Târiḫ al-Duwal* was dealt with in the entry.

TABLE II. 1. A.

Political, Military and Administrative Affairs [PMA]

PMA1. – [**Aynî**] {List of military, administrative and religious officials in Egypt and Syria} [Ist.B2 **95b-96a**/DK 425]

– HI: {Focus on religious personnel} [93b]

PMA2. – [**IF**] The sultan removed from office most of the incumbent governors of al-Wajh al-Qiblî and al-Wajh al-Bahrî and issued an edict that they be replaced by people who had never occupied these positions before. The sultan ordered the *nâ'ib al-saltanah*, Sûdûn al-Fakhrî al-Shaykhûnî, to choose governors from amongst a group of commanders of the *halqah*: Shâhîn al-'Alâ'î al-Kalbakî to al-Gharbîyah; Turqajî al-Sarghitmishî to al-Bahnasawîyah; Qijmâs al-Sayfî to al-Manûfiyah [2nd of Muḥarram; 245]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 96a]

– Maq.: [732]

– IH: + Sûdûn nominated the three without payment of a bribe. [During this year; 83]

– AJ: [321]

PMA3. – [**IF**] {Arrest and beating of Ibn Faḍâlah, the chief of al-Zuhûr tribe and one Khâlid ibn Baghdâd. The endeavour of Bakalmish, the *amîr akhûr*, who tried to intercede in Ibn Baghdâd's favour, annoyed the sultan who beat him and ordered him arrested. Other emirs interceded in his favour, so the sultan released him from jail and bestowed presents upon him} [3rd of Muḥarram; 245]

– IH: [81-82]

PMA4. – [**IF**] The sultan bestowed a robe of honour on the new *wâlîs* [4th of Muḥarram; 245]

– Maq.: [732]

PMA5. – [**IF**] {A messenger from Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî arrived in Cairo with news that al-Nâsirî and Aytamish al-Bajâsî had feigned a falling out to attract Mîntâshîs out of their hideouts in Damascus: one thousand two hundred of them were arrested. The sultan sent his thanks} [6th of Muḥarram; 245-6]

– Maq.: [732]

– IH: [During the month of Muḥarram; 54, 56]

– IT: [17]

– AJ: [321-2]

– ABM: [299]

– IY: This year, during the month of Muḥarram, news arrived that strife erupted between Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and Aytamish al-Bajâsî during which the former armed his mamluks. The emirs intervened and put an end to the conflict [442]

*PMA6. – **[HI]** [A very difficult to read marginal *khbar* which probably talks about the departure of Kumushbughâ and a number of emirs to Egypt on the 10th of Muḥarram] [n.d.; 93b]

PMA7. – **[IS]** A courier came from the Northern provinces urging on the Syrian troops of Damascus [14th of Muḥarram; 71]

PMA8. – **[IS]** {Al-Nâsirî and the Syrian troops left Damascus heading north over a three-day period.} [15th of Muḥarram; 71]

PMA9. – **[ZDT]** {The Syrian viceroys headed towards ‘Ayntâb following the sultan’s orders to confront Mintâsh who was besieging the citadel of that city. When the Mintâshîs sensed the arrival of the loyalist troops near ‘Ayntâb, they broke off the siege and headed towards Mar‘ash. The loyalist troops followed the Mintâshîs, some of whom defected, were killed or imprisoned. The citadel was rebuilt and the city’s inhabitant moved back into their homes} [n.d.; 263a-b]

PMA10. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** {Arrest and mulcting of high civilian functionaries: Abû al-Faraj, Sinn Ibrah and al-Baqarî} [16th of Muḥarram; 246/*Al-Muntaqâ* 166a]

– ‘Aynî: + The money taken was all silver dirhams [15th Muḥarram; DK 425]

– Maq.: [732]

– IH: [During the month of Muḥarram; 65]

– AJ: [322]

PMA10’. – **[Anon.]** {The sultan convoked a number of former (“*ma‘zûlîn*”) *wazîrs*, among others, al-Maqsí, al-Baqarî and Ibn Makânîs, and assigned them to new positions} [n.d.; fols. 299b-300a]

PMA11. – **[IS]** {Iyâs arrived in Damascus from Safad with troops and then headed north following Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî. After this, news ceased to arrive in Damascus from the expeditionary force, and all sorts of untrue rumours started to circulate} [21st of Muḥarram; 71]

PMA12. – **[IS]** {A courier arrived from Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî to the interim viceroy in Damascus informing him that the troops were doing fine. Tidings were sounded, etc. Some rumours said that Sûlî had captured Mintâsh, and others that the latter had escaped. “Various false rumours circulated amongst the people and they were afraid because of the contradictory reports.”³²} [First Friday, probably the the 6th of Safar; 71]

PMA13. – **[IS]** “On the next day the lantern men proclaimed that those emirs who were staying in the city and the troopers should leave; but no one followed to join the viceroy of Syria, al-Nâsirî, and the people were more and more afraid and would believe neither great nor small. Let us ask God to turn the outcome to good.”³³ [The following day, probably the 7th of Safar; 71-2]

³² Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 101.

³³ Ibid.

PMA14. – [IS] {Ibn Sasrá relates that one of those present with al-Nâsirî had told him that the people in Aleppo rejoiced when he entered the city on the 25th of Muḥarram because they liked him}[n.d.; 72]

PMA15. – [IS] Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and the troops of Aleppo headed towards Mar‘ash where they met Mintâsh in a battle during which many from both sides died. The loyalist forces could not defeat their foe and they fell back, disappointed, on Aleppo. [Kânûn (January) = First decade of Safar; 72]

PMA16. – [IS] {Many people in the North died from the bitter cold. Digression about the cold}[Kânûn (January) = First decade of Safar; 72-3]

PMA17. – [IS] The bad weather and high prices persisted in Aleppo, causing most of the grooms and enlisted troops to flee [n.d.; 73]

PMA18. – [IF] At the beginning of Safar, it became known that negotiations between Qadi Najm al-Dîn al-Tambadî,³⁴ the *muhtasib* of Cairo, and Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, the *shâdd al-dawâwîn*, concerning donations to the pilgrims unable to continue the *hajj* (“*al-munqati ‘in min al-hujjâj*”); the qadi [?] ordered the mulcting of the emir [?] who paid up a fixed amount of money [At the beginning of Safar; 246]

PMA19. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] {Arrival of Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî, the viceroy of Aleppo in Cairo where he was honoured by the sultan and by the emirs who also lavished presents upon him. He received an emirate of a hundred and Înâl [min Khujâ’s *iqṭâ*’, to which three villages were added. He was accompanied by a number of emirs, amongst them: Altunbughâ al-Ashrafî, Hasan al-Kujkunî, the viceroy of al-Karak, Barmash, the *dawâdâr* of Kumushbughâ, as well as a number of emirs from amongst his own mamluks, such as Arghûn his *dawâdâr* and Shâhîn his *ra’s nawbah* [9th of Safar; 247/Al-Muntaqâ 166b]

– IK: When his regime was again firmly established, Barqûq summoned Kumushbughâ in Dhû al-Hijjah 792 and nominated in his stead Qarâdamurdâsh who was transferred to Aleppo from Tripoli. Kumushbughâ arrived on the 9th of Safar. [499-500]

– ‘Aynî: + {The Înâl in question was Înâl, the *amîr akhûr*, who had just been appointed viceroy of Tripoli; the two villages added to Kumushbughâ’s *iqṭâ*’ came from the *dîwân al-mufrad*; a daily ration of seven hundred *artâl* of meat was also given to him [9th of Safar; Ist.B2 96a/9th of Muḥarram; DK 425-6]

– Maq.: [733]

– IH: “In the month of Safar, Emir Kumushbughâ arrived from Aleppo, so the sultan ordered that he be [well] received.”/“On the 9th of Safar, Emir Kumushbughâ arrived from Aleppo and was received by the viceroy. The sultan offered him a great deal of gifts. He was accompanied by Hasan al-Kujkunî” [54, 78]

– IQS: [368]

– IT: [17]

³⁴ Also written as Tanbadî in the sources

- AJ: [7th of Safar; 322]
- ABM: “Kumushbughâ arrived and was seated higher near the sultan than the *atâbak* *Înâl al-Yûsufî*” [300]
- IY: [443]

PMA20. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** News reached Cairo that the mamluks of the Syrian viceroys, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî of Damascus; Qarâdamurdâsh of Aleppo; Aḥmad ibn al-Mihmandâr of Hama and Iyâs al-Jurjâwî of Safad; had arrived in ‘Ayntâb to fight Mintâsh and that, as a result, he had fled to Mar‘ash not before some of his men defected and joined the loyalist forces [11th of Safar; **247/Al-Muntaqâ** 166b-167a]

- Maq.: [734]
- IQS: [368]
- IT: [18]
- AJ: [322]
- ABM: [301]

PMA21. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** {Arrest and imprisonment of Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî, the *nâ’ib* of al-Wajh Qiblî} [The middle decade of Safar; **247/Al-Muntaqâ** 167a]

- Maq: + “This is the habit of the sultan that he is patient with his enemies in that he does not take revenge on them until he has the opportunity to discipline them for a punishable crime so that he does not appear to be taking revenge; all of this is due to his self-command and reserve. Follow this and you will realize that it is as I said.” [11th of Safar; 734]
- IQS: [n.d.; 368]
- AJ: [11th of Safar; 323]

PMA22. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Husâm al-Dîn Hasan ibn Bâkîsh, the former viceroy of Gaza, was taken out of prison and punished in front of the sultan. [15th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqâ** 167a]

- Maq.: [734]
- IQS: [n.d.; 368-9]
- IH: [66]
- IT: [18]
- AJ: [323]
- IY: [442-3]

PMA23. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî was beaten again, released into the hands of the *wâlî* of Cairo and made to pay back what he had taken from the people [15th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqâ** 167a]

- Maq.: [734]
- IQS: [n.d.; 368-9]
- IT: [18]
- Maq.: [734]
- AJ: Maq. [323]

PMA24. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nâsir a-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Laylá, the *wâlî* of al-Jîzah, is replaced by Mubârak Shâh al-Zâhirî as *wâlî* and *kâshif* [15th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqá** 167a]

– Maq.: [734]

PMA25. – **[IF]** The sultan summoned the son of al-Hâj ‘Ubayd al-Buzdâr, the *muqaddam al-dawlah*, after the latter’s death, and appointed him to his father’s position. He also issued an edict that he be replaced by deputies until his recovery [15th of Safar; 248]

PMA26. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Yalbughâ al-Aḥmadî al-Zâhirî [al-Majnûn] as the replacement of Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî [19th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqá** 167a]

– Maq.: [734]

– IH: [66, 78, 83]

– IQS: [n.d.; 369]

– IT: [18]

– AJ: [323]

PMA27. – **[IF]** Confirmation of Asanbughâ al-Sayfî Sûdûn Bâq as *wâlî* of al-Fayyûm and *kâshif* of al-Bahnasawîyah and al-Atfihîyah instead of Yalbughâ al-Aḥmadî [19th of Safar; 248]

– Maq.: [734]

– IH: [During this year; 83]

PMA28. – **[IF]** Confirmation of Toqtây al-Shihâbî as *wâlî* of al-Ashmûnayn in replacement of Asanbughâ al-Sayfî Sûdûn Bâq [19th of Safar; 248]

– Maq.: [734]

– IH: [During this year; 83]

PMA29. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Confirmation of Damurdâsh al-Sayfî Uljây as *nâ’ib* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî instead of al-Sharîf Baktamur [21st of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqá** 167a]

– Maq.: [734]

– IH: [During this year; 83]

PMA30. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Beating of Ibn al-Habbâl al-Hanbalî, the qadi of Tripoli, because of a *fatwá* he had issued against the sultan and in favour of Mintâsh [29th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqá** 167a]

– Maq.: [735]

– IH: [At the end of Safar; 66-7; 78-9]

– IQS: [During Safar; 369]

– IT: [18]

– AJ: [323]

– ABM: [300]

PMA31. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** About seventy al-Zuhûr tribesmen, amongst them the children of Fudâlah (“*awlâd Fudâlah*”) were brought by Anwât al-Yûsufî, the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî, and were ordered nailed and cut at the waist by the sultan, as they had been involved in highway robberies, murders, etc. [29th of Safar; **248/Al-Muntaqá** 167a]

- Maq.: [735]
- IQS.: [During Ṣafar; 369]
- ABM: [During Ṣafar; 300]

PMA32. – **[IS]** The month of Rabî‘ al-Awwal started and the expeditionary force was still in Aleppo [74]

PMA33. – **[IS]** Arrival of a post messenger with an edict from the sultan for the recall of all Syrian troops back from Aleppo to their respective home bases [5th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 74]

- ZDT: The loyalist forces stayed in ‘Ayntâb a few days, and, after they had fortified the city’s citadel, then returned home to their respective viceroalties [n.d.; 263b]

PMA34. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Nomination by Barqûq of Sharaf al-Dîn Yûnus al-Qashtamurî, an Egyptian emir of forty, as viceroy of al-Karak instead of Qudayd al-Qalamtâwî who was summoned to Cairo [7th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; **249/Al-Muntaqâ** 167a-b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [735]
- IQS.: [369]
- AJ: [323]

PMA35. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** The sultan ordered the re-appropriation of the *iqtâ‘* of the viceroy of Alexandria, Arghûn al-‘Uthmânî al-Bujmaqdâr al-Ashrafî, and his retirement in this city; his *iqtâ‘* was given to Husâm al-Dîn Hasan al-Kujkunî who had been the viceroy of al-Karak [8th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; **249/Al-Muntaqâ** 167b]

- ‘Aynî: [96b]
- Maq.: [735]
- IQS [369]
- IT: [18]
- AJ: [323]

PMA36. – **[IS]** {An edict from the sultan arrived in Damascus requesting the demolition of the new gate that was renovated by Mîntâsh so that it is would not be identified with his name. A man who questioned the demolition of such a fine gate was beaten by Barqûq’s mamluks then taken to the citadel from which he never reappeared} [During Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 74]

PMA37. – **[IK]** {Aytamish al-Bajâsî was summoned to Cairo after the sultan had firmly secured his rule. This report is preceded by half a page long description of al-Bajâsî’s life events starting with his defeat in Syria at the hands of Barqûq’s enemies in 791. Qunuq Bâý was sent out to accompany Aytamish back to Cairo} [8th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 500]

- IF/Al-Muntaqâ: [249/Al-Muntaqâ 167b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96a; DK 426]
- Maq.: [735]
- IQS: [369]

- IT: [18]
- AJ: [323]
- ABM: [301]

PMA38. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Arrival in Cairo from Syria of Abû Yazîd al-Khâzin, the son-in-law of al-Shaykh Akmal al-Dîn, along with al-Shaykh Shams al-Dîn al-Sûfi, the *nâzir* of al-Mâristân al-Mansûri, who had been sent to Aleppó on an investigative mission to inquire about those parts; they related, among other things, that a number of emirs had abandoned Mintâsh, that the latter had fled and that the loyalist troops had returned [10th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; **249/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- IS: “...the viceroy of Syria entered Damascus, [and] candles were lighted for him....”³⁵ [n.d.; 74]
- *HI: Al-Nâsirî entered Damascus [date unclear; 94a]
- Maq.: [736]
- IH: “During this year, the sultan sent al-Shaykh Shams al-Dîn al-Sûfi, the *nâzir* of al-Mâristân, to inquire about the whereabouts of Mintâsh. He reached Aleppo, returned to Cairo in Rabî‘ al-Awwal, and informed the sultan that Mintâsh had gone alone to Sanbuâ³⁶ without any soldiers (*shâridan min al-‘asâkir*).” [80]
- IQS: “During [Rabî‘ al-Awwal], the Syrian troops who had gone to catch Mintâsh returned.” [369]
- AJ: [323]

PMA39. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Ibn Bâkîsh was released into the hands of the governor of Cairo, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn al-Tablâwî, to be mulcted [13th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; **249/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- ‘Aynî: [DK 428]
- Maq.: [736]
- AJ: [324]

PMA40. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Al-Sharîf Baktamur, viceroy of al-Wajh al-Bahrî, was arrested because he hurt the ego of Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd the *ustâdâr* for the reason that he did not send him a present. The *ustâdâr* spoke to the sultan about Baktamur’s poor results as a tax-farmer in the area of Tarûjah. Al-Sharîf Baktamur was later released, upon the intercession of Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Jamâl al-Dîn ‘Abdallâh ibn Baktamur, the *hâjib*, on the condition that he paid one hundred thousand dirhams}[During the middle decade of the month; **249-50/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- Maq.: [13th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 736]

PMA41. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Tashlâqî became the new *wâlî* of Qatya on the condition that he brings in one hundred and thirty thousand dirhams per month. [During this month; **250/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- Maq.: [736]
- IQS: [369]

³⁵ Ibid., p. 103.

³⁶ The editor of *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* noted that the city in question was located in the Sa‘îd!!!; p. 80 footnote no. 4.

PMA42. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî al-Khâssakî al-Zâhirî left with the post with a *taqlid* for Nu‘ayr of the Fadl tribe confirming his continuance as emir [During the last decade of the month; **250/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- Maq.: [13th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 736]
- IH: [67]
- IQS: [369]
- ABM: [301]

PMA43 – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Confirmation by the sultan of Barmash al-Kumushbughâwî’s appointment as *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Tripoli instead of Asandamur al-Sayfî who had been the city’s viceroy but had finally become its *hâjib al-hujjâb* [1st of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; **250/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [736]
- IQS: [369]
- AJ: [324]
- ABM: [301]

PMA44. – **[IS]** An edict from the sultan arrived in Damascus summoning to Cairo the Mintâshîs imprisoned in the Citadel, among others Jardamur Akhû Tâz, the former viceroy of Damascus; his son Jarbughâ; Malik, the son of his sister; Muḥammad Shâh ibn Baydamur; ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Altunbughâ, Jardamur’s *ustâdâr*; Shihâb al-Dîn the *zardkâsh*; Qadi Fath al-Dîn ibn al-Shahîd; Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Qurashî, and others [During Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 74]

PMA45. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Confirmation by the sultan of al-Hâj Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmân as *muqaddam al-dawlah* instead of Al-Hâj ‘Ubayd al-Buzdâr. This position was added to that he already held as *muqaddam al-khâss* [1st of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; **250/Al-Muntaqá** 167b]

- Maq.: [736]

PMA46. – **[IS]** Departure of the imprisoned emirs from Damascus towards Cairo under the command of Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, who accompanied them to Gaza [[First?] Thursday [9th?] of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 74]

- *HI: [11th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 94a]

PMA47. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The arrest by the sultan of Shâhîn al-Sarghitmishî, his *amîr akhûr*, was reported. News had reached the sultan about him and his alleged sympathies for Mintâsh so he was exiled to the Sa‘îd. It was also reported that he was arrested because horses belonging to the *khâss* were found in his stables [19th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; **250/Al-Muntaqá** 167b-168a]

- Maq.: [736]
- IQS: [370]
- AJ: [324]

PMA48. – [**‘Aynî**] {Aytamish al-Bajâsî was received by the sultan and the emirs at court all of whom lavished presents on him. Aytamish was accompanied by Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, and by sixty-three prisoners, among others Jardamur Akhû Tâz the previous viceroy of Damascus; his son; his nephew Malik; his *ustâdâr*, Alṭunbughâ; Damurdâsh al-Yûsufî; Alṭunbughâ al-Halabî; a Turcoman who used to slaughter the mamluks under the orders of Mintâsh. Also in chains were Qadis Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn al-Qurashî, who had been *qâdî al-qudât*; Fath al-Dîn ibn al-Shahîd, *kâtib al-sirr*; and Shams al-Dîn ibn Mashkûr who was the *nâzir al-jaysh*, all of whom were from Damascus. A group of around one hundred Zâhirî mamluks who had been imprisoned in the citadel of Damascus also accompanied Aytamish} [4th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; Ist.B2 96a/DK 426]

– IK: [500]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [250-1/*Al-Muntaqá* 168a]

– IS: [74]

– Maq.: [736-7]

– IH: [67-8]

– IQS: [370]

– IT: [18-19]

– AJ: [324-5]

– IY: During the month of *Safar*, the expeditionary force, headed by Aytamish, that had gone to Syria to fight Mintâsh, returned to Cairo. Along with Aytamish came sixty-three emirs of various ranks, and about one thousand *sultânî* mamluks. [443]

PMA49. – [**IF/*Al-Muntaqá***] {The prisoners accompanying the party from Syria were presented to the sultan who scolded them and then ordered them imprisoned save one, Ibn Mashkûr, who was mulcted} [4th of Jumâdá al-Awwal; 251/*Al-Muntaqá* 168a]

– IK: [500]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96a-b/DK 426]

– Maq.: [737]

– IS: “When they arrived in Cairo, the sultan had them brought before him and remonstrated with them for what had happened to him on their account. From all of them only Šihâb al-dîn the armorer was saved...”³⁷ [n.d.; 74]

– IH: [68]

– IQS: [370]

– IT [19]

– AJ: [325]

– ABM: [301]

PMA50. – [**IS**] The viceroy of Damascus nominated Kizil *hâjib al-maysarah* instead of Âqbughâ al-Buzlârî [4th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 74]

PMA51. – [**IS**] As was the habit of the viceroys, al-Nâsirî went to al-Marj where he stayed for a while [9th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 75]

³⁷ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. 104-5.

PMA52. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Anwât al-Yûsufî the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî brought in sixty-three members of al-Zuhûr tribe who were responsible of great mischief [13th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; **251/Al-Muntaqá** 168a]

– Maq.: [737]

PMA53. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Arrival of Jibrîl al-Khawârizmî in obeisance to the sultan after tribulations in Syria with Mintâsh and others; the sultan forgave him following the intercession of Nu‘ayr} [Last decade of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; **251/Al-Muntaqá** 168a-b]

– Maq.: [737]

– IH: [68]

– IQS: [370-1]

PMA54. – **[‘Aynî]** Nomination of Hamzah al-Ja‘farî as *wakîl bayt al-mâl* in Aleppo and *nâzir* of the Nûrî mosque [29th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]

– IF/Al-Muntaqá: [28th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

– Maq.: [738]

PMA55. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Confirmation of Qadi Badr al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Sharaf al-Dîn Mûsá ibn al-Shihâb Maḥmûd al-Ḥalabî in his position as *nâzir al-jaysh* in Aleppo [28th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

– ‘Aynî: [29th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]

– Maq.: [738]

– IQS: [371]

PMA56 – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan released Âqbughâ al-Mârdînî and Tashbughâ al-Sayfî following the respective intercession of Sûdûn al-Fakhrî al-Shaykhûnî and Aytamish al-Bajâsî [During the last decade of the month; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

– Maq.: [738]

– IQS: [371]

PMA57. – **[IS]** Return to Damascus of Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, who had accompanied the prisoners to Cairo [Sunday, the 2nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 75]

PMA58. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Arrest of Emirs Asandamur al-Sharafî al-Yûnusî; Ismâ‘îl al-Turukmânî; Kizl al-Qirimî; Âqbughâ al-Bajâsî; al-Dhabbâh, who used to kill people on behalf of Mintâsh; and possibly Sarbughâ al-Zâhirî; they were then released into the custody of the governor of Cairo, Ibn al-Ṭablâwî [2nd or 3rd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

– HI: The sultan arrested a number of emirs amongst them Asandamur al-Sharafî and al-Dhabbâh. This Asandamur had been a viceroy of Hama and when Mintâsh [...?] he fled to the sultan [94a]

– Maq.: [738]

– IH: [70, 73]

– IQS: [371]

– IT: [19]

– AJ: [325]

PMA59. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] The sultan ordered the arrest of eleven Egyptian emirs from the days of Mintâsh: Quṭlûbughâ al-Tashtamurî, the *hâjib*; Toqtây al-Tashtamurî; Alâbughâ al-Tashtamurî; Qarâbughâ al-Sayfî Uljây; Âqbughâ al-Sayfî Uljây; Baybughâ al-Sayfî Uljây; Taybughâ al-Sayfî Uljây; Muḥammad ibn Baydamur al-Khawârizmî; Jibrîl al-Khawârizmî; Manjak al-Zaynî and Arghûn Shâh al-Sayfî [9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 252/*Al-Muntaqá* 168b]

– HI: The sultan then arrested another group of emirs among them Sanjaq [al-Ḥasanî?], the former *hâjib* of Damascus at the time of the rebellion against Barqûq, and a companion to Jardamur; Muḥammad Shâh ibn Baydamur and Jibrîl [al-Khawârizmî] who were all put to death before the sultan's departure to Syria [94a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96a]

– Maq.: [739]

– IH: [68-9]

– IQS: [371]

– IT: [19-20]

– AJ: [325-6]

PMA60. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] The sultan ordered the nailing of a number of those arrested namely Asandamur al-Sharafî al-Yûnusî; Âqbughâ al-Bajâsî; Ismâ‘îl al-Turukmânî, the *amîr al-battâlin* under Mintâsh; Kizl al-Qirimî; Şarbughâ al-Zâhirî. Ibn al-Ṭablâwî nailed the emirs in his own house, then paraded with them through Cairo to below the citadel, and finally to al-Mahâyir where they were cut at the waist as if they were thieves [9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 252-3/*Al-Muntaqá* 168b]

– Aynî: [10th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; DK 426-7/Ist.B2 96b]

– Maq.: [739]

– IH: [70]

– IQS: [371]

– IT: [19-20]

– AJ: [326]

– ABM: [302]

– IY: [443-4]

PMA61. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] Charges for which the penalty was death were brought against Altunbughâ al-Ḥalabî and Altunbughâ, Jardamur's *ustâdâr*, before the court of the Mâlikî *Qâdî al-Qudât* Shams al-Dîn al-Rakrâkî. Heavily shackled, they were then imprisoned in the Shamâyil prison [9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 253/*Al-Muntaqá* 168b]

– Maq.: [739]

– IH: [74]

– IQS: [372]

– IT: [20]

– AJ: [326]

PMA62. – [IF] It was reported that Jardamur Akhû Ṭâz the former viceroy of Damascus and Qadî al-Qurashî acted as infidels; reports were written in this respect about them [9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 253]

PMA63. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan had Emir Qabjaq and his son-in-law arrested and imprisoned [12th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 168b-169a]

- ‘Aynî: Arrest of Sanjaq al-Hasanî and Sarâytamur al-Sharafî [14th Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.B2 96b]
- Maq.: [739]
- IT: [20]
- AJ: [326]

PMA64. – **[IS]** Acting upon the summon of the viceroy of Damascus, Emir Jaqmaq, the viceroy of Homs, arrived only to be imprisoned by him in the citadel [14th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 75]

PMA65. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Qadi Ibn al-Qurashî was beaten following the complaint of a Persian man regarding a debt. Al-Tablâwî was instructed by the sultan to extract the money from the qadi [15th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b]
- Maq.: [739]
- IH: [70-1]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [20]
- AJ: [326]

PMA66. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Emir Quṭlûbughâ al-Safawî as *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Cairo [19th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [740]
- IH: [69]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [Rajab; 22]
- AJ: [327]

PMA67. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Emir Batkhâs as *hâjib thâni ra's al-maysarah* [19th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: [740]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [Rajab; 22]
- AJ: [327]

PMA68. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Emir Qudayd as *hâjib saghîr* [19th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- ‘Aynî: Nomination of Emir Qudayd and Sûdûn al-Tughaytamurî as *hâjibs sikhâr* [Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [740]
- IQS: Nomination of Emir Malik as *hâjib thâlith* [372]
- IT: [Rajab; 22]
- AJ: [327]

PMA69. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Emir ‘Alî Sûdûn Bâshâ as *hâjib saghîr* [19th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: ...*hâjib râbi*’... [740]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [22]
- AJ: [327]

PMA70. – **[IT]** Nomination of Yalbughâ al-Ashqar, the *amîr akhûr*, as viceroy of Gaza instead of ‘Aqbughâ al-Saghîr because of the latter’s convocation to Cairo [Rajab [sic]; 22]

- IF/Al-Muntaqá: ...Yalbughâ al-Ishiqtamurî...[During the middle decade of the month; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]
- Maq.: [740]
- IQS: [372]
- AJ: [327]

PMA71. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Shahrî as viceroy of Malatyah [During the middle decade of the month; **253/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: [740]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [22]
- AJ: [327]
- ABM: [302]
- IY: [444]

PMA72. – **[IS]** The viceroy of Damascus proclaimed that the soldiery leave the city after Friday prayer and head to al-Kiswah for a month-long stay; after the emirs complained, he backtracked [21st of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 75]

PMA73. – **[HI]** The viceroy al-Nâsirî arrived in Damascus from al-Marj [21st of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

PMA74. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {One Jamâl al-Dîn al-Hadabânî al-Kurdî accused Malik, the nephew of Jaramur Akhû Tâz, of having taken from him six hundred thousand dirhams and of having provoked enmity towards him from the part of people in power (“*arbâb al-dawlah*”) in Damascus. The sultan ordered him beaten and released into the hands of Ibn al-Tablâwî: this led to his death on the 25th of this month} [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **253-4/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: ...of having provoked enmity towards him from the part of Mintâsh...[740]
- IH: [71, 81]
- IT: [20]
- AJ: [327]

PMA75. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Arghûn Shâh, the *khâzindâr*, was invested with the position of *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus, instead of Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, who became viceroy of Hama [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/25th** of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; *Al-Muntaqá* 169a]

- Maq.: [740]
- IQS: [372]
- IT: [22]
- AJ: [327]
- ABM: [302]
- IY: [444]

PMA76. – **[HI]** “We also learned that [Arghûn Shâh, the *khâzindâr*, the newly appointed *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus] had left for Syria. He reached Safad where he stayed a short period of time, then arrived in Damascus after the entry of Mintâsh in it, so al-Nâsirî did not sign his appointment papers.” [29th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

- IQS: [372]

PMA77. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Nomination of emirs of forty, among them Qâsim, the son of Kumushbughâ, Sûdûn Bâshâ al-Tughaytamurî, etc.} [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- ‘Aynî: [20th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 99a]

- Maq.: [740]

- IH: “During this month, Qâsim, the son of Kumushbughâ, a boy of seven or around that, was nominated to an emirate of forty.” [72]

- IT: [22]

- AJ: [327]

PMA78. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Nomination of emirs of ten} [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah/25th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: [740]

- IT: [22]

- AJ: [327]

PMA79. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Arrival of Âqbughâ al-Saghîr, the viceroy of Gaza, following the sultan’s summon [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: [741]

- AJ: [327]

PMA80. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan ordered the arrest of Barakah’s mamluks and those who had served Mintâsh; the *wâlî* embarked upon this task [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/25th** of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; *Al-Muntaqá* 169a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b]

- Maq. [741]

- IH: [72]

- IT: [20]

- AJ: [327]

PMA81. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The captured mamluks were put on exhibition, some arrested and others released [22nd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/Al-Muntaqá** 169a]

- Maq.: [740]

- AJ: [28th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 327]

PMA82. – **[HI]** Nomination of Qarâbughâ al-‘Alâ’î as *shâdd al-awqâf* [23rd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

– IQS: [372]

PMA83. – **[IS]** {News arrived in Damascus from the North that Mintâsh had reached Hama with a large number of Turcomans, Turks and others, and that the city’s viceroy, Ibn al-Mihmandâr, had fled. Al-Nâsirî had the lantern men call upon the troops to prepare for departure and asked the viceroy of the citadel to fortify it. When people heard the news, fear spread among them} [23rd of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 75-6]

– HI: [Tuesday the 24th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

– IQS: [372]

PMA84. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Ibn al-Qurashî was beaten with cudgels by al-Tablâwî, the *wâlî* [25th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254/Al-Muntaqâ** 169a-b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96a]

– Maq.: [741]

– IT: [20]

– AJ: [328]

– ABM: [303]

PMA85. – **[IF]** Nomination of al-Sârim, the previous *wâlî* of Cairo, as governor of al-Ashmûnayn instead of Toqtây al-Shihâbî [26th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 254]

– Maq.: [741]

PMA86. – **[IK]** Mintâsh remained without a point of attachment (“*sharîd*”) after he had parted with the Arabs. In the middle of 793, he took the decision to head to Damascus, it is said at the incitement of al-Nâsirî who wanted to trick him in order to capture him. [n.d.; 501]

PMA87. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** {Mintâsh’s dash towards Damascus, and his itinerary all the way from Mar’ash, Sarmîn, Hama, Tripoli, Homs, Baalbek to Damascus} [n.d.; **255/Al-Muntaqâ** 169b]

– IK: [501]

– ZDT: [263b-264a]

– ID: [262-3]

– IS: [75, 76]

– HI: [95a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 428]

– Maq.: [741]

– IH: [54-5, 56-7]

– IQS: [373]

– IT: [21]

– AJ: [328]

– IY: [444]

PMA88. – **[IS]** “Reports reached al-Nâsirî, the viceroy, that Mintâš had reached Hamâ. He was distressed and said, ‘There is no might and power except in God the Exalted the Glorious.’ He immediately summoned the lantern men and had them proclaim that the troops be prepared to leave after the Friday prayer. When the people heard this news, fear and alarming rumors spread among them. Al-Nâsirî summoned the viceroy of the citadel and said to him, ‘I am going out of the city. Fortify the citadel and take care.’ The viceroy left on Friday, and people were afraid, most of them moving to the interior of the city. The gates were locked and the citadel fortified. [–] Al-Nâsirî and the troops of Syria turned in the direction of the Biqâ‘, making for Mintâš. Alâbughâ remained as interim viceroy... ”³⁸ [Friday, the 28th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 75-76]

– IK: [501]

– ZDT: [264a]

– ID: [263]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: When news of Mintâš’s arrival reached al-Nâsirî, he went to meet him by means of the Zabadânî road [255/*Al-Muntaqâ* 169a]

– HI: [20th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 94b, 95a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 428]

– Maq.: [741]

– IH: [55; 57]

– IQS: [373]

– IT: [21]

– AJ: [328]

– ABM: [328]

PMA89. – **[IF]** When news of the arrival of al-Nâsirî and the soldiery of Damascus reached Mintâš he retreated to the Isâ‘, a mountain near Tripoli, which is the home of Ibn Atamân al-Turukmânî [n.d.; 255]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 428]

PMA90. – **[HI]** News reached Yalbughâ and his men that Mintâš had reached Damascus through the Biqâ‘ valley, so they returned to the city [28th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 94b, 95b]

– IH: [55; 57]

– IQS: [373]

PMA91. – **[Al-Muntaqâ]** When news reached Mintâš and his men that Yalbughâ and his men had left Damascus, they headed to the city [n.d.; 169a]

– IK: [501]

– ZDT: [264a]

– HI: [95a]

– IF: {Mintâš and Yalbughâ unknowingly crossed paths on their way, respectively to and from Damascus} [255]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/Ayn DK 429]

– IH: [55]

– IQS: [373]

³⁸ Ibid., p. 106.

- IT: [21]
- ABM: [303]

PMA92. – **[IS]** “News arrived that [Mintâš] was at Hasyâ, and that Ibn Hilâl al-Dawla was encamped at al-Zabadânî. [Mintâš] attacked the district of the Qaysîs, killing many of them, while Ibn Yahmir al-Turukmâni captured Tripoli.”³⁹ [n.d.; 76]

PMA93. – **[HI]** On the last Sunday of the month,⁴⁰ tidings were sounded at the citadel in Damascus [The 29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah or the 1st of Rajab; 94b]

PMA94. – **[HI]** News arrived about the coming of Mintâsh’s troops to al-Mizzah from the Biqâ’ valley where the Yamanîs had taken over the lands of Qays. People were surprised not to hear any news from the Syrian troops [Sunday the 29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah or the 1st of Rajab; 94b]

- IS: “Reports reached the city at late evening prayer that most of Mintâsh’s troops were at al-Mizza. The people spent a bad night, fearing a siege and what had happened to them in the days when the sultan was at Qubbat Yalbuğâ.⁴¹ They wavered between belief and disbelief.”⁴² [76]

- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: “They arrived from the Biqâ’ valley.” [n.d.; *Al-Muntaqâ* 169b]

PMA95. – **[IS]** {On the morning of the 1st of Rajab, Mintâsh, Aḥmad Shukr and their troops appeared at al-Maydân. Mintâsh settled in al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ as “the gates of the city were locked and the war call was beaten in the citadel. The grand chamberlain fled to within the city...”⁴³ [1st of Rajab; 76]

- IK: [501]

- ZDT: [264a]

- ID: [263]

- IF: Mintâsh arrived in Damascus and moved into al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ while his emirs settled in the houses around it, and his associates in the Tankiz and Yalbughâ mosques [29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 255]

- HI: [95a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 428, 429]

- Maq.: [741, 742]

- IH: [55, 57]

- IQS: [373]

- IT: [21]

- AJ: [328, 9]

- ABM: [303]

- IY: [444]

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Muslim calendars give this Sunday both as the 29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah or 1st of Rajab.

⁴¹ A small mosque located a couple of miles south of Damascus; Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 16 footnote no. 109.

⁴² Ibid., p. 106.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 107.

PMA96. – **[HI]** A group of Mintâshîs headed towards Bâb al-Saghîr with the intention of conquering the city, and by means of trickery managed to enter through Bâb Kaysân.⁴⁴ They were helped in their endeavour by some of the inhabitants of al-Shâghûr and others. They met no resistance as the soldiery and the qadis had retreated into the citadel, and Alâbughâ, the *hâjib*, into Dâr al-Sa‘âdah.⁴⁵ The Mintâshîs, among them Aḥmad Shukr al-Baydamurî, then entered the city and looted a large number of horses from the stables. They took only horses and weapons. It is said that Mintâsh prevented them from doing so [1st of Rajab; 95a-b]

- IK: Mintâsh started imposing payments on people and confiscating their property [501]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [29th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 255/*Al-Muntaqâ* 169a]
- ZDT: [264a]
- IS: [n.d.; 76; 77]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 428-9]
- Maq.: [741, 742]
- IH: [55, 57]
- IQS: [373]
- IT: [21]
- AJ: [328-9]
- IY: [444]

PMA97. – **[IF]** {Verbal exchange between Mintâsh and Aḥmad Shukr concerning the former’s preference for money rather than the horses brought to him by the latter. As they prepared to go back into the city, Yalbughâ arrived back in Damascus [1st of Rajab; 255]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 429]
- Maq.: [742]
- IT: [21]
- AJ: [329]

PMA98. – **[HI]** When Mintâsh arrived in al-Maydân, the populace went to him and sought his protection while showing great joy. The people of Damascus displayed a wide spectrum of reactions vis-à-vis his arrival [n.d.; 95b]

- ZDT: [264a]
- IS: [76, 77].
- IQS: [373]

PMA99. – **[HI]** Safety was accorded to the people of al-Sâlihîyah, and was proclaimed inside and outside of the city [n.d.; 95b]

- IS: “Mintâš immediately proclaimed safety and security and that no one was to take anything from anyone.”⁴⁶ [76]
- IQS: [373]

⁴⁴ A gate in the southeast corner of the fortifications of Damascus; *ibid.*, p. 57 footnote no. 354.

⁴⁵ The seat of the viceroy of Damascus located right next to the citadel in the northwest corner of the fortifications; *ibid.*, p. 6 footnote no. 27.

⁴⁶ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 107.

PMA100. – [IS] Aḥmad Shukr visited the household of his *ustâdh* Baydamur al-Khawârizmî wherefrom the latter's son Aḥmad and most of the Baydamûrîs rode out with him thinking that al-Nâsirî's hold over the city was over [n.d.; 77]

– HI: [95a]

PMA101. – [IS] Aḥmad Shukr summoned Iyâs, the mamluk of Ibn al-Ghâwî, and nominated him as *wâlî al-madînah* [77]

PMA102. – [IS] Al-Zu'ayfirînî rode with Shukr's party hoping that he would become the city's chief qadî, as Mintâsh had promised him this position and the *niyâbah* to Shukr [n.d.; 77]

PMA103. – [IS] {Comments about the brevity of the Mintâshî regime in Damascus for, despite the letter-patents ("*manâshîr*") they issued, the likes of Aḥmad Shukr, Iyâs and al-Zu'ayfirînî were not capable of filling in the shoes of their respective predecessors namely, Baydamur, Ibn al-Ghâwî and Ibn Jamâ'ah. Digression about parallels to this story in Ibn Kathîr's work}[n.d.; 77-8]

PMA104. – [HI] {Mention of the rumours concerning al-Nâsirî's alleged links with and sympathies for Mintâsh, and his correspondence with him, something that led to the sultans' decision to go to Syria} [n.d.; 95b]

– IK: [501-2]

– ZDT: [264a-b]

– 'Aynî: If he really wanted, al-Nâsirî could have captured Mintâsh, but he did not because of the enmity he felt towards Barqûq. News about this reached the sultan who prepared to go to Syria [Ist.B2 97a/DK 429-30]

– IS: The speed with which the Mintâshîs took the city contrasted with the fruitless siege Barqûq laid to Damascus for two to three months [in 791-2] [76]

– IT: [21]

PMA105. – [IS] "The people remained in fear of the Mintâshîs who were roaming the city, looting, until the afternoon, when suddenly dust was stirred up so that it blocked all directions. It was reported that al-Nâsirî and the troops of Syria had arrived from the direction of al-Mizza [–] Al-Nâsirî and [his] troops arrived below the citadel, entering the Maydân, and they fought for an hour, but could not prevail."⁴⁷ [n.d.; 78]

– IK: [501]

– ZDT: [264a]

– ID: [263]

– IF: [1st of Rajab; 255]

– HI: [95b]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 429]

– Maq.: [742]

– IH: [55, 57]

– IQS: [373]

– IT: [21]

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 109.

- AJ: [329]
- ABM: [303]

PMA106. – **[IS]** Aḥmad Shukr and his party left the city at the arrival of Yalbughâ [n.d.; 78]

PMA107. – **[ZDT]** {Fighting continued between the two parties and lasted from early Rajab until the beginning of Sha‘bân, with great loss of life and property} [n.d.; 264b]

- IK: [501]
- ID: [263]
- IF: [255]
- HI: [95b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 429]
- Maq.: [742]
- IQS : [374]
- IH: [55, 57]
- IT: [21]
- AJ: [329]
- ABM: [303]

PMA108. – **[IS]** {Most of the soldiers (“*mu‘zam al-Turk*”) as well as Mintâsh and his aides, remained war-ready on their horses. The Mintâshîs torched the houses of Yalû and al-Nâsirî both of which were near al-Maydân. They also looted all of al-Nâsirî’s tents located nearby and took from them tents, horses and weapons. In their endeavour they were helped “by the covetous populace who have neither honor nor religion.”⁴⁸ The Mintâshîs also dug a pit behind Bâb al-Maydân⁴⁹ which blocked access to it, and which was defended by Aḥmad Shukr and by a cannon set up on the mosque located there. Fires and fighting raged throughout the night} [Night of Monday 1st to Tuesday 2nd of Rajab; 78]

- HI: Yalbughâ’s house, which was located at Bâb al-Maydân, was torched, and the city’s gates were obstructed [95b]
- IQS: [373-4]

PMA109. – **[HI]** As a defensive measure, the chief-judges of all four *madhhabs* were given the responsibility of gates located around the western half of the city [Night of Monday 1st to Tuesday 2nd of Rajab; 95b]

- IQS: [374]

PMA110. – **[HI]** The population divided and developed a ‘*asabiyyah* towards the warring parties: the populace, namely the people of al-Shuwaykah and al-Shâghûr, and a few of

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ There is no gate by this name in Damascus. According to Sauvaget, cited by Brinner, the term *bâb* in Damascus designates “les points où la campagne laisse la place aux constructions, où les chemins venant de l’extérieur deviennent des rues;” see reference in *ibid.*, p. 63 footnote no. 383. Regardless, the spot in question was probably located to the west of the fortifications of the city.

the inhabitants of Maydân al-Hasâ,⁵⁰ supported Mintâsh, and the elite (“*jumhûruhum*”) al-Nâsirî. [Night of Monday 1st to Tuesday 2nd of Rajab; 95b]

– IS: Most inhabitants of al-Sâlihîyah and those of al-Shuwaykah supported Mintâsh [Tuesday the 2nd of Rajab; 79]

– IQS: [374]

PMA111. – [HI] The Mintâshî party was located in the following places: from al-Sharafayn⁵¹ to the building of Bahâdur behind Dâr al-Bittîkh,⁵² as well as from the mosque of Tankiz to the Hikr al-Summâq neighbourhood [n.d.; 95b-96a]

– IQS: [374]

PMA112. – [IS] The fighting continued with great loss of life and destruction of property on both sides, while commercial activity in the Mintâshî-controlled area of al-Maydân continued unhindered, as food was brought in and sold by the people from the Biqâ‘. “...and the inhabitants of al-Sâlihîya continued coming, living off them; and most of them fought for [the Mintâshîs], as did the people of al-Šuwayka. Every evil was prevalent among them, to the extent that they began to take things from people without right.”⁵³ [2nd of Rajab; 78-9]

PMA113. – [IS] The fighting continued with the troops in the citadel using cannons, mangonels and artillery against the Mintâshîs who torched the house of Ibn al-Sharîshî and captured the mosque of Yalbughâ [3rd of Rajab; 79]

– HI: The Mintâshîs took the mosque of Yalbughâ and they then started fighting below the citadel. The soldiers in the citadel shot at them with artillery and mangonels, and, as a result, stones fell on the mosque of Yalbughâ [n.d.; 96a]

– IQS: [374]

PMA114. – [IF] The sultan nominated Faraj ibn Aydamur al-Sayfî as *wâlî* of al-Gharbîyah province instead of Shâhîn al-‘Alâ’î al-Kalbakî [3rd of Rajab; 255-6]

– Maq.: [742]

– AJ: [329]

PMA115. – [IS] {Great details about the artillery duels between the two parties and about the distribution of artillery pieces on the battlefield} [3rd of Rajab [?]; 79-80]

PMA116. – [IS] {More buildings, such as the house of Malik Âs, Dâr al-Ghanam, their surroundings all the way to the spring of Dâr al-Bittîkh, were torched, as the fighting and the killing continued} [3rd of Rajab [?]; 80]

⁵⁰ A neighborhood located south of the city near its namesake horse track; *ibid.*, p. 51 footnote no. 310.

⁵¹ In his *Al-Durrah al-Mudî‘ah*, Ibn Sasrâ speaks of al-Sharaf al-A‘lá, a neighborhood, we are told by Brinner, “situated on hills outside and to the west of Damascus, north of the Maydân;” *ibid.*, p. 44-5 footnote no. 269. Émilie Ouechek refers to different quarters named Sharaf: Southern Sharaf, Northern Sharaf, Lower Sharaf, etc. All these probably refer to different locations in one large and sprawling area encompassing al-Sharaf al-A‘lá; *Index Général*, p. 27.

⁵² A market located just north of the citadel of Damascus; Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 61 footnote no. 367.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

PMA117. – [IF] The drums of the citadel sounded to announce the arrival of Iyâs al-Jurjâwî, the viceroy of Safad [4th of Rajab; 79]

PMA118. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Kumushbughâ al-Sarâytamurî, the *dawâdâr* of Qarâdamurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, arrived in Cairo with news about Mintâsh's coming to Damascus [5th of Rajab; 256/*Al-Muntaqâ* 170a]

– ID: [262-3]

– Maq.: [742]

– AJ: [329]

PMA119. – [HI] Arrival of the nomination papers of Arghûn Shâh al-Ibrâhîmî the sultan's *khâzindâr*, who had been appointed as *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus instead of the incumbent who was to go Hama as its viceroy. Al-Nâsirî refrained from signing his documents [At the beginning of the month; 96a]

PMA120. – [IS] {A Barqûqî party from the Biqâ' comprising Ibn al-Hanash, Tankizbughâ, the viceroy of Baalbek, and Qaysî tribesmen (“*ushrân*”) and others, on its way to help al-Nâsirî, was met by a force sent by Mintâsh and led by Shukr Aḥmad, Khalîl ibn al-Qalânîsî and Ibn Hilâl al-Dawlah at 'Aqabat al-Tînah; the Qaysîs were crushed and those captured released into the hands of their Yamanî foes, led by Ibn Hilâl al-Dawlah, who slaughtered them. Negative comments concerning the tribesmen who partook in the killings} [12th, but probably the 6th of Rajab; 80-1]

– HI: [6th of Rajab; 96a-b]

– IQS: [374]

PMA121. – [IS] A person brought to the attention of Ibn Sasrá the fact that the Qaysîs came to Damascus only to loot the city [n.d.; 81]

PMA122. – [IS] {Arrival of Iyâs al-Jurjâwî, the viceroy of Safad, who promptly joined the fighting. That day “the viceroy of Syria made siege-towers which moved on the ground like carts and had skins on them.”⁵⁴} [Monday the 15th, but probably the 8th of Rajab; 81]

– HI: [8th of Rajab; 96b]

– IQS: [374]

PMA123. – [IS] {The fighting and deliberate action of the Barqûqîs in Damascus led to great fires, set by Sûdûn Bâq, that laid waste a number of quarters and landmarks outside of the city walls, including the mosque of Tankiz} [16th, but probably the 9th of Rajab; 81]

– HI: [96a]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 429]

– IQS: [374]

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 113.

PMA124. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The Qadi Ibn al-Qurashî was reported to have been beaten to death in the Shamâyil prison. It was also reported that he was strangled [9th of Rajab; 256/Al-Muntaqá 170a]

- ‘Aynî: [97a]
- Maq.: [742]
- IH: [71]
- IT: [22]
- AJ: [329]
- ABM: [304]
- IY: [444-5]

PMA125. – **[IS]** {Dialogue between al-Nâsirî and the qadis in order to get them to enlist the population in the fight for the legitimate ruler, Barqûq. All groups, including the Christians and Jews, were enjoined to participate in the fight, and to get organized according to their trade, place of habitation, *madhhab* and religion} [17th, but probably the 10th of Rajab; 81-2]

PMA126. – **[IS]** {Mintâsh warned the populace, which had been mobilized by al-Nâsirî, not to get involved in the fight between the two parties. Digression} [17th, but probably the 10th of Rajab; 82]

PMA127. – **[IS]** The fighting resumed and many people died, while in the mosque of Yalbughâ, al-Zu‘ayfirîni was urging people to fight on against the loyalists [17th, but probably the 10th of Rajab; 82]

PMA128. – **[HI]** {The Qaysîs inside the city of Damascus captured a Yamanî grandee who was released thanks to pressure from the people because he was a righteous person} [11th of Rajab; 96b]

PMA129. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Following a meeting of the qadis in Cairo, Alṭunbughâ al-Ḥalabî and Alṭunbughâ, Jardamur’s *ustâdâr*, were executed following the accusations filed at the court of the Mâlikî Qadi al-Rakrâkî by al-Sharîf al-‘Uqaybî against them that they had insulted the Prophet. What happened to these emirs was unheard of in these times [11th of Rajab; 256/Al-Muntaqá 170a]

- HI : [96b]
- ‘Aynî: [97a]
- Maq.: [742]
- IH: [74]
- IQS: [375]
- IT: [23]
- AJ: [329]
- ABM: [305]

PMA130. – **[IS]** {The Mintâshîs captured the building of Bahâdur where they installed a cannon with which they fired at Bâb al-Naṣr. Many neighbourhoods suffered from the fighting, but those outside the walls were better off than those inside. Verse} [19th, but probably the 12th of Rajab; 82-3]

PMA131. – [HI] The qadis listened to a message from the caliph urging the people to fight in favour of the legitimate ruler, Barqûq [14th of Rajab; 96b]

PMA132. – [HI] Imprisonment of Nûr al-Dîn ibn Hilâl al-Dawlah, the *muwaqqi'*, because of [...] [14th? of Rajab; 96b]

PMA133. – [IS] Tidings were sounded in the citadel as news reached Damascus concerning the imminent arrival of Qarâdamurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, who was said to be at Khân Lâjîn. People rejoiced but the news turned out to be false [Thursday, but probably Monday the 15th of Rajab; 83]

PMA134. – [IS] {A Mintâshî raiding party of three hundred men who had gone to Wâdî al-Taym and taken horses from there, was intercepted with its loot by Barqûqîs acting upon the orders of al-Nâsirî} [18th of Rajab; 83]

– HI: [During these days; 96b]

PMA135. – [IS] Renewed fighting between the two parties [20th of Rajab; 83]

PMA136. – [IS] Al-Nâsirî ordered the people of al-Sâlihîyah to come down from their neighbourhood to fight along his party, something that perplexed them. He also ordered the mills of the quarter shut; the inhabitants suffered from the two protagonists [20th of Rajab; 83]

PMA137. – [IS] Al-Nâsirî went out to Qubbat Yalbughâ expecting that Mintâsh would come out in the open to fight him, to no avail [21st of Rajab; 84]

*PMA138. – [HI] The soldiery of Damascus captured the building of Bahâdur, thus causing the flight of the Mintâshîs who headed towards the market of Sârûjâ, which they set on fire. This caused the burning down of al-Shâmîyah al-Barrânîyah *madrakah* [A successful offensive by al-Nâsirî's forces allowed them to remove the Mintâshîs from the building of Bahâdur in Sûq al-Ghanam,⁵⁵ as well as from Dâr al-Bittîkh and areas thereabout. They also reached the market of Sârûjâ whose stores they looted because they depended on the Mintâshîs' business⁵⁶] [23rd of Rajab; 96a, 96b]

– IS: {Al-Nâsirî's men captured the building of Bahâdur, which was behind Dâr al-Ghanam, and removed the cannon that the Mintâshîs had installed on it. Al-Nâsirî appointed Emir al-Buzlârî and a large number of men to protect the edifice from the Mintâshîs} [84]

– IQS: [347]

⁵⁵ PMA138 in *Al-Durrah al-Mudî'ah* refers to a Dâr al-Ghanam, an area situated near Dâr al-Bittîkh; *ibid.*, p. 111 footnote no. 670. In this same footnote, Popper noted that there was also a Dâr/Sûq al-Ghanam located south of Damascus. Since the appellations Dâr and Sûq appear, in this context, to be interchangeable, Ibn Hîjjî was probably referring to Ibn Sasrâ's Dâr al-Ghanam.

⁵⁶ The sentence in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 96b.

PMA139. – [HI] News reached Damascus about the arrival of the new *hâjib* [Arghûn Shâh al-Ibrâhîmî *al-khâzindâr*] in Safad. When the latter heard about this [the fighting in Damascus?] he went to Irbid to [...] [n.d.; 96b-97a]

PMA140. – [HI] Arrival of a number of emirs who, at the beginning of the month, had left for Cairo but headed back to Damascus as reinforcements [?] as soon as they were informed [?] about the events there [n.d.; 97a]

PMA141. – [IS] After he had left behind the sultan and the army in Gaza, Abû Yazîd [ibn Murâd al-Khâzin] arrived from Cairo with a supply of money from the sultan to be distributed to the soldiery [24th of Rajab; 84]

PMA142. – [HI] The viceroy of Damascus received a letter from the sultan giving him full powers [n.d.; 97a]

PMA143. – [HI] {News arrive about the execution of Alṭunbughâ al-Ḥalabî and Alṭunbughâ *ustâdâr* Jardamur, which had taken place following the accusations of al-Sharîf al-‘Uqaybî against them} [n.d.; 97a]

PMA144. – [HI] {In Damascus, people’s *zakât* payments were taken from them, and the authorities requested money from the *waqfs* to help pay for the war effort. The amount due, fifty thousand dirhams, were divided amongst the four *madhhabs*. The qadis found the payment difficult because of the losses incurred by the *waqfs* during the fighting} [During this month; 97a-b]

– IQS: [375]

PMA145. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Arrival in Cairo of Emir ‘Alî ibn Nu‘ayr who was imprisoned [24th of Rajab; 256/*Al-Muntaqâ* 170a]

– Maq.: [743]

– AJ: [329]

PMA146. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Arrival in Cairo of a post rider messenger with news that Mintâsh and the Turcomans who were with him had been defeated, that most of the latter had fled and many of them killed, and that Mintâsh was besieged in al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq. This was because of the arrival of the soldiers from Gaza and of Arghûn Shâh, the *hâjib al-hujjâb* [27th of Rajab; 256-7/*Al-Muntaqâ* 170a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/ DK 429-30]

– Maq.: Arrival in Cairo of a post rider with news that fighting was still going on in Damascus, that Mintâsh had been defeated, that many of those with him had been killed, that most of the Turcomans who were with him had fled, and that he was besieged in al-Qaṣr al-Ablaq [743]

– IT: [21]

– AJ: [330]

– ABM: [305]

PMA147. – [IF] Ibrâhîm al-Bâshaqardî replaced al-Shihâbî as *wâlî* of Aswân [Last decade of Rajab; 257]

– Maq.: [743]

PMA148. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Anwât, the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî, arrived with about seventy members of al-Zuhûr tribe, thirty-six of whom were ordered cut at the waist [Last decade of Rajab; **257/Al-Muntaqá** 170a-b]

– Maq.: [743]

– IQS: [375]

PMA149. – **[IS]** {People remained in fear and distress as a result of the fighting and the death and destruction. Digression including verse by ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn Aybak about the destruction of places of worship during the fighting} [During this month; 84-5]

PMA150. – **[IS]** People rejoiced because of the news of the coming of the sultan. Al-Nâsirî distributed the gold brought by Abû Yazîd to the soldiers according to their rank. [24th of Rajab; 86]

PMA151. – **[IS]** {The Mintâshîs recaptured the building of Bahâdur that they had lost to the Barqûqîs, and torched Dâr al-Bittîkh and its surroundings. The capture of the building was a great strategic loss for al-Nâsirî. Details about the configuration of artillery pieces on the battleground and the ebb and flow of the protagonists as they incessantly lost and recaptured the mosque located at Bâb al-Maydân, which became known as the Mosque of the Jinn. The Mintâshîs fought like lions} [25th of Rajab; 86]

– IQS: [374]

– HI: [96a]

PMA152. – **[IH]** Al-Nâsirî wrote to the sultan insisting upon his coming to Syria [n.d.; 55, 58]

– ABM: [305]

PMA153. – **[IK]** The sultan prepared to go to Syria [n.d.; 502]

– ZDT: [264b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a]

PMA154. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan issued a royal edict to the emirs of Egypt ordering them to get ready to head to Syria [1st of Sha‘bân; **257/Al-Muntaqá** 171a]

– ID: [263]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a/DK 430]

– Maq.: [743]

– IQS : [375]

– IT: The sultan ordered the departure of an expeditionary force to help al-Nâsirî in his fight against Mintâsh. Those concerned embarked upon preparations. Then the departure of the sultan himself was announced [23]

– AJ: [330]

– ABM: [305]

– IY: When the news [of Shukr Aḥmad’s raid into Damascus] reached the sultan, he became perplexed and called upon the soldiers to assemble for review [–] His resolution to confront Mintâsh grew [444]

PMA155. – [Maq.] The *wazîr* and the *nâzir al-khâss* started preparing the sultan's trip and looking after what he needed for travel [1st of Sha'bân; 743]

– IF: [257]

– 'Aynî: [DK 430]

– IT: [23]

– AJ: [330]

PMA156. – [IS] {Story about the boy who went to al-Nâsirî and convinced him to let him sit inside Bâb al-Nasr to inform the Barqûqîs about the comings and goings of those he knew were pro-Mintâshî inhabitants of the city shuttling between the areas held by Mintâsh and those of the loyalists. His denunciations made him so feared by the people of Damascus, that some wished they could kill him if they happened upon him outside of the city} [1st of Sha'bân; 86-7]

– HI: [During this month; 97b]

– IQS: [375]

PMA157. – [IS] {When he saw the Prophet in a dream, a man was told by him to go and instruct the viceroy al-Nâsirî about asking the *khatîb* of the Omayyad mosque to sermon the people, which he did. The text of sermon. "The people were overcome by emotion, regret, and repentance from what they heard on this day."⁵⁷} [3rd of Sha'bân; 87-8]

PMA158. – [HI] Inside the Omeyyad mosque, the qadis read a letter written by the sultan, in which he thanked the population of Damascus for its steadfastness and noted that his departure for al-Raydânîyah on his way out to Syria would take place on the 19th of the month [4th of Sha'bân; 97b]

PMA159. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {The mamluk of the viceroy of Şafad arrived in Cairo with news about the escape of Mintâsh from Damascus and his pursuit by Yalbughâ. He also said that the mamluk of the viceroy of Damascus would arrive shortly with [more?] news} [5th of Sha'bân; 257/*Al-Muntaqâ* 171a]

– Maq.: [742]

– IT: [21]

– AJ: [330]

– ABM: [306]

PMA160. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] 'Alâ' al-Dîn ibn al-Tablâwî, the *wâlî* of Cairo, cut Ibn Bâkîsh, the former viceroy of Gaza, at the waist, because his son had assembled tribesmen and others, and joined Mintâsh. They robbed whoever crossed their path on their way to al-Ramlah. These disturbances led to a breakdown of communications between Egypt and Syria [5th of Sha'bân; 257/*Al-Muntaqâ* 171a]

– Maq.: [743]

– IT: [23]

– AJ: [330]

– IY: [446]

⁵⁷ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 121.

PMA161. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqā*] It was reported that ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ibn al-Tablāwī had Husayn ibn al-Kūrānī cut at the waist. This turned out to be untrue: the truth was that ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ibn al-Tablāwī had beaten al-Husayn ibn al-Kūrānī with cudgels, and only later strangled him [6th of Sha‘bān; 257/*Al-Muntaqā* 171a]

– ‘Aynī: [Ist.B2 96b/DK 427-8]

– Maq.: [743]

– IH: [73]

– IT: [23]

– AJ: He was brought in the presence of the sultan, beaten with cudgels and a stick, and berated for what he had done to the relatives of the sultan during his absence [330]

– ABM: [306]

– IY: [445]

PMA162. – [HI] {Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-Habbāb was arrested, made to pay money and punished for having sent fodder, which was nevertheless intercepted, to Mīntāsh at al-Maydān} [6th of Sha‘bān; 97b-98a]

– IQS: [10th of Sha‘bān; 376]

PMA163. – [HI] {Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-Husbānī was detained on the charge that he was appointed to Dār al-Hadīth by Mīntāsh after the arrest of Ibn al-Qurashī, and that he corresponded with Mīntāsh, which was not true} [6th of Sha‘bān; 98a]

– IQS: [10th of Sha‘bān; 376]

PMA164. – [HI] Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-Habbāb and Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-Husbānī are released after seven days [sic], given professorships in a number of *madrāsahs* and made to pay money} [8th of Sha‘bān; 98a]

– IQS: [10th of Sha‘bān; 376]

PMA165. – [HI] {Areas around Tankiz’s mosque, which had not previously burned down, were consumed in a fire} [8th of Sha‘bān; 98a]

PMA166. – [HI] {Capture of an important Turcoman emir, known as Tūghān, as a result of a raid and a pursuit led by Emir Ibn al-Shaykh ‘Alī and a group of soldiers, amongst them ‘Umar ibn Manjak} [8th of Sha‘bān; 98a]

PMA167. – [IS] Four Turcomans from Tripoli transporting gunpowder to Mīntāsh were captured and then cut at the waist [8th of Sha‘bān; 88]

PMA168. – [IS] {In order to show the assiduousness of the populace in fighting for the sultan, al-Nāsīrī gathered the populace in front of Abū Yazīd, Barqūq’s envoy, and led them in a huge battle against Mīntāsh during which they did very well but many of them died. Abu Yazīd was impressed by the people and he thanked them, after which they returned to their places} [8th of Sha‘bān; 88]

PMA169. – **[IS]** People in the city still cannot find peace of mind and sleep because of the sounds of the battles [8th of Sha‘bân; 88]

PMA170. – **[IS]** {The night of its arrival in Damascus, an expeditionary force led by Âqbughâ al-Saghîr, the viceroy of Tripoli, and Ibn al-Hanash, accompanied by a multitude of troops, suffered a murderous attack on its encampments at al-Muṣallâ⁵⁸ and Maydân al-Ḥaṣâ by the Mintâshîs Ibn al-Qalânîsî, Shukr Aḥmad and their men, who also looted the premises. In the morning, after he heard about the attack, al-Nâsirî moved the force inside the city. Comments about the fear the Mintâshîs instilled in the Tripolitans} [8th of Sha‘bân; 89]

– HI: ...the viceroy of Tripoli, Înâl Khujâ... [98a-b]

– IQS: [376]

PMA171. – **[HI]** Al-Nâsirî and a group of soldiers rode out until they reached the cemetery of the Sufis⁵⁹ where some fighting took place [10th of Sha‘bân; 98b]

PMA172. – **[HI]** The rivers Bânyâs and al-Qanawât⁶⁰ were cut off thus causing great harm to the inhabitants of Damascus [10th of Sha‘bân; 98b]

PMA173. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** The pennant was raised indicating the sultan’s departure with the troops [10th of Sha‘bân; 257-8/Al-Muntaqâ 171a-b]

– IK: [502]

– ‘Aynî: [DK 430]

– Maq.: [743]

– IT: [23]

– AJ: [230]

– ABM: [305]

– IY: [444]

– Anon.: The pennant was raised and the sultan ordered the troops to get ready to fight Mintâsh and Nu‘ayr. Mintâsh’s depredations had increased and led to the destruction of most of the regions of Damascus and Aleppo, and the looting of people’s wealth [300a]

PMA174. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** The sultan ordered the four chief judges ready to accompany him to Syria [10th of Sha‘bân; 258/Al-Muntaqâ 171b]

– Maq.: [743]

– ABM: The sultan ordered the four chief judges and the caliph to get ready to leave with him [305]

⁵⁸ “The prayer ground used for public worship on the two great festivals. To the south of Damascus, north of Maydân al-Ḥaṣâ;” *ibid.*, p. 122 footnote no. 724.

⁵⁹ This cemetery was located west of the city, just south of al-Maydân; Pouzet, *Damas au VI^e/XIII^e Siècle*, p. 82 footnote no. 335.

⁶⁰ Both rivers, which run parallel to one another west of Damascus, were part of the water system of the city originating from the Baradâ river; see the map of the surroundings of Damascus at the end of *ibid.*; see also, Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 45 footnotes nos. 274 and 275.

PMA175. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] Abû Yazîd al-Khâzin, accompanied by Shaykh Hasan, al-Nâsirî's *ra's nawbah*, returned from the information gathering mission that took them to Syria at the beginning of the disturbances there [11th of Sha'bân; 258/*Al-Muntaqá* 171b]

PMA176. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {A number of emirs, among them Sarâytamur al-Sayfî and Takâ al-Ashrafî, were mulcted then executed by the *wâlî* of Cairo} [11th of Sha'bân; 258/*Al-Muntaqá* 171b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b/DK 427]
- Maq.: [744]
- IH: [72]
- IT: [23]
- AJ: [330]
- AJ: [305]

PMA177. – [HI] {After hearing the order of the viceroy al-Nâsirî to fight following the Friday prayer, a large number of plebeians, encouraged by their men of religion, went out to battle. When he saw them, the viceroy was impressed and then had them withdraw}[11th of Sha'bân; 98b]

PMA178. – [HI] A group of loyalist soldiers went towards al-Kiswah because it was reported that ‘Anqâ’ [the Arab tribal chief]⁶¹ had arrived there. When they reached the said location, ‘Anqâ’ took another path and arrived in al-Maydân where he hooked up with the *Mintâshîs* [11th of Sha'bân; 98b]

- IS: The *Mintâshîs* rejoiced because of the arrival of ‘Anqâ’, the emir of the ‘Arabs, and one thousand horsemen [20th, but probably the 10th of Sha'bân; 89]
- IQS: [376]

PMA179. – [HI] {A great battle took place at al-Qanawât, which led to the drowning of many of al-Nâsirî's foes in trenches full of mud, and to the defeat and flight of the *Mintâshîs* many of whom were captured and executed. The loyalists took their equipment and cannons. The populace looted the houses there including that of Amîr Faraj ibn Manjak} [12th of Sha'bân; 98b-99a]

- IS: {The Syrian troops divided into three groups to attack the *Mintâshîs*' positions north, northwest and west of the citadel at al-Qanawât. Many people died and ‘Anqâ’ was shaken by what he saw; the day ended in a stalemate} [22nd, but probably the 12th of Sha'bân; 89-90]
- IQS: [376-7]

PMA180. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] The sultan reviewed the imprisoned emirs and singled out a group of them for execution [12th of Sha'bân; 258/*Al-Muntaqá* 171b]

- Maq.: [744]
- IT: [23-4]
- AJ: [331]
- IY: [446]

⁶¹ ‘Anqâ’ Ibn Shaṭī (or Shaṭá), leader of the Mirâ tribe, was murdered by an Ismâ‘îlî in 794/1391; see Tritton, “The Tribes of Syria,” p. 571.

PMA181. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {These emirs, amongst them Jântamur Akhû Tâz, his son, the eunuch Toqtây, and Qadi Fath al-Dîn ibn al-Shahîd, were taken from the Shamâyil prison enchained like thieves, and were executed in the desert [13th or 27th of Sha‘bân; 285/*Al-Muntaqá* 171b]

- IK: People of dissension from amongst the imprisoned emirs were executed [502]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b/DK 427]
- Maq.: [744]
- IH: [72-3]
- IT: [23-4]
- AJ: [331]
- ABM: [305-6]
- IY: News arrived that the sultan had ordered the execution in Damascus [sic] of Jântamur Akhû Tâz, his son, the eunuch Toqtây, and Qadi Fath al-Dîn ibn al-Shahîd {Two verses of Ibn Iyâs’s composition} [445]

PMA182. – [HI] Arrival of Arghûn Shâh al-Khâzindâr the appointed *hâjib al-hujjâb*. He had arrived in Safad and then headed towards Irbid along with his commander (“*muqaddam*”) Qâsim ibn [...?] and Emir ‘Umar Faraj ibn ‘Umar Shâh [13th of Sha‘bân; 99a]

- IQS: [377]

PMA183. – [HI] Escape of Ishiqtamur’s *dawâdâr* who had fled to Mintâsh [the rest of the sentence is unreadable][15th of Sha‘bân; 99a]

PMA184. – [IS] {As fighting was going on, Tumântamur Akhû Mintâsh deserted to al-Nâsirî and was later followed by another emir called Khûdar} [26th, but probably the 16th of Sha‘bân; 90]

- IK: Mintâsh rode out to fight al-Nâsirî and was abandoned by his *atâbak* Yamâztamur and most of his soldiers; Mintâsh fled and Yamâztamur was honoured by the viceroy upon the latter’s return to Damascus. [502]
- HI: {Tumântamur escaped to al-Nâsirî and informed him about Mintâsh’s intention to flee; Tumântamur, who had been one the most important members of Mintâsh’s entourage and his deputy in Aleppo, was rewarded by the viceroy with a robe of honor} [16th of Sha‘bân; 99a]
- IQS: [17th of Sha‘bân; 377]

PMA185. – [IS] {When Mintâsh heard about this, he feared that others would betray him, so he rode out with his soldiers and ‘Anqâ’, and headed towards al-Mizzah. People informed al-Nâsirî about this, so he followed him but could not catch up with him; he nevertheless captured those Mintâshîs who delayed departing. As night fell, Mintâsh crossed to al-Lajâ⁶² and al-Nâsirî returned to the city}[26th, but probably the 16th of Sha‘bân; 90]

⁶² “...the name of the black lava-flow area southeast of Damascus on the road to Bosrâ in the Hawrân;” Popper, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 124 footnote no. 734.

- IK: Mintâsh fled from Damascus along with ‘Anqâ’ ibn [empty space], emir of the Mirâ tribe [Middle of Sha‘bân; 502]
- HI: {Mintâsh and ‘Anqâ’ then fled from al-Maydân to Qubbat Yalbughâ by means of al-Mizzah. When the viceroy heard about this, he followed him with the troops, but night fell and he could not catch up with him. The populace then embarked upon the looting of al-Maydân, and went to al-Sâlihîyah which they pillaged} [16th of Sha‘bân; 99a]
- IH: When the siege of Damascus became too long, Mintâsh left and headed for Baalbek [57]
- IQS: [17th of Sha‘bân; 377]

PMA186. – [IS] {When the Mintâshîs abandoned al-Maydân, the populace invested it “and took whatever they had left behind, whatever they needed. The populace, together with the Turcomans from Tripoli, tribesmen from Ğubbat ‘Asâl, Turks, and every worthless evildoer went out to plunder al-Sâlihîya.”⁶³ They looted this suburb of Damascus, killed, destroyed and did ugly things. Those who indulged the most in the looting were the Tripolitans, the Safadîs, tribesmen from Talfitâ, “and some of the people of Damascus who have neither honor nor religion.”⁶⁴} [26th, but probably the 16th of Sha‘bân; 90-1]

- HI: [16th of Sha‘bân; 99a]
- IQS: [17th of Sha‘bân; 377]

PMA187. – [IS] {After he got wind of Nu‘ayr ibn Hayyâr’s arrival in ‘Adhrâ’ and Dumayr to help Mintâsh, al-Nâsirî went to meet his foe. The troops from Tripoli and Safad were exhausted and al-Nâsirî was utterly defeated and fled back with those lucky to have survived the encounter. Long description of the sorry state of the Syrian troops after the battle, including verse by ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn Aybak} [27th, but probably the 17th of Sha‘bân; 91-2]

- IK: An encounter took place between them [al-Nâsirî and Nu‘ayr or ‘Anqâ’?] in which he viceroy of Damascus was defeated [n.d.; 502]
- HI: [17th of Sha‘bân; 99a-b]
- IH: [57-8]
- IQS: [18th of Sha‘bân; 377]
- SIY: {When the battle took place between al-Nâsirî and Nu‘ayr at ‘Adhrâ outside of Damascus, the emirs of the Gharb were with the viceroy. Al-Nâsirî was defeated and bad things happened to the Syrian troops and to the emirs of the Gharb} [n.d.; 209-10; **215-216**; 217; 233]
- IY: [When the sultan left Damascus], Nu‘ayr ibn Hayyâr and the emir of the Fadl tribe arrived and looted most villages around Damascus; al-Nâsirî went out to meet them; they fought at a place called al-Kiswah where the viceroy met with his foe and was utterly defeated [–] Nu‘ayr then headed back to his territories [447]

⁶³ Ibid., p. 124.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 125.

PMA188. – [IS] {Reflections on the defeat of the Barqûqî troops being attributed to their ill treatment of the people of al-Şâlihiyah. Parallels with Ghâzân's occupation of Damascus in 699/1299} [n.d.; 92-3]

PMA189. – [HI] Nu'ayr ibn Hayyâr sent his *hâjib* accompanied by Kishlî, one of the great emirs, who had vanished [as a result of the battle of Dumayr?], and asked for forgiveness and security. It was said that Nu'ayr had not been aware of Mintâsh's flight and also that he had come to Damascus to ask al-Nâsirî about certain matters [17th of Sha'bân; 99b]

– IS: Nu'ayr sent his apologies for what happened, which was “a false statement about himself and a lie.”⁶⁵ [20th of Sha'bân; 93]

– IQS: [19th of Sha'bân; 377]

PMA190. – [HI] A proclamation by al-Nâsirî to the soldiery present in the city was read, and another the following day [17th of Sha'bân; 99b]

PMA191. – [HI] Contradictory rumours circulated about the whereabouts of Nu'ayr and his alleged capture by Mintâsh and 'Anqâ' [n.d.; 99b]

PMA192. – [IS] {Commentary about the casualties of the battle of Dumayr. Amongst those who died were Emir 'Umar ibn Manjak; Ibn al-Hanash; Ibn al-Ghazzâwî; Kirjî; Ahmad, *wâlî al-barr*, and others. It is said that one thousand two hundred and sixty people were killed on both sides during the battle} [n.d.; 93]

– IK: Fifteen Syrian emirs were killed among them Ibrâhîm ibn Manjak and others [502]

– HI: Emir Muḥammad ibn al-Shaykh 'Alî, Ibrâhîm ibn Manjak, Ibn al-Hanash [...?] were killed [n.d.; 99a⁶⁶]

– SIY: Emir Fakhr al-Dîn ibn Zayn al-Dîn Şâliḥ was wounded and Shujâ' al-Dîn ibn Fath al-Dîn Muḥammad was killed. 'Alâ' al-Dîn ibn al-Hanash, who had been given an emirate of forty by Barqûq, was killed during this battle. Mintâsh had previously executed his father and brother when he captured them in Baalbek. [n.d.; 215-216; 217]

– IY: Fifteen Syrian emirs were killed [447]

PMA193. – [IS] “Al-Nâsirî opened the gates of the city and proclaimed security and safety. The people were at ease, the troops went to their villages, while the people went to their homes and opened their shops.”⁶⁷ [n.d.; 93]

– HI: Bâb al-Faraj in Damascus was opened [22nd of Sha'bân; 99b]

– IQS: Bâb al-Faraj was opened after that its closure had led people to crowd around Bâb al-Nasr, something which led to great suffering [378]

PMA194. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] The sultan ordered the banishment of Emir Zayn al-Dîn, the *amîr hajj* Ibn Mughultây to Qûs; but through the intercession of Emir Sûdûn al-

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 127.

⁶⁶ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

⁶⁷ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 127.

Fakhrî, the viceroy of Egypt, he was sent to Dumyât [17th of Sha‘bân; **259/Al-Muntaqá** 171b]

- Maq.: [745]
- IQS: [378]

PMA195. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] The sultan ordered the dismissed (“*battâlin*”) emirs banished to Alexandria and Dumyât [17th of Sha‘bân; **259/Al-Muntaqá** 171b]

- IK: [n.d.; 502]
- Maq.: [745]
- IQS: [378]
- AJ: [331]

PMA196. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] Tuluktamur⁶⁸ al-Muhammadî al-Dawâdâr and Sarâytamur al-Sharafî went home after being released by the sultan [17th of Sha‘bân; **259/Al-Muntaqá** 171b]

- Maq.: [745]
- IQS: Tuluktamur al-Muhammadî al-Dawâdâr was released [378]
- AJ: Of those banished, two emirs, Muluktamur al-Dawâdâr and Sarâytamur, were released [331]

PMA197. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] The sultan had a number of emirs arrested and imprisoned [18th of Sha‘bân; **259/Al-Muntaqá** 171b]

- Maq.: [745]
- IQS: [378]
- IT: [24]
- AJ: [331]
- ABM: [306]

PMA198. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] The arrested emirs were executed by the *wâlî* [19th of Sha‘bân; **259/Al-Muntaqá** 171b-172a]

- Maq.: [745]
- IQS: [378]
- IT: [24]
- AJ: [331]
- ABM: [306]

PMA199. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] {As he prepared his departure to Syria, the sultan appointed a number of emirs to positions of authority, chief among them, Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* and Sûdûn al-Shaykhûnî as *nâ'ib al-qal'ah*} [n.d.; **259-260/Al-Muntaqá** 172a]

- IK: [502]
- ZDT: + Only a few were left behind in the service of Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî, the *atâbak al-'asâkir*, and Sûdûn al-Shaykhûnî, the *nâ'ib al-saltanah* [267b]
- ID: [263]

⁶⁸ Probably Tûlûtamur; see Jean Sauvaget, “Noms et surnoms de Mamelouks,” in *Journal Asiatique* vol. CCXXXVIII (1950), p. 51.

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97a-b/DK 430-1]
- Maq.: [745]
- IH: [58]
- IQS: [378]
- IT: [24]
- AJ: [331-2]
- ABM: [306]
- IY: [446]
- Anon.: The sultan appointed a number of emirs to positions of authority, chief among them, Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* and *atâbak* until his return, and Sûdûn al-Fakhrî as *nâ'ib al-qa'ah*. He also issued an edict ordering the emirs residing in Egypt to attend upon Kumushbughâ the *atâbak* each Monday and Thursday. [300a-b]

PMA200. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {The sultan ordered a number of civilian and religious officials, chief among them *Qâdî al-Qudât* al-Bulqînî, to accompany him to Syria} [n.d.; 260/*Al-Muntaqâ* 172a]

- IK: [502]
- ZDT: [267a-b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 431]
- Maq.: [745]
- IH: [58]
- IT: [24-5]
- AJ: [332]
- Anon.: [300b]

PMA201. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The sultan left Cairo for al-Raydânîyah [20th of Sha‘bân; 260/*Al-Muntaqâ* 172a]

- IK: [502]
- ID: + where he stayed for five days until the troops were ready [263]
- HI: The sultan departed from Cairo towards Syria and stopped at al-Raydânîyah until the 26th [99b]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 431]
- Maq.: [745-6]
- IH: [55, 56]
- IQS: [378]
- IT: [22nd of Sha‘bân; 25]
- AJ: [332]
- ABM: [18th of Sha‘bân; 306]
- IY: News arrived concerning the increased power of Mintâsh, which led the sultan to review the troops and to pay a *nafaqah*, after which he set up camp at al-Raydânîyah. He then departed in a great convoy accompanied by the caliph, the four judges, most emirs and the troops [22nd of Sha‘bân; 446]
- Anon.: [20th of Ramadân; 300a]

PMA202. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The contingents of the emirs also left along with a number of emirs of one hundred, among them, Buṭâ the *dawâdâr*; Julbân the *ra's nawbah*; Sûdûn

al-Turuntâ'î; Kumushbughâ al-Saghir; Înal al-Kabîr; Emir Aytamish; Shaykh al-Khâssakî; Ahmad ibn Yalbughâ and Bakalmish, the *amîr akhûr* [20th of Sha'bân; **260/Al-Muntaqá** 172a]

PMA203. – **[IF]** Emir Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd stayed in Cairo to prepare all that the troops needed for their journey in terms of food and fodder [20th of Sha'bân; 260]

PMA204. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {At al-Raydânîyah, Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Âqbughâ Âs, the *shâdd al-dawâwîn*, was arrested, beaten and released into the hands of al-Tablâwî to get him to pay four hundred thousand silver dirhams, because of complaints of fiscal and commercial malversations lodged by Christians from Shawbak and by Qadi Badr al-Dîn al-Iqfahsî, Emir Buṭâ's secretary}[22nd of Sha'bân; **260/Al-Muntaqá** 172a]

– Maq.: [746]

– IH: [82]

– IQS: [378]

– ABM: [306]

PMA205. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Emir 'Alâ' al-Dîn 'Alî ibn al-Tablâwî became temporarily *shâdd al-dawâwîn* instead of Ibn Âqbughâ Âs [22nd of Sha'bân; **260/Al-Muntaqá** 172a]

– Maq.: [746]

– IQS: [378]

PMA206. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {According to Ibn Duqmâq, most inmates of the Shamâyil prison were presented to the sultan for punishment. Thirty seven of them, amongst them Muhammad ibn al-Husâm the *ustâdâr* of Arghûn Uskî and Ahmad ibn al-Naqû'î, were singled out for drowning, while others were ordered cut at the waist} [23rd of Sha'bân; **261/Al-Muntaqá** 172b]

– 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b/DK 427]

– Maq.: [746]

– HI : After the departure of the sultan a number of people were executed [99b]

– IQS: [378-9]

– IT: [25]

– AJ: [332]

– ABM: [306]

PMA207. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** It was reported that the sultan's mamluks looted the entire contents of Âqbughâ Âs's tent [24th of Sha'bân; **261/Al-Muntaqá** 172b⁶⁹]

– IQS: [378]

– ABM: [306]

PMA208. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** It was reported that the sultan nominated Nâsir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Rajab ibn Kalfat as *shâdd al-dawâwîn* instead of Âqbughâ Âs [24th Sha'bân; **261/Al-Muntaqá** 172b]

– Maq.: [746]

– IH: + He accompanied the troops out of Cairo [82]

⁶⁹ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- IQS: [378]
- IT: ...Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Rajab ibn Kalbak...[25]
- AJ: [332]

PMA209. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Al-Ṭablâwî found many belongings (horses, boats, material; etc.) at the house of Âqbughâ Âṣ [n.d.; **261/Al-Muntaqá** 172b]

- Maq.: [746]

PMA210. – **[Maq.]** Al-Ṭablâwî treated Âqbughâ Âṣ harshly [22nd of Sha‘bân; 746]

- IH: [82]

PMA211. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Contrary to what people expected, al-Ṭablâwî treated Âqbughâ Âṣ kindly [24th of Sha‘bân; **261/n.d.**; *Al-Muntaqá* 172b]

PMA212. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The sultan appointed Abû Bakr ibn Sunqur al-Jamâlî to an emirate of forty which was to be sustained by two villages, Malwá and Siryâqûs, which were taken from the *khâss*, and as emir of the *mahmil* heading towards the Hijâz [n.d.; **261/Al-Muntaqá** 172b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 99a/DK 436]
- Maq.: [746]
- IQS: [379]
- IT: [25]
- AJ: [331]

PMA213. – **[IQS]** Al-Nâsirî’s order for the troops to head out the following day to meet Mintâsh was proclaimed. The troops found this order hard because it came following their defeat [25th of Sha‘bân; 379]

PMA214. – **[IQS]** News arrived in Damascus that Mintâsh had come to Shaqhab.⁷⁰ The reason for this was that when news about the defeat of the Syrian troops at Dumayr [at the hands of Nu‘ayr ibn Hayyâr] reached him, he thought he could take over the city. He parted with ‘Anqâ’ [26th of Sha‘bân; 379]

PMA215. – **[IQS]** {The Syrian troops happened upon Mintâsh at the plain of al-Kiswah; some of the Mintâshîs went over to the Syrians while the rest fled only to be pursued by the troops who captured a number of them, except Mintâsh who eluded them} [27th of Sha‘bân; 379]

- IK: The following day, al-Nâsirî set out in pursuit of Mintâsh [502]
- ZDT: After their flight from al-Maydân, Mintâsh and a few men, headed towards al-Kiswah with al-Nâsirî in pursuit. The Syrian troops captured those they laid their hands upon [n.d.; 268a]
- IS: Al-Nâsirî and some soldiers scouted the roads and trails on the way to al-Kiswah as Nu‘ayr and the Arabs had departed from the surroundings [Sunday, either the 20th or the 27th of Sha‘bân, probably the latter; 93]

⁷⁰ A place located about twenty miles south of Damascus; Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 42 footnote no. 251.

PMA216. – **[IK]** Al-Nâsirî was told that the peasants (“*fallahîn*”) who had left the surroundings of Damascus [?] were besieging Mintâsh, so he rode out to fight him [?] [n.d.; 502]

PMA217. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Barqûq remained at al-Raydânîyah reviewing the troops, until his departure for Syria on the 26th [26th of Sha‘bân; **261/Al-Muntaqâ** 172b]

– IK: [Beginning of Ramadân; 502]

– ZDT: The sultan left for Syria when news reached him concerning Mintâsh’s arrival there [Last decade of Sha‘bân; **267a**, 267b]

– ID: [263]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 431]

– Maq.: [746]

– IH: [58]

– IT: [25]

– AJ: [332]

– ABM: [306]

– IY: [447]

– Anon.: [300b]

PMA218. – **[IF]** Proclamation of security and safety in Cairo [26th of Sha‘bân; 261]

PMA219. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** A proclamation was made calling upon people to prepare for the *hajj* [26th of Sha‘bân; **261/Al-Muntaqâ** 172b]

– Maq.: [747]

– AJ: [332]

PMA220. – **[IQS]** Arrival in Damascus of Emir Tamurbughâ with the responses of the sultan to al-Nâsirî’s correspondence and his requests: among other things, the confirmation of Alâbughâ as *hâjib*, of Kashlî as viceroy of Hama, the return to emirs of their *iqta’* which had been granted to others, etc. [28th of Sha‘bân; 379-80]

PMA221. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** During the night of the 29th of Sha‘bân, twelve emirs were executed by the *wâlî*, including Arghûn Shâh al-Sayfî Tamurbây; Alâbughâ al-Tashtamurî; Âqbughâ al-Sayfî Uljây and Buzlâr al-Khalîlî [29th of Sha‘bân; **262/Al-Muntaqâ** 172b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2; 23rd of Sha‘bân; 96b/DK 427]

– Maq.: [747]

– IH: [73]

– IQS: [380]

– IT: [25]

– AJ: [332]

PMA222. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** During the night of the 29th of Sha‘bân, Sanjaq al-Hasanî, Qarâbughâ al-Sayfî Uljây and Mansûr, the *hâjib* of Gaza, were executed [1st of Ramadân; **262/Al-Muntaqâ** 172b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b]

- Maq.: [747]
- IQS: [380]
- IT: “Then, during the last night of Sha‘bân, Sanjaq al-Hasanî, [who had been] the viceroy of Hama then Tripoli, Qarâbughâ al-Sayfî Uljây and Mansûr, the *hâjib* of Gaza were executed. I believe that with these were the last to be executed of the thirty-seven individuals the sultan had reviewed at al-Raydânîyah.” [25]
- AJ: [333]

PMA223. – **[Maq.]** Arrival in Cairo of a post messenger sent by the sultan to Kumushbughâ with the news of Mintâsh’s defeat on the 16th and his flight along with ‘Anqâ’. The emirs and the mamluks rejoiced at the news [1st of Ramadân; 747]

– IF: Arrival in Cairo of a post messenger bearing a letter from the sultan to Kumushbughâ the content of which was reported to have been the news of Mintâsh’s defeat and escape; the emirs and their troops rejoiced at the news; tidings were sounded and it was proclaimed that the enemy of the sultan had been captured [1st of Ramadân; 262]

– ABM : Arrival in Cairo of the post from the sultan with the news of Mintâsh’s defeat and his escape along with ‘Anqâ’; the emirs and their troops rejoiced at the news [306-7]

PMA224. – **[ZDT]** {Short description of Barqûq’s itinerary to Qatyâ} [n.d.; 267b]

PMA225. – **[IQS]** Al-Nâsirî and the troops left Damascus in search of Mintâsh [3rd of Ramadân; 380]

PMA226. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Sûdûn al-Tayyâr al-Zâhirî arrived in Cairo with briefs from the sultan informing the emirs in Cairo that Barqûq had reached Qatyâ on the 2nd of Ramadân, that the news concerning the defeat and escape of Mintâsh from Damascus along with fifty horsemen were true, that the sultan’s foe was besieged at the citadel of al-Zur‘ah by the local peasants who send word about it to the viceroy of Damascus, and that the latter was on his way to pick him up. Sûdûn was rewarded by the Egyptian emirs [4th of Ramadân; **262/Al-Muntaqâ** 174b]

– IK: [502]

– Maq.: Arrival of the post with information about the sultan’s stay at Qatyâ, and with the confirmation of Mintâsh’s escape from Damascus along with fifty horsemen [747]

– IQS: [380]

– AJ: Arrival of the post from Qatyâ with the news that the sultan was secure and well/News arrived about Mintâsh’s escape from Damascus along with fifty horsemen [1st of Ramadân; 9th of Ramadân; 333]

– IY: Emir Sûdûn al-Tayyâr arrived in Cairo with briefs from the sultan informing the emirs in Cairo that when he reached Damascus, Mintâsh fled towards the Euphrates [n.d.; 447]

PMA227. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Rajab ibn Kalfat returned to Cairo from the sultan’s encampment with a letter from Barqûq to the *ustâdâr* Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd whose content said: ‘Arrest the bearer of this letter and take one hundred

and sixty thousand dirhams from him.' Ibn Kalfat was arrested and seventy thousand dirhams were taken from him [4th of Ramadân; **262/Al-Muntaqá** 172b]

- Maq.: [747]
- IH: [82]
- IQS: [380]
- AJ: [333]
- ABM: + {Proverbial musing about the irony of Ibn Rajab's situation} [307]

PMA228. – **[IF]** Proclamation of safety and security in Cairo and its surroundings following the arrival of a letter from the sultan; people were asked to decorate the city as conflicting rumours circulated about Mintâsh's arrest and his flight from Damascus [6th of Ramadân; 262-3]

- Maq.: Cairo was decorated [474]
- AJ: Cairo was decorated when news arrived about the flight of Mintâsh [333]
- IY: Cairo was decorated for seven days [447]

PMA229. – **[IS]** Emir Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî reviewed two hundred enlisted troops and sent them to the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî to help him in his dealings with the depredations of the Arab tribesmen; the *kâshif* stationed them in three different locations [6th of Ramadân; **263/Al-Muntaqá** 174b]

- Maq.: Emir Kumushbughâ sent two hundred horsemen from amongst the enlisted troops as reinforcement to the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî [747]
- AJ: [333]
- IY: After the sultan's departure, Emir Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî reviewed the *awlâd al-nâs* who were enlisted soldiers and sent about two hundred of them to the Sa'id [sic] for them to remain with the *kâshif*. [447]

PMA230. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** It was reported that Emir Aḥmad, the son of 'Alî ibn al-Tashlâqî, the governor of Qatyâ, was cut at the waist for a crime he committed [6th of Ramadân; **263/Al-Muntaqá** 174b]

- ZDT: Upon the sultan's arrival in Qatyâ, he nominated as its viceroy emir 'Izz al-Dîn Aydamur a.k.a. al-Dawâdâr, the former viceroy of Baalbek, to the surprise of 'Alâ' al-Dîn ibn al-Tashlâqî the incumbent, whose son Aḥmad was crucified then killed for highway robbery and murder {Reflections on the sense of justice of the sultan} [267b-268a]
- 'Aynî: Upon the sultan's arrival in Qatyâ, he had Aḥmad, the son of 'Alâ' al-Dîn ibn al-Tashlâqî, the city's governor, cut at the waist because he was a highway robber who preyed on merchants [Ist.B2 **97b/DK** 431]
- Maq.: [747]
- IH: ...Aḥmad the son of 'Alî ibn al-Bashlâqî... [82]
- AJ: [333]

PMA231. – **[IS]** Qarâdamurdâsh's mamluk arrived in Damascus and informed al-Nâsirî that he had left the sultan back in Gaza [Monday, probably the 6th of Ramadân; 93]

PMA232. – **[ZDT]** The sultan arrived in Gaza and readied himself to leave for Damascus [7th of Ramadân; 268a]

– IQS: The sultan arrived at Gaza in great pomp [381]

PMA233. – [ZDT] On the sultan's way to Syria, news arrived about Mintâsh's escape from al-Maydân along with a few men towards al-Kiswah [After the 7th of Ramadân; 268a]

PMA234. – [IF] The decorations in Cairo were removed [8th of Ramadân; 263]
 – Maq.: The decorations were removed because there was no justification for them [747]

PMA235. – [IS] A man arrived in Damascus and said that Mintâsh was at al-Zur'ah⁷¹ and that a falling out had taken place between him and 'Anqâ' [After the 6th of Ramadân; 93]

PMA236. – [IQS] A report arrived in Damascus that Mintâsh had fled but could not be found. It was said that he had gone to Nu'ayr. When al-Nâsirî arrived in Sarkhad⁷² with the troops, he found no one [9th of Ramadân; 381]

– IS: "A report arrived that Mintâš had gone to Nu'ayr and was with him."⁷³ [A few days after the 7th; 93]

PMA237. – [IF] News were reported in Cairo about the reinstatement by the sultan of Qadi Badr al-Dîn ibn Faḍl as *kâtib al-sirr* instead of al-Karakî who was then appointed to *nazar al-jaysh* instead of Ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz [10th of Ramadân; 263]

PMA238. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] Emir Kumushbughâ summoned Emir Baktamur, al-Jûbânî's *dawâdâr*, arrested him and sent him to Batkhâs, the *amîr majlis*. Emir Baktamur fled from his captors and vanished without a trace, so the lantern men proclaimed that he had escaped and that he was to be captured [10th of Ramadân; 263/Al-Muntaqâ 175a]

– 'Aynî: Kumushbughâ arrested Badr al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Sarâ'î al-Kalistânî because of the escape of Emir Baktamur, al-Jûbânî's *dawâdâr*, whom he was accused of hiding [Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

– Maq.: [748]

PMA239. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] It was reported that news had arrived about Muḥammad Nu'ayr ibn Ḥayyâr the emir of al-Faḍl tribe: the latter had reached Damascus after the flight of Mintâsh and, when met by al-Nâsirî, he defeated the viceroy and killed a number of Syrian emirs, among them Ibrâhîm ibn Manjak, and a number of mamluks [First decade of Ramadân; 263/Al-Muntaqâ 175a]

PMA240. – [IF] {A letter sent by Sûdûn al-Turuntâ'î to Qadi Ibn Makânis, the intendant of his *dîwân* in Egypt, was read in Ibn al-Furât's presence: its contents were requests concerning Ibn Makânis and information about the trip of the sultan's party (their safe

⁷¹ In the text it is al-Azraq, but basing himself on Ibn al-Furât, Brinner commented that the correct reading should be al-Zur'ah; see *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 128 footnote no. 759, and PMA226.

⁷² "...chief city of the Ḥawrân district south of Damascus;" Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 31 footnote no. 184.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 128.

arrival in Gaza; news about Mintâsh who is reported to have fled Damascus along with a few men, etc.)) [13th of Ramadân; 264]

PMA241. – [**Aynî**] {Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî met the sultan at Mastabat Lajjûn where the sultan dismounted, walked a few feet and had him ride one of his own mounts decorated with a golden attire} [n.d.; Ist.B2 97b/DK 431-2]

– ZDT: When al-Nâsirî went out to meet the sultan at al-Lajjûn, the latter treated him well and dismounted for him [n.d.; 268a]

– IK: Reports reached al-Nâsirî about the sultan's entry into Syria; he set out and met him at Qâbûn; Barqûq overindulged him, dismounted for him, embraced him and had him ride next to him [502]

– IS: The sultan was approaching Damascus and arrived in al-Ghawr, where the viceroy and the emirs went out to meet him; people assembled to welcome the sultan [93]

– Maq.: Al-Nâsirî went out to meet the sultan at al-Lajjûn [748]

– IH: [58]

– IQS: [14th of Ramadân; 381]

– IT: [26]

PMA242. – [**IQS**] A report arrived that Ibn al-Ḥarâmî, a Mintâshî who had rebelled in Baalbek, had fled from that city's citadel with a number of inhabitants and one Ibn al-Najîb who was killed before he managed to escape by a man called Ibn Maḥbûb. The sultan had ordered al-Nâsirî and a group of soldiers to head to Baalbek, but the report arrived in Damascus before their departure [27th of Ramadân; 382-3]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: {Ibn al-Furât read a letter sent by *mutawallî al-biqâ 'ayn*, Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad, to the *malik al-umarâ'* [the sultan, al-Nâsirî or Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî?], informing him in detail about events dating back to the middle of the month: among other things, the activities of *al-munâfiqîn* [the Shî'tes?] in Baalbek; their alliance with the Mintâshîs; the persecution of the Qaysîs; the threat posed by the tribesmen of Wâdî al-Taym; and the wait for the arrival of the loyalist troops/News arrived that the Mintâshîs were in Baalbek [Last decade of Ramadân; 264/n.d.; *Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

PMA243. – [**IQS**] Arrival in Damascus of Shams al-Dîn ibn Mashkûr, who was appointed *nazir al-jaysh* after having been mulcted [18th of Ramadân; 381]

PMA244 – [**IQS**] Return of Yalbughâ from his meeting with the sultan, wearing an impressive robe of honor [29th, but probably the 20th of Ramadân; 381]

– IK: The sultan sent [al-Nâsirî] back to Damascus [502]

– ZDT: The viceroy preceded the sultan to his seat of power to prepare for his arrival [268a]

PMA245. – [**ID**] When the sultan arrived in Irbid, Mintâsh fled from Damascus [n.d.; 263]

– IH: When the sultan approached Damascus, Mintâsh fled [56]

PMA246. – **[IS]** {The sultan entered Damascus. “Al-Nâsirî bore the royal sunshade over his head, candles were lighted, and the singing girls played.”⁷⁴ Barqûq then entered the citadel, which the viceroy had repainted and refurnished, and sat on the throne, with the officials standing each in his place. The sultan rejoiced at his entry into the citadel after he had felt anguish about it because what had happened in the past. Short digression about the vicissitudes of Barqûq’s recent history. Panegyric verse by one Shaykh Shams al-Dîn al-Zarkhûnî} [22nd of Ramadân; 93-96]

– IK: Al-Nâsirî came out of the city another time when Barqûq reached Damascus; the sultan and emirs entered the citadel while al-Nâsirî held *al-khubz* over Barqûq’s head [502]

– ZDT: + {Long passage about the justice of the sultan and the positive impact of his rule} [268a-b]

– ID: [263]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Arrival of the sultan and the Egyptian troops in Damascus, which had been decorated. [265/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 431]

– Maq.: [748]

– IH: + All the rebels whether Arabs, Turks and Turcomans, submitted to him so that no sword was drawn in his face [56, 58]

– IQS: The sultan entered the city and settled in the citadel, with the viceroy bearing the royal sunshade {Detailed description of the positioning of the Syrian qadis} [382]

– IT: ...with al-Nâsirî bearing the royal sunshade over his head... [25-26]

– AJ: ...Yalbughâ al-Majnûn... [334]

– ABM: [307]

– IY: [447]

– Anon.: + the sultan settled in al-Qaṣr al-Ablaḡ [300b]

PMA247. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** Emir Kumushbughâ nominated Shâhîn al-‘Alâ’î al-Kalbakî as *kâshif* al-Wajh al-Qiblî instead of Anwât al-Yûsufî who was arrested [22nd of Ramadân; 265/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

– Maq.: [748]

PMA248. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** The sultan prayed in the Omeyyad mosque [23rd of Ramadân; 265/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

– ZDT: The day of Ramadân, the sultan went to al-Maydân and then to the Omeyyad mosque where he prayed, after which he visited the blessed alleged locations of the prophets’ tombs; he then went back to the citadel [268b]

– ‘Aynî: [DK 432]

– Maq.: [748]

– IH: [58]

– IQS: The sultan prayed at the Omeyyad mosque with the *amîr kabîr* Inâl on his side, and below him the viceroy al-Nâsirî and Emir Aytamish; Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn al-Bâ’ûnî delivered a powerful (“*balighah*”) sermon [382]

– IT: [26]

⁷⁴ Ibid.

- AJ: [334]
- ABM: [307]
- Anon.: [307]

PMA249. – **[Maq.]** {After the prayer, the *jâwîsh* proclaimed an amnesty and that the past was the past, etc. People then called out their blessings upon Barqûq, as they had been expecting hardship for what they had done to him in deed and in words at the time of his siege of the city in 791-2} [23rd of Ramadân; 748]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Peace and security were proclaimed and the sultan presided a meeting at the citadel attended by the religious elite of Egypt and Syria [265/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

– IS: [96]

– ‘Aynî: DK: {People called out their blessings upon him and showered him with money. It was even reported that a Persian merchant showered him with twenty thousand dirhams. After the prayer, the sultan ordered the *jâwîsh* to proclaim, in the mosque, security and safety to the people of Damascus and that the past was the past; people clamoured to God to give the sultan long life [Ist.B2 97b/DK 432]

– IH: [58]

– IT: [26]

– AJ: [334]

– ABM: [307]

– IY: {Upon the arrival of the sultan in Damascus, people evacuated the city for fear of al-Zâhir, because of what they had said and done to him during the siege of the city in 791-2. Barqûq proclaimed peace and security, etc.} [447]

– Anon.: [300b]

PMA250. – **[IS]** {Depredations of the Egyptian soldiers in Damascus in which they were joined by “every evil and dissolute person.”⁷⁵ Long digressions about thieves and thievery} [n.d.; 96-99]

PMA251. – **[IF]** {Return to Cairo of Arghûn, Kumushbughâ’s *amîr majlis*, and of *qâdî al-Bahr* Sharaf al-Dîn ibn al-Raddâd, who had gone to Syria to inform the sultan about the good news concerning the Nile; they recounted that they had left the sultan in Irbid, that Mintâsh had fled on the 16th of Sha‘bân along with ‘Anqâ’, that while in Gaza Barqûq had had people executed and that most people came to him in submission} [24th of Ramadân; 265]

PMA252. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** Emir ‘Alî al-Jariktamurî al-Qâzânî al-Barîdî, one of the legatees of Tamurbây al-Damurdâshî and the *mihmandâr* at the time of Mintâsh’s regime, was executed outside of Cairo [25th of Ramadân; 265/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175a]

– Maq.: [748]

– AJ: [334]

PMA253. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** A letter arrived to Barqûq from the viceroy of Hama in which he reported that Nu‘ayr was saying that he was never in rebellion and that when he

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 130.

came to Damascus the viceroy al-Nâsirî feared that he was collaborating with Mintâsh, so that fighting erupted between them despite him. Nu‘ayr declared his loyalty to the sultan, asked for an amnesty and offered to capture Mintâsh; a letter was sent back to him saying that if he did just that all his requests in terms of *iqṭâ’*, rewards, etc. would be met [n.d.; **265-6/Al-Muntaqâ** 175a]

– IK: In a letter from the viceroy of Hama to Barqûq, Nu‘ayr apologized for what he had done (“*mâ waqa ‘a minhu*”) and accused al-Nâsirî in the matter of Mintâsh (“*wa-ittahama al-Nâsirî fi amr Mintâsh*”), [because in so doing?] he aimed at nipping the rebellion in the bud. He also sought security for his person and guaranteed to bring Mintâsh from wherever he was; the sultan acquiesced [n.d.; 502]

– IH: [59-60]

PMA254. – [IQS] The *wazîr* Tâj al-Dîn ibn Bishârah vanished, some said he fled. He was replaced by al-Najm [ibn Makânîs?] to both the *wizârah* and *nazar al-jaysh*. Ibn Hîjjî said: “He is one of the best of his community.” [27th of Ramadân; 382]

PMA255. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] A post messenger arrived carrying to the emirs in Cairo a letter announcing the entry of the sultan into Damascus [2nd of Shawwâl; **266/Al-Muntaqâ** 175b]

– Maq.: [749]

– Anon.: [300b]

PMA256. – [IQS] The *hâjib* Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad, also known as Ibn Naqîb al-Qal‘ah, was savagely beaten in the presence of the sultan because of his involvement in the *mazalim* [4th of Shawwâl; 383]

PMA257. – [IF] Emir Kumushbughâ nominated Quṭlû Shâh al-Safawî as *wâlî* of Qalyûb in replacement of Tankiz al-Barîdî [First decade of Shawwâl; 266]

– Maq.: [749]

PMA258. – [IS] The sultan prayed than headed for Barzah⁷⁶ (“*baraza ilâ Barzah*”), along with all the troops and al-Nâsirî, on their way towards Aleppo and its districts, and left behind in Damascus Sûdûn Bâq as interim viceroy [8th of Shawwâl; 99]

– IF/Al-Muntaqâ: The sultan headed for Barzah (“*baraza ilâ Barzah*”) and left behind in Damascus people to take care of the city [7th of Shawwâl; **266/Al-Muntaqâ** 175b]

– ZDT: On the second of Shawwâl, the sultan prayed at the mosque and then left for the outskirts of the city, on his way to Aleppo [168b-169a]

– IS: The sultan left Barzah [Sunday, the 10th of Shawwâl; 93]

– ‘Aynî: {The sultan went to Barzah (“*baraza ilâ Barzah*”)} [Ist.B2 97b/DK **432**]

– IQS: After praying at the mosque with a small number of his retinue, the sultan left following prayer time on his way towards the Northern provinces and stopped at Barzah [8th of Shawwâl; 383]

– IH: [60]

⁷⁶ A spot about four miles north of Damascus; *ibid.*, p. 20 footnote no.127.

PMA259. – **[IF]** The sultan left Damascus for Aleppo on Friday the 8th of Shawwâl [8th of Shawwâl; 266]

- IK: After he had spent *ʿĪd al-Fitr* in Damascus, he headed for Aleppo seeking Mintâsh [502]
- ID: [7th of Shawwâl; 263]
- Maq.: [7th of Shawwâl; 749]
- IH: [60]
- IT: The sultan stayed in Damascus until the 2nd of Shawwâl and then headed towards Aleppo [2nd of Shawwâl; 27]
- AJ: [334]
- ABM: [308]
- Anon.: [300b-301a]

PMA260. – **[Maq.]** Fakhr al-Dîn ʿAbd al-Rahmân ibn Makânis settled into the *wizârah* in Damascus [7th of Shawwâl; 749]

- IH: [60]

PMA261. – **[IF]** {Arrival of a letter from Fakhr al-Dîn ʿAbd al-Rahmân ibn Makânis, the Syrian *wazîr*, to his son in Cairo, Qadi Majd al-Dîn Fadl Allâh, informing the latter about his arrival in al-Nabak, on the evening of the 11th of Shawwâl, on his way to the Euphrates [n.d.; 266]}

PMA262. – **[IQS]** {Following the departure of the sultan, all the city gates but a few were closed. Then came an edict from the sultan arrived ordering the opening of all gates except that of Kaysân} [n.d.; 384]

PMA263. – **[IS]** Iyâs arrived from Safad and left immediately to catch up with the sultan; Sûdûn was left behind and ruled as a despot [12th of Shawwâl; 99]

PMA264. – **[ZDT]** The sultan arrived in Homs where he visited the shrine of the martyr Khâlid ibn al-Walîd [13th of Shawwâl; 269a]

- IQS: [384]
- IT: The sultan arrived in Homs [27]

PMA265. – **[IQS]** Correspondence arrived from the sultan regarding Sûdûn Bâq's nomination as *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* in Damascus. The news was proclaimed in the city [13th of Shawwâl; 384]

PMA266. – **[IQS]** [After the sultan's arrival in Homs on the 13th of Shawwâl], he summoned Qadi Badr al-Dîn ibn Fadl Allâh to his tent where he was nominated *kâtib al-sirr* [14th of Shawwâl; 384]

- ZDT: [n.d.; 265a]
- IH: [61; 79]
- IT: [27]
- IY: [449]

PMA267. – [ZDT] The sultan arrived in Hama where he was met by the viceroy of the city, Damurdâsh al-Aḥmadî, and its qadis [n.d.; 269a]

– IT: [27]

– IQS: [15th of Shawwâl; 384]

PMA268. – [IQS] The sultan arrived in Salamîyah on Saturday [16th of Shawwâl; 384]

PMA269. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] {Arrival in Cairo of Bahâdur al-Tâjî, the post messenger, carrying letters from the sultan informing the emirs of Egypt about, among other things, the departure of the sultan to Barzah and the arrival there of a delegation from the viceroy of Aleppo accompanied by a man called Muḥsinî [?], the *dawâdâr* of Sûlî ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir, who presented to the sultan a gift {description} from his master and a letter apologizing for having taken Sîs. The letter also informed those in Cairo that the most important emirs of the ‘Îsâ and Muhannâ tribes pledged obeisance to the sultan, and that Mintâsh and Nu‘ayr were at al-Raḥbah⁷⁷ and Ja‘bar.⁷⁸ The sultan was said to have sent Shihâb al-Dîn al-‘Abbâsî with the letter from the caliph to Nu‘ayr, etc.}/When the sultan left for Barzah, a delegation from the viceroy of Aleppo arrived accompanied by the *dawâdâr* of Sûlî ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir who carried a letter presenting a gift {description} to him and apologizing for having taken Sîs [17th of Shawwâl; 266-7/n.d.; *Al-Muntaqâ* 175b]

– IK: [502]

– Maq: [19th of Shawwâl; 750]

– IH: [60]

– IQS: [383-4]

– AJ: [334]

– ABM: [308]

– IY: [During Ramadân; 447]

– Anon.: When news about the sultan’s departure for Aleppo arrived in Cairo, tidings were sounded for three days [n.d.; 301a]

PMA270. – [IQS] The Qadi ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Karakî ibn al-Muqirri arrived in Damascus back from the sultan’s company. As he was fatigued, he was removed from office and replaced by Ibn Faḍl Allâh [12th (but probably the 18th) of Shawwâl; 384]

– ZDT: [265a]

– IH: The sultan ordered al-Karakî back to Damascus where he remained, in a sickly state; upon the sultan’s return from Aleppo, al-Karakî accompanied him back to Egypt where he died [in 794][61]

– IY: During Dhû al-Qa‘dah, news arrived that the *kâtib al-sirr* ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Karakî had died in Homs [449]

PMA271. – [IF] Muḥammad Sadaqah ibn al-A‘sar was nominated *wâlî* of al-Ashmûnayn instead al-Sârim [2nd decade of Shawwâl; 267]

– Maq.: [750]

⁷⁷ A town in the Jazîrah region of Northern Syria; *ibid.*; p. 77 footnote no. 466.

⁷⁸ “...a fortress situated on the left bank of the Euphrates...” *ibid.*; p. 210 footnote no. 1257.

PMA272. – **[IF]** Kumushbughâ confirmed Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Qarâbughâ a.k.a. Ibn Mushidd al-Aḥwâsh, as *wâlî* of Dumyât instead of Siddîq al-Zâhirî [2nd decade of Shawwâl; 267]

– Maq.: [750]

PMA273. – **[IQS]** {Incident in Damascus involving one Qadi Sarî al-Dîn ibn al-Misllâtî who, equipped with a letter from the sultan, had one ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Majdalî imprisoned for stealing his wife’s material (“*qimâsh*”)} [20th of Shawwâl; 384-5]

PMA274. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Barqûq arrived in Aleppo, prayed at the Nûrî mosque and started arbitrating amongst the people on Mondays and Thursdays [22nd of Shawwâl; 267/Al-Muntaqâ 175b]

– IK: [502]

– ZDT: [21st of Shawwâl; 269a]

– ID: [263]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 432]

– IH: [56; 60-1]

– IQS: [20th of Shawwâl; 385]

– IT: [27]

PMA275. – **[IS]** {An incident involving the nailing of two young men accused by Sûdûn Bâq to be Mintâshîs, reflected the interim viceroy’s despotic and violent ways} [23rd of Shawwâl; 99]

– IH: [60]

PMA276. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** After that Kumushbughâ summoned him from Alexandria, Muḥammad Shâh, the son of Emir Baydamur al-Khawârizmî, arrived in Cairo [24th of Shawwâl; 268/Al-Muntaqâ 175b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 96b]

– Maq.: [750]

– IQS: [385]

– AJ: [335]

PMA277. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqâ]** Muḥammad Shâh, who was a very handsome young man, was executed during the night of the 25th [25th of Shawwâl; 268/Al-Muntaqâ 175b]

– Maq.: [750]

– IH: [73]

– IQS: [385]

– AJ: [335]

PMA278. – **[IF]** Kumushbughâ’s *amîr akhûr* who had been sent to the sultan in Syria, returned to Cairo with news about Barqûq’s entry into Aleppo on the 22nd of Shawwâl and his appointment of Badr al-Dîn ibn Faḍl Allâh al-‘Umarî as *kâtib al-sirr* instead of ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-‘Âmirî al-Karakî because the latter was fatigued [The last Saturday of Shawwâl or the first Saturday of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 268]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b]

– Maq.: [751]

- AJ: [335]
- ABM: [309]
- IY: [447]

PMA279. – [IS] News reached Damascus via one of al-Nâsirî's mamluks that the sultan had entered Aleppo, something that rejoiced people a lot [The last Saturday of Shawwâl or the first Saturday of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 99]

PMA280. – [ZDT] Upon his arrival in Aleppo, the sultan sent a number of emirs, led by Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, towards the cities of al-Bîrah and al-Ruhâ to inspect the Turcomans there and those rebellious amongst them, and to get them to provide sheep as part of their *zakât* payment, as was the habit [n.d.; 269a-b]

- IS: The sultan dispatched al-Nâsirî, Aytamish al-Bajâsî, Kumushbughâ al-Saghîr, and Butâ to al-Bîrah, while he stayed behind with his mamluks and the rest of the emirs [n.d.; 99-100]

PMA281. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Tidings were sounded for three days because of the news concerning the sultan's entry in Aleppo [1st of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 268/*Al-Muntaqâ* 176b]

- 'Aynî: Tidings were sounded for three days [DK 432]
- Maq.: [751]
- AJ: [335]

PMA282. – [ZDT] During the first decade of the month, while the troops were on the mission the sultan sent them on, news arrived to Barqûq that Mintâsh and a group of mamluks and emirs had arrived in Ra's al-'Ayn from Mârdîn, and that Husayn ibn Ishiq, Sâlim al-Dûkârî's cousin, had confronted and captured them [First decade of the month; 269b]

PMA283. – [IF] A post rider arrived with the news of Mintâsh's capture at the hands of Sâlim al-Dûkârî who, by doing so, wanted to curry favours with the sultan [2nd of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 268-9]

- Maq.: News arrived about Mintâsh's capture [751]

PMA284. – [ZDT] Conflicting reports concerning the capture of Mintâsh arrived steadily [n.d.; 269b]

- Maq.: + but they turned out not to be true [2nd of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 751]

PMA285. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn al-Halabî, the *muwaqqi' al-dast* and the scribe of Qutlûbughâ al-Safawî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, brought to the attention of his patron that a letter had arrived from Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî informing him that Sâlim al-Dûkârî had captured Mintâsh, that the Turcomans had entered into obeisance and that Nu'ayr had fled, but would hopefully be arrested [3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 269/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a]

PMA286. – [IS] {Sûdûn Bâq proclaimed the obligation for people to hang lamps on their homes and stores, if not they would be punished. People acquiesced because they feared

him, and so Damascus was alight at night. Sûdûn rode out at night to inspect the city and to call upon its people not to leave their homes} [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 100]

PMA287. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] News arrived in Egypt that the sultan had nominated Qadi Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn al-Qadi Badr al-Dîn al-Fâqûsî as *muwaqqi‘ al-dast* instead of Qadi Nâsir al-Dîn al-Tûsî after the latter’s death in Syria [n.d.; 269/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a]

– Maq.: [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 751]

– IH: [During Shawwâl; 79-80]

– AJ: [336]

– ABM: [309]

– IY: During this month, news arrived about the death of Qadi Nâsir al-Dîn, the *muwaqqi‘ al-dast*, who had been travelling with the sultan [449]

PMA288. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Upon the sultan’s arrival in Aleppo, news came that Sâlim al-Dûkârî had captured Mintâsh. The ruler of Mârdîn then informed Barqûq that a number of Mintâshî emirs and mamluks had arrived in his city, and that he had arrested thirteen of them and a group of mamluks [n.d.; 269/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a]

– ZDT: + The messenger of the ruler of Mârdîn arrived with the true picture concerning the capture of Mintâsh by al-Dûkârî’s cousin [269b]

– ID: News reached the sultan that Sâlim al-Dûkârî had captured Mintâsh [–] and that the ruler of Mârdîn had captured a group Mintâshî emirs who were in his custody [263]

– IK: Then news arrived to the sultan that Mintâsh had parted ways with Nu‘ayr and had gone through the province of Mârdîn whose soldiers engaged him and captured a number of his companions; Nu‘ayr managed to escape to Sâlim al-Rûdkârî [sic], a Turcoman emir, who arrested him and then informed the sultan about the arrest [502]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b/DK 432-3]

– Maq.: [26th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 751]

– IH: [61]

– AJ: [336]

– IQS: [385-6]

– IT: [27]

– ABM: [309]

PMA289. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Barqûq sent out Qarâdamurdâsh and the Aleppan troops in one direction, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and the Damascus soldiery in another, and Înâl al-Yûsufî to Mârdîn to pick up those arrested by its ruler/Barqûq sent out Qarâdamurdâsh and the Aleppan troops in one direction,⁷⁹ Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and the Damascus soldiery to Sûlî to bring Mintâsh, and Înâl al-Yûsufî and the Egyptian troops to Mârdîn to pick up those Mintâshî emirs and those mamluks arrested by the city’s ruler after their flight there [n.d.; 269/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a]

– IK: The sultan ordered Qarâdamurdâsh and his troops to head to Sâlim al-Rûdkârî to bring Mintâsh; al-Nâsirî was sent in Qarâdamurdâsh’s wake while Înâl, the *atâbak*, was sent to bring Mintâsh’s followers (“*ashâb*”) from Ra’s al-‘Ayn.

⁷⁹ The mention “*ilâ Sûlî*” was crossed and followed by “*min jihah.*”

- ID: The sultan sent out Qarâdamurdâsh and the Aleppan troops to Sâlim al-Dûkârî, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and the Damascus soldiery in another direction, and the Egyptian troops to Mârdîn [–] So the troops headed out [263]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 97b-98a/DK 333]
- Maq.: [751-2]
- IH: The sultan sent out Înâl al-Yûsufî to pick the Mintâshîs captured by the ruler of Mârdîn [–] [After he received news from Sâlim al-Dûkârî that he had captured Mintâsh], he sent out Damurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, with a force in one direction, and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî with another in a different direction [61]
- IQS: [386]
- IT: He sent Qarâ al-Aḥmadî, the viceroy of Aleppo, to Sâlim al-Dûkârî to pick up Mintâsh [–] As for the *amîr kabîr* Înâl al-Yûsufî, he had been sent by the sultan to the ruler of Mârdîn [27]
- AJ: [27th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 336]
- ABM: [309]
- Anon.: News arrived that upon his entry into Aleppo, the sultan sent out troops in pursuit of Mintâsh and Nu‘ayr [301a]

PMA290. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {Tamur al-Khâssakî arrived in Cairo from Aleppo and informed Kumushbughâ that the sultan was in that city and that those who had been sent to capture Mintâsh had not yet returned} [16th or 18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 270/*Al-Muntaqâ*; 177a]

- Maq.: [26th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 751]

PMA291. – [IF] Kumushbughâ asked Ibn al-Tablâwî, the *wâlî* of Cairo, to proclaim peace and security, as the sultan’s enemy had been captured. Tidings were sounded for three days [16th or 18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 270]

- Maq.: [752]
- AJ: [336]
- ABM: [309]

PMA292. – [IF] Kumushbughâ nominated Aydamur al-Shamsî Abû Zaltah as the viceroy of al-Buḥayrah instead of Damurdâsh al-Sayfî Uljây [During the middle decade of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 270]

- Maq.: [752]

PMA293. – [ZDT] A message was sent out to the troops to exert themselves in achieving their goals and to return to Aleppo [n.d.; 269b]

PMA294. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The mamluk of Înâl al-Yûsufî, the *atâbak*, arrived in Cairo with the news that when Qarâdamurdâsh and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and their respective troops went to fetch Mintâsh from Sâlim al-Dûkârî, Qarâdamurdâsh spent four days at the latter’s encampment requesting the handing over of Mintâsh while Sâlim delayed him. Qarâdamurdâsh then attacked Sâlim al-Dûkârî, looted his quarters and killed a number of his men. This prompted Sâlim al-Dûkârî to flee along with Mintâsh to Sinjâr. After this, Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî arrived and an altercation occurred between the two during which al-Nâsirî produced a dagger with which he wanted to hit Qarâdamurdâsh. A great conflict

(“*fitnah*”) almost erupted, but the two returned without achieving anything as Sâlim al-Dûkârî along with Mintâsh had gone to Sinjâr and fortified themselves there. [In the meantime, the messenger continued], Înâl arrived with the Egyptian troops after he had gone to Ra’s al-‘Ayn and taken custody of the Mintâshî emirs, chief amongst them Qashtamur al-Ashrafî. [The messenger also informed the people in Cairo, first, that] a letter arrived to the sultan from the ruler of Mârdîn apologizing and saying that God willing he will capture the sultan’s enemy, etc.; and second, that Barqûq will be leaving Aleppo for Damascus on Friday [27th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; **270**/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a-b]

– IK: [503]

– ZDT: The troops sent out by Barqûq from Aleppo returned during the second decade of the month. In their company were those Mintâshî emirs and mamluks captured by the ruler of Mârdîn, amongst them Qashtamur al-Ashrafî; they also explained why Mintâsh stayed behind with Sâlim al-Dûkârî’s and why he was not handed over to them [n.d.; 269b]

– ID: [263-4]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98a/DK 433]

– Maq.: [752]

– IH: : [61-62]

– IQS: [386]

– AJ: [336-7]

– IT: [27]

– ABM: [309, 310, 311]

PMA295. – [**Anon.**] A battle took place between the Mintâshîs and the troops sent out by Barqûq upon his arrival in Aleppo during which many from both sides, the Arabs who were with Mintâsh and Nu‘ayr and the Syrian troops, died. Mintâsh and Nu‘ayr suffered a crushing defeat and headed towards Sinjâr after the sultan’s victory over them. After news reached Cairo about this, tiding were sounded for seven days [n.d.; 301a]

PMA296. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] When the troops that had gone to bring in Mintâsh came back to Aleppo and news reached the sultan about what had happened between Qarâdamurdâsh and Sâlim al-Dûkârî, the latter’s flight to Sinjâr and the altercation between Qarâdamurdâsh and al-Nâsirî, Barqûq saw the truth of what had been reported to him about al-Nâsirî: that Mintâsh had gone to Damascus only as a result of al-Nâsirî’s correspondence with him; that the pair had met three times in the bath in Damascus; and that all of what Mintâsh did in Damascus was done with the approval of al-Nâsirî. In the meantime, Sâlim al-Dûkârî informed the sultan that al-Nâsirî had sent him a letter saying: “run away with Mintâsh because as long as the latter is around (“*mawjûd*”), we will be around (“*mawjûdîn*”).” When the sultan saw al-Nâsirî’s letter, which was sent to him by Sâlim, he believed what had been reported about him. He arrested and killed al-Nâsirî after much reproaching. It was said that the sultan’s mamluks cut al-Nâsirî into pieces in Aleppo during Dhû al-Qa‘dah. [n.d.; **271**/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177b]

– IK: {Sâlim al-Rûdkârî wrote to the sultan apologizing about the matter of Mintâsh and saying that al-Nâsirî had written him ordering him to protect Mintâsh. On the 6th of Dhû al-Hijjah, the sultan held a huge sitting and summoned al-Nâsirî. He scolded then arrested him} [503]

- ZDT: News about Yalbughâ's evil actions and intentions reached the sultan, which prompted Barqûq to arrest him and a number of his companions [During the last decade of the month, 269b]
- ID: It became apparent to the sultan that al-Nâsirî had sent for Mintâsh to come to Damascus, and that it was he who dispatched a letter to Sâlim al-Dûkârî telling him: 'do not hand him over.' This was ascertained in the mind of the sultan from a variety of sources ("*min turuq*") [–] Things became clear to the sultan so he arrested al-Nâsirî and that was the last that was heard of him [*Al-Nafhah* 264]
- 'Aynî: Then Sâlim al-Dûkârî informed the sultan that al-Nâsirî had sent him a letter saying: 'run away with Mintâsh because as long as the latter is around, we will be around.' Sâlim forwarded al-Nâsirî's letter to the sultan with his. When the sultan saw al-Nâsirî's missive, it became apparent to him that al-Nâsirî had not abandoned his treachery {details} and that killing him was the best thing. The sultan kept these thoughts in his heart. On the 27th of Dhû al-Qa'dah, he rode as part of a procession to the citadel and indicated to Yalbughâ to come up to him because he wanted to bestow upon him the viceroyalty of Aleppo. When the emirs of the sultan went up to the citadel, he ordered its gates closed, and arrested Yalbughâ, then shackled and imprisoned him for two nights. On the third night, Sunday evening, he ordered him killed. This was done and his head was brought up to the sultan on a plate. The arrival of Sâlim al-Dûkârî's letter, which we have mentioned, confirmed all that had been said about al-Nâsirî, among other things: that he and Mintâsh had met three times in the bath in Damascus; that all of what Mintâsh did in Damascus was done with the approval of al-Nâsirî; that the latter had him come to Damascus; and that he had gone to Damascus only as a result of al-Nâsirî's correspondence with him [27th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; Ist.B2 98a/DK 433-4]
- Maq.: + From the very beginning, Yalbughâ was ill-intentioned, so that it was said that people associated themselves with him only to see their situation worsen because of him [752-3]
- IH: [62-3]
- IS: "A man whom I trust, one of the prominent people, told me that when the sultan seized al-Nâsirî in the citadel of Aleppo, he remonstrated with him about several things which had happened through him in the affairs of the sultan, one of which he [cited], saying: 'O you, when the citadel of Aleppo revolted against you, you took it in three days, for you had a purpose. But when Mintâsh revolted against you and was in the Maydân, with only a stone's throw between him and you, and although you had the armies of Syria, Safed, and Tripoli as well as the people of Damascus, you had no ambition to capture him.' {Verse} Then [the sultan] had him executed, and he was slain and thrown into Bagdad {Digression about a place called Baghdad in Aleppo} {Digression on unusual coincidences}."⁸⁰ [n.d.; 101]
- IQS: [386]
- IT. "As these convictions grew stronger in az-Zâhir's mind and the old resentment which he harbored against an-Nâsirî when he had revolted and had deposed and imprisoned him in al-Karak was revived, and he now ascribed to him the cause of all the harm and all the troubles which had come upon him to the

⁸⁰ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, pp. 136-7.

present. He kept his resentment to himself, however, until an-Nâsirî arrived at Aleppo, when he arrested him [–] Al-Nâsirî was one of the most powerful emirs and one of the oldest mamlûks of the Commander-in-Chief Yalbughâ al-‘Umarî. An account of his relations with Mintâsh and others has been given in the chapter on al-Malik az-Zâhir’s first reign and that of al-Malik al-Mansûr Hâjjî, and a repetition of the account is unnecessary here. Chief Hanafite Cadi Badr al-Dîn Mahmûd Al-‘Ainî in his history says in regard to Yalbughâ: ‘From the beginning of his tutelage in the days of al-Malik an-Nâsir Hasan to the end of his life he was engaged in intrigues, was malicious in thought and policy, and of ill omen. It is said that he never sided with any party in any affair but that it resulted in their reverse, and instances of this fact in his career are cited in evidence. He supported in succession his master his master Yalbughâ al-Khâssakî, and he was defeated; Asandamur al-Nâsirî, and he was overwhelmed and conquered; al-Ashraf Sha‘bân ibn Husain, and he was killed; and Emir Baraka, and he met failure.’ So far the quotation from al-‘Aynî.

I add: His own victory over al-Malik az-Zâhir Barqûq, his seizure of the domain of Egypt, and his imprisonment of az-Zâhir in al-Karak belong with all al-‘Ainî has mentioned. Al-‘Ainî has also failed to include the defeat of an-Nâsirî by Mintâsh at the Gate of the Chain and his imprisonment by him; for the story of an-Nâsirî’s relations with Mintâsh would have afforded al-‘Ainî the strongest evidence in favour of his statement that an-Nâsirî was ill-omened.”⁸¹ [27-8, 28-9]

– AJ. [337]

– ABM: [309, 310]

– IY: + And when the sultan got wind of Sâlim al-Dûkârî’s letter, he asked for the emirs and Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and read it in their presence. Yalbughâ denied it, so a copy of the Qur’ân was brought for him to swear on it, but his tongue got entangled and he could not answer {Verse}. The sultan then arrested Yalbughâ and a number of emirs, imprisoned them in the citadel of Aleppo then had them killed [447, 448]

– Anon.: They were imprisoned in the citadel of Aleppo where they stayed a few days after which they were ordered strangled, then buried during the night [301a-b]

PMA297. – [IF/Al-Muntaqâ] The sultan also arrested a number of emirs along with Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî, amongst others, Ahmad ibn al-Mihmandâr, the viceroy of Hama; Emir Kashlî his close associate (“*akhû*”) and Shaykh Hasan, his *ra’s nawbah*; and others, and that was the last that was heard of them [n.d.; 271/Al-Muntaqâ 177b]

– IK: Yalbughâ was arrested along with Emir Kashlî, his close associate (“*akhû*”); Shaykh Hasan, his *ra’s nawbah*; and Ahmad ibn al-Mihmandâr, who had given him control of the city’s citadel [in 791?]. He ordered them killed along with Qashtamur al-Ashrafî who had arrived from Mârdîn with them [503]

– ZDT: Yalbughâ was arrested along with some of his companions amongst them Kashlî; Qashtamur al-Ashrafî; Ahmad ibn al-Mihmandâr; Shaykh Hasan; and others, all of whom were executed at the citadel of Aleppo [During the last decade of the month; 269b-270a]

⁸¹ Popper, *The History of Egypt*, vol. 13, pp. 130-1.

- ‘Aynî: Also killed along with al-Nâsirî, were the two children of Ibn al-Mihmandâr, Muḥammad and Aḥmad; Shaykh Ḥasan, his *ra's nawbah*; Kishlî al-Qalamṭâwî, an emir of one hundred and one of his closest companions; and Qashtamur al-Ashrafî, an emir of one hundred from Egypt [27th of Dhû al-Qa'dah; Ist.B2 98a/DK 434]
- Maq.: [752-3]
- IH: [62-3, 73]
- IQS: [386]
- IT: [28]
- AJ: [337]
- ABM: [311]
- IY: [447, 448]
- Anon.: [301b]

PMA298. – [**‘Aynî**] When the sultan finished dealing with all this, he removed Qarâdamurdâsh from the viceroyalty of Aleppo and ordered him to travel back with him to Cairo, and in his stead, he nominated Julbân, the *ra's nawbah*. He then appointed Butâ al-Dawâdâr as viceroy of Damascus; Iyâs al-Jurjâwî, the viceroy of Ṣafad, as that of Tripoli instead of Īnâl min Khujâ ‘Alî because of the latter’s death; Arghûn al-Khâzindâr, the *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus, as viceroy of Ṣafad instead of Iyâs al-Jurjâwî; Tamurbughâ al-Manjakî, as *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus instead of Arghûn Shâh because of the latter’s appointment to Ṣafad; Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî, one of the emirs of a hundred in Aleppo, as viceroy of Hama instead of ‘Umar ibn al-Mihmandâr, because of the latter’s imprisonment and killing. The sultan then gave the *iqṭâ’* of Butâ al-Dawâdâr to Qarâdamurdâsh, who had been the viceroy of Aleppo, and that of Julbân, who had become the viceroy of that city, to Tanibâk al-Yahyâwî who had been an emir of forty. He also appointed Emir Abû Yazîd, the son in law of Shaykh Akmal al-Dîn as *dawâdâr* instead of Butâ [n.d.; Ist.B2 98a-b/DK 434-5]

- IK: [503]
- ZDT: [265a-b; 266a-b; 266b-267a; 270a]
- ID: [264]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [271/*Al-Muntaqâ* 179b-180a]
- Maq.: [753]
- IH: [63-4]
- IQS: [387]
- IT: + “...and the two appointees [Butâ and Julbân] were the first mamlûks of az-Zâhir to be advanced to such high positions and be made governors of important provinces [...] He also invested Emir Abû Yazîd ibn Murâd the treasurer with the office of grand executive secretary in succession to Butâ (transferred to the vice-regency of Damascus) in recognition of the Sultan’s obligation to him incurred when he went into hiding in Abû Yazîd’s home during the insurrection of an-Nâsirî and Mintâsh.”⁸² [29]
- AJ: [337-8]

⁸² Ibid., p. 131.

- ABM: A person close to al-Zâhir known as Abû Yazîd was appointed to the *dawâdâriyah*, because he had hid the sultan during the rebellion of Mintâsh and al-Nâsirî, so the sultan recognized what he had done [311]
- IY: [448]
- Anon.: [301b]

PMA299. – [ZDT] {On the morning of the 1st of Dhû al-Hijjah, the sultan came down from the citadel and headed to al-‘Ayn, outside of Aleppo, where he stayed, on his way to Damascus via Ma‘arrat al-Nu‘mân} [1st of Dhû al-Hijjah; 270a]

- IK: The sultan left Aleppo and reached Damascus in the middle of Dhû al-Hijjah [503]
- ID: The sultan returned to Damascus victorious [264]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [271/*Al-Muntaqâ* 178a]
- Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]
- Maq.: [752]
- IH: [64]
- IQS: [387]
- IT: [29]
- AJ: [337, 338]
- Anon.: [299]

PMA300. – [IS] On the second day of Dhû al-Hijjah, a post messenger from the sultan in Aleppo arrived in Damascus and mentioned that the sultan had arrested al-Nâsirî and a number of emirs who had plotted to kill him [2nd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 100]

PMA301. – [IS] “When Sûdûn Bâq heard this report, he immediately moved into the viceregal palace with his mamlûks and aides, desiring to be the viceroy of Syria. He was close to the sultan, but with kings the nearest to them is furthest from them. He ruled in the viceregal palace as was the custom of the viceroys, seizing a certain emir of the third class, beating and crucifying him because of his being a Mintâshî. He did not let up with anyone and the people feared him very much...”⁸³ [2nd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 100]

PMA302. – [ZDT] Arrival of the sultan in Hama [5th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 270a]

PMA303. – [IF] Arrival in Cairo of Ismâ‘îl ibn Sinjâb al-Najjâb, the relative of Qadi ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-‘Âmirî al-Karakî who was the *kâtib al-sirr*, with the information that the latter was still alive after he had been close to dying, and that the sultan had summoned him [5th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 271-2]

PMA304. – [IS] “...on the 5th of the month, [...] a post rider came from the sultan, from Aleppo, reporting that the sultan had bestowed the viceroyalty of Damascus upon Butâ, his executive secretary, that his lieutenant was Âqbughâ al-Fîl, and that the latter had already reached Hân Lâġîn.”⁸⁴ [5th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 100]

⁸³ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 135.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 135-6.

PMA305. – [IS] “When Sûdûn Bâq heard this report, he did not welcome it, and he moved from the viceregal palace to his home. This was one of the secret kindnesses of God the exalted to the people of Damascus; that he was not appointed over them, for he would have destroyed Damascus; but the Lord is generous.”⁸⁵ [5th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 100]

PMA306. – [IS] “Emir Butâ’s lieutenant entered the viceregal palace, and the blazons were changed at once.”⁸⁶ [n.d.; 100]

PMA307. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Arrival in Egypt of the mamluk of Butâ al-Dawâdâr and that of Batkhâs, the *amîr hâjib*, with information that the sultan had arrested Yalbughâ al-Nâsirî and a group of people because of what has already been explained, and that he had left Aleppo for Damascus at the beginning of Dhû al-Hijjah [6th of Dhû al-Hijjah; *272/al-Muntaqâ* 178a]

– Maq.: [752]

– IQS: [387]

– AJ: [337]

– ABM: [312]

– Anon.: [301a]

PMA308. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] [After that news arrived from the sultan with the mamluk of Butâ al-Dawâdâr], a proclamation was read by means of the lantern men for the owners of shops inside and outside of the Qasbah to whiten them, according to Kumushbughâ’s edict; people acquiesced [6th of Dhû al-Hijjah; *272/al-Muntaqâ* 178a]

– Maq.: [753]

– IQS: [387]

– AJ: [338]

– ABM: A proclamation was read that the roads the sultan will pass through from the old city of Cairo (“*qasbat al-Qâhirah*”) to be cleaned [312]

– IY: [449]

PMA309. – [ZDT] Arrival of the sultan in Homs [7th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 270a]

PMA310. – [IS] “The people were happy about Sûdûn Bâq’s leaving them and about Emir Butâ’s coming to them as viceroy. He was renowned for his generosity and as a fine-looking man of good character. When he reached Hân Lâgîn the people went out to meet him, and he entered Damascus on Monday the second day of the month, wearing the robe of office.”⁸⁷ [8th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 101]

PMA311. – [IS] “Another post rider came two or three days later, reporting that the sultan had left Aleppo, making for Damascus, and had reached Hamâ. Bands announced the arrival of the sultan”⁸⁸ [8th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 101]

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

PMA312. – [**‘Aynî**] The sultan celebrated ‘Īd al-Adhá in the town of Qârâ [n.d.; Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

PMA313. – [**IS**] The sultan arrived in ‘Adhrâ’ and Dumayr where people went out to meet him [n.d.; 103]

PMA314. – [**ZDT**] The sultan reached Damascus on Friday the 12th of Dhû al-Hijjah [12th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 270a-b]

– IK: [The sultan] reached Damascus in the middle of Dhû al-Hijjah [503]

– ‘Aynî: [13th of Dhû al-Hijjah; Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

– IS: “On Friday the 18th of the month, the sultan and the troops entered Damascus, and the populace assembled to witness their entry on that day, rejoicing. He entered the citadel, as was his custom, and ruled from there, proclaiming security and safety in the city. The troops camped in their usual places in the city...”⁸⁹ [18th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 103]

– IH: [13th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 64]

– IQS: On the 12th, the sultan entered Damascus early in the day and prayed at the mosque [12th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 387]

– IT: [23rd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 29]

– Anon.: [23th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 301b]

PMA315. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqâ**] Arrival of a post messenger in the citadel of Cairo with information that the sultan had entered Damascus on the 13th of Dhû al-Hijjah [16th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 272/Al-Muntaqâ 178a]

– Maq.: [753]

– AJ: [338]

PMA316. – [**IQS**] This day, four emirs were arrested and imprisoned: Alâbughâ, the *hâjib*; Sûdûn Bâq and Âqbây, who were emirs of a hundred; and Muqbil al-Rûmî. People thanked the sultan for this as Sûdûn Bâq had done such injustices and had so harmed the community during the sultan’s absence, that even unbelievers would not have acted like he did. As for al-Rûmî, he was one of the most evil of God’s creations [18th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 387]

– IK: He killed twenty-five people from amongst the evil doers (“*ahl al-fasâd*”) [503]

– IF/Al-Muntaqâ: Upon the arrival of the sultan in Damascus, the following met their fate and were secretly killed: Emirs Alâbughâ al-‘Uthmânî and Sûdûn Bâq Tamurbây [n.d.; 272/Al-Muntaqâ 178a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

– Maq.: [753]

– IS: “...and on Thursday, the 25th of the month, the sultan seized Alâbughâ, the grand chamberlain, and Sûdûn Bâq, while they were at the sultan’s repast. This affair was the result of [Sûdûn’s] injustices, may God the Exalted curse him. He also seized Âqbây and Ğibġaq. He arrested these four and had them carried off to

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 138.

a tower in the citadel, and no word was heard of them after that day.”⁹⁰ [25th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 103]

– IH: [74]

– IT: [29]

– AJ: [338]

– ABM: [312]

PMA317. – [IQS] Tamurbughâ al-Manjakî became *hâjib al-hujjâb* in Damascus, and the *iqta'* of Sûdûn al-Zâhirî and that of Âqbay were given to Âqbughâ al-Saghîr, who was viceroy of Gaza, and more was added to the latter's *iqta'* [18th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 387-8]

– IS: “He appointed Alâbugâ al-Manğakî grand chamberlain of Damascus. He was a good chamberlain and a good ruler, conscious of the welfare of the people, and the populace of Damascus liked him. He appointed Argûn Şâh to the viceregency of Safed instead of Iyâs...”⁹¹ [25th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 103]

PMA318. – [IS] “On the 21st of the month the sultan summoned those from the side of Mintâş who were imprisoned in the citadel, and they were brought before him. They were Emir Aḥmad ibn Baydamur; Mustafâ al-Baydamurî, the paternal uncle of Emir Aḥmad ibn Baydamur; Yalbugâ al-‘Alâ’î; the son of Amîr ‘Alî, the viceroy of Syria; Tashtamur, the captain of the guard of Ibn Qafğaq; Barşbugâ, the viceroy of Hims; Algâbugâ, the grand chamberlain of Tripoli; Azdamur Abû Daqan, a mamlûk of İnâl; Baybugâ, the viceroy of Hamâ; Qarâbugâ al-‘Umarî; Ğulbân al-Muḥammadî; the captain of the guard of al-Nâsirî, and a group of emirs, mamlûks, and others to the number of twenty persons. He immediately ordered them crucified and cut in two at the waist, and they were brought down from the citadel with chains in their necks, barefooted, up to the stables of the sultan.”⁹² {Details about the weather that day; the sultan's viewing of the proceedings along with large crowds of people; the weeping of Emir Aḥmad ibn Baydamur's mother; the execution of the prisoners; people's anguished reaction to the killing of Emir Aḥmad, a young and well-appreciated man. Verse by Shaykh ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn Aybak eulogizing the young emir. Recitation by Emir Aḥmad, the last person to be executed, of a single verse. Digression on steadfastness upon bereavement}[21st of Dhû al-Hijjah; 103-9]

– IK: [503]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Twenty three emirs were also nailed, among them: Aḥmad ibn Baydamur al-Khawârizmî, a young man; Muḥammad ibn Amîr ‘Alî al-Mârdînî; Yalbughâ al-‘Alâ’î, ‘Alî al-Mârdînî's mamluk; Naghâjaq al-Sayfî Maliktamur al-Mârdînî who had been viceroy in Malatyah; Kumushbughâ al-Sayfî Manjak who had been viceroy in Baalbek; Gharîb al-Khâssakî ibn Hâjjî Khaṭâ’î; and Qarâbughâ al-‘Umarî al-Ashrafî [n.d.; 272/*Al-Muntaqâ* 178a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

– Maq.: [753-4]

– IH: [64, 73]

– IQS: On Sunday the 21st, the prisoners, numbering twenty-one individuals, were taken out of the citadel and presented to the sultan who then ordered them

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 138-9.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 139.

⁹² Ibid., pp. 139-40.

crucified and killed. They were nailed and paraded in the city while a proclamation about them read: 'This is the punishment for those who conspire against the sultan.' Then they were all cut at the waist below the citadel. People grieved for them and cursed those who did this to them. Amongst those killed were: Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm Shāh ibn Baydamur, who was a young man, in whose favour people interceded and whose mother spent money for his life, all in vain; Emir Muḥammad, son of 'Alī al-Mārdīnī; Yalbughā al-'Alā'ī, 'Alī al-Mārdīnī's mamluk; Bughājuq al-Sayfī Taliktamur al-Mārdīnī, who had been viceroy in Malatyah; Kumushbughā al-Manjakī, who had been viceroy in Baalbek; Gharīb al-Khāssakī; and Qarābughā al-'Umarī al-Ashrafī [388]

– IT: [29]

– Anon. The sultan ordered the arrest of a group of about twenty-three emirs who were supporters of Yalbughā and Mīntāsh and their nailing. They were nailed to camels, paraded in the streets of Damascus, then cut at the waist [301b]

– ABM: When he entered the city, he killed a number of emirs [312]

PMA319. – [IK] Barqūq appointed as head of the Arabs Muḥammad ibn Muḥannā, and gave Nu'ayr's *iqṭā'* to a number of Turcomans [n.d.; 503]

PMA320. – [IT] The sultan remained in Damascus whose people were in great fear of him [n.d.; 29]

PMA321. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqā*] The sultan left for Cairo [22nd of Dhū al-Ḥijjah; 272/*Al-Muntaqā* 178a]

– IK: [503]

– ZDT: [270b]

– 'Aynī: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 435]

– Maq.: [23rd of Dhū al-Ḥijjah; 754]

– IS: [109-110]

– IH: [64-5]

– IQS: [388]

– IT: [29]

– AJ: [338]

– IY: [448]

– ABM: [312]

PMA322. – [IQS] {Incident in Damascus about the forging of signatures on a document pertaining to the property of a mamluk, Asanbughā al-Baydamurī, which was safe-deposited with one Aḥmad ibn al-Qādī Taqī al-Dīn ibn al-Zāhirī. The latter individual was made to pay for the value of the property by selling his properties and his positions} [22nd of Dhū al-Ḥijjah; 388]

PMA323. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqā*] In Cairo, it was reported that the sultan had defeated his enemies, and that he had left Damascus for Egypt on Monday [the 22nd] [24th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah; 272/*Al-Muntaqā* 178b]

PMA324. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] News arrived in Cairo about the sultan's coming to Gaza [29th of Dhû al-Hijjah; **273/Al-Muntaqá** 178b]

– Anon.: [301b]

PMA325. – [**'Aynî**] The sultan reached Ramlah [29th of Dhû al-Hijjah; Ist.B2 **98b/DK** 435]

PMA326. – [**ZDT**] {Description of the sultan's trip to Egypt which took place during the first two decades of the month of Muharram, including his arrival in the city of Qâqûn at the beginning of this month. Details about the sultan's arrival in Cairo on the 16th of Muharram}[270b-271a]

PMA327. – [**'Aynî**] The year ended as the sultan and the troops were heading back to Egypt [n.d.; Ist.B2 **98b/DK** 435]

PMA328. – [**IF/Al-Muntaqá**] {Passage about the good governance of Kumushbughâ during the sultan's absence} [n.d.; **273/Al-Muntaqá** 178b]

– Maq.: [754]

– IQS: [389]

– AJ: [338]

– ABM: [312]

PMA329. – [**IY**] Many conflicts took place during this year in which uncountable numbers of emirs and soldiers were killed because of Mintâsh. During this year also, a great deal of disturbances took place in Cairo because of the absence of the sultan [n.d.; 449]

Religious Life [RL]

RL1. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Zayn al-Dîn al-‘Irâqî taught at al-Zâhirîyah al-‘Atîqah al-Ruknîyah and al-Fâdilîyah *madrasahs* after the death of Sadr al-Dîn ibn Razîn} [18th of Muharram; **246/Al-Muntaqá** 166a]

- Maq.: [733]
- IH: [78]
- IQS: [During Muharram; 368]

RL2. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** The Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* allowed Qadi al-Qâyâtî to replace Ibn Razîn as judge at the *madrasah* al-Sâlihîyah [During Muharram; **246/Al-Muntaqá** 166a]

- Maq.: [18th of Muharram; 733]
- IH: [78]

RL3. – **[IS]** “On the 28th of the month, the *mahmil* entered the city and it had been brought back safely, praise be to God.”⁹³ [28th of Muharram; 71]

RL4. – **[IF]** It was announced that the sultan had confirmed Najm al-Dîn al-Tambadî’s nomination as *muhtasib* [8th of Safar; 264]

RL5. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of Jamâl al-Dîn, the son of Qadi Hâfiz al-Dîn, as Hanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Aleppo instead of Muhibb al-Dîn ibn al-Shihnah al-Hanafî al-Halabî [n.d.; 266b]

- IF/Al-Muntaqá: [28th of Jumâdá al-‘Ulá; 251-2/Al-Muntaqá 168b]
- ‘Aynî: [29th of Jumâdá al-‘Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [737-8, 738]
- IH: [69]
- IQS: [371]
- AJ: [12th of Jumâdá al-‘Ulá; 325]
- ABM: [302]
- IY: [443]

RL6. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of Kamâl al-Dîn ibn al-‘Adîm as *qâdî al-‘askar* in Aleppo instead of Jamâl al-Dîn ibn al-Hâfiz [28th of Jumâdá al-‘Ulá; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

- ‘Aynî: [29th of Jumâdá al-‘Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]
- Maq.: [738]
- IH: [69]
- IQS: [371]
- AJ: [325]

RL7. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Nomination of ibn Kamâl al-Dîn al-Ma‘arrî as Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* in Tripoli instead of Shihâb al-Dîn al-Sallâwî [28th of Jumâdá al-‘Ulá; **252/Al-Muntaqá** 168b]

- HI: [94b]

⁹³ Ibid., p. 101.

- Maq.: [738];
- IQS: [371]
- IY: Nomination of Shams al-Dîn al-Ghazzî...[443]
- ABM: [302]

RL8. – **[HI]** Nomination of Burhân al-Dîn al-Tâdhilî as Mâlikî *qâdî* [*al-quḍât?*] in Damascus while he was in Cairo instead of Ibn al-Qafsî [–] The latter remained in his position with the approval of the viceroy and when Barqûq arrived in Damascus, he maintained him in it [18th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 94a-b]

- ‘Aynî: [29th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]
- IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: [28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 252/*Al-Muntaqá* 168b]
- Maq.: [738]
- IH: [69]
- IQS: [371]

RL9. – **[ZDT]** Nomination of ‘Alam al-Dîn ibn al-Qafsî as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus, his fifth time in this position, instead of Burhân al-Dîn ibn al-Šanhâjî, until his removal from office a little while later at the end of this year [During this year; 265b-266a]

- IY: Nomination of ‘Alam al-Dîn ibn al-Qafsî as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus [443]
- ABM: [302]
- IY: [443]

RL9’. – **[Maq.]** Nomination of Ibn al-Qafsî as Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus instead of al-Sakisîwî [?], his fifth time in this position [28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 738]

RL10. – **[ZDT]** Return of Burhân al-Dîn ibn al-Šanhâjî to the Mâlikî judgeship in Damascus in replacement of ‘Alam al-Dîn ibn al-Qafsî [During this year; 266a]

- Maq.: [28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 738]

RL11. – **[Maq.]** Nomination of Ibn al-Munajjâ al-Tannûkhî as Hanbalî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus instead of Sharaf al-Dîn ibn ‘Abd al-Qâdir after his death [28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 738]

- ABM: [302]
- IY: [Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 443]

RL12. – **[HI]** Arrival in Damascus of “*shaykhunâ hâfiz al-‘asr*” [Ibn al-‘Irâqî?] from Cairo after visiting Jerusalem and Hebron [16th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

RL13. – **[IF]** The sultan confirmed Qadi Najm al-Dîn al-Tambadî in his position as *muhtasib* of Cairo, because rumours circulated that Qadi Bahâ’ al-Dîn ibn al-Burjî had sought and obtained this position [25th of Rajab; 256]

- Maq.: [743]

RL14. – **[IS]** The procession of the *mahmil* did not take place this month [During the month of Rajab; 84]

RL15. – **[IQS]** Death of the son of Shaykh Sharaf al-Dîn ibn al-Sharîshî [7th of Sha‘bân; 376]

RL16. – **[Maq.]** {The sultan unexpectedly removed Majd al-Dîn Ismâ‘îl al-Turukmânî,⁹⁴ who had been readying himself to go to Syria with the sultan, as Hanafî chief judge in Cairo, and nominated in his stead Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd al-Qaysarî (d.799/1397) {Commentary about his new title of *al-janâb al-‘âlî*, which had only been given to Qadi al-Karakî before him} [15th of Sha‘bân; 744]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: + He got his position through the intercession of Buṭâ, the *dawâdâr* [258-9/*Al-Muntaqâ* 171b]

– ZDT: ...Ismâ‘îl al-Kinânî... [264b-265a]

– HI: [99a]

– ‘Aynî: Ismâ‘îl al-Kinânî [12th of Sha‘bân; Ist.B2 97b/DK 430]

– IH: “Jamâl al-Dîn al-Muḥtasib was nominated to the Hanafî judiciary in replacement of our Shaykh Majd al-Dîn Ismâ‘îl ibn Ibrâhîm al-Kinânî, but he lasted in this position less than a year.” [74-5]

– IQS: [377]

– IT: [24]

– AJ: [331]

– ABM: [306]

– IY: ...Majd al-Dîn Ismâ‘îl al-Kîmânî... [445-6]

RL17. – **[IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*]** {At al-Raydânîyah, Shaykh Shams al-Dîn ibn al-Jazarî was nominated by the sultan Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus instead of Sharaf al-Dîn Mas‘ûd at the intercession of the *ustâdâr* Jamâl al-Dîn Maḥmûd in exchange for the payment of money} [23rd of Sha‘bân; 260-1/*Al-Muntaqâ* 172a-b]

– HI: Ibn al-Jazarî sought the nomination of head of the judiciary in Damascus and paid one hundred thousand [...?]. A robe of honor was bestowed upon him at al-Raydânîyah, so he returned to Cairo to pay the money owed to Maḥmûd the *ustâdâr* [99b]

– ‘Aynî: [2nd of Sha‘bân; Ist.B2 97b/DK 431]

– Maq.: [746]

– IQS: [379]

– IH: [75]

RL18. – **[IQS]** [Arrival in Damascus of Emir Tamurbughâ with the responses of the sultan to al-Nâsirî’s correspondence and his requests: among other things: [–] the confirmation of judges in their positions, and the continuation of Qadi Ibn al-Qafsî al-Mâlikî who had been removed and replaced by al-Tâdhilî [28th of Sha‘bân; 380]

RL19. – **[IQS]** Shaykh Shihâb al-Dîn ibn Hijjî and Qadi Tâj al-Dîn ibn al-Zuhrî began their work as deputy judges; Qadi Jamâl al-Dîn al-Bahnasî was removed from office [Beginning of Ramadân; 380]

⁹⁴ Both Ibn al-Furât and al-Maqrîzî appear to have been wrong in stating that he was the incumbent, as both al-‘Aynî and Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir indicated that it was one Ismâ‘îl al-Kinânî who was replaced by al-Qaysarî; this is confirmed by Salibi; “Listes Chronologiques,” pp. 101-2

RL20. – [IQS] {A document signed by al-Nâsirî appointed Qadi Sharaf al-Dîn ibn Khaṭīb al-Ḥadīthah as lecturer at a number of *madrasahs* in Damascus after it was confirmed that the incumbents, Ibn al-Ḥusbânî and Ibn Ḥabbâb were inept} [6th of Ramadân; 380-1]

RL21. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] During the absence of the sultan, Kumushbughâ al-Ḥamawî nominated Qadi Bahâ' al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Bûrjî al-Shâfi'î as *muhtasib* of Cairo instead of Najm al-Dîn al-Ṭambadî. The *nâ'ib al-ghaybah* sent a letter to the sultan about al-Bûrjî's case along with the latter's nomination papers. The sultan did sign as [Ibn al-Furât] saw his signature on the nomination papers when they arrived in Cairo on the 17th of Ramadân [8th of Ramadân; 263/*Al-Muntaqá* 174b]

– 'Aynî: [2nd of Ramadân; Ist.B2 98b/DK435]

– Maq.: Bahâ' al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Burjî was confirmed in his position as *muhtasib* of Cairo instead of Najm al-Dîn al-Ṭanbadî, *muwaqqi' al-dust* after a money payment to Emir Kumushbughâ. [748]

– IH: [75]

– IQS: [381]

– AJ: [333]

RL22. – [IQS] {Ibn al-Jazarî managed to catch up with the sultan only one stop before the latter's arrival in Damascus; the tenure of Qadi Sharaf al-Dîn Mas'ûd had come to an end after he had been nominated to the judiciary of the cities he went through on his way [to Damascus?][n.d.; 382]

RL23. – [IQS] The four chief judges were confirmed in their positions by Barqûq [24th of Ramadân; 382]

RL24. – [IQS] The Egyptian Mâlikî qadi fined Ibn al-Jazarî an amount of money claimed by Ibn al-Sûfi, the *nâzir al-waqf al-Mansûrî*, in a matter pertaining to the said *waqf* [28th of Ramadân; 383]

RL25. – [IQS] When the sultan arrived in Damascus, he kept Sharaf al-Dîn Mas'ûd as Shâfi'î *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus, so Ibn al-Jazarî lost what he had paid; the amount was said to have been around one hundred thousand dirhams [n.d.; 379]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqá*: {Al-Jazarî lost his money, rumored to have amounted to one hundred thousand dirhams, because upon his arrival in Damascus in the sultan's train, al-Nâsirî prevented him from assuming his position which was left to the responsibility of Sharaf al-Dîn Mas'ûd} [n.d.; 261/*Al-Muntaqá* 172b]

– Maq.: Ibn al-Jazarî was removed from the judiciary of Damascus before he entered the city, and Mas'ûd was reinstated [7th of Ramadân; 749]

– IH: "...but after upon his arrival in Damascus in the sultan's train, the sultan cooled towards him as Mas'ûd sought his previous position and was returned to it." [75]

RL26. – [IQS] {The day of the 'Īd, the sultan prayed at al-Maydân and the qadi of Egypt pronounced the sermon} [The day of the 'Īd; 383]

RL27. – [IQS] Burhân al-Dîn ibn ‘Adnân resumed his position as head of the syndicate of the Ashrâf after Ibn al-Tabâtîbî had replaced him at its head in Cairo [6th of Shawwâl; 383]

RL28. – [IS] “On Monday, the 22nd of the month, the *mahmil* went out, bare, without a provision train, drums or water-camel, and with only a few people. The emir of the caravan was Âqbugâ al-Buzlârî.”⁹⁵ [22nd of Shawwâl; ⁹⁶ 99]

RL29. – [IF] It was reported that the viceroy Kumushbughâ had removed Qadi Nûr al-Dîn ibn ‘Abd al-Wârith al-Bakrî from the *hisbah* of Old Cairo [26th of Shawwâl; 268]

– Maq.: [750]

RL30. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The viceroy Kumushbughâ nominated al-Sharîf ibn Bint ibn ‘Atâ who was chief judge of the *Hanafîs* in Alexandria, as the *muhtasib* of Old Cairo instead of al-Bakrî [27th of Shawwâl; 268/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b]

– Maq.: [26th of Shawwâl; 750]

– IH: [82]

RL31. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] [News arrived in Egypt that] the Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* Shams al-Dîn al-Rakrâkî died in Homs on his way to Aleppo in the company of the sultan. Emir Kumushbughâ ordered his deputies to rule in his place until the return of the sultan [n.d.; 269/*Al-Muntaqâ* 177a]

– ‘Aynî: Kumushbughâ ordered Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn al-Daftarî [?], the deputy Mâlikî chief judge, to rule until a new appointment was made, because *Qâdî al-Quḍât* Shams al-Dîn al-Rakrâkî had died in Homs. He also ordered Qadi Nûr al-Dîn ibn al-Khallâl al-Mâlikî to rule at the *Sâlihiyah* [*madrasah?*] as he had been forbidden from doing so [Beginning of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.B2 98b]

– Maq.: [751]

– AJ: [336]

– IT: [31]

– ABM: [308, 309]

– IY: [446]

RL32. – [IS] “[The sultan] appointed Ahmad al-Bâ‘ûnî chief *cadi* [–] Al-Bâ‘ûnî upheld the honor of the law and was a good *cadi*. He had been appointed preacher of the Omayyad mosque and was a good preacher, composing the best sermons ‘from the tip of the pen.’ The jurists feared him, for he had a group of important ones beaten by decree of the sultan and had them disgraced publicly in Damascus, exhibiting them on camels. He was equal to his task: when he began a matter, he completed it. The sultan inclined to his words and liked him, whereas most of the jurists hated him. They slandered him and accused him of bearing a grudge against them. The sultan, however, did not listen to their words.”⁹⁷ [n.d.; 103]

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 134.

⁹⁶ There is no Monday 22nd during Shawwâl. It would have to be either Monday the 18th or the 25th, or Friday the 22nd.

⁹⁷ Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 139.

- ZDT: [265a]
- IQS: The *khatib* Shihâb al-Dîn al-Bâ‘ûnî was appointed to the Shâfi‘î bench in Damascus instead of Qadi Sharaf al-Dîn Mas‘ûd [18th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 387]
- IH: [n.d.; 58-9]

RL33. – [IQS] Qadi ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn Munajjâ Mas‘ûd was appointed to the Hanbalî bench instead of Qadi Sharaf al-Dîn ibn ‘Abd al-Qâdir [18th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 387]

- ZDT: [During this year; 266a]
- IS: [n.d.; 103]

RL34. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] It was reported that Emir Kumushbughâ reappointed Qadi Nûr al-Dîn ‘Alî ibn ‘Abd al-Wârith al-Bakrî as *muhtasib* of Old Cairo instead of Nâsir al-Dîn ibn Bint ‘Atâ, after the latter’s removal from office [24th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 272-3/*Al-Muntaqâ* 178b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b]
- Maq.: [754]

RL35. – [IQS] The viceroy nominated Qadi Burhân al-Dîn al-Tâdhilî to the Mâlikî bench, with the approval of the sultan [27th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 389]

RL36. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Arrival of the announcers (“*mubashshirû*”) of the *hajj* with news about the safety and security of the pilgrims [29th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 273/*Al-Muntaqâ* 178b]

- Maq.: [745]
- AJ: [24th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 338]

RL37. – [IH] Completion of the Fakhriyah *madrasah* [n.d.; 77]

RL38. – [IQS]{Incident involving the execution of Franks from Jerusalem who had insulted the Prophet and sought to convert people to their faith} [During Dhû al-Hijjah; 389-90]

Social History/Miscellany [SHM]

SHM1. – [AJ] The year began on a Friday and people were at peace [321]

– IS: [71]

– HI: [93b]

– Maq.: [732]

SHM2. – [IS] The month of Safar began. [71]

SHM3. – [IF] A proclamation read in Cairo and its surroundings forbade members of the religious class (“*muta ‘ammimûr*”), save holders of important positions, to ride a horse under penalty of having their mounts seized [During Muharram; 246]

– Maq.: [733]

– ABM: [300]

SHM4. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqá*] {The sultan ordered the destruction of some architectural features of al-Nâsir Haṣan’s *madrasah*} {8th of Safar; 254-5/*Al-Muntaqá* 166b}

– Maq.: [733]

– IH: [65-6]

– IQS: [368]

– IT: [2nd of Safar; 17]

– AJ: [322]

– ABM: [300]

– IY: [443]

SHM5. – [IS] The month of Rabî‘ al-Thânî began [74]

– AJ: [324]

SHM6. – [IS] The month of Jumâdá al-Ûlá began. [74]

SHM7. – [IF] Acting upon the order of the sultan, Maḥmûd the *ustâdâr* had a number of properties destroyed in al-Ĥârah al-Jawwânîyah neighborhood; instead he built a *wikâlah* [13th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 251]

– ‘Aynî: [During the month Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.B2 99a]

– Maq.: [737]

– IH: [69]

SHM8. – [IS] {Acting upon the viceroy’s order, Aḥmad ibn al-Barîdî the *hâjib* reduced the price of bread to the satisfaction of all the people} [25th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 75]

SHM9. – [‘Aynî] {First person account of al-‘Aynî’s return (“*alá muddatî al-thâniyah*”) from Aleppo to Cairo: he stated he was accompanied by Jamâl al-Dîn al-Ĥâfiz al-Ĥalabî; Kamâl al-Dîn ibn al-‘Adîm; Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Sanqarî; the latter’s son, Shihâb al-Dîn; and Sayyid Ḥamzah al-Ja‘farî al-Ĥalabî [At the beginning of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.B2 99a]}

SHM10. – [IS] The month of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah began [75]

SHM10'. – **[HI]** End of the construction of a market and a bathhouse built by the viceroy west of Bâb al-Maydân in Damascus [During the month of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 94b]

SHM11. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Apparition of a comet in the sky; Ibn Duqmâq was quoted as saying that it had appeared in 778 just before the coup against al-Ashraf} [Last decade of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; **254-5/Al-Muntaqá** 169b]

- Maq.: [741]
- IH: [81]
- AJ: [328]
- ABM: [303]
- IY: [444]

SHM12. – **[IS]** The month of Rajab began [76]

SHM13. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** News about the Nile [16th of Rajab; **256/Al-Muntaqá** 170a]

- Maq.: [743]
- IH: [81]

*SHM14. – **[HI]** {Story about the caretaker of a bathhouse in Damascus and his encounter with a number of personalities among others, Ibn Jamâ'ah and Ibn al-Qurashî} [n.d.; 97b]

SHM15. – **[HI]** The month of Sha'bân began [97b]

- IS: [86]

SHM16. – **[HI]** The al-Qanawât river in Damascus resumed its course after being cut off for six days [16th of Sha'bân; 99a]

SHM17. – **[IS]** The month of Ramadân began. [93]

SHM18. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Detailed data about the increase of the amplitude of the Nile. The *qâdî al-Bahr* Sharaf al-Dîn ibn al-Raddâd, along with Arghûn, Kumushbughâ's *amîr majlis*, traveled to inform the sultan's party in Syria about the good news} [10th of Ramadân; **263/Al-Muntaqá** 174b-175a]

- Maq.: [748]
- IQS: [381]
- AJ: [333]

SHM19. – **[IQS]** In Damascus, the al-Gâbiyah and al-Faradîs gates were opened [13th of Ramadân; 381]

SHM20. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** Lantern men in Cairo proclaimed an edict from Emir Kumushbughâ preventing women from visiting shrines under penalty of death for them and their muleteers, by being cut at the waist [29th of Ramadân; **266/Al-Muntaqá** 175a]

- 'Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 436]
- Maq.: [749]

- IH: [75-6]
- IQS: [383]
- IT: [26]
- AJ: [334]
- ABM: [307]
- IY: The viceroy Kumushbughâ proclaimed that no woman would get out of her house [448]

SHM21. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** People were prevented from sailing in boats to look at the Nile under penalty of death by burning them, the boat and the sailor. People had avoided these activities during the *‘Īd* and nobody dared disobey. As a result of this, there was great tranquility [29th of Ramadān; **266/Al-Muntaqá** 175a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 436]
- Maq.: [749]
- IH: [76]
- IQS: [383]
- IT: [26]
- AJ: [334]
- ABM: [307]
- IY: [448]

SHM22. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {The viceroy Kumushbughâ banned women in Cairo from wearing shifts with large sleeves, to no avail} [23rd of Shawwâl; **267/Al-Muntaqá** 175b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 436]
- Maq.: + In the wearing of large dresses, women from the populace had overindulged until they imitated in their dress the womenfolk of the rulers and the elite (“*al-mukluk way-al a’ an*”) [750]
- IH: [76]
- IQS: [385]
- IT: [25-6]
- AJ: When women lifted their sleeves, all of her body could be seen [335]
- ABM: + women of loose morals (“*al-nisâ’ al-‘âhirât*”) said the following [about this interdiction]: {a two verse *zajal* criticizing Kumushbughâ} [308]
- IY: [448-9]

SHM23. – **[IS]** Great want (“*ghalâ*”) continued in Aleppo {details} [n.d.; 100]

SHM24. – **[Al-Muntaqá]** The first day of the month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah was a Sunday [176b]

- ZDT: [269b]
- AJ: [335]
- IS: The month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah began while the sultan was in Aleppo [100]

SHM25. – **[IF/Al-Muntaqá]** {Kumushbughâ al-Hamawî sent some of his mamluks to act against women who contravened the ban on wearing fashionable shirts in the markets, streets, and bazaars of Cairo and its surroundings. As soon as the sultan came back, the women resumed doing so} [2nd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; **268/Al-Muntaqá** 176b-177a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 98b/DK 436]
- Maq.: [751]
- IH: [76]
- IQS: [385]
- AJ: [335]
- ABM: [309]

SHM26. – [**‘Aynî**] {Kumushbughâ asked the *mutawallî al-ṣinâ‘ah* and *ra‘is al-bahr* to pledge not to allow any of the troops to cross the Nile without his permission} [n.d.; Ist.B2 98b-99a]

SHM27. – [**IF**] {News about the Nile} [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 269]

- Maq.: [751]
- AJ: [336]

SHM28. – [**IS**] The month of Dhû al-Hijjah began [100]

- AJ: [337]

SHM29. – [**IH**] “During this year I travelled to Qûs in the Sa‘îd, but I did not benefit from the trip in terms of *hadîth* auditions. However, I met with a number of people of science, amongst them, Nâsir al-Dîn, the qadi of Hû and Ibn al-Sirâj, the qadi of Qûs, and with a number of people of letters whose compositions I heard.” [n.d.; 77]

Foreign Affairs [FA]

FA1. – [IK] {Long paragraph about the relations between the ruler of Ifrîqyâ, Abû al-‘Abbâs Aḥmad ibn Abî Ḥafs al-Muwahhîdî, and Egypt, the visit of his envoy Abû ‘Abdallâh Muḥammad ibn Abî Hilâl to Cairo, the latter’s *hajj* and return home at the end of Rabî‘ [blank space]} [n.d.; 501]

– IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [During Safar; 248-9/*Al-Muntaqâ* 167a]

– Maq.: [29th of Safar; 735]

– ABM: [300]

FA2. – [IF/*Al-Muntaqâ*] A report arrived with news of Bâyezîd’s capture of the city of Qaysâriyah [First decade of Shawwâl; 266/*Al-Muntaqâ* 175b]

– Maq.: [749]

– IH: [76; 83]

– IQS : [383]

– AJ: [334]

– ABM: [307]

FA3. – [IH] Sûlî ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir arrived with the keys of the city of Sîs and a letter of apology for having captured it [During this year; 79]

FA4. – [IH] Death of Qârâ Ḥasan who had become the leader of the Turcomans after the murder of Qârâ Muḥammad. His son Ḥusayn Beg succeeded him [n.d.; 77]

FA5. – [IH] Yahyâ, an Artûqid prince from Mârdîn, died in the fort of Kayfâ. He had sought refuge and stayed because he had rebelled against his cousin [During this year, 77-8]

TABLE II. 1. B.

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
PMA:	PMA:	PMA:	PMA: PMA2 PMA3 PMA4 PMA5	PMA: PMA10	PMA: PMA7 PMA8 PMA11 PMA12 PMA13 PMA14 PMA15 PMA16 PMA17	PMA: PMA1 *PMA6	PMA: PMA1 PMA2	PMA: PMA1	PMA: PMA2 PMA4 PMA5	PMA: PMA2 PMA3 PMA5	PMA:	PMA: PMA5	PMA: PMA5 PMA10	PMA: PMA2 PMA5 PMA5	PMA: PMA5	PMA: PMA10'
PMA19	PMA9		PMA18 PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23 PMA24 PMA25 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28 PMA29 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23 PMA24 PMA26 PMA29 PMA30 PMA31			PMA19	PMA19	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23 PMA24 PMA26 PMA27 PMA28 PMA29 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA22 PMA26 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA20 PMA22 PMA23	PMA19 PMA20 PMA22 PMA23 PMA26 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA20 PMA22 PMA23 PMA26 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA20 PMA22 PMA23 PMA26 PMA30 PMA31	PMA19 PMA22	
	PMA33				PMA32 PMA33											

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
PMA37			PMA34 PMA35	PMA34 PMA35	PMA36		PMA34 PMA35		PMA34 PMA35		PMA34 PMA35	PMA35	PMA34 PMA35			
			PMA37 PMA38 PMA39 PMA40 PMA41 PMA42 PMA43	PMA37 PMA38 PMA39 PMA40 PMA41 PMA42 PMA43	PMA38	*PMA38	PMA37	PMA37 PMA39	PMA37 PMA38 PMA39 PMA40 PMA41 PMA42 PMA43	PMA38	PMA37 PMA38	PMA37	PMA37 PMA38 PMA39	PMA37		
			PMA45	PMA45	PMA44				PMA42 PMA43	PMA42	PMA41 PMA42 PMA43		PMA43	PMA42 PMA43		
			PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA46	*PMA46			PMA45		PMA47 PMA48 PMA49		PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA48 PMA49	PMA48	
PMA48 PMA49			PMA52 PMA53 PMA54 PMA55 PMA56	PMA52 PMA53 PMA54 PMA55 PMA56	PMA48		PMA48 PMA49	PMA48 PMA49	PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA48 PMA49	PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA48 PMA49	PMA47 PMA48 PMA49	PMA48 PMA49	PMA48	
			PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61 PMA62 PMA63	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61 PMA62 PMA63	PMA50 PMA51				PMA52 PMA53 PMA54 PMA55 PMA56	PMA53	PMA53 PMA55 PMA56					
			PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69 PMA70	PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69 PMA70	PMA57	PMA58 PMA59	PMA59 PMA60	PMA60	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61	PMA58 PMA59 PMA60 PMA61	PMA60	PMA60	
					PMA57				PMA63		PMA63	PMA63	PMA63			
					PMA64		PMA65 PMA66		PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69 PMA70	PMA65 PMA66	PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69 PMA70	PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69	PMA65 PMA66 PMA67 PMA68 PMA69 PMA70			

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayni Ist.B2	'Ayni DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
			PMA71	PMA71	PMA72				PMA71		PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	
			PMA74 PMA75	PMA74 PMA75		PMA73			PMA74 PMA75	PMA74	PMA75 PMA76	PMA74 PMA75	PMA74 PMA75	PMA75	PMA75	
			PMA77 PMA78 PMA79 PMA80 PMA81	PMA77 PMA78 PMA79 PMA80 PMA81			PMA77		PMA77 PMA78 PMA79 PMA80 PMA81	PMA77		PMA77 PMA78	PMA77 PMA78 PMA79 PMA80 PMA81			
			PMA84 PMA85	PMA84					PMA82 PMA83		PMA82 PMA83		PMA84	PMA84	PMA84	
PMA86 PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88 PMA89	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88 PMA89	PMA87 PMA88 PMA89	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA87 PMA88	PMA88	PMA87	
PMA91	PMA91		PMA91	PMA91			PMA90	PMA91		PMA90	PMA90 PMA91			PMA91		
					PMA92											
PMA95 PMA96	PMA95 PMA96 PMA98	PMA95	PMA95 PMA96 PMA97	PMA96	PMA94 PMA95 PMA96	PMA93 PMA94 PMA95 PMA96	PMA95 PMA96 PMA97	PMA95 PMA96 PMA97	PMA95 PMA96 PMA97	PMA95 PMA96	PMA95 PMA96	PMA95 PMA96	PMA95 PMA96 PMA97	PMA95	PMA95 PMA96	
					PMA98 PMA99 PMA100 PMA101 PMA102 PMA103 PMA104 PMA105 PMA106	PMA98 PMA99 PMA100					PMA98 PMA99 PMA100					
PMA104 PMA105	PMA104 PMA105	PMA105	PMA105			PMA104 PMA105	PMA104 PMA105	PMA104 PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA104 PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	PMA105	
PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107			PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107	PMA107		

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.	
		PMA118	PMA114 PMA118 PMA124 PMA129	PMA118 PMA124 PMA129	PMA108 PMA109 PMA110 PMA111 PMA112 PMA113 PMA115 PMA116 PMA117 PMA120 PMA121 PMA122 PMA123 PMA125 PMA126 PMA127 PMA128 PMA129 PMA130 PMA133 PMA134 PMA135 PMA136 PMA137 PMA138 PMA141 PMA142 PMA143 PMA144	PMA108 PMA109 PMA110 PMA111 PMA113 PMA119 PMA120 PMA122 PMA123 PMA128 PMA129 PMA131 PMA132 PMA134 *PMA138 PMA139 PMA140 PMA142 PMA143 PMA144											
							PMA123 PMA124	PMA123	PMA114 PMA118 PMA124	PMA124	PMA108 PMA109 PMA110 PMA111 PMA113 PMA120 PMA122 PMA123 PMA129	PMA124	PMA114 PMA118 PMA124	PMA124	PMA124	PMA124	
							PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129		
											PMA138						
											PMA144						

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayni Ist.B2	'Ayni DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.	
PMA153	PMA153	PMA154	PMA145 PMA146 PMA147 PMA148	PMA145 PMA146 PMA148	PMA149 PMA150 PMA151	PMA151	PMA146	PMA146	PMA145 PMA146 PMA147 PMA148	PMA152	PMA148	PMA146	PMA145 PMA146	PMA146			
			PMA154 PMA155	PMA154	PMA156 PMA157	PMA156 PMA158	PMA153 PMA154	PMA154 PMA155	PMA154 PMA155		PMA154 PMA156	PMA154 PMA155	PMA154 PMA155	PMA154 PMA159	PMA154	PMA154	
			PMA159 PMA160 PMA161	PMA159 PMA160 PMA161			PMA161	PMA161	PMA159 PMA160 PMA161	PMA161		PMA160 PMA161	PMA159 PMA160 PMA161	PMA159 PMA161	PMA159 PMA160 PMA161	PMA160 PMA161	
					PMA162 PMA163 PMA164 PMA165 PMA166						PMA162 PMA163 PMA164						
					PMA167 PMA168 PMA169 PMA170	PMA170 PMA171 PMA172					PMA170						
PMA173			PMA173 PMA174 PMA175 PMA176	PMA173 PMA174 PMA175 PMA176			PMA176	PMA176	PMA173 PMA174	PMA176		PMA173	PMA173	PMA173 PMA174	PMA173	PMA173	PMA173
					PMA177 PMA178 PMA179	PMA177 PMA178 PMA179			PMA176		PMA178 PMA179		PMA176	PMA176	PMA176		
PMA181			PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181			PMA181	PMA181	PMA180 PMA181	PMA181		PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181	PMA180 PMA181

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.		
PMA226	PMA224	PMA245 PMA246	PMA219						PMA219		PMA220 PMA221 PMA222		PMA219					
			PMA221 PMA222 PMA223	PMA221 PMA222	PMA221	PMA221 PMA222	PMA221	PMA221 PMA222 PMA223	PMA221	PMA221 PMA222 PMA223	PMA221	PMA222	PMA221 PMA222	PMA223				
			PMA226 PMA227 PMA228 PMA229 PMA230	PMA226 PMA227		PMA226 PMA227 PMA228 PMA229 PMA230					PMA226 PMA227 PMA228 PMA229 PMA230	PMA227	PMA225 PMA226 PMA227		PMA226 PMA227 PMA228 PMA229 PMA230	PMA227	PMA226 PMA228 PMA229	
			PMA232 PMA233				PMA231		PMA230 PMA230	PMA230			PMA232					
				PMA234							PMA234							
												PMA236						
PMA241	PMA241		PMA237 PMA238 PMA239 PMA240	PMA238 PMA239			PMA238 PMA238	PMA238	PMA238									
			PMA242	PMA242		PMA241	PMA241 PMA241	PMA241	PMA241	PMA241	PMA241 PMA242 PMA243 PMA244	PMA241						
PMA244	PMA244									PMA245								
PMA246	PMA246		PMA246 PMA247 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA247 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246		PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249	PMA246 PMA248 PMA249		
	PMA248																	
PMA253			PMA251 PMA252 PMA253	PMA252 PMA253					PMA252	PMA253			PMA252					
			PMA255	PMA255					PMA255		PMA254					PMA255		

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
PMA259	PMA258	PMA259	PMA257 PMA258 PMA259	PMA259	PMA258 PMA259		PMA258	PMA258	PMA257 PMA259 PMA260	PMA258 PMA259 PMA260	PMA256 PMA258	PMA259	PMA259	PMA259		PMA259
	PMA264 PMA266 PMA267				PMA263					PMA266	PMA262 PMA264 PMA265 PMA266 PMA267 PMA268	PMA264 PMA266 PMA267				PMA266
PMA269	PMA270		PMA269	PMA269					PMA269 PMA271 PMA272	PMA269 PMA270	PMA269 PMA270		PMA269	PMA269	PMA269 PMA270	PMA269
PMA274	PMA274	PMA274	PMA274	PMA274	PMA275		PMA274	PMA274		PMA274 PMA275	PMA273 PMA274	PMA274				
			PMA276 PMA277 PMA278	PMA276 PMA277			PMA276 PMA277 PMA278		PMA276 PMA277 PMA278	PMA277	PMA276 PMA277		PMA276 PMA277 PMA278	PMA278	PMA278	
	PMA280 PMA282 PMA284		PMA281	PMA281	PMA279 PMA280			PMA281	PMA281				PMA281			
			PMA283						PMA283 PMA284							
			PMA285	PMA285	PMA286					PMA286						
PMA288 PMA289	PMA288	PMA288 PMA289	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289 PMA290 PMA291 PMA292	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289			PMA288 PMA289	PMA288 PMA289	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289 PMA290 PMA291 PMA292	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289	PMA288 PMA289	PMA288 PMA289	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289 PMA291	PMA287 PMA288 PMA289	PMA287	PMA289

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
PMA294	PMA293 PMA294	PMA294	PMA294	PMA294			PMA294	PMA294		PMA295						
PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296		PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298	PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299						
	PMA302		PMA303		PMA300 PMA301											
	PMA309		PMA307 PMA308	PMA307 PMA308	PMA304 PMA305 PMA306				PMA307 PMA308		PMA307 PMA308		PMA307 PMA308	PMA307 PMA308	PMA308	PMA307
PMA314	PMA314		PMA315 PMA316	PMA315 PMA316	PMA310 PMA311		PMA312	PMA312		PMA314	PMA314	PMA314		PMA316		PMA314
PMA316			PMA318	PMA318	PMA313 PMA314		PMA314	PMA314	PMA315 PMA316	PMA316	PMA316 PMA317 PMA318	PMA316	PMA316	PMA316		
PMA318 PMA319					PMA316 PMA317 PMA318		PMA316	PMA316	PMA318	PMA318	PMA318	PMA318	PMA318	PMA318		PMA318
PMA321	PMA321		PMA321	PMA321	PMA318		PMA318	PMA318								
	PMA326		PMA323 PMA324	PMA323 PMA324	PMA321		PMA321	PMA321	PMA321	PMA321	PMA321 PMA322	PMA320 PMA321	PMA321	PMA321	PMA321	PMA321
					PMA325		PMA325	PMA325								PMA324
			PMA328	PMA328	PMA327		PMA327	PMA327	PMA328		PMA328		PMA328	PMA328	PMA329	

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
RL:	RL:	RL:	RL: RL1 RL2	RL: RL1 RL2	RL: RL3	RL:	RL:	RL:	RL: RL1 RL2	RL :	RL: RL1	RL:	RL:	RL:	RL:	RL :
	RL5		RL4 RL5 RL6 RL7 RL8	RL5 RL6 RL7 RL8		RL7 RL8	RL5 RL6 RL7 RL8		RL5 RL6 RL7 RL8 RL9	RL5 RL6 RL8	RL5 RL6 RL7 RL8		RL5 RL6	RL5 RL7 RL9	RL5 RL7 RL9	
	RL9								RL10 RL11					RL11	RL11	
	RL10		RL13		RL14	RL12			RL13							
	RL16		RL16 RL17	RL16 RL17		RL16 RL17	RL16 RL17	RL16 RL17	RL16	RL16 RL17	RL15 RL16 RL17 RL18 RL19 RL20 RL21 RL22 RL23 RL24 RL25 RL26 RL27	RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16	
			RL21	RL21			RL21	RL21	RL21	RL21			RL21			
			RL25	RL25					RL25	RL25						
			RL29 RL30 RL31	RL30 RL31	RL28		RL30 RL31		RL29 RL30 RL31	RL30					RL31	RL31
	RL32 RL33		RL34	RL34	RL32 RL33		RL34		RL34	RL32	RL32 RL33					

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
SHM:	SHM:	SHM:	RL36	RL36	SHM: SHM1 SHM2	SHM: SHM1	SHM:	SHM:	SHM: SHM1	SHM: SHM3 SHM4	RL35 RL37 RL38	SHM: SHM4	SHM: SHM4 SHM5	SHM: SHM3 SHM4	SHM: SHM4	SHM :
			SHM3 SHM4	SHM4	SHM6 SHM8 SHM10					SHM7 SHM7						
			SHM7		SHM11 SHM12 SHM13 SHM15 SHM17	SHM10'			SHM11 SHM13	SHM11 SHM13	SHM11		SHM11 SHM11	SHM11 SHM11	SHM11	
			SHM11 SHM13	SHM11 SHM13												
			SHM18	SHM18					SHM18		SHM18 SHM19 SHM20 SHM21 SHM22		SHM18 SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM18 SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	
			SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22					SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22		SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	SHM20 SHM21 SHM22	
			SHM23 SHM24	SHM23 SHM24												
			SHM25	SHM24 SHM25					SHM25	SHM25	SHM25		SHM24 SHM25	SHM24 SHM25	SHM25	
			SHM27		SHM23 SHM24				SHM25 SHM26	SHM25						
					SHM28					SHM27			SHM27 SHM28			
										SHM29						

IK	ZDT	ID <i>Al-Nafzah</i>	IF	IF <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	IS	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní DK	Maq.	IH	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anonym.
FA: FA1	FA:	FA:	FA: FA1 FA2	FA: FA1 FA2	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA:	FA: FA1 FA2	FA: FA2 FA3 FA4 FA5	FA: FA2	FA :	FA: FA2	FA: FA1 FA2	FA:	FA:

TABLE II. 2. A.

II. 2. A. i.

Ibn Khaldûn – <i>Kitâb al-'Ibar</i>	
PMA19	PMA298
PMA37	PMA299
PMA48	PMA314
PMA49	PMA316
FA1	PMA318
PMA86	PMA319
PMA87	PMA321
PMA88	
PMA91	
PMA96	
PMA95	
PMA96	
PMA105	
PMA107	
PMA104	
PMA153	
PMA173	
PMA181	
PMA195	
PMA201	
PMA199	
PMA200	
PMA217	
PMA226	
PMA185	
PMA187	
PMA192	
PMA215	
PMA216	
PMA184	
PMA241	
PMA244	
PMA246	
PMA253	
PMA259	
PMA269	
PMA274	
PMA288	
PMA289	
PMA294	
PMA296	
PMA297	

II. 2. A. ii.

Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir – *Dhayl Durrat al-Aslâk*

PMA9	PMA282
PMA33	PMA284
PMA9	PMA288
PMA87	PMA293
PMA88	PMA294
PMA91	PMA296
PMA96	PMA297
PMA95	PMA298
PMA105	PMA299
PMA98	PMA302
PMA104	PMA309
PMA107	PMA314
PMA153	PMA321
RL16	PMA326
PMA266	Obituaries
PMA270	
PMA298	
RL32	
RL9	
RL10	
RL33	
PMA298	
RL5	
PMA298	
PMA217	
PMA200	
PMA199	
PMA217	
PMA224	
PMA230	
PMA232	
PMA233	
PMA215	
PMA241	
PMA244	
PMA246	
PMA248	
PMA258	
PMA264	
PMA267	
PMA274	
PMA280	
SHM24	

II. 2. A. iii.

Ibn Duqmâq – *Al-Nafḥah*

PMA118
PMA87
PMA88
PMA95
PMA105
PMA107
PMA95
PMA154
PMA199
PMA201
PMA217
PMA245
PMA246
PMA259
PMA274
PMA288
PMA289
PMA288
PMA289
PMA294
PMA296
PMA294
PMA296
PMA298
PMA299

II. 2. A. iv. a.

Ibn al-Furât – *Târîkh al-Duwal*

PMA2	RL6	PMA145	PMA223	PMA287
PMA3	PMA54	RL13	PMA226	RL31
PMA4	RL7	PMA146	PMA227	SHM27
PMA5	RL8	PMA147	PMA228	PMA288
PMA10	PMA55	PMA148	PMA229	PMA289
RL1	PMA56	PMA154	PMA230	PMA290
RL2	PMA58	PMA155	PMA234	PMA291
SHM3	PMA59	PMA159	RL21	PMA292
PMA18	PMA60	PMA160	PMA237	PMA294
RL4	PMA61	PMA161	SHM18	PMA296
SHM4	PMA62	PMA173	PMA238	PMA297
PMA19	PMA63	PMA174	PMA239	PMA298
PMA20	PMA65	PMA175	PMA240	PMA299
PMA21	PMA66	PMA176	PMA242	PMA303
PMA22	PMA67	PMA180	PMA246	PMA307
PMA23	PMA68	PMA181	PMA248	PMA308
PMA24	PMA69	RL16	PMA249	PMA315
PMA25	PMA70	PMA194	PMA247	PMA316
PMA26	PMA71	PMA195	PMA251	PMA318
PMA27	PMA74	PMA196	PMA252	PMA321
PMA28	PMA75	PMA197	PMA253	PMA323
PMA29	PMA77	PMA198	SHM20	RL34
PMA30	PMA78	PMA199	SHM21	RL36
PMA31	PMA79	PMA200	PMA255	PMA324
FA1	PMA80	PMA201	FA2	PMA328
PMA34	PMA81	PMA202	PMA257	Obituaries
PMA35	PMA84	PMA203	PMA258	
PMA37	PMA85	PMA204	PMA259	
PMA38	SHM11	PMA205	PMA261	
PMA39	PMA87	RL17	PMA269	
PMA40	PMA88	RL25	PMA271	
PMA41	PMA96	PMA206	PMA272	
PMA42	PMA95	PMA207	SHM22	
PMA43	PMA91	PMA208	PMA274	
PMA45	PMA95	PMA209	PMA276	
PMA47	PMA97	PMA211	PMA277	
PMA48	PMA105	PMA209	RL29	
PMA49	PMA107	PMA212	RL30	
PMA48	PMA114	PMA217	PMA278	
SHM7	PMA118	PMA218	PMA281	
PMA52	PMA124	PMA219	SHM25	
PMA53	PMA129	PMA221	PMA283	
RL5	SHM13	PMA222	PMA285	

II. 2. A. iv. b.

Ibn al-Furât – *Al-Muntaqá*

PMA10	PMA60	PMA194	PMA259
RL1	PMA61	PMA195	PMA269
RL2	PMA63	PMA196	SHM22
Obituaries	PMA65	PMA197	PMA274
SHM4	PMA66	PMA198	PMA276
PMA19	PMA67	PMA199	PMA277
PMA20	PMA68	PMA200	RL30
PMA21	PMA69	PMA201	Obituaries
PMA22	PMA70	PMA202	SHM24
PMA23	PMA71	PMA204	PMA281
PMA24	PMA74	PMA205	SHM25
PMA26	PMA75	RL17	PMA285
PMA29	PMA77	RL25	PMA287
PMA30	PMA78	PMA206	RL31
PMA31	PMA79	PMA208	PMA288
FA1	PMA80	PMA209	PMA289
Obituaries	PMA81	PMA211	PMA292
PMA34	PMA84	PMA209	PMA294
PMA35	SHM11	PMA212	PMA296
PMA37	PMA87	PMA217	PMA297
PMA38	PMA88	PMA221	PMA298
PMA39	PMA91	PMA222	Obituaries
PMA40	PMA96	Obituaries	PMA299
PMA41	Obituaries	PMA226	PMA307
PMA42	PMA118	PMA227	PMA308
Obituaries	PMA124	PMA229	PMA315
PMA43	PMA129	PMA230	PMA316
PMA45	SHM13	RL21	PMA318
PMA47	PMA145	SHM18	PMA321
PMA48	PMA146	PMA238	PMA323
PMA49	PMA148	PMA239	RL34
PMA48	Obituaries	PMA242	RL36
PMA52	PMA154	PMA246	PMA324
PMA53	PMA159	PMA248	PMA328
RL5	PMA160	PMA249	Obituaries
RL6	PMA161	PMA247	
PMA54	PMA173	PMA252	
RL7	PMA174	PMA253	
RL8	PMA175	SHM20	
PMA55	PMA176	SHM21	
PMA56	PMA180	Obituaries	
PMA58	PMA181	PMA255	
PMA59	RL16	FA2	

II. 2. A. v.

Ibn Sasrá – *Al-Durrah al-Mudī'ah*

SHM1	PMA102	PMA186
PMA7	PMA96	PMA187
PMA8	PMA103	PMA188
PMA11	PMA105	PMA215
RL3	PMA106	PMA189
SHM2	PMA105	PMA192
PMA12	PMA108	PMA193
PMA13	PMA112	SHM17
PMA14	PMA110	PMA231
PMA15	PMA112	PMA235
PMA16	PMA113	PMA236
PMA17	PMA117	PMA241
PMA32	PMA115	PMA246
PMA33	PMA116	PMA249
PMA38	PMA120	PMA250
PMA36	PMA121	PMA258
PMA44	PMA122	PMA259
PMA46	PMA123	PMA263
PMA48	PMA125	RL28
SHM6	PMA126	PMA275
PMA50	PMA127	PMA279
PMA51	PMA130	PMA280
SHM8	PMA133	SHM23
SHM10	PMA134	SHM24
PMA57	PMA135	PMA286
PMA64	PMA136	SHM28
PMA72	PMA137	PMA300
PMA87	PMA138	PMA301
PMA88	PMA141	PMA304
PMA92	RL14	PMA305
PMA87	PMA149	PMA306
PMA88	PMA150	PMA310
PMA94	PMA151	PMA311
SHM12	SHM15	PMA296
PMA95	PMA156	PMA313
PMA98	PMA157	PMA314
PMA99	PMA168	PMA316
PMA96	PMA167	PMA317
PMA104	PMA169	RL32
PMA96	PMA170	RL33
PMA98	PMA178	RL32
PMA96	PMA179	PMA318
PMA100	PMA184	PMA321
PMA101	PMA185	

II. 2. A. vi.

Ibn Hijjī – Tārīkh Ibn Hijjī

PMA1	PMA113	PMA190
SHM1	PMA123	PMA191
*PMA6	*PMA138	PMA201
Obituaries	PMA151	PMA221
*PMA38	PMA119	RL17
*PMA46	PMA120	PMA193
PMA58	PMA122	Obituaries
PMA59	PMA128	
RL8	PMA129	
RL7	PMA134	
RL8	PMA131	
RL12	PMA132	
SHM10'	PMA139	
PMA73	PMA140	
PMA82	PMA142	
PMA83	PMA143	
PMA88	PMA144	
PMA87	PMA156	
PMA90	*SHM14	
PMA75	Obituaries	
PMA76	SHM15	
PMA93	PMA158	
PMA94	PMA162	
Obituaries	PMA163	
PMA95	PMA164	
PMA87	PMA165	
PMA88	PMA166	
PMA95	PMA170	
PMA96	PMA171	
PMA98	PMA172	
PMA99	PMA177	
PMA98	PMA178	
PMA100	PMA179	
PMA104	PMA182	
PMA90	RL16	
PMA105	PMA183	
PMA104	PMA184	
PMA108	SHM16	
PMA109	PMA185	
PMA110	PMA186	
PMA107	PMA187	
PMA111	PMA189	

II. 2. A. vii. a.

Al-'Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – Ist.B2

PMA1	PMA206	SHM22
PMA2	PMA212	SHM25
PMA19	PMA217	SHM26
PMA34	PMA221	Obituaries
PMA35	PMA222	
PMA37	PMA230	
PMA42	PMA238	
PMA43	PMA241	
PMA48	PMA246	
PMA49	PMA249	
PMA54	PMA258	
PMA55	PMA274	
PMA59	PMA276	
PMA60	PMA277	
PMA63	PMA278	
PMA65	PMA288	
PMA66	PMA289	
PMA68	PMA294	
PMA77	PMA296	
PMA80	PMA297	
PMA84	PMA298	
PMA87	PMA299	
PMA88	PMA312	
PMA89	PMA314	
PMA91	PMA316	
PMA95	PMA318	
PMA96	PMA321	
PMA97	PMA325	
PMA104	PMA327	
PMA105	RL5	
PMA107	RL6	
PMA123	RL7	
PMA124	RL8	
PMA129	RL16	
PMA146	RL17	
PMA153	RL21	
PMA154	RL30	
PMA161	RL31	
PMA176	RL34	
PMA181	SHM7	
PMA199	SHM9	
PMA200	SHM20	
PMA201	SHM21	

II. 2. A. vii. b.

Al-'Aynî - 'Iqd al-Jumân - DK

PMA1
 PMA10
 PMA19
 PMA37
 PMA39
 PMA48
 PMA49
 PMA60
 PMA87
 PMA88
 PMA89
 PMA91
 PMA95
 PMA96
 PMA97
 PMA104
 PMA105
 PMA107
 PMA123
 PMA146
 PMA154
 PMA155
 PMA161
 PMA173
 PMA176
 PMA181
 PMA199
 PMA200
 PMA201
 PMA206
 PMA212
 PMA217
 PMA221
 PMA230
 PMA238
 PMA241
 PMA246
 PMA248
 PMA249
 PMA258
 PMA274
 PMA281
 PMA288

PMA289
 PMA294
 PMA296
 PMA297
 PMA298
 PMA299
 PMA312
 PMA314
 PMA316
 PMA318
 PMA321
 PMA325
 PMA327
 RL16
 RL17
 RL21
 SHM20
 SHM21
 SHM22
 SHM25

II. 2. A. viii.

Al-Maqrîzî – Kitâb al-Sulûk

SHM1	RL9	PMA145	RL21	PMA297
PMA2	RL10	RL13	SHM18	PMA296
PMA4	RL11	PMA146	PMA238	PMA298
PMA5	RL5	PMA147	PMA246	PMA299
PMA10	RL8	PMA148	PMA241	PMA308
RL1	PMA55	PMA154	PMA249	PMA315
RL2	PMA56	PMA155	PMA248	PMA316
SHM3	PMA58	PMA159	PMA249	PMA318
SHM4	PMA59	PMA160	PMA247	PMA321
PMA19	PMA60	PMA161	PMA252	RL34
PMA20	PMA61	PMA173	SHM20	RL36
PMA21	PMA63	PMA174	SHM21	PMA328
PMA22	PMA65	PMA176	PMA255	Obituaries
PMA23	PMA66	PMA180	FA2	
PMA24	PMA67	PMA181	PMA257	
PMA26	PMA68	RL16	PMA259	
PMA27	PMA69	PMA194	PMA260	
PMA28	PMA70	PMA195	RL25	
PMA29	PMA71	PMA196	PMA269	
PMA30	PMA74	PMA197	PMA271	
PMA31	PMA75	PMA198	PMA272	
FA1	PMA77	PMA199	SHM22	
PMA34	PMA78	PMA200	PMA276	
PMA35	PMA79	PMA201	PMA277	
PMA37	PMA80	PMA204	RL29	
PMA38	PMA81	PMA205	RL30	
PMA39	PMA84	PMA210	PMA278	
PMA40	PMA85	PMA209	PMA281	
PMA41	SHM11	RL17	SHM25	
PMA42	PMA95	PMA206	PMA283	
PMA43	PMA87	PMA208	PMA284	
PMA45	PMA88	PMA212	PMA287	
PMA47	PMA96	PMA217	RL31	
PMA48	PMA95	PMA219	SHM27	
PMA49	PMA96	PMA221	PMA288	
PMA48	PMA97	PMA222	PMA289	
SHM7	PMA105	PMA223	PMA290	
PMA52	PMA107	PMA226	PMA291	
PMA53	PMA114	PMA227	PMA292	
RL5	PMA118	PMA228	PMA294	
RL6	PMA124	PMA229	PMA299	
PMA54	PMA129	PMA230	PMA307	
RL7	SHM13	PMA234	PMA296	

II. 2. A. ix.

Ibn Hajar – *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*

PMA19	PMA260	PMA80	FA2
PMA5	PMA259	PMA176	PMA2
PMA87	PMA274	PMA181	PMA26
PMA88	PMA266	PMA161	PMA27
PMA91	PMA270	PMA318	PMA28
PMA95	PMA266	PMA277	PMA29
PMA96	PMA270	PMA297	Obituaries
PMA105	PMA288	PMA221	
PMA201	PMA289	Obituary	
PMA246	PMA294	PMA58	
PMA245	PMA288	PMA316	
PMA246	PMA289	PMA129	
PMA259	PMA294	RL16	
PMA274	PMA296	RL17	
PMA5	PMA297	RL25	
PMA87	PMA298	RL21	
PMA88	PMA299	SHM20	
PMA87	PMA314	SHM21	
PMA96	PMA318	SHM22	
PMA91	PMA321	SHM25	
PMA95	PMA10	FA2	
PMA90	SHM4	SHM29	
PMA105	PMA22	FA4	
PMA107	PMA26	RL37	
PMA186	PMA30	FA5	
PMA187	PMA42	RL1	
PMA152	PMA48	PMA19	
PMA201	PMA49	PMA26	
PMA199	PMA53	PMA30	
PMA200	PMA48	FA3	
PMA246	PMA53	PMA266	
PMA241	PMA59	PMA287	
PMA248	PMA66	PMA38	
PMA249	SHM7	PMA74	
RL32	RL6	SHM11	
PMA253	RL5	SHM13	
PMA269	RL8	PMA3	
PMA258	PMA58	PMA204	
PMA275	PMA60	PMA210	
PMA286	PMA65	PMA208	
PMA316	PMA124	PMA227	
PMA258	PMA74	PMA230	
PMA259	PMA77	RL30	

II. 2. A. x.

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah – Târîkh Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah (TIQS)			
RL1	PMA88	PMA194	SHM20
SHM4	PMA90	PMA195	SHM21
PMA19	PMA95	PMA196	RL26
PMA20	PMA87	PMA197	PMA256
PMA21	PMA88	PMA198	RL27
PMA22	PMA91	PMA201	PMA258
PMA23	PMA95	PMA199	FA2
PMA26	PMA96	PMA204	PMA269
PMA30	PMA98	PMA207	PMA262
PMA31	PMA99	PMA204	PMA264
PMA34	PMA100	PMA205	PMA266
PMA35	PMA90	PMA208	PMA267
PMA37	PMA105	PMA193	PMA268
PMA38	PMA108	PMA206	PMA270
PMA41	PMA109	RL17	PMA265
PMA42	PMA110	RL25	PMA273
PMA43	PMA107	PMA212	PMA274
PMA47	PMA111	PMA213	PMA276
PMA48	PMA113	PMA214	PMA277
PMA49	PMA123	PMA215	SHM22
PMA48	PMA138	PMA220	SHM25
PMA53	PMA151	RL18	PMA288
RL5	PMA120	PMA221	PMA289
RL6	PMA122	PMA222	PMA294
PMA55	PMA129	RL19	PMA296
RL7	PMA138	PMA225	PMA297
RL8	PMA144	PMA226	PMA298
PMA56	PMA156	PMA227	PMA299
PMA58	PMA148	RL20	PMA307
PMA59	PMA154	PMA232	PMA308
PMA60	PMA162	PMA236	PMA314
PMA61	PMA163	SHM19	RL32
PMA65	PMA164	RL21	RL33
PMA66	RL15	SHM18	PMA316
PMA67	PMA170	PMA241	PMA317
PMA68	PMA178	PMA243	PMA318
PMA69	PMA179	PMA244	PMA321
PMA70	PMA182	PMA246	PMA322
PMA71	RL16	RL22	RL35
PMA75	PMA184	PMA248	PMA328
PMA76	PMA185	RL23	RL38
PMA82	PMA186	PMA254	Obituaries
SHM11	PMA187	PMA242	
PMA83	PMA189	RL24	

II. 2. A. xi.

Ibn Taghrîbirdî – *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*

PMA5	PMA77	PMA297
SHM4	PMA78	PMA296
PMA19	PMA124	PMA298
PMA20	PMA129	PMA299
PMA22	PMA154	PMA314
PMA23	PMA155	PMA316
PMA26	PMA160	PMA318
PMA30	PMA161	PMA320
PMA35	PMA173	PMA321
PMA37	PMA176	
PMA48	PMA180	
PMA49	PMA181	
PMA48	RL16	
PMA58	PMA197	
PMA59	PMA198	
PMA60	PMA199	
PMA61	PMA200	
PMA63	PMA201	
PMA65	PMA206	
PMA74	PMA208	
PMA80	PMA212	
PMA84	PMA217	
PMA95	PMA222	
PMA88	PMA246	
PMA96	PMA241	
PMA95	PMA246	
PMA96	PMA249	
PMA87	PMA248	
PMA88	PMA249	
PMA95	SHM20	
PMA97	SHM21	
PMA105	SHM22	
PMA107	PMA259	
PMA146	PMA274	
PMA107	PMA264	
PMA185	PMA267	
PMA104	PMA266	
PMA66	PMA274	
PMA67	PMA288	
PMA68	PMA289	
PMA69	PMA294	
PMA71	PMA289	
PMA75	PMA296	

II. 2. A. xii.

Al-Jawharî – Nuzhat al-Nufûs

SHM1	PMA81	PMA227	PMA328
PMA2	PMA84	PMA228	Obituaries
PMA5	SHM11	PMA229	
PMA10	PMA95	PMA230	
SHM4	PMA87	RL21	
PMA19	PMA88	SHM18	
PMA20	PMA96	PMA246	
PMA21	PMA95	PMA248	
PMA22	PMA96	PMA249	
PMA23	PMA97	PMA252	
PMA26	PMA105	SHM20	
PMA30	PMA107	SHM21	
PMA34	PMA114	FA2	
PMA35	PMA118	PMA259	
PMA37	PMA124	PMA269	
PMA38	PMA129	SHM22	
PMA39	PMA145	PMA276	
SHM5	PMA146	PMA277	
PMA43	PMA155	PMA278	
PMA47	PMA154	SHM24	
PMA48	PMA159	PMA281	
PMA49	PMA160	SHM25	
PMA48	PMA161	PMA287	
RL5	PMA173	RL31	
RL6	PMA176	SHM27	
PMA58	PMA180	PMA288	
PMA59	PMA181	PMA291	
PMA60	RL16	PMA289	
PMA61	PMA195	PMA294	
PMA63	PMA196	SHM28	
PMA65	PMA197	PMA299	
PMA66	PMA198	PMA307	
PMA67	PMA199	PMA296	
PMA68	PMA200	PMA297	
PMA69	PMA201	PMA296	
PMA70	PMA206	PMA298	
PMA71	PMA208	PMA299	
PMA74	PMA212	PMA308	
PMA75	PMA217	PMA315	
PMA77	PMA219	PMA316	
PMA78	PMA221	PMA318	
PMA79	PMA222	PMA321	
PMA80	PMA226	RL36	

II. 2. A. xiii.

Al-Malaṭī – Nayl al-Amal

PMA5	PMA197
Obituaries	PMA198
SHM3	PMA199
SHM4	PMA201
PMA19	PMA204
PMA30	PMA207
PMA31	PMA206
FA1	PMA217
PMA20	PMA223
PMA37	PMA227
PMA42	PMA246
PMA43	PMA248
PMA48	PMA249
PMA49	SHM20
Obituaries	SHM21
RL5	FA2
RL7	PMA259
RL9	PMA269
RL11	Obituaries
PMA60	SHM22
PMA71	RL31
PMA75	PMA278
Obituaries	SHM25
SHM11	PMA287
PMA84	RL31
PMA95	PMA289
PMA88	PMA288
PMA91	PMA291
PMA105	PMA294
PMA107	PMA296
PMA124	PMA294
Obituaries	PMA296
PMA129	Obituaries
PMA152	PMA294
PMA146	PMA297
PMA154	PMA298
PMA159	PMA307
PMA173	PMA316
PMA174	PMA318
PMA176	PMA308
PMA181	Obituaries
PMA161	PMA328
RL16	PMA321

II. 2. A. xiv.

Ibn Iyâs – *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*

PMA5	PMA296
PMA22	PMA297
SHM4	PMA298
PMA19	PMA321
PMA48	SHM20
RL5	SHM21
RL7	SHM22
RL9	PMA287
RL11	PMA270
PMA60	PMA266
Obituary	Obituary
PMA71	PMA308
PMA75	Obituaries
Obituary	PMA329
SHM11	
PMA87	
PMA95	
PMA96	
PMA154	
PMA173	
PMA154	
PMA124	
PMA161	
Obituary	
PMA181	
Obituary	
RL16	
RL31	
PMA201	
PMA160	
PMA180	
PMA199	
PMA217	
PMA229	
PMA226	
PMA228	
PMA246	
PMA249	
PMA269	
PMA187	
PMA278	
PMA296	
PMA297	

II. 2. A. xv.

Anonymous – *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*

PMA10'
PMA173
PMA201
PMA199
PMA217
PMA200
PMA255
PMA246
PMA249
PMA246
PMA249
PMA248
PMA259
PMA269
PMA289
PMA295
PMA307
PMA296
PMA297
PMA296
PMA298
PMA299
PMA314
PMA318
PMA324

TABLE II. 2. B.

II. 2. B. i.

Ibn al-Furât <i>Târîkh al-Duwal</i>	Ibn al-Furât <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	Al-Maqrîzî <i>Kitâb al-Sulûk</i>	Al-Jawharî <i>Nuzhat al-Nufûs</i>
PMA2		SHM1	SHM1
PMA3		PMA2	PMA2
PMA4			
PMA5		PMA4	
PMA10	PMA10	PMA5	PMA5
RL1	RL1	PMA10	PMA10
RL2	RL2	RL1	
	Obituaries	RL2	
SHM3		SHM3	
PMA18			
RL4			
SHM4	SHM4	SHM4	SHM4
PMA19	PMA19	PMA19	PMA19
PMA20	PMA20	PMA20	PMA20
PMA21	PMA21	PMA21	PMA21
PMA22	PMA22	PMA22	PMA22
PMA23	PMA23	PMA23	PMA23
PMA24	PMA24	PMA24	
PMA25			
PMA26	PMA26	PMA26	PMA26
PMA27		PMA27	
PMA28		PMA28	
PMA29	PMA29	PMA29	
PMA30	PMA30	PMA30	PMA30
PMA31	PMA31	PMA31	
FA1	FA1	FA1	
	Obituaries		
PMA34	PMA34	PMA34	PMA34
PMA35	PMA35	PMA35	PMA35
PMA37	PMA37	PMA37	PMA37
PMA38	PMA38	PMA38	PMA38
PMA39	PMA39	PMA39	PMA39
			SHM5
PMA40	PMA40	PMA40	
PMA41	PMA41	PMA41	
PMA42	PMA42	PMA42	
	Obituaries		
PMA43	PMA43	PMA43	PMA43
PMA45	PMA45	PMA45	
PMA47	PMA47	PMA47	PMA47
PMA48	PMA48	PMA48	PMA48

PMA49	PMA49	PMA49	PMA49
PMA48	PMA48	PMA48	PMA48
SHM7		SHM7	
PMA52	PMA52	PMA52	
PMA53	PMA53	PMA53	
RL5	RL5	RL5	RL5
RL6	RL6	RL6	RL6
PMA54	PMA54	PMA54	
RL7	RL7	RL7	
RL8	RL8		
		RL9	
		RL10	
		RL11	
		RL5	
		RL8	
PMA55	PMA55	PMA55	
PMA56	PMA56	PMA56	
PMA58	PMA58	PMA58	PMA58
PMA59	PMA59	PMA59	PMA59
PMA60	PMA60	PMA60	PMA60
PMA61	PMA61	PMA61	PMA61
PMA62			
PMA63	PMA63	PMA63	PMA63
PMA65	PMA65	PMA65	PMA65
PMA66	PMA66	PMA66	PMA66
PMA67	PMA67	PMA67	PMA67
PMA68	PMA68	PMA68	PMA68
PMA69	PMA69	PMA69	PMA69
PMA70	PMA70	PMA70	PMA70
PMA71	PMA71	PMA71	PMA71
PMA74	PMA74	PMA74	PMA74
PMA75	PMA75	PMA75	PMA75
PMA76	PMA76	PMA76	PMA76
PMA77	PMA77	PMA77	PMA77
PMA78	PMA78	PMA78	PMA78
PMA79	PMA79	PMA79	PMA79
PMA80	PMA80	PMA80	PMA80
PMA81	PMA81	PMA81	PMA81
PMA84	PMA84	PMA84	PMA84
PMA85		PMA85	
SHM11	SHM11	SHM11	SHM11
		{PMA95	PMA95
PMA87	PMA87	PMA87	PMA87
PMA88	PMA88	PMA88	PMA88
PMA96	{PMA91	PMA96	PMA96
PMA95	PMA96}	PMA95	PMA95
PMA91		PMA96}	PMA96

PMA95		PMA97	PMA97
PMA97		PMA105	PMA105
PMA105		PMA107	PMA107
PMA107	Obituaries		
PMA114		PMA114	PMA114
PMA118	PMA118	PMA118	PMA118
PMA124	PMA124	PMA124	PMA124
PMA129	PMA129	PMA129	PMA129
SHM13	SHM13	SHM13	
PMA145	PMA145	PMA145	PMA145
RL13		RL13	
PMA146	PMA146	PMA146	PMA146
PMA147		PMA147	
PMA148	PMA148	PMA148	
	Obituaries		
PMA154	PMA154	PMA154	{PMA155
PMA155		PMA155	PMA154}
PMA159	PMA159	PMA159	PMA159
PMA160	PMA160	PMA160	PMA160
PMA161	PMA161	PMA161	PMA161
PMA173	PMA173	PMA173	PMA173
PMA174	PMA174	PMA174	
PMA175	PMA175		
PMA176	PMA176	PMA176	PMA176
PMA180	PMA180	PMA180	PMA180
PMA181	PMA181	PMA181	PMA181
RL16	RL16	RL16	RL16
PMA194	PMA194	PMA194	
PMA195	PMA195	PMA195	PMA195
PMA196	PMA196	PMA196	PMA196
PMA197	PMA197	PMA197	PMA197
PMA198	PMA198	PMA198	PMA198
PMA199	PMA199	PMA199	PMA199
PMA200	PMA200	PMA200	PMA200
PMA201	PMA201	PMA201	PMA201
PMA202	PMA202		
PMA203			
PMA204	PMA204	PMA204	
PMA205	PMA205	PMA205	
		{PMA210	
		PMA209}	
RL17	RL17	RL17	
RL25	RL25		
PMA206	PMA206	PMA206	PMA206
PMA207			
PMA208	PMA208	PMA208	PMA208

PMA209	PMA209	{	
PMA211	PMA211		
PMA209	PMA209	}	
PMA212	PMA212	PMA212	PMA212
PMA217	PMA217	PMA217	PMA217
PMA218			
PMA219		PMA219	PMA219
PMA221	PMA221	PMA221	PMA221
PMA222	PMA222	PMA222	PMA222
	Obituaries		
PMA223		PMA223	
PMA226	PMA226	PMA226	PMA226
PMA227	PMA227	PMA227	PMA227
PMA228		PMA228	PMA228
PMA229	PMA229	PMA229	PMA229
PMA230	PMA230	PMA230	PMA230
PMA234		PMA234	
RL21	RL21	RL21	RL21
PMA237			
SHM18	SHM18	SHM18	SHM18
PMA238	PMA238	PMA238	
PMA239	PMA239		
PMA240			
PMA242	PMA242		
PMA246	PMA246	{PMA246	PMA246
		PMA241	
		PMA249}	
PMA248	PMA248	PMA248	PMA248
PMA249	PMA249	PMA249	PMA249
PMA247	PMA247	PMA247	
PMA251			
PMA252	PMA252	PMA252	PMA252
PMA253	PMA253		
SHM20	SHM20	SHM20	SHM20
SHM21	SHM21	SHM21	SHM21
	Obituaries		
PMA255	PMA255	PMA255	
FA2	FA2	FA2	FA2
PMA257		PMA257	
PMA258			
PMA259	PMA259	PMA259	PMA259
		PMA260	
		RL25	
PMA261			
PMA269	PMA269	PMA269	PMA269
PMA271		PMA271	
PMA272		PMA272	

SHM22 PMA274 PMA276 PMA277 RL29 RL30 PMA278 PMA281 SHM25 PMA283 PMA285 PMA287 RL31 SHM27 PMA288 PMA289 PMA290 PMA291 PMA292 PMA294 PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 PMA299 PMA303 PMA307 PMA308 PMA315 PMA316 PMA318 PMA321 PMA323 RL34 RL36 PMA324 PMA328	SHM22 PMA274 PMA276 PMA277 RL30 Obituaries SHM24 PMA281 SHM25 PMA285 PMA287 RL31 PMA288 PMA289 PMA292 PMA294 PMA296 PMA297 PMA298 Obituaries PMA299 PMA307 PMA308 PMA315 PMA316 PMA318 PMA321 PMA323 RL34 RL36 PMA324 PMA328 Obituaries	SHM22 PMA276 PMA277 RL29 RL30 PMA278 PMA281 SHM25 PMA283 PMA284 PMA287 RL31 SHM27 PMA288 PMA289 PMA290 PMA291 PMA292 PMA294 {PMA299 PMA307} PMA296 PMA297 PMA296 PMA298 PMA299 PMA308 PMA315 PMA316 PMA318 PMA321 RL34 RL36 PMA328	SHM22 PMA276 PMA277 PMA278 SHM24 PMA281 SHM25 PMA287 RL31 SHM27 PMA288 {PMA291} PMA289 PMA294 SHM28 PMA299 PMA307 PMA296 PMA297 PMA296 PMA298 PMA299 PMA308 PMA315 PMA316 PMA318 PMA321 RL36 PMA328
---	---	---	---

II. 2. B. ii.

Al-'Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – Ist.B2	Al-'Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – DK
PMA1	PMA1
PMA2	
	PMA10
PMA19	PMA19
PMA34	
PMA35	
PMA37	PMA37
	PMA39
PMA42	
PMA43	
PMA48	PMA48
PMA49	PMA49
PMA54	
PMA55	
PMA59	
PMA60	PMA60
PMA63	
PMA65	
PMA66	
PMA68	
PMA77	
PMA80	
PMA84	
PMA87	PMA87
PMA88	PMA88
PMA89	PMA89
PMA91	PMA91
PMA95	PMA95
PMA96	PMA96
PMA97	PMA97
PMA104	PMA104
PMA105	PMA105
PMA107	PMA107
PMA123	PMA123
PMA124	
PMA129	
PMA146	PMA146
PMA153	
PMA154	PMA154
	PMA155
PMA161	PMA161
	PMA173
PMA176	PMA176
PMA181	PMA181
PMA199	PMA199

PMA200	PMA200
PMA201	PMA201
PMA206	PMA206
PMA212	PMA212
PMA217	PMA217
PMA221	PMA221
PMA222	
PMA230	PMA230
PMA238	PMA238
PMA241	PMA241
PMA246	PMA246
	PMA248
PMA249	PMA249
PMA258	PMA258
PMA274	PMA274
PMA276	
PMA277	
PMA278	
PMA288	PMA281
PMA289	PMA288
PMA294	PMA289
PMA296	PMA294
PMA297	PMA296
PMA298	PMA297
PMA299	PMA298
PMA312	PMA299
PMA314	PMA312
PMA316	PMA314
PMA318	PMA316
PMA321	PMA318
PMA325	PMA321
PMA327	PMA325
RL5	
RL6	
RL7	
RL8	
RL16	RL16
RL17	RL17
RL21	RL21
RL30	
RL31	
RL34	
SHM7	
SHM9	
SHM20	SHM20
SHM21	SHM21

SHM22 SHM25 SHM26 Obituaries	SHM22 SHM25 Obituaries
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

TABLES OF CHAPTER THREE
804/1401-2

The Sources

- [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*]⁹⁸ = Ibn Duqmâq = *Al-Muntaqá* = MS Chester Beatty 4125, fols. 197b-203a
 [ID] = *Al-Nafḥah* = pp. 326-331-333
 [HI] = Ibn H̱ijjî = *Târîkh Ibn H̱ijjî* = MS Berlin Ahlwardt 9458, fols. 129b-140a
 [‘Aynî] = Al-‘Aynî = *‘Iqd al-Jumân* = Ist.B2 = MS Ahmet III 2911/B2, fols. 130a-132a
 = Ist.19 = MS Ahmet III 2911/19, fols. 58a-61a-61b
 [Maq.] = Al-Maqrîzî = *Kitâb al-Sulûk* = vol. 3:3, pp. 1077-1089-1090.
 [IH] = Ibn H̱ajar = *Inbâ’ al-Ghumr* = vol. 5, pp. 1-26-55
 [IQS] = Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah = *Târîkh Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah* = *TIQS* = vol. 4, pp. 254-274-291
 = 1st recension of *Târîkh Ibn H̱ijjî* = 1st. = MS Chester Beatty
 4125, fols. 253a-260b-261a
 = 2nd. recension = 2nd. = MS Chester Beatty MS 5527, fols.
 234b-252a-253a
 [IT] = Ibn Taghrîbirdî = *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* = vol. 12, pp. 219-226
 [AJ] = Al-Jawharî al-Sayrafî = *Nuzhat al-Nufûs* = vol. 2, 133-146-148
 [ABM] = ‘Abd al-Bâsîṭ al-Malaṭî = *Nayl al-Amal* = vol. 3, pp. 68-79-80
 [IY] = Ibn Iyâs = *Badâ’i’ al-Zuhûr* = vol. 1:2, pp. 638-657-658
 [Anon.] = Anonymous = *Jawâhir al-Sulûk* = MS British Museum, Or. 6854, fols. 336a-339

Those reports found in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah’s second recension that are very likely to be of Duqmâqian origin, have been identified with an asterisk.

⁹⁸ The presence of [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] at the beginning of a report, indicates that either *Al-Muntaqá* alone or both *Al-Nafḥah* and *Al-Muntaqá* were referred to in the entry, in which case both page and folio numbers – with the latter preceded by the title *Al-Muntaqá* – appear at the end, separated by a back slash. As for [ID], it means that only *Al-Nafḥah* was dealt with in the entry.

TABLE III. 1. A.**Political, Military and Administrative Affairs [PMA]**

PMA1. – [IQS] {Exhaustive list of military, administrative and religious officials in Egypt and Syria} [1st. 253a/2nd. 234b-235b]

– HI: [129b]

– ‘Aynî: {Shorter list} [Ist.19 58a/ Ist.B2 130a]

– AJ: [133]

PMA2. – [HI] The viceroy of Damascus went out with the troops seeking the Arab tribesmen [1st of Muḥarram; 129b]

– IQS: [1st. 253a]

PMA3. – [Maq.] Emir Zayn al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Mihtâr headed to Syria on a mission on behalf of the sultan [2nd. of Muḥarram; 1076]

– IY: [639]

PMA4. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] The mamluk of the viceroy of Damascus and that of the viceroy of Aleppo arrived in Cairo with the news that Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî, the *nâ’ib* of Aleppo, had clashed with Nu‘ayr and defeated him, and had arrested Ibn Shuhrî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb* of this city [4th of Muḥarram; 197b]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

PMA5. – [HI] Arab tribesmen cut caravan routes from Egypt and Jerusalem at Sha‘sha‘ and al-Burayj, so the viceroy went out after them with the troops, to no avail [5th of Muḥarram; 129b]

– IH: [1-2]

– IQS: [1st. 253a/2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

PMA6. – [‘Aynî] Arikmâs al-Zâhirî, an emir of ten who had been removed from the *niyâbah* of ‘Ayntâb by Damurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, was nominated viceroy of Malatyah [9th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a/ Ist.B2 130a]

– Maq.: [1076]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a⁹⁹/TIQS 254]

– AJ: [133-4]

– IY: [639]

PMA7. – [‘Aynî] Emir ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn, Yalbak’s son in law, remained *kâshif* of al-Buḥayrah [9th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a]

– Maq.: [1076]

– AJ: [134]

PMA8. – [‘Aynî] Sa‘d al-Dîn ibn Ghurâb remained *wazîr* in order to finish working on the *nafaqah* to be paid to the sultan’s mamluks [9th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a]

⁹⁹ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- Maq.: [1076]
- AJ: [134]
- IY: [639]

PMA9. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqā]** The sultan's letter arrived to Qutûlbak, the *amîr hajj*, ordering him to arrest Munjid ibn Khâtîr, the leader of the Banû 'Uqbah. When the latter was apprehended, the Arab tribesmen attacked and looted both pilgrims and traders [Middle decade of Muḥarram; 197b]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

– IY: News arrived that the Banû Sâlim Arabs attacked the pilgrims. The *amîr hajj* fought against them and defeated their leader, Munjid ibn Khâtîr [639]

PMA10. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqā]** When Munjid was brought to Cairo, a robe of honour was bestowed upon him and he resumed being the leader of the Banû 'Uqbah, while pledging to return the stolen property [Middle decade of Muḥarram; 197b]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

– IY: The leader of the Banû Sâlim Arabs, Munjid ibn Khâtîr, was captured and brought to Cairo where the sultan ordered that he be hanged; he pledged to return the stolen property, so he was put in jail until he did so [639]

PMA11. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqā]** Al-Sârim, who had been the *wâlî* of Cairo, was appointed *wâlî* of Old Cairo instead of Muḥammad al-Dânî [19th of Muḥarram; 197b]

– 'Aynî: Al-Sârim was appointed *wâlî* of Old Cairo instead of Nâsir al-Dîn al-Dânî [16th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a]

– Maq.: [1076]

– IY: [639]

PMA12. – **[HI]** {The order to apprehend Taghrîbirdî, the viceroy of Damascus, arrived secretly, and so preparations were made for his arrest. When he sensed this, the viceroy escaped with a few of his mamluks after sending his *dawâdâr* to mislead the *hâjib* and others assembled at his house for the reading of the sultan's missive, as to his whereabouts, while he made for Aleppo whose viceroy, Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî, was his friend} [21st of Muḥarram; 130a]

– ID: As Taghrîbirdî, the viceroy of Damascus, intended to revolt, the troops rode out and wanted to arrest him, so he fled to Aleppo [*Al-Nafḥah* 327]

– IH: The order to capture Taghrîbirdî arrived in Damascus, and the *dawâdâr* wanted to arrest him but he fled towards Aleppo [1, 2]

– IQS: [1st. 253b/2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

– IT: The emirs in Egypt sent a missive ordering the arrest of Taghrîbirdî ("*al-wâli*"), but one of them wrote to him a letter of warning that arrived before that of the sultan. He thus rode out of Dâr al-Sa'âdah with a few of his mamluks and headed towards Aleppo [219]

– ABM: [68]

PMA13. – **[HI]** The qadis gathered at the *amîr kabîr*'s residence and wrote a record about what had happened with Taghrîbirdî [22nd of Muḥarram; 130a]

– IQS: [1st. 253b/2nd. 236a/TIQS 254]

- PMA14. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Ibn Yazîd min Bâbâ who had been *amîr jandâr* was nominated *hâjib saghîr* [25th of Muharram; 197b]
 – ‘Aynî: Emir Bâyezîd, who was an emir of ten, was nominated as one of the *hujjâb sîghâr* in Egypt [23rd of Muharram; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]
 – Maq.: Emir Abû Yazîd, one of the *hâjibs*, was appointed an emir of ten [23rd of Muharram; 1077]
 – AJ: [134]
 – IY: [639]
- PMA15. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Âqbughâ Jarkas was appointed *ra's nawbah* [25th of Muharram; 197b]
- PMA16. – **[HI]** {Arrival in Damascus of Shams al-Dîn al-Nâbulsî al-Hanbalî who had been a prisoner of Tamerlane and had escaped from Baghdad. He told about the destruction of that city, Tamerlane's dispatch of a missive to the sultan with Altunbughâ al-'Uthmânî, and the drowning of Sadr al-Dîn al-Minâwî in the Zâb river. Al-Nâbulsî al-Hanbalî was accompanied by Jamâl al-Dîn ibn al-Muhaddith who had been a *hâjib* during Tamerlane's occupation of Damascus} [29th of Muharram; 130a]
 – IQS: [1st. 253b/2nd. 236a-b/TIQS 255]
- PMA17. – **[HI]** {Description of the tribulations of one 'Abd al-Malik and his appointment as *wâlî* of Damascus, a position he occupied under Tamerlane. Despite all his wrongdoings, "he was appointed as *wâlî* by this greedy regime."} [29th of Muharram; 130a-b]
 – IQS: + "And I have mentioned this incident only because of the oddity of the appointment of a person who had done what he had done during the days of the Tatars." [1st. 253b/2nd. 236b/TIQS 255]
- PMA18. – **[HI]** Sunqur was appointed *wâlî al-barr* instead of Ibn al-Kalanbanânî [?] who had fled along with the viceroy [29th of Muharram; 130b]
 – IQS: [1st. 254a]
- PMA19. – **['Aynî]** {News reached Cairo about the events surrounding the escape of Taghrîbirdî from Damascus} [1st of Safar; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]
 – Maq.: [1077]
 – AJ: [134]
 – IY: [639-40]
- PMA20. – **['Aynî]** Instead of Taghrîbirdî, the sultan appointed as viceroy of Damascus, the *atâbak al-'asâkir* of the city who had been *nâ'ib* of Aleppo, Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî, a.k.a. al-Atrûsh [1st of Safar; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]
 – ID: The sultan sent a *taqlîd* to Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî nominating him viceroy of Damascus [*Al-Nafhah* 327]
 – Maq.: [1077]
 – IH: [Dhû al-Qa'dah; 1, 19]

- IQS: The *amîr kabîr* Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî was nominated to the *niyâbah* of Damascus [During this month; *TIQS* 257]
- IT: [219]
- AJ: [134-5]
- ABM: [69]
- IY: [640]
- Anon.: [336a]

PMA21. – [**‘Aynî**] Tamurbughâ al-Manjakî was appointed viceroy of Safad instead of Emir Duqmâq [1st of Safar; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]

- Maq.: [1077]
- IT: [219]
- AJ: [135]
- ABM: [69]
- IY: [640]

PMA22. – [**‘Aynî**] Emir Duqmâq was appointed viceroy of Aleppo instead of Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî who was removed from office [1st of Safar; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]

- ID: [*Al-Nafḥah* 327]
- Maq.: [1077]
- IQS: [*TIQS* 257]
- IT: ...Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî who was removed from office because he had rebelled and joined Taghrîbirdî... [219]
- AJ: [135]
- ABM: [69]
- IY: [640]
- Anon.: + {Emir Nawrûz became the main power broker in Egypt} [During those days; 336a]

PMA23. – [**‘Aynî**] After a few days, news arrived that Taghrîbirdî had gone to Aleppo to join Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî [n.d.; Ist.19 **58a**/Ist.B2 130a]

- Maq.: [1077]
- IH: Taghrîbirdî reached Damurdâsh in Aleppo [2]
- IT: [219]
- AJ: [135]
- IY: [640]

PMA24. – [**HI**] {Story about a clash in Tripoli between the locals and Frankish pirates} [10th to 14th of Safar; 130b]

- Maq.: [1079]
- IH: [3]
- IQS: [1st. 254a/2nd. 237a/*TIQS* 255-6]
- ABM: [70]
- IY: [642]

PMA25. – [**IQS**] [Arrival in Damascus of the envoy of Baybars, the *amîr kabîr*, who brought a letter from the sultan nominating Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî to the *niyâbah* and

ordering that the property of Taghrîbirdî, of which nothing was found, be confiscated. [The *taqlid* of Duqmâq, who was to replace Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî as viceroy of Aleppo, arrived as well. With the envoy were also orders to the viceroys of *niyâbahs*, to those of the fortresses and to the emirs of the Arab tribesmen and of the Turcomans, informing them, [first], that Damurdâsh was summoned to come to Cairo and that in case he did not acquiesce, he was to be arrested and sent to Egypt; and [second], that Taghrîbirdî was to head for Jerusalem as an unemployed (“*battâl*”) emir, as he had himself requested earlier on¹⁰⁰]/Damurdâsh was summoned to Cairo. An edict was issued for Emir Taghrîbirdî to head for Jerusalem as he had himself requested earlier on [14th of Safar; 1st. 254b/2nd. 237b/ *TIQS* 257]

– HI: Arrival in Damascus of the envoy of Baybars, the *amîr kabîr*, who brought a letter from the sultan nominating Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî to the *niyâbah* of Damascus and ordering that the property of Taghrîbirdî, of which nothing was found, be confiscated [14th of Safar; 131a]

PMA26. – [HI] Arrival in Damascus from Cairo of Emir ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn, the son of the viceroy of al-Ṣubaybah¹⁰¹ to take over his *iqṭâ’* and assume his position as *hâjib*. He became the second *hâjib* out of a total of seven, something which was an oddity. This fellow had been in Damascus during the days of Tamerlane’s occupation but had gone to Egypt following the great fire that engulfed the city [in 803] [At the beginning of Safar; 130b]

– IQS: [1st. 254a/2nd. 237a/ *TIQS* 256]

PMA27. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] On the 10th of Safar, when a number of emirs refused to attend upon the sultan in the Citadel, al-Nâsir Faraj sent them an envoy, Qânîbây, the *hâjib al-hujjâb*, to inquire about the reasons behind their refusal. The emirs said that they had enemies who had to be handed over to them, otherwise they would not go up to the Citadel. After exchanges between the two groups, it was decided that eight emirs of forty and of ten, as well as eight mamluks, would be sent away to Syria. On the 11th, the emirs who had refused to go up to the Citadel sent the *hâjibs* to order those to be exiled to leave. When they went to Sûdûn al-Nawrûzî’s house, he jumped out of a window into Birkat al-Fîl. So they headed to the others who also could not be found. The sultan had outwardly acquiesced to them, namely Emirs Sûdûn al-Ḥamzâwî, Sûdûn al-Nawrûzî Baqjah, Sûdûn al-Qâsimî Bashtâw, Sûdûn al-Wâhî, Azbak al-Dawâdâr, and Qânîbây al-Khâzindâr, and four mamluks, Tughaytamur al-Dawâdâr, Înâl al-Muḥammadî al-Sâqî, and Âqbughâ al-Faqîh, being sent away, but secretly loathed doing so. He thus sent Baybars, the *atâbak*, to intercede in their favour, to no avail. Then the caliph and the qadis tried to intercede, again to no avail. Things remained thus until the 16th when an agreement was reached that only Sûdûn al-Ḥamzâwî would leave to occupy the position of *nâ’ib* of Ṣafad, while the others would leave the *khâssakîyah* and would be part of the sultan’s outer circle instead (“*umarâ’ barrâniyyîn*”) and would not go up to the Citadel. As for the four mamluks, they would have to join the *halqah* while keeping their *iqṭâ’*’s. All, the sultan, the emirs and the *sultânî* mamluks pledged to respect this accord [10th-16th of Safar; 197b-198a]

¹⁰⁰ The long passage in brackets is written at the bottom margin of fol. 237b.

¹⁰¹ A fortress located in Jabal al-Shaykh in Syria; see Popper, *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 69, map no. 13.

- ‘Aynî: [Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî’s appointment to the *niyâbah* of Safad] was the cause behind what happened between him and the grand emirs. These, Emirs Nawrûz al-Hâfizî, Jakam, Sûdûn Tâz, Tamurbughâ al-Mashtûb and Qânîbây al-‘Alâ’î, refrained from attending upon the sultan at the Citadel from the beginning of the month until this day, and an armed conflict almost erupted. As for Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî, he was getting war-ready at his house along with his supporters. The grand emirs had decided that eight persons would have to leave for Syria while retaining their *iqṭâ*’s: Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî, Sûdûn Baqjah, both emirs of forty and *ru’ûs nawb*; Azbak al-Dawâdâr and Sûdûn Bashtâw, emirs of ten; Qânîbây al-Khâzindâr al-Jundî, a simple mamluk, Birdî Bak al-Khâssakî, and two others from the *khâssakîyah*. Then some emirs intervened and made peace amongst them on the condition that Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî leaves for Syria and the others not attend upon the sultan (“*wa-lâ yatlu’ûn ilâ al-khidmah*”). The mamluks were made to accept the accord barrack after barrack [1st-24th of Safar; Ist.19 **58b**/Ist.B2 130a-b]
- Maq.: [1078]
- IQS: Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî who was an emir of forty, tried to stir up a rebellion [2nd. 237a-b/TIQS 257]
- IH: [6]
- IT: [220]
- AJ: [135-6]
- ABM: Rumours circulated in Egypt about a conflict on the verge of occurring between two groups: on the one hand, Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî, Sûdûn Baqjah, Uzbak and Qânîbây, and on the other, Nawrûz, Jakam min ‘Awaḍ, Sûdûn Tâz and Tamurbughâ al-Mashtûb. To bring about peace, it was decided to send Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî to Safad as its viceroy and for all to pledge to be in accord [69]
- IY: [640-1]

PMA28. – [IH] Jântamur al-Turuntây al-Turukmânî, the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî, clashed with the Arabs of Ibn ‘Umar al-Hawârî/Jântamur al-Nizâmî, the *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî, was killed during a war between him and Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azîz a-Hawârî, the chief of the Arabs there [Middle of Safar; **4, 21**]

PMA29. – [ID/A*I-Muntaqâ*] Tâj al-Dîn ibn al-Baqarî was appointed to the *dîwân al-mufrad* [22nd of Safar; 198a]

– IQS: [2nd. 238a/TIQS 257]

PMA30. – [HI] Emir Kujuk, a manumitted mamluk of ‘Umar ibn Manjak died. [He had been given an emirate of ten in 792 and had gone on the *hajj* in 801¹⁰²][24th of Safar; 131a]

– IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 238a¹⁰³]

PMA31. – [ID/A*I-Muntaqâ*] ‘Alam al-Din Abû Kumm, continued in his position as *wazîr*. Ibn al-Baqarî had been summoned to take over the *wizârah* but did not agree to it because the conditions he posed were not accepted. [25th of Safar; 198a-b]

¹⁰² The sentence in brackets, in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah’s hand, is in the margin of fol. 131a.

¹⁰³ In both first and second recension, this report was placed in the obituaries section.

- ‘Aynî: [24th of Safar; Ist.19 58b]
- Maq.: [1077]
- IH: [8]
- IQS: [2nd. 238a/*TIQS* 257]
- AJ: [135]
- IY: [640]

PMA32. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Arrival of a post rider from Tripoli with news about the encounter there between the locals and the Franks [25th of Safar; 198a-b]

PMA33. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî was summoned to come to the Citadel where his *tashrif* was brought. Some mamluks refused [?] and did not invite him to wear the *tashrif* [25th of Safar; 198a]

- ‘Aynî: An edict was issued nominating Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî viceroy of Safad instead of Duqmâq following the latter’s appointment to the *niyâbah* of Aleppo [24th of Safar; Ist.19 58b/Ist.B2 130a]
- Maq.: [1078]
- IQS: Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî was nominated *nâ’ib* of Safad [*TIQS* 257]
- AJ: [135]
- ABM: [69]
- IY: [641]

PMA34. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] The sultan sent out Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî’s *taqlîd* as *nâ’ib* of Damascus instead of Taghrîbirdî [25th of Safar; 198a]

- ‘Aynî: The *tashrif* of Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî was sent out to him by means of Ghubjuq al-Khâssakî [20th of Safar; Ist.19 58a/Ist.B2 130a]
- Maq.: Ghunjuq [1077]
- AJ: [135]
- IY: [640]

PMA35. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] The sultan sent out Duqmâq al-Muhammadi’s nomination papers as *nâ’ib* of Aleppo instead of Damurdâsh al-Muhammadi [25th of Safar; 198a]

- ‘Aynî: [24th of Safar; Ist.19 58b/Ist.B2 130b]
- Maq.: [1078]
- AJ: [136]
- IY: [641]

PMA36. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] A letter arrived from the viceroy of Damascus, Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî, with news that he had received a missive from the viceroy of al-Rahbah which told of the arrival in that city of Alṭunbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, the former viceroy of Safad, Zayn al-Dîn ibn al-Tahhân, the former viceroy of Gaza, and Qadi Shams al-Dîn al-Nâbulî al-Hanbalî [25th of Safar; 198a]

- IH: During this month Alṭunbughâ al-‘Uthmânî escaped from Tamerlane [8]

PMA37. – [**Maq.**] Hasan ibn Qarâjâ was appointed *wâlî* of al-Jîzah, instead of Ibn al-Kûrânî who was removed from this office [25th of Safar; 1078]

- AJ: [136]

PMA38. – [**‘Aynî**] Emir Damurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, captured ‘Alîbâk ibn Khalîl, the son of Emir Zayn al-Dîn Qarâjâ ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir along with fifty Turcoman relatives of his, and imprisoned them. When Emir Taghrîbirdî arrived in Aleppo, he interceded in their favour, so they were freed and sent home with robes of honour [During these days; Ist.19 **58b**/Ist.B2 130a]

– Maq.: News arrived that Emir Damurdâsh, the viceroy of Aleppo, captured Khalîl ibn Qarâjâ ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir, the leader of the Turcomans, and imprisoned him. When Emir Taghrîbirdî, the viceroy of Damascus, arrived in Aleppo, he interceded in his favour, so he was freed along those with him, about fifty men. [1078]

– IH: [2]

– IQS: [2nd. 238a¹⁰⁴]

– IT: “[When Taghrîbirdî arrived in Aleppo], Damurdâsh, its viceroy, had captured Emir Khalîl ibn Qarâjâ ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir, the leader of the Turcomans. My father ordered him to free them, after which they all decided to rebel against the sultan because of the negative influence of the emirs of his entourage.” [219-20]

– AJ: [135]

– ABM: [69]

– IY: [640]

PMA39. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] A robe of honour was bestowed upon Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî as viceroy of Safad. He went down from the Citadel and, accompanied by Înâl Bâi ibn Qijmâs, Sûdûn min Zadah and Asanbughâ al-Musâfirî [?] al-Muşâri‘, did the round of the emirs to salute them and then went home [28th of Safar; **198b/Al-Nafḥah 327**]

– ‘Aynî: [27th of Safar; Ist.19 58b]

– Maq.: [27th of Safar; 1078]

– IQS: [2nd. 237b]

– IT: [27th of Safar; 220]

– AJ: [136]

– ABM: [72]

– IY: [641-2]

PMA40. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Arrival in Cairo of Altunbughâ al-‘Uthmânî and Zayn al-Dîn ibn al-Tahhân who went up to the citadel where they greeted the sultan and then the emirs/Arrival in Cairo of Altunbughâ al-‘Uthmânî, the former viceroy of Safad, who had been a prisoner of Tamerlane, along with Zayn al-Dîn ‘Umar ibn al-Tahhân [28th of Safar; *Al-Muntaqâ* **198b/Al-Nafḥah 327**]

– ‘Aynî: + The two mentioned that they had parted ways with Tamerlane in the vicinity of Baghdad [27th of Safar; Ist.19 **58b**/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: [27th of Safar; 1079]

– IQS: [2nd. 238a/TIQS 257]

– IT: [220]

¹⁰⁴ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- AJ: [137]
- ABM: [69]
- IY: [642]

PMA41. – [HI] The eunuch ‘Abd al-Latîf, the sultan’s *lâlâ*, left Damascus for Cairo. He had been a prisoner of Tamerlane but had escaped and, a few days earlier, had arrived in Damascus where he stayed at the Kukhânîyah [?] *madrasah* for a few days. He then headed to Cairo [29th of Safar; 131a-b]

– IQS: [28th of Safar; 1st. 254b/2nd. 238a/TIQS 257]

PMA42. – [HI] {News about a letter that arrived from Nâsir al-Dîn ibn al-Sârim to his brother in Damascus concerning arrangements for Ibn Hîjjî’s trip to Egypt} [Last day of Safar; 131b¹⁰⁵]

PMA43. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Tâj al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Razzâq became *wâlî* of Qat’yâ instead of his brother Karîm al-Dîn [Last day of Safar; 198b]

– IQS: [2nd. 238a/TIQS 257]

PMA44. – [HI] Âqbughâ, the viceroy of Damascus, wore the robe of investiture that had arrived with his *taqlîd* earlier that day. The *taqlîd*, which was dated [blank] of Safar, was read by Muhyî al-Dîn because the *kâtib al-sirr* was sick [5th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 131b]

– Maq.: [1079]

– IQS: ...The *taqlîd* was dated the 23rd of Safar....Muhyî al-Dîn al-Madanî.../...Muhyî al-Dîn ibn al-Madanî... [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b]

– IY: [642]

PMA45. – [HI] {Arrival in Damascus of letters from Cairo, among others, from the brother of Ibn Hîjjî informing their father that his eldest son, Najm al-Dîn, had been nominated as *qâdî al-qudât* of Hama. Copy of this letter} [5th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 131b]

– IQS: [1st. 255a]

PMA46. – [HI] {Amongst the missives sent from Cairo was the news that a disagreement had occurred in Cairo amongst the emirs, but it was solved with the sending away of some of them} [5th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 131b]

– IQS: [1st. 255a]

PMA47. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî headed [for the *niyâbah* of Safad] after bidding farewell to the emirs [6th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b]

– IQS: [2nd. 238b]

PMA48. – [HI] The viceroy of Safad, Emir Duqmâq, who had been appointed to Aleppo, arrived from that city and was welcomed by the *nâ’ib* of Damascus and the troops. It was reported that he carried a letter from the sultan to Damurdâsh granting him security and summoning him to Cairo, and another to Taghrîbirdî ordering him to head to Jerusalem as

¹⁰⁵ This report is struck through vertically.

an unemployed (“*battâl*”) emir following his own request formulated earlier on. God did bring peace between the two parties [10th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

- Maq.: [1079]
- IH: [19]
- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b/During Safar; *TIQS* 258]
- ABM: Damurdâsh was summoned to Cairo [69]
- IY: [640, 642-3]

PMA49. – [HI] The sultan’s *amîr akhûr* arrived in Damascus to seize whatever property was confiscated from Taghrîbirdî. He embarked upon this task on the 16th of Safar [n.d.; 132a]

- Maq.: Taghrîbirdî was to head to Jerusalem after his property was confiscated [1079]
- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b]
- IY: [643]

PMA50. – [HI] Duqmâq left Damascus after he received a letter from the viceroy of Hama [12th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

- Maq.: Duqmâq headed out of Damascus towards Aleppo [1080]
- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b/During Safar; *TIQS* 258]
- IT: All this and Duqmâq, the viceroys of Aleppo, Âqbughâ al-Atrûsh, and of Damascus, and numbers of tribesmen (“*ashîr*”) and Turcomans, were readying themselves to fight Taghrîbirdî and Damurdâsh/Duqmâq gathered his forces, both troops and Turcomans, and headed towards Aleppo to fight Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî [220/223]
- ABM: [72]
- IY: [643]

PMA51. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {Altunbughâ al-‘Ajamî, the *wâlî al-‘arab*, was given the *niyâbah* of al-Wajh al-Qibli in replacement of Jântamur al-Turuntây [15th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b]

- ‘Aynî: Altunbughâ al-‘Ajamî, the *wâlî* of Damietta, was nominated *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Qibli in replacement of Jântamur al-Turuntây al-Turukmânî following the latter’s death/...following the latter’s killing... [Ist.19 58b/Ist.B2 130b]
- Maq.: [1080]
- AJ: [137]
- IY: [643]

PMA52. – [‘Aynî] Nawrûz al-Hâfizî went up to the Citadel to attend upon the sultan after having refrained from doing for over two months following the conflict that took place those days, and was granted two silk robes by the sultan who did the same for Sûdûn Tâz [15th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; Ist.19 58b/Ist.B2 130b]

- ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Robes of honour were bestowed upon Nawrûz al-Hâfizî and Sûdûn Tâz confirming them, respectively, as *ra’s nawbah* and *atâbak al-‘asâkir*, and *amîr akhûr* [15th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b]
- Maq.: [1080]

- IH: A robe of honour was bestowed upon Nawrûz who had not attended upon the sultan for months [6]
- IQS: [2nd. 238b]
- IT: [220]
- AJ: [137]
- IY: [643]

PMA53. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** A robe of honour was bestowed upon Jakam confirming him as *dawâdâr* because of what had happened between him and Sûdûn al-Hamzâwî and others. When he came down from the Citadel, he had the lantern men proclaim: ‘let whoever was unjustly treated see Emir Jakam’s deputy [for redress]’ [18th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 58b/Ist.B2 130b]
- Maq.: [1080]
- IH: [6-7]
- IQS: [2nd. 238b]
- IT: [220]
- AJ: [137]
- IY: [643]

PMA54. – **[HI]** In Damascus, a proclamation was issued enjoining the troops to ready themselves to head to Aleppo, as news arrived by means of two escapee emirs from that city that Damurdâsh was planning to come to Damascus [18th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

- Maq.: [1080]
- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b]
- IY: [643]

PMA55. – **[HI]** Qarâbughâ al-Hâjib headed to Cairo along with the person who had carried the *taqlîd* to the viceroy, and brought back with him correspondence concerning Qadi Al-Nâbulî al-Hanbalî [23rd of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 238b]

PMA56. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** “‘Abd al-Laṭîf al-Ashrafî al-Sâqî arrived in Cairo after escaping from Tamerlane in the vicinity of Tabriz. He told me personally (*min lafzihi*) that Tamerlane had gone from Mârdîn to Tabriz and had sent his son from Mârdîn to Baghdad. There he battled the inhabitants of the city who defeated him. This news reached Tamerlane when he was one stop away from Tabriz, and he then returned to Baghdad. The above-mentioned eunuch fled that night [?]. He also told about the drowning of Qadi al-Minâwî at a bridge over the Zâb river. When al-Sâqî arrived in Cairo, the sultan was very happy with him: he bestowed upon him many things and organized in his honour a great party.” [23rd of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 199a/Al-Nafḥah 328]

- IQS: [2nd. 238b-239a/TIQS 258]
- IY: + {The escapee told of the death of many prominent people who were taken by Tamerlane; list of these people} [Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 645]
- Anon.: [336a]

PMA57. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] Fakhr al-Dîn ibn Ghurâb became *nâzir al-khâss* instead of his brother Sa‘d al-Dîn, with the latter’s agreement (“*bi-ridâh*”) [25th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b-199a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]
- Maq.: [1080]
- IH: Fakhr al-Dîn ibn Ghurâb became *nâzir al-khâss* instead of his brother Sa‘d al-Dîn at the latter’s request [At the end of Safar; 8]
- IQS: [2nd. 239a¹⁰⁶]
- AJ: [137]
- ABM: [71]
- IY: [643]

PMA58. – [‘**Aynî**] Tâj al-Dîn ibn al-Hazîn, the *mustawfi al-dawlah* in Cairo, was appointed *wazîr* in Syria instead of Ibn al-Salâh following the latter’s removal from office [27th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; Ist.19 59a]

- HI: The *wazîr* was removed from office and replaced by a man appointed from Egypt [At the end of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133b]
- Maq.: [1080]
- IQS: Salâh al-Dîn ibn Abî Shâkir was removed from the *wizârah* and replaced [by an individual called Tâj al-Dîn ibn al-Hazîn¹⁰⁷][At the end of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1st. 255b/2nd. 240b/TIQS 259]
- AJ: [137]
- IY: [643]

PMA59. – [HI] The *kâtib al-sirr* brought with him a robe of investiture from Egypt which he wore that same day [29th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

- IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 239a]

PMA60. – [HI] {The *nâzir al-khâss* in Cairo sent a letter, reproduced by Ibn Hîjjî, to his deputy in Damascus asking the latter to provide the necessary funding for Ibn Hîjjî’s trip to Egypt} [29th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a-b]

PMA61. – [IT] Taghrîbirdî and Damurdâsh went out of Aleppo to wait for Duqmâq and to fight him [n.d.; 220, 223-4]

PMA62. – [‘**Aynî**] Jumuq, who had been an emir of twenty and *ra’s nawbah*, was appointed second *dawâdâr* instead of Jarkas al-Qâsimî al-Muṣârî‘ [5th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]

- ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: ...Jumuq Murâdimashq...[7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]
- Maq.: [1080]
- IQS: [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 2nd. 239b/TIQS 258]
- IT: [220-1]
- AJ: [138]
- IY: [643]

¹⁰⁶ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹⁰⁷ The sentence in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 240b.

PMA63. – [**‘Aynî**] Tanibak al-Khâssakî was appointed *dawâdâr* [5th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: [1080]

– AJ: [138]

– IY: [643]

PMA64. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Sulaymân al-Sharafî was nominated viceroy of al-Karak instead of Jarkas [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]

– ‘Aynî: ...instead of Emir [blank]/Emir Sulaymân was nominated viceroy of al-Karak [Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: ... instead of Emir Jarkas, Tanam’s father [1080]

– IQS: [2nd. 239b/TIQS 258]

– AJ: [138]

– IY: [643]

PMA65. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Emirs Înâl al-Muzaffarî, Qântamur al-Dawâdârî and Tamur al-Khâssakî were given each an emirate of ten from the *iqtâ‘* of Emir Shihâb al-Dîn ibn Qutaybah [?] which was taken over by al-Baqarî during the absence of the *ustâdâr* [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]

– IQS: Emirs Înâl al-Muzaffarî, Qântamur al-Dawâdârî, Tamur al-Khâssakî were given each an emirate of ten [2nd. 239b]

PMA66. – [**HI**] News arrived in Damascus that Damurdâsh and Duqmâq had clashed, but it turned out not to be true [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 132b]

– IQS: [1st. 255a]

PMA67. – [**HI**] The viceroy of Damascus rode out with the troops towards al-Wajh al-Qiblî because it was said that Arab tribesmen and peasants were engaged in highway robbery. He captured a number of them, and after coming back by midday, he nailed and crucified a group of them [9th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 132b]

– IQS: [1st. 255a/2nd. 240a/TIQS 258]

PMA68. – [**HI**] Emir Yahyâ ibn al-‘Affif was nominated to the *wilâyat al-barr* [in Syria] after the removal of Sunqur [During those days; 132b]

– IQS: [1st. 255a, 255b]

PMA69. – [**IT**] Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî encountered Duqmâq on the outskirts of Aleppo, defeated him, caused him and his men to flee, and plundered their belongings. [n.d.; 224]

PMA70. – [**IQS**] News arrived that Duqmâq, the viceroy of Aleppo, and the troops accompanying him, had approached Aleppo. A Turcoman emir whom Duqmâq had been angry at and had put in shackles, plotted against him and headed towards the city, followed in this by the Turcomans. Duqmâq returned to Hama with that city’s viceroy [12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1st. 255b/2nd. 240a/TIQS 259]

– HI: [132b]

- Maq.: Those Turcomans who were with Emir Duqmâq left him as he approached Aleppo [During this month; 1081]
- IH: [4]
- ABM: [72]
- IY: [644]

PMA71. – **[IQS]** The envoy of Duqmâq arrived the following day requesting the help of the troops of Damascus. A proclamation was read for the troops to prepare to leave, so the emirs readied themselves [13th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1st. 255b/2nd. **240a**]

- HI: [132b]
- Maq.: [1081]
- IH: [4]

PMA72. – **[IT]** [After his defeat at the hands of Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî on the outskirts of Aleppo], Duqmâq headed back to Damascus where he sought the help of its viceroy Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî. He also wrote to all the viceroys of Syria asking them to support the sultan’s cause. He gathered large numbers of Arab tribesmen and Turcomans, as well as most of the Damascene troops and headed again towards Aleppo with a huge army. His foes had only their mamluks, as the resources of Aleppo were stained a year and a few months after Tamerlane stay there [n.d.; 224]

PMA73. – **[‘Aynî]** Emir Mubârak Shâh al-Zâhirî, the *hâjib* and *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Qiblî, was given the *wizârah*, on top of his other positions, in replacement of ‘Alam al-Dîn Abû Kumm who was arrested and handed over to the *shâdd al-dawâwîn* [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.19 **59a**/Ist.B2 130b]

- ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*: Mubârak Shâh al-Nâsirî... [17th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]
- Maq.: [1081]
- IH: [7]
- IQS: [2nd. 240a/*TIQS* 259]
- IT: [221]
- AJ: [138]
- ABM: [72]
- IY: [644]

PMA74. – **[HI]** News arrived that Damurdâsh’s vanguard had reached al-Ma‘arrâh, and that Duqmâq, the viceroy of Aleppo, was still in Hama. Reinforcements were sent to him, consisting of two emirs, Asanbây and another emir called Baktamur, accompanied by one [mamluk?] from each emir in Damascus [20th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]

- Maq.: [Âqbughâ, the viceroy of Damascus] sent [Duqmâq] a group of soldiers as reinforcement [1081]
- IH: [4]
- IQS: Reinforcements were sent to him, consisting of two emirs, Asanbây and Baktamur Jalaq, accompanied by one [mamluk?] from each emir [in Damascus] [1st. 255b/2nd. 240a/*TIQS* **259**]
- ABM: [72]
- IY: [644]

PMA75. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Âqtamur al-Barîdî al-Zâhirî was nominated *wâlî* of Cairo in replacement of Nâsir al-Dîn ibn al-Tablâwî [21st of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]

- ‘Aynî: Âqtamur al-Barîdî al-Zâhirî, a *sultânî* mamluk... [Ist.19 **59a**/Ist.be 130b]
- Maq.: [1081]
- IQS: [2nd. 240a]
- AJ: [138]
- IY: [644]

PMA76. – **[HI]** “News about the removal of the *hâjib* Shâhîn Tarkâsh [?] reached me.” [24th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]

- IQS: News arrived about removal of the *hâjib* Shâhîn Tarkâsh [1st. 255b/2nd. **240a**/TIQS 257]

PMA77. – **[HI]** {The viceroy of Damascus attacked the Arab tribesmen who were engaged in highway robbery. He returned the following day after he had captured a number of them and recovered material they had taken from people, but which ended up being looted by the mamluks}[25th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]

- IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. 240a-b]

PMA78. – **[HI]** An edict arrived from Cairo to remove from office all extra *hâjibs* whose number had reached [blank] and who were {list of the *hâjibs*}[At the end of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133b]

- IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. **240b**]

PMA79. – **[IT]** {When Duqmâq approached Aleppo, Damurdâsh proposed to Taghrîbirdî to head towards the Turcoman areas, but the latter disagreed arguing that only a victory would strengthen them in their eyes} [n.d.; 224]

PMA80. – **[HI]** ‘Abd al-Malik, the *wâlî*, who had just been appointed and who had occupied that position under Tamerlane, was removed and replaced by Jaqmaq, Ibn al-Ghâwî’s mamluk [2nd of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 133b]

- IQS: +{Negative comments about the *wâlîs*} [1st. 256a/2nd. **241a**]

PMA81. – **[Maq.]** Damurdâsh encountered Duqmâq at Hama and was defeated after a long fight during which many were hurt. Duqmâq and the soldiery from Damascus headed towards Aleppo, as the emirs of the city had won it over in the name of the sultan [2nd. of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 1081]

- IH: [4]
- IT: {The encounter did take place, and Duqmâq was on the verge of being defeated, when a number of the duo’s forces defected thus causing them to head north to the Turcomans, while Duqmâq took control of Aleppo} [n.d.; 224]
- ABM: [72]
- IY: [643]

PMA82. – **[HI]** Emîr Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Naqîb, the *hâjib*, the father of the two *hâjibs*, arrived in Damascus [4th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 133b]

- IQS: [1st. 256a]

PMA83. – [HI] Tidings were sounded at the citadel of Damascus because Damurdâsh had been defeated and had fled after a battle with Duqmâq that, it was said, had taken place outside of Hama. Previously, after Damurdâsh had left Aleppo, the chief of the Turcomans, a Dhû al-Ghâdir, took over the city in the name of the sultan, so that Damurdâsh could not return to it after his defeat and thus had to flee [5th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 133b]

– IQS: News arrived about the defeat and flight of Damurdâsh; the battle, during which many were hurt, had taken place near Hama and had lasted the whole day. [1st. 256a-b/2nd. 241a/TIQS 260]

PMA84. – [HI] News arrived that the battle, during which many were hurt, had taken place outside of Aleppo and that Asanbây had taken part in it [n.d.; 133b-134a]

– IQS [1st. 256a/2nd. 241a]

PMA85. – [HI] Tidings were sounded at the citadel of Damascus to celebrate the capture of Aleppo and its viceroy's entry into it [n.d.; 134a]

– IQS: [1st. 256a-b/2nd. 241b]

PMA86. – [HI] Emir Qarâbughâ, the *hâjib*, returned to Damascus after an absence of about two months [19th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 134a]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 241b]

PMA87. – [HI] There was a total of four *hâjibs*, Jaqmaq, Damurdâsh, Qarâbughâ and Abû Bakr ibn Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Naqîb, to whom the latter's brother, Sha'bân, was added [20th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 134a]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 241b/TIQS 260-1]

PMA88. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] News arrived from the viceroy of Damascus that Duqmâq had defeated Damurdâsh [21st of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 199b-200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 241b]

PMA89. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Jarkas al-Sûdûnî, the viceroy of al-Karak, was given an emirate of one hundred in Damascus [21st of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 242a/TIQS 261]

PMA90. – [HI] Asanbây, Baktamur and the troops that were sent as reinforcements to Duqmâq, returned to Damascus after an absence of more than a month [23rd of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 134a]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a]

PMA91. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Rukn al-Dîn Baybars, the *atâbak*, returned to Cairo from al-Buhayrah. [24th of Jumâdá al-Ûlá; 200a]

PMA92. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Damurdâsh al-Uljâ'î, an emir of forty from Aleppo, arrived in Cairo with news that the battle that opposed Duqmâq to Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî, had taken place between Aleppo and Qânâ, close to Hama, and that Duqmâq was first

defeated. After, it was Damurdâsh's turn and so he returned to Aleppo where he confiscated the property of some of its inhabitants; he then headed out of the city with his family and around thirty horsemen. Duqmâq then entered Aleppo and was well received by its inhabitants [25th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 241b-242a/TIQS 260]

PMA93. – [HI] {Tidings were sounded because the *hâjib* of Tripoli and others who had been imprisoned by the rebel viceroy of the city, had managed to free themselves from the citadel of [Blank] [28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134b]

– IQS: [1st. 256b]

PMA94. – [HI] Sadaqah was given the *niyâbat al-qal'ah* of Damascus, and so the drums were sounded, as was the habit [30th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134b¹⁰⁸]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a/TIQS 261]

PMA95. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Mihtâr arrived from the region of Nâblus and told that Surûq, the viceroy of Gaza, had rebelled [5th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 242a/TIQS 261]

– Anon.: [336b]

PMA96. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Altunbughâ al-'Uthmânî was nominated viceroy of Gaza instead of Surûq al-Zâhirî, who had rebelled [7th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 200a]

– 'Aynî: [8th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: [1083]

– IH: [8]

– IQS: [2nd. 242b/TIQS 261]

– IT: [221]

– AJ: [139]

– ABM: [74]

– IY: Jumâdá al-Úlá [646, 647]

– Anon.: [336b]

PMA97. – [HI] A missive arrived from the sultan to Salâmish, the *hâjib* of Gaza, asking him to arrest Surûq, the city's viceroy. [n.d.; 135a]

– ID/Al-Muntaqâ: The sultan had sent a letter to 'Umar ibn Fadl, the leader of the Hazm tribe to engage Surûq and arrest him [200a]

– IH: [14]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b/TIQS 261]

PMA98. – [HI] Surûq had been informed that thieves were engaged in highway robbery at [...?] so he went after them, captured them and returned to Gaza where he cut them at the waist. He took much of what they had stolen. Surûq learned about the sultan's letter [to Salâmish] and so headed for Gaza [n.d.; 135a]

– IH: [13-14]

¹⁰⁸ This report is written in Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah's hand in the top margin of this folio.

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b]

PMA99. – [HI] Surûq entered Gaza on the night of the 9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah. Battle drums were sounded at the Maydân of the city, while the emirs, among them Jarkas, the viceroy of al-Karak, gathered the troops at Tall al-Misriyyîn wherefrom they confronted Surûq's forces. About twenty horsemen came out and defeated the emirs: Jarkas was captured and Salâmish fled to the Arab tribesmen of 'Umar ibn Fadl of the Hazm tribe [9th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]

– ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: [200a]

– Maq.: Emir Surûq, the viceroy of Gaza, rode out and fought against Emir Salâmish, the *hâjib* and Emir Jarkas, the viceroy of al-Karak. The latter were defeated and Salâmish fled while Jarkas was captured. Salâmish gathered strength and sought the help of 'Umar ibn Fadl of the Hazm tribe [1082]

– IH: [14]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b/*TIQS* 261-2]

– ABM: [73]

– IY: [644-5]

PMA100. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] During the first decade of the month, the viceroy of Damascus sent a report that Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, the viceroy of Tripoli, had rebelled with the help of many Turcomans and seized Uljâybughâ al-Jamâlî, the *hâjib al-hujjâb* there, as well as the second *hâjib* and three other emirs, all of whom were imprisoned at al-Marqab [First decade of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 242b/*TIQS* 261]

– IY: [Rajab; 647]

– Anon.: [336a-b]

PMA101. – [HI] {Salâmish returned to Gaza with the Arab tribesmen and defeated Surûq who was arrested. Some looting took place, but 'Umar ibn Fadl prevented his men from engaging in it [14th-15th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]}

– ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: + Surûq was sent to Jerusalem as an unemployed ("*battâl*") emir [200a]

– Maq.: [1082]

– IH: [14]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b, 243a/*TIQS* 262]

– ABM: [73]

– IY: *Muqaddam al-barîd* [who had arrived with Surûq's sword] brought news that, following the rebellion of Surûq, the emir of the Hazm tribe had engaged the latter, defeated and killed him during the battle, and then sent his sword to the sultan; Surûq's belongings were confiscated [645, 647]

– Anon.: ['Umar ibn Fadl] followed Surûq, captured and beheaded him, then sent his head to the sultan in Cairo [336b]

PMA102. – [IQS] {A battle took place between ibn Nafad [?] and the 'Îsâs and the Wâ'îls. Emir Sûdûn al-Hâfizi rode out and, after seizing Ibn Nafad, the parties made peace [During the middle of the month of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 2nd. 243a]}

- PMA103. – [HI] News arrived that Surûq, the viceroy of Gaza, had rebelled and captured Jarkas the viceroy of al-Karak [16th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b]
- PMA104. – [HI] News about the capture of Surûq reached Damascus [18th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b-243a/TIQS 261]
- PMA105. – [HI] Ibn al-‘Afif was removed as *wâlî al-barr* in Syria and replaced by Sunqur [18th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
– IQS: [1st. 257b]
- PMA106. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Tughaytamur al-Barîdî, the *muqaddam al-barîd*, arrived in Cairo with the sword of Surûq al-Zâhirî [19th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 200a]
– IQS: [2nd. 243a]
– IY: [Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 647]
- PMA107. – [HI] Arrival of Ibn al-Hazîn, the new Syrian *wazîr* [20th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
– IQS: [1st. 257a-b/2nd. 243a]
- PMA108. – [HI] Arrival in Damascus of the response to the viceroy’s correspondence concerning Ibn al-Akhnâ’î, giving him free rein in this matter [1st of Rajab; 135b]
– IQS: [1st. 257b/2nd. 243b]
- PMA109. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Emir Quruqmâs al-Zâhirî, *wâlî al-‘Arab*, was nominated *kâshif* of al-Wajh al-Bahrî instead of Asanbughâ al-Sayfî Sûdûn Bâq [1st of Rajab; 200a-b]
- PMA110. – [HI] {Asanbây was nominated *ra’s maymanah* but he did not receive the *iqtâ’* that went with the position. Rather, it was an emir called Taghrîbirdî who got it. This person had been in Cairo and upon his return to Damascus he became overseer of the *waqfs*, a position he abused with his harshness towards those in charge of them} [3rd of Rajab; 135b]
– IQS: ...Taghrîbirdî al-Qajqârî... [1st. 257b/2nd. 243b/TIQS 262]
- PMA111. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Emir Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Sunqur al-Yahyâwî’s emirate of forty was taken away from him and three days later he was appointed *nâzir* of the Jabalîyah *waqfs* [3rd of Rajab; 200b]
– IQS: [2nd. 243b/TIQS 262]
- PMA112. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] News arrived in Cairo that Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî and Taghrîbirdî had gathered a large number of Turcomans and headed to Aleppo where they clashed with Duqmâq al-Muḥammadî who utterly defeated them and plundered all their belongings [During the middle decade of Rajab; 200b]

PMA113. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Emir Baysaq al-Shaykhî, the *amîr akhûr*, arrived from the Hijâz and told of the completion of the building of the Haram with the exception of the roofs. He also told of a verbal exchange with a group of Arab tribesmen, which led him to ride out of Mecca [During the middle decade of the month of Rajab; 200b]

– IQS: [2nd. 244a/TIQS 263]

– Anon.: [336b]

PMA114. – **[HI]** {Ibn Shâkir, who had been replaced as *wazîr* by Ibn Hazîn, the Egyptian, resumed this position one month after the arrival of the latter}[20th of Rajab; 136a]

– IQS: [1st. 258a/2nd. 244a/TIQS 259]

PMA115. – **[HI]** “Ibn al-Bâniyâsî, the *ustâdâr* of the viceroy of Damascus, was nominated *shâdd al-muhimmât* and given all that had been the administrative responsibilities of Sha‘bân ibn Shihâb al-Dîn, the *hâjib*, save the *dîwân al-mufrad*. A robe of honour was bestowed upon *nâzir al-jaysh*, and I heard that Ibn Sunqur was appointed *shâdd al-awqâf*.”[20th of Rajab; 136a]

– IQS: ... Sha‘bân ibn Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Barîdî... [1st. 258a/2nd. **244a-b**]

PMA116. – **[HI]** Emir Nâsir al-Dîn ibn Sunqur, who had been *hâjib* in the past, was added to the others holding this position [1st of Sha‘bân; 136b]

– IQS: + [1st. 258b/2nd. 245a/TIQS 264]

PMA117. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Mubârak Shâh, the *wazîr* in Egypt, fled along with the *nâzir al-dawlah* [3rd of Sha‘bân; 200b]

– IQS: [2nd. 245a]

PMA118. – **[HI]** The viceroy headed towards the tribal zone in Syria and stayed at al-Khayrîyah [?] [4th of Sha‘bân; 136b¹⁰⁹]

– IQS: [1st. 258b]

PMA119. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Emir Fakhr al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Ghurâb was nominated *wazîr* instead of Mubârak Shâh, and became in charge of *nazar al-khâss*. That same day Mubârak Shâh arrived dressed as a *faqîr* and was arrested, shackled but then released. He reverted back to his position of *hâjib* and *kâshif jusûr* of al-Jîzîyah [8th of Sha‘bân; 200b-201a]

– IQS: [2nd. 245a, 245a-b/TIQS 264-5]

PMA120. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Arghûn Shâh al-Sâlihî, an emir of ten, headed towards Syria with a letter to Damurdâsh granting him amnesty and an emirate of one hundred in Damascus, in response to his sending of his nephew with this request. Taghrîbirdî was to go to Jerusalem as an unemployed (“*battâl*”) emir [29th of Sha‘bân; 201a]

– IQS: [2nd. 246a]

¹⁰⁹ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- PMA121. – [HI] {An edict issued by the sultan arrived in Damascus ordering the viceroy to send emirs of ten and forty to the southern provinces of Syria, such as ‘Ajlûn, al-Salt, etc., in order to protect harvests} [At the end of Sha‘bân; 137b]
– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a/TIQS 266]
- PMA122. – [HI] Surûq, who had been the viceroy of Gaza, was given an emirate of forty to which was added the revenues of villages thus making it the equivalent of an emirate of one hundred. He then made the request to become *kâshif* of the Wajh al-Qiblî in Syria and *shâdd* of the al-Aghwâr region, which was granted to him; in this job, he was very useful in fending off the Arab tribesmen. [During the month of Sha‘bân; 137b]
– Maq.: [1082]
– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a/TIQS 266]
– ABM: [75]
- PMA123. – [IH] {Ibn Sûjî and his Turcomans raided the region of Tripoli, but was defeated by the future sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh} [During the month of Sha‘bân; 16-7]
– ABM: [75]
- PMA124. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Fâris al-Dîn Shâhîn al-Sa‘dî, the *tawâshî* and the sultan’s *lâlâ*, left Cairo with a robe of investiture for Surûq al-Zâhirî appointing the latter as *kâshif* of the Wajh al-Qiblî in Syria and *shâdd* of al-Aghwâr [3rd of Ramadân; 201a]
– IQS: [2nd. 246a]
- PMA125. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Yûnus al-Zâhirî was nominated *hâjib* in Alexandria instead of Emir Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn Sallâm [At the beginning of Ramadân; 201a]
– IQS: [2nd. 246a-b]
- PMA126. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Mankalîbughâ al-Khudarî [?], who had been *hâjib* in Alexandria, was nominated *shâdd al-dawâwîn* instead of Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn Rajab [At the beginning of Ramadân; 201a]
– IQS: [2nd. 246a]
- PMA127. – [HI] Arrival of the nomination papers of ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn al-Qirimî al-Halabî as *kâtib al-sirr* in Tripoli [At the beginning of Ramadân; 138a]
– IQS: [1st. 259a]
- PMA128. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn Rajab was nominated *hâjib* in Cairo, but without an *iqṭâ‘* [14th of Ramadân; 201a]
– IQS: [2nd. 246a]
- PMA129. – [HI] {Arrival in Damascus of the sultan’s *amîr akhûr* to collect money due to his master} [23rd of Ramadân; 138a]
– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246b¹¹⁰]

¹¹⁰ In this folio, this report is struck through.

PMA130. – [HI] Damurdâsh and his party had gone to Aleppo along with Ibn Ramadân and a large group of people. Duqmâq, the viceroy of Aleppo, rode out to confront them and readied his troops for battle. When Nu‘ayr arrived during the night of the 18th, Damurdâsh’s party fled, was pursued, caught up with and plundered [18th-19th of Ramadân; 138a]

- Maq.: [1082]
- IH: [3-4, 4]
- IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246b/TIQS 266]
- ABM: ...Ibn Ramadân, the emir of Adanah... [75-6]
- IY: [646]

PMA131. – [HI] News reached Damascus that Damurdâsh and his party had been defeated [26th of Ramadân; 138a]

- IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246b]

PMA132. – [HI] Following an absence of a little less than two month, the viceroy of Damascus returned to the city after he had gone to the al-Wajh al-Qiblî and visited Jerusalem. He remained in Damascus until Friday [the second of Shawwâl] then headed with the troops to al-Marj [28th of Ramadân; 138a]

- IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 246b]

PMA133. – [Maq.] During those days, the antagonism amongst the emirs increased, and Nawrûz, Jakam and Qânîbây refrained from attending upon the sultan. The month of Ramadân came and went, and the emirs neither attended upon the sultan to present their wishes to him on the occasion of the ‘Îd, nor did they pray with him [n.d.; 1083]

- ‘Aynî: At the end of Ramadân, many rumours circulated [concerning tensions] amongst the grandees of Egypt, on the one hand, between Sûdûn Tâz, the *amîr akhûr kabîr*, and on the other, Nawrûz al-Hâfîzî and Jakam, the *dawâdâr al-kabîr*. Thus, Nawrûz, Jakam and Qânîbây neither attended upon the sultan and presented their wishes to him on the occasion of ‘Îd al-Fitr, nor did they go up to the Citadel to pray with him. The sultan prayed on his own in the mosque of the Citadel and the above-mentioned emirs in their homes [At the end of Ramadân; Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]
- IH: [9]
- IT: [221]
- AJ: [139]
- ABM: [74, 76-7]
- IY: [650]
- Anon.: [337b]

PMA134. – [‘Aynî] “On the second day of ‘Îd al-Fitr, Friday the second of Shawwâl, the great conflict between Sûdûn Tâz and Nawrûz al-Hâfîzî and Jakam erupted. The sultan went down to the Stables and sat at the chair installed on the fortification wall overlooking al-Rumaylah square, which is below the citadel.¹¹¹ Sûdûn Tâz joined the sultan there early in the day and sent a small group of men to arrest Nawrûz at his home.

¹¹¹ See Popper, *Syria and Egypt*, p. 64, map 8.

Nawrûz stood in front of his house, while Emirs Jakam, Qânîbây and Qurqmâs al-Rammâh rode out along with many emirs and mamluks. The battle between the warring parties, during which many men and horses were wounded, lasted from the morning until noon, and even though it saw no winner, the pendulum was tilting in Nawrûz's favour, and had Sûdûn Tâz not resorted to trickery, he and his supporters would have been defeated. Sûdûn Tâz had instructed the sultan to send the caliph and the four *quḍât al-quḍâ'* to Nawrûz to sue for reconciliation, something to which the latter acquiesced. As a result his resolve and that of those with him petered out, as they all laid aside their weapons at the end of that day. An emir whom I trust and who had been with Sûdûn Tâz, informed me that had Nawrûz and Jakam postponed their acceptance of reconciliation for just another hour, Sûdûn Tâz would have been overtaken and arrested, but Allâh willed otherwise." [2nd of Shawwâl; Ist.19 59a-b/Ist.B2 130b-131a]

–ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*: The parties of, on the one hand, Emirs Nawrûz al-Hâfizi, Jakam and Qânîbây, and on the other, Emir Sûdûn Tâz, war-readied themselves, and as the sultan went down and settled in the Royal Stables, the emirs and the *sultânî* mamluks fought. After the intervention of the qadis and the caliph, the warring parties reconciled, so the sultan went back to the Citadel and the emirs to their homes [2nd of Shawwâl; 201a-b/ *Al-Nafḥah* 328-9]

– HI: The emirs of Egypt quarrelled/The reason behind this was that Emir Jakam, the *dawâdâr*, decided with Nawrûz al-Hâfizi, the *amîr kabîr*, and others, to rise against Sûdûn Tâz, the *amîr akhûr* and *amîr kabîr* and the sultan's party [138a; 138b]

– Maq.: [1083]

– IH: [9, 12]

– IQS: [1st. 259b-260a/2nd. 247a/TIQS 266-7]

– IT: [221]

– AJ: [139]

– ABM: [77]

– IY: + {Verse} [650-1, 652]

– Anon.: [337b; 339a]

PMA135. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The caliph and the qadis were summoned to the Citadel where they met with the sultan. They then went down to the city and did a round of the homes of the emirs who were made to swear allegiance to the sultan [2nd of Shawwâl; 201b/*Al-Nafḥah* 329]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 59b/Ist.B2 131a]

– Maq.: [1083]

– IH: [12]

– IQS: ...and they did a round of the homes of Nawrûz, Baybars, the *atâbak*, and those of the rest of the emirs, all of whom they made to swear allegiance to the sultan [2nd. 247a]

– IT: [222]

– IY: + {Verse} [651]

PMA136. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {Emir Nawrûz went up to the Citadel and made peace with Sûdûn Tâz} [5th of Shawwâl; 201b]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 59b/Ist.B2 131a]

- Maq.: [1083]
- IH: Nawrûz went up to attend upon the sultan and was invested with a robe of honour [12]
- IQS: [2nd. 247a]
- IT: [222]
- AJ: [8th of Shawwâl; 139]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: + {Verse} [651]
- Anon.: The emirs went up to the citadel and were invested with robes of honour [337b-338a]

PMA137. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] A letter arrived from the viceroy of Aleppo with news that he had engaged Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî for the third time. The son of Nu‘ayr, along with a number of Arab tribesmen, had come to help him and during two days they clashed with Damurdâsh who was accompanied by Aḥmad ibn Ramadân and his Turcomans. They then sent for Nu‘ayr who was nearby, and when Damurdâsh heard about his arrival, he went away at the beginning of the evening and was pursued by his foes. In the morning of the following day, Duqmâq and Nu‘ayr reached the encampment of Ibn Ramadân where they utterly defeated the latter, and plundered, it was said, over sixty thousand tents and everything therein. This good news was brought by Sumâq [?], the brother of Duqmâq, the viceroy of Aleppo [5th of Shawwâl 201b]

- IQS: + “I read in the history of Egypt that the son of Nu‘ayr arrived to support Duqmâq, the viceroy of Aleppo” [n.d.; 2nd. 246b¹¹²/TIQS 269]

PMA138. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] Emir Jakam, the *dawâdâr*, went up to the Citadel where there was talk that Qânîbây al-‘Alâ’î would become viceroy of Hama. When they brought him a robe like that of Nawrûz, he refused to wear it and said: “You send my friend into exile, and you expect me to wear a robe!” He then went home [8th of Shawwâl; 201b/*Al-Nafḥah* 329]

- ‘Aynî: Jakam went up to the Citadel, but he was afraid as many rumours circulated thereabouts. Neither Qânîbây, nor Qurqmâs went up to the citadel with him, and when they were summoned, they could not be found. Two robes of investiture were prepared one for Qânîbây as viceroy of Hama, and the second for Qurqmâs as *hâjib* in Damascus. Jakam went down from the citadel without a robe of investiture [Ist.19 59b/Ist.B2 131a]
- Maq.: [1083-4]
- IH: Jakam went up to the citadel but was not invested with a robe [12]
- IQS: Qânîbây was appointed viceroy of Hama [2nd. 247a/TIQS 267]
- IT: [222]
- AJ: Jakam also went up to the citadel and was invested with a robe, so that tensions settled down [139]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: [651]

¹¹² This report is written in the margin of this folio.

PMA139. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] Baybars, the *atâbak*, was invested with a robe of honour giving him full powers [201b; 8th of Shawwâl]
 – IQS: [2nd. 247a]

PMA140. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] The sultan sent to Jakam a *tashrif* investing Qânîbây with the viceroyalty of Hama; [the carriers of the message] said: “This is the *tashrif* of your brother Qânîbây al-‘Alâ’î.” He replied: “Send it to his own house.” When they went there, they did not find him [8th of Shawwâl **201b**/*Al-Nafhah* 329]

– ‘Aynî: Emirs Sarmâsh, the *ra’s nawbah*, and Bashbây, the *hâjib*, went down to the house of Jakam and asked for Qânîbây, thinking that he was there. Jakam said: “He is not at my place.” They then looked for him [Ist.19 **59b**/Ist.B2 131a]

– Maq.: [1084]

– IH: Qânîbây had been given the viceroyalty of Hama but had refused it/Jakam was asked about the whereabouts of a number of emirs who were with him, but even though he knew about them, he denied it [9, 12]

– IQS: [2nd. 247a]

– IT: [222]

– ABM: [77]

– IY: [651]

– Anon.: [338a]

PMA141. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {During the rest of the day, Jakam transferred his belongings out of his house to Birkat al-Habash,¹¹³ and so did Qânîbây al-‘Alâ’î and Qurqmâs al-Înâlî. They were joined by a number of important *sultânî* mamluks such as Yashbak al-Sâqî, Yashbak al-‘Uthmânî, Qurqmâs al-Khâzindâr, etc., and about five hundred others. They stayed there until Friday the 9th} [8th-9th of Shawwâl **201b-202a**/*Al-Nafhah* 329]

– ‘Aynî: {Jakam rode out with a number of emirs and mamluks to Birkat al-Habash} [The night of Friday the 9th; Ist.19 **59b**/Ist.B2.131a]

– Maq.: [1084]

– IH: [9, 12]

– IQS: Jakam was furious, so he rode out along with Qânîbây and Qurqmâs al-Înâlî to Birkat al-Habash + [2nd. 247a-b/*TIQS* 267]

– IT: [222]

– AJ: [140]

– ABM: [77]

– IY: [651-2]

– Anon.: [338a]

PMA142. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] Nawrûz al-Hâfizî went up to the Citadel where he prayed with the sultan. He had just left when he was summoned back by means of a *jâmdâr*, but he refused to acquiesce [9th of Shawwâl; **202a**/*Al-Nafhah* 329]

– IQS: [2nd. 247b]

– Anon.: [338a]

¹¹³ Located south of Cairo; see *Egypt and Syria*, p. 37 and p. 61, map no. 5.

PMA143. – [HI] The viceroy of Damascus and the troops went to al-Marj where they remained [138a; 9th of Shawwâl]
 – IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b]

PMA144. – [HI] {In his missive, Ibn H̱ijjî's brother said that a letter had arrived in Hama on the 5th of Shawwâl from the viceroy of Aleppo, which reported that after the defeat of Ibn Ramadân and Damurdâsh and their flight, a Turcoman emir who was Ibn Ramadân's adversary caught up with him and insulted him [n.d.; 138b]
 – IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b]

PMA145. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] {Nawrûz met with a number of emirs, among others Tamurbughâ al-Mashtûb and Sûdûn min Zâdah, and under the cover of darkness went to Jakam while the people in the Citadel shot at them with arrows and naphta} [9th of Shawwâl; 202a/*Al-Nafhah* 329]
 – ‘Aynî: + There were about two thousand rebels, emirs and mamluks [Ist.19 59b/Ist.B2 131a]
 – Maq.: [1084]
 – IH: [12]
 – IQS: [2nd. 247b/*TIQS* 267]
 – IT: [222]
 – AJ: [140-1]
 – ABM: [77]
 – IY: [652]
 – Anon.: [338a]

PMA146. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] The *sultânî* mamluks and the emirs assembled at Sûq al-Khayl¹¹⁴ and then dispersed the same day. The qadis were summoned to the Citadel and were made to stay at the Royal Stables until the end of the day. All that and the emirs at Birkat al-H̱abash were becoming more and more numerous [10th of Shawwâl; 202a/*Al-Nafhah* 329]
 – Anon.: The emirs who supported the sultan went up to Sûq al-Khayl [338a]

PMA147. – [‘Aynî] [The rebel emirs] stayed there [at Birkat al-H̱abash] Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, and whenever they met with the supporters of Sûdûn Tâz, they skirmished [10th-13th of Shawwâl; Ist.19 59b/Ist.B2 131a]
 – IH: [9]
 – AJ: [141]

PMA148. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*] A group of emirs and mamluks from amongst those at Birkat al-H̱abash rode out to al-Qubbat al-Ṣafrâ¹¹⁵ [?], took the horses of some emirs and then left [11th of Shawwâl; 202a]
 – IQS: A group of emirs and mamluks from amongst those at Birkat al-H̱abash came to al-Qubbat al-Ṣafrâ' but no one came out to confront them [2nd. 247b]

¹¹⁴ Located just below the western fortifications of the Citadel; see *ibid.*, p. 26 and p. 37 and p. 64, map no. 8.

¹¹⁵ I found no reference to this spot in any of the works I consulted.

PMA149. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {A violent clash took place between rebel and loyalist emirs and mamluks at the Qarâfah al-Sughrah¹¹⁶ during which a number of the latter were killed and injured. Some were captured and brought back to the rebel camp where they were well treated, and then released with a letter for the sultan. In it the rebels assured the sovereign of their loyalty, but questioned his decision to support Sûdûn Tâz. The rebels' letter only added to the sultan's resolve [13th of Shawwâl; 202a]

– IQS [2nd. 247b/*TIQS* 267]

– IY: + {The clash took place at the mausoleum of Qadi Bakkâr} [652]

– Anon.: [338a]

PMA150. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {A number of emirs, among others, Sûdûn al-Jalb and Tamurbughâ al-Turuntâ'î joined the rebels} [13th of Shawwâl; 202a]

– IQS [2nd. 247b/*TIQS* 267]

– IY: [652]

PMA151. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] The sultan had lantern men proclaim to the *sultânî* mamluks that he was calling for a review of troops for tomorrow, the day when the fighting will take place, and that whoever refrained from showing up would have only himself to blame [13th of Shawwâl; **202a**/*Al-Nafhah* 329]

– IQS [2nd. 247b]

PMA152. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {Since the qadis had received letters from the rebels summoning them, the sultan had Emir Ahmad ibn Rajab ibn Kalbak issue an edict enjoining them to stay at the Sultân Hasan *madrasah*. After the sultan's victory they went and saluted him, then headed home} [13th of Shawwâl; 202b]

– IQS [2nd. 248a]

PMA153. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {The sultan rode out with the caliph and the emirs, and headed with the troops towards al-Qarâfah, with the supporters of Sûdûn Tâz and Yashbak leading the way. The loyalists met their foes, defeated them and captured some, among others, Tamurbughâ al-Mashtûb and Sûdûn min Zâdah, while the likes of Nawrûz, Jakam and Qânîbây al-'Alâ'î fled} [14th of Shawwâl; **202a-b**/*Al-Nafhah* 329-30]

– 'Aynî: + {The sultan's foes were confused because they thought fighting would take place on Thursday the 15th, the day after the troop review. This was a trick by Sûdûn Tâz} [Ist.19 **59b-60a**/Ist.B2 131a]

– Maq.: [1084-5]

– IH: [12, 12-13]

– IQS [2nd. 247b-248a/*TIQS* 267-8]

– IT: [222-3]

– AJ: [141]

– ABM: [77]

– IY: + {Verse} [652-3]

– Anon.: [338a, 338b]

¹¹⁶ A quarter located south of the Citadel; see *ibid.*, p. 36 and p. 37 and p. 61, map no. 5.

PMA154. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {The defeated emirs who managed to flee headed towards the Sa'íd with Ibn al-Turkîyah and three hundred of his Arab tribesmen, then went to al-Jîzah where they stole horses that belonged to emirs and stayed there for three days. The sultan corresponded with them while they were there} [14th of Shawwâl; 202b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60a/Ist.B2 131a-b]
- Maq.: [1085]
- IQS [2nd. 248a/TIQS 268]
- IT: [223]
- AJ: [141, 142]
- IY: [654]
- Anon.: + The sultan sent them an amnesty [338b]

PMA155. – **[HI]** It was rumoured that Emir Shâhîn Tarkâsh, the previous *hâjib*, was killed, reportedly by the inhabitants of Talfitâ because he had arrested from amongst them a number of evildoers [15th of Shawwâl; 138b]

- IQS Emir Shâhîn Tarkâsh who had been a *hâjib* in one of the villages of the Jubbah¹¹⁷.... [1st. 259b]

PMA156. – **[HI]** {The viceroy of Safad captured Sunbur Bayk [?], the emir of the Hârithah tribe, because of his rebelliousness and evildoing} [During those days; 138b]

- IH: [17]
- IQS: ...Mutayrik, the emir of the Hârithah tribe... [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b/TIQS 270]

PMA157. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Tamurbughâ al-Mashtûb and Sûdûn min Zâdah were sent to prison in Alexandria in the company of Sûdûn Bâÿ [17th of Shawwâl; 203a]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60a/Ist.B2 131a]
- Maq.: [1085]
- IH: [13]
- IQS: [2nd. 248b/TIQS 268]
- IT: [223]
- AJ: [141]
- IY: [653-4]
- Anon.: [339a]

PMA158. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {Yashbak al-Sha'bânî, who had been summoned by the sultan on the 15th of the month, arrived from Alexandria and was very well received by Sûdûn Tâz}/Emir Yashbak was released [19th of Shawwâl; **203a/Al-Nafhah 330**]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60a/Ist.B2 131b]
- Maq.: [1085]
- IH: [13]
- IQS: [2nd. 248b/TIQS 268]
- IT: [223]
- AJ: [142]
- ABM: [78]

¹¹⁷ A district in the Anti-Lebanon Range which includes the village of Talfitâ; see Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 124, footnote no. 735.

- IY: [654]
- Anon.: [339a]

PMA159. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {The sultan bestowed a robe of honour on Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî} [20th of Shawwâl; 203a]
 – IQS: [2nd. 248b]

PMA160. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {Nawrûz returned to the fold on the 20th of Shawwâl and settled in the house of Baybars, after both the latter and Înâl Bâi ibn Qijmâs pledged that he would not be hurt and that he would be given the viceroyalty of Damascus}/One by one they returned to the fold, first Nawrûz [20th of Shawwâl; **202b-203a/Al-Nafhah 330**]
 – ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60a/Ist.B2 131b]
 – Maq.: [1085]
 – IH: [13]
 – IQS: [2nd. 248a¹¹⁸/TIQS 268]
 – IT: [223]
 – AJ: [142]
 – IY: [654]
 – Anon.: The sultan made it known that Nawrûz would be nominated to the viceroyalty of Damascus; as a result the emir went to the house of Baybars [339b]

PMA161. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Nawrûz al-Hâfizî, who was at the house of Baybars, received there the robe investing him with the viceroyalty of Damascus for him to wear [20th of Shawwâl; 203a]
 – ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]
 – Maq.: [1086]
 – IQS: A robe investing Nawrûz al-Hâfizî with the viceroyalty of Damascus was sent to him at the house of Baybars [2nd. **248b-249a/TIQS 268**]
 – IT: [224]
 – AJ: [143]
 – IY: [655]

PMA162. – **[HI]** Tidings were sounded in Damascus after the arrival of a letter from the viceroy of Safad with news that the sultan had defeated his foes [20th of Shawwâl; 138b]
 – IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 249a]

PMA163. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {Emir Jakam made known his interest in going to Damietta as an unemployed (“*battâl*”) emir. His request was granted, but when he came to Cairo he was arrested and sent to prison in Alexandria in the company of Uzbek al-Dawâdâr. Yashbak al-Shaybânî promised to the latter that he would compensate him if he refrained from mulcting Jakam/Then Jakam [returned to the fold] [20th-21st of Shawwâl; **203a/Al-Nafhah 330**]
 – ‘Aynî: +{Jakam was abandoned by his men} [21st-22nd of Shawwâl; Ist.19 60a/Ist.B2 131b]
 – Maq.: [1085]

¹¹⁸ A section of this report is written in the margin of this folio.

- IH: Jakam was sent to the citadel of al-Marqab [13]
- IQS: [2nd. 249a/TIQS 268-9]
- IT: [223, 224]
- AJ: [142-3]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: [654]
- Anon.: [339a]

PMA164. – [**Aynî**] {Nawrûz was summoned to the Citadel where he was arrested and sent a prisoner to Alexandria. Emirs Baybars and Īnâl, who had guaranteed his safety, were angry and refused to attend upon the sultan until the emirs intervened} [22nd of Shawwâl; Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]

- ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: [203a¹¹⁹/*Al-Nafhah* 330]
- Maq.: [1086]
- IH: [13]
- IQS: [2nd. 249a/TIQS 269]
- IT: [224]
- AJ: [143]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: [655]
- Anon.: [338b-339a]

*PMA165. – [**IQS**] As for Qânîbây al-‘Alâ’î, Qurqmâs al-Īnâlî al-Rammâh and Jânîbâk al-Ashqar, they vanished in the city and nobody heard anything about them [22nd of Shawwâl; 2nd. 249b/TIQS 269]

- ID: [*Al-Nafhah* 330]
- ‘Aynî: As for Qânîbây and Qurqmâs, they both vanished in the city and nobody heard anything about them [Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]
- Maq.: [1086]
- IH: Qânîbây vanished and nobody heard anything about him [13]
- IT: [224]
- AJ: [143]
- IY: [655]

PMA166. – [**HI**] The viceroy and the troops entered Damascus back from al-Marj [22nd of Shawwâl; 138b]

- IQS: [1st. 260a/2nd. 249a]

PMA167. – [**HI**] {A document arrived from Cairo nominating Surûq as *kâshif al-kushshâf*, on top of his responsibilities as *kâshif* of al-Aghwâr} [During those days; 138b-139a]

- IH: [14]
- IQS: [1st. 260a/2nd. 249a]

¹¹⁹ The *Muntaqá min Târikh Ibn Duqmâq* ends at the point of the refusal of the two emirs to attend upon the sultan at the Citadel.

*PMA168. – [IQS] {The *iqṭā'* of Yashbak, which had been given to Jakam, was returned to him. As for the important mamluks of the sultan's *khâssakîyah* who were with Nawrûz and Jakam, such as Īnâl al-Ilyâsî, Ashbak al-'Uthmânî, and others, they were given *iqṭā'*s in Syria} [26th of Shawwâl; 2nd. 249a-b/TIQS 269]

*PMA169. – [IQS] Âqtamur al-Barîdî was nominated *hâjib* on top of being *wâlî* of Cairo [26th of Shawwâl; 2nd. 249b]

*PMA170. – [IQS] Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî, who had been *ustâdâr*, reappeared and went up to the Citadel where he kissed the ground in front of the sultan, then paid visit to the emirs after which he headed home [26th of Shawwâl; 2nd. 249b/TIQS 270]

PMA171. – [Maq.] The papers nominating Shaykh al-Mahmûdî as viceroy of Damascus were written [27th of Shawwâl; 1086]

- IH: [17] [SHM52]
- IQS: [2nd. 249b¹²⁰]
- IT: [225]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: [655]

*PMA172. – [IQS] Sûdûn Baqjah and Alṭunbughâ al-Dawâdâr were sent to fetch, respectively, Âqbây al-Karakî and both Quṭlûbughâ al-Ḥasanî al-Karakî and Jarkas al-Qâsimî [29th of Shawwâl; 2nd. 249b]

- ID: Âqbây al-Karakî, Quṭlûbughâ al-Karakî and Jarkas al-Qâsimî were released from prison [*Al-Nafḥah* 330]

PMA173. – [HI] News reached Damascus that the clash between the Zâhirî mamluks and the sultan had taken place and that Faraj had defeated Nawrûz and Jakam who were arrested. As a result of this, tidings were sounded [29th of Shawwâl; 139a]

- IQS: [1st 260a/2nd. 249b]

PMA174. – [HI] News reached Damascus that the *kâshif* of Nâblus was killed, reportedly by Arab tribesmen [29th of Shawwâl; 139a]

- IQS: [1st 260a]

*PMA175. – [IQS] {Redistribution of *iqṭā'*s} [3rd of Dhû al-Qa'dah; 2nd. 250a/TIQS 270-1]

- 'Aynî: [Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]
- Maq.: [1086-7]
- IT: [223, 224-5]
- AJ: [143-4]
- ABM: [77]
- IY: [655]

¹²⁰ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

PMA176. – [HI] With the arrival of the news about the arrest of Nawrûz and Jakam, which took place at the beginning of the second decade of Shawwâl, tidings were sounded in Damascus [3rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a¹²¹]

– IQS: [1st 260a]

PMA177. – [HI] The sultan’s *khâzindâr* brought to Damascus a letter from Faraj relating the conflict in Egypt, which took place over the course of the 2nd and [10th of Shawwâl¹²²] and culminated with the great battle of the 14th. Measures were taken to celebrate this event} [4th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a]

– IQS: [1st 260a/2nd. 250a]

PMA178. – [‘Aynî] {The rest of the emirs who were imprisoned in Alexandria, namely Âqbây al-Karakî, Qutlûbughâ al-Karakî and Jarkas al-Muṣârî‘, arrived in Cairo. Sûdûn Tâz had intended to send them out to Syria, but he did not succeed so numerous were members of their party and the sultan’s leaning towards them} [6th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]

– Maq.: [1087]

– IQS: [2nd. 250a¹²³/TIQS 270]

– IT: [225]

– AJ: [144]

– ABM: [77]

– IY: [655]

– Anon.: [339a]

PMA179. – [HI] In Damascus, the *hâjib* organized a banquet at Qubbat Yalbughâ, which was attended by the viceroy and the emirs [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a]

– IQS: [1st 260a/2nd. 250a-b]

*PMA180. – [IQS] The emirs who arrived from Alexandria were invested with appointments: Qutlûbughâ al-Karakî was given back his *iqṭâ‘* [the rest is unreadable] [8th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 2nd. 250a¹²⁴]

– ‘Aynî: The emirs who had arrived from Alexandria were invested with silk robes of honour embroidered with gold [6th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.19 60b]

– Maq.: [1087]

– AJ: [145]

– IY: [655]

PMA181. – [HI] {The sultan’s brief ordering the removal from office of Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî arrived in Damascus. Âqbughâ left for Jerusalem a few days later. The letter also reported that Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî had been released from prison, as well as the two Karakîs, Âqbây and Qutlûbughâ} [9th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a]

¹²¹ This report is written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah’s hand in the margin of this folio.

¹²² The words in brackets are written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah’s hand in the margin of fol. 139a.

¹²³ A section of this report appears in the margin of this folio.

¹²⁴ This report is written in the bottom margin of this folio.

- Maq.: {The sultan’s brief ordering the removal from office of Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî arrived in Damascus} [1087]
- IH: Âqbughâ al-Jamâlî was retired to Damascus [sic] [18]
- IQS: [1st 260a¹²⁵/2nd. 250b/TIQS 271]
- IY: [656]

PMA182. – [HI] A letter arrived from the viceroy of Aleppo in which he asked for help because Qarâ Yûsuf, Ibn Ramadân and so and so, had assembled and had entered Marj [blank] on their way to Aleppo. The viceroy’s envoy was immediately despatched to the sultan [10th of Dhû al-Qa’dah; 139a]

- IQS: [1st 260a-b/2nd. 250b]

*PMA183. – [IQS] {Sa’d al-Dîn ibn Ghurâb¹²⁶ was nominated *ustâdâr* after a mamluk of the sultan’s *khâssakîyah* and a number of his friends aggressed Ibn Ghurâb with daggers} [13th of Dhû al-Qa’dah; 2nd. 250a-b]

*PMA184. – [IQS] Yalbughâ al-Sâlimî was summoned to the house of Baybars, the *atâbak*, and was informed of the sultan’s order for him and his family to go to Damietta; an order upon which he acted by leaving on Sunday [the 16th] [14th of Dhû al-Qa’dah; 2nd. 250b]

- ‘Aynî: [18th of Dhû al-Qa’dah; Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]
- Maq.: [1088]
- AJ: [145]
- ABM: [78]
- IY: [656]

PMA185. – [HI] {The viceroy of Damascus left for Jerusalem, as the steward of the new incumbent, Shaykh al-Mahmûdî, reached the city with orders that the soldiery be war-ready upon his arrival} [17th of Dhû al-Qa’dah; 139a-b]

- Maq.: [1087]
- IQS: [1st 260b/2nd. 250b]
- IT: [225]
- ABM: [78]
- IY: [656]

*PMA186. – [IQS] The emirs were playing ball at the house of Baybars, the *atâbak*. When Sûdûn Tâz and Yashbak al-Sha’bânî went out they were confronted by about three hundred new *julbân* mamluks, [and an Egyptian source even said that they were more than a thousand¹²⁷]. They said to Sûdûn, among other things: “You have expelled our brothers in order to weaken us.” Sûdûn and Yashbak then rode up to the Royal Stables and closed its doors while the mamluks gathered below the gate of the Citadel and heaped abuse at the two. After an hour, Yashbak left and the mamluks insulted him until he reached his place. At noon, the sultan sent out the *hâjibs* who went and fetched two of the

¹²⁵ Parts of this report are written in the margin of this folio.

¹²⁶ On Sa’d al-Dîn Ibrâhîm ibn Ghurâb (d. 808/1406), see Marthel-Toumian, *Les Civils et l’administration*, pp. 100-2.

¹²⁷ The sentence in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 250b.

mamluks responsible for the disorder. They were beaten and the disturbance stopped [18th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 2nd. **250b-251a/TIQS 271**]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]
- Maq.: [1087]
- IH: [22]
- IT: [225]
- AJ: [145]
- IY: [656]

*PMA187. – **[IQS]** Baybars was confirmed as *atâbak* and Yashbak retook his position of *dawâdâr* in replacement of Jakam [24th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 2nd. **251a/TIQS 269**]

- ID: [*Al-Nafhah* 330]
- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60b-61a/Ist.B2 131b-132a]
- Maq.: [1088]
- IH: [13, 22]
- IT: [225]
- ABM: [78]
- AJ: [145]
- IY: [656]

*PMA188. – **[IQS]** Karîm al-Dîn was appointed *wâlî* of Qatyâ instead of his brother, Emir Tâj al-Dîn ibn al-Razzâq, of whom six hundred thousand dirhams were taken [24th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 2nd. **251a/TIQS 271-2**]

PMA189. – **[ID]** {A conflict occurred between Khidr ibn Mûsâ ibn Massîs and the leaders (“*mashâyikh*”) of the city of Tarûjah,¹²⁸ and so the former came to Cairo asking for help. Ten emirs of one hundred, among others Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî and Sûdûn Tâz, fourteen emirs of forty, and about a thousand of the sultan’s mamluks went back with him to al-Buḥayrah province. There they remained a few days and then returned after peace was established between the rival parties} [n.d.; *Al-Nafhah* 331]

- ‘Aynî: The troops from Egypt left Cairo hurriedly to confront the Arab tribesmen of Tarûjah, so that only two emirs, one of them being Baybars and the other Bashbây, and other minor ones, were left behind. They returned from al-Buḥayrah the night of ‘Îd al-Adḥâ [24th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.19 61a]
- Maq.: [1088]
- IH: [22]
- *IQS: {Emirs of one hundred, among others Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî and Sûdûn Tâz, of forty and of ten, and about a thousand mamluks travelled to al-Buḥayrah province to solve problems arising amongst Arab tribesmen there, from the Zamâlah and Murrân [?] tribes and then they returned on the 9th of Dhû al-Hijjah} [24th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 2nd. **251a/TIQS 272**]
- AJ: [145]
- IY: [656]
- Anon.: [339b]

¹²⁸ The city of Tarûjah is located in the province of al-Buḥayrah; see *Egypt and Syria*, vol. 15, p. 60, map no. 4.

*PMA190. – **[IQS]** {The sultan gave Âqbây al-Karakî an emirate of forty and a horse} [2nd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 251b]

*PMA191. – **[IQS]** Emir Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sallâm was given the *iqṭâ'* and the position occupied by Emir Ruslân, the *hâjib* [3rd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 251b]

*PMA192. – **[IQS]** Sûdûn Tâz was confirmed as *amîr akhûr* [14th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 251b]

*PMA193. – **[IQS]** Âqbây al-Înâlî al-Karakî was given an emirate of a hundred and resumed his position of *khâzindâr* [14th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. **251b/TIQS 272**]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 61a/Ist.B2 132a]

– Maq.: [1088]

– IT: [225]

– AJ: [145]

– IY: [656]

PMA194. – **[HI]** The new viceroy of Damascus, Emir Shaykh al-Khâssakî, arrived from Tripoli [14th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 139b]

– Maq.: [1088]

– IH: Shaykh settled in Damascus and continued getting promoted until he became sultan. After the incident [of the comet sighting], Shaykh would spent twenty years as emir and sultan [18, 19]

– IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 251b/TIQS 272]

– ABM: [87]

– IY: [656]

*PMA195. – **[IQS]** Nâsir al-Dîn ibn Khalîl was nominated *wâlî* of Cairo and *hâjib* instead of Âqtamur al-Barîdî following his removal from office [23rd of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 251b]

– ‘Aynî: Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Kalbak, who had been *naqîb al-jaysh*,... [Ist.19 **61a**/Ist.B2 132a]

– Maq.: Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alî ibn Kalfat al-Turukmânî... [1088]

– AJ: [146]

– IY: [656]

PMA196. – **[‘Aynî]** Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Laylá was appointed *wâlî* of Old Cairo instead of Nâsir al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Dânî [23rd of Dhû al-Hijjah; Ist.19 61a]

– Maq.: [1088]

– AJ: [146]

– IY: [656]

PMA197. – **[HI]** News arrived in Damascus that the Turcomans had linked up with Damurdâsh and Taghrîbirdî and had reached Aleppo, and that Duqmâq, that city’s viceroy, and the viceroy of Hama had joined forces with Nu‘ayr ibn Hayyâr and his Arab

tribesmen. The viceroy of Damascus then sent Emir Qarâbughâ to Damurdâsh to dissuade him from such an alliance, especially that this time the Egyptians were on his foes' side. Qarâbughâ did not however manage to meet Damurdâsh and his party [24th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 140a]

- Maq.: [1089]
- IH: [19-20]
- IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 252a/TIQS 273]
- IT: [226]
- IY: [657]

*PMA198. – **[IQS]** Tâj al-Dîn ibn Shâkir was appointed *kâtib al-sirr* of Damascus instead of 'Alâ' al-Dîn, the *naqîb al-Ashrâf*. Later, this appointment was annulled and Qadi Sadr al-Dîn ibn Âdamî assumed this position [date unclear; 2nd. 251b]

*PMA199. – **[IQS]** Emir Allân, a.k.a. 'Allân, al-Yahyâwî was appointed viceroy of Hama instead of Yûnus al-Hâfizî [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 251b-252a/TIQS 273]

- 'Aynî: 'Allân al-Aqta', the emir of one hundred, [Ist.19 61a/Ist.B2 132a]
- Maq.: [1089]
- IH: [23]
- IT: [225]
- AJ: [146]
- IY: [657]

*PMA200. – **[IQS]** Emir Jumuq min Admashq was appointed viceroy of al-Karak in replacement of Salmân al-Sharfî [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 252a/TIQS 273]

- 'Aynî: Emir Jumuq, the second *dawâdâr* and emir of forty.... in replacement of Salmân al-Turukmânî [Ist.19 61a/Ist.B2 132a]
- Maq.: [1089]
- IH: [23]
- IT: [225]
- AJ: [146]
- IY: [657]

PMA201. – **['Aynî]** These nominations [of Emirs Jumuq and 'Allân] were made without their approval, in order to weaken Sûdûn Tâz whose supporters they were [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; [Ist.19 61a/Ist.B2 132a]

- Maq.: [1089]
- IH: [23]
- IT: [225]
- AJ: [146]
- IY: [657]

*PMA202. – **[IQS]** Emir Sûdûn Baqjah headed to Syria with the nomination papers of Damurdâsh al-Muhammadi as viceroy of Tripoli in replacement of Shaykh al-Mahmûdî.

[Taghrîbirdî was ordered to Egypt as an emir]¹²⁹ [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 252a/TIQS 273]

- Maq.: A letter was written appointing Damurdâsh al-Muḥammadî viceroy of Tripoli in replacement of Shaykh al-Maḥmûdî [1089]
- IH: [17-8]
- IT: [226]
- IY: [657]

*PMA203. – [IQS] Emir Âqbây, the *khâzindâr*, was given the *iqṭâ'* of 'Allân al-Yahyâwî that the latter had taken from Qânîbây al-'Alâ'î [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd. 252a]

PMA204. – [Maq.] 'Umar ibn al-Taḥhân was appointed viceroy of Maltayah [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 1089]

- IQS: Zayn al-Dîn ibn al-Taḥhân... [2nd. 252a¹³⁰/TIQS 273]
- IT: [226]
- IY: [657]

PMA205. – [Maq.] Emir 'Alî Bayk ibn Dhû al-Ghâdir was appointed viceroy of 'Ayntâb [30th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 1089]

- IT: [226]
- IY: [657]

PMA206. – [HI] {Arab tribesmen killed Mankalîbughâ al-Sûdîni, the *kâshif* al-Wajh al-Qiblî in the region of 'Ajlûn} [At the end of Dhû al-Hijjah; 140a]

- IQS: [1st. 260b]

¹²⁹ The sentence in brackets is written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's hand in the margin of fol. 252a.

¹³⁰ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

Religious Life [RL]

RL1.– [HI] {Confirmation of the Shāfi‘ī and Ḥanbalī *quḍāt al-qadā’* in Damascus} [11th of Muḥarram; 129b-130a]

– IQS: [1st. 253a-b/2nd. 236a]

RL2.– [HI] {Tuesday, [the 12th of Muḥarram], was the first of the five days the Christians celebrate [?]} [12th of Muḥarram; 130a]

RL3.– [‘Aynī] Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Bannâ, the witness (“*shâhid*”) of Emir Jakam the *dawâdâr*, was appointed *nâzir al-ahbâs* instead of Badr al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn al-Dâyah [16th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a/Ist.B2 130a]

– Maq.: [1076]

– IH: Ibn al-Bannâ, the witness of Jakam’s *dîwân*, was appointed *nâzir al-ahbâs*, but he then died on the 7th of Ṣafar [7]

– AJ: [134]

– IY: [639]

RL4.– [HI] The new *muhtasib* who had been nominated by Taghrîbirdî on Thursday [the 21st of Muḥarram] saw his appointment annulled as a result of the viceroy’s flight, so the previous incumbent resumed his position [21st of Muḥarram; 130a]

– IQS: [1st. 253b]

RL5.– [‘Aynī] Shihâb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-Jawâshinî was nominated Ḥanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus instead of Shams al-Dīn ibn Quṭb after the latter’s removal [26th of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a/Ist.B2 130a]

– ID/*Al-Muntaqâ*: [25th of Ṣafar; 198a]

– Maq.: [27th of Muḥarram; 1077]

– IH: [6]

– AJ: [134]

– ABM: [68]

– IY: [639]

RL6.– [HI] “Even though I did not hear of it until today [the 29th of Muḥarram], two days earlier the Shafi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* chose as deputy Shihâb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdallah ibn Badr al-Ghazzî. He told me: ‘I wanted to inform him, but twice I forgot. He is a good man of knowledge’” [27th of Muḥarram; 130b]

– IQS: The Shafi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* chose as a deputy, a newcomer to this position, Shaykh Shihâb al-Dīn al-‘Umarî [27th of Muḥarram; 1st. 253b-254a/2nd 236a¹³¹/TIQS 254]

RL7.– [HI] At the end of this day, it turned out that Qadi Jamâl al-Dīn ibn al-Quṭb was dismissed as Ḥanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* in Damascus after being in office for four months and a decade. However, he resumed his old position with the approval of the viceroy, at the

¹³¹ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

end of that month. These actions constitute cases of manipulation and irreligion (“*talâ‘ub wa-qillat dîn*”). [14th of Safar; 131a]

– IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 237b-238a/*TIQS* 257]

RL8.– [**Maq.**] A letter of appointment was sent to Najm al-Dîn ‘Umar ibn Hijjî as Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* at Hama, and another to ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn Mughlî transferring him from the position of Hanbalî qâdî al-quḍât in Hama to that of Aleppo [5th of Safar; 1077]

– IH: [6]

– IQS: [2nd. 236b¹³²/*TIQS* 258]

– ABM: [69]

RL9.– [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Nomination of Qadi Taqî al-Dîn Abû Bakr ibn al-Wassâs [?] as Hanafi qadî al-quḍat of Jerusalem instead of Ibn Balmân [?] [During Safar; 197b]

RL10.– [**HI**] [In Damascus], the new viceroy confirmed Badr al-Dîn ibn al-Mûsilî in his position of *muhtasib* [29th of Safar; 131b]

– IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 238a]

RL11. – [**ID/Al-Muntaqâ**] Qadi Shams al-Din al-Shâdhilî was nominated *muhtasib* of Cairo instead of Shams al-Din al-Bakhânîsî [?] [18th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 198b]

– ‘Aynî: Qadi Shams al-Din al-Shâdhilî, who was *muhtasib* of Old Cairo, replaced that of Cairo, Shams al-Din Muḥammad al-Bakhânîsî after the latter’s removal from office [Ist.19 **58b-59a**/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: [1080]

– IH: [8]

– IQS: [2nd. 238b¹³³/*TIQS* 258]

– AJ: [137]

– IY: [643]

RL12. – [**‘Aynî**] Qadi Tâj al-Dîn, the relative (“*qarîb*”) of Ibn Jamâ‘ah, was appointed *muhtasib* of Old Cairo instead of Nûr al-Dîn al-Bakrî following the latter’s removal from office [3rd of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.19 **59a**/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: Qadi Tâj al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alî, a.k.a as ibn al-Mukallah [?], the stepson of ibn Jamâ‘ah,...[1080]

– AJ: [138]

– IY: [643]

RL13. – [**‘Aynî**] Maḥmûd ibn Aḥmad al-‘Aynî was nominated to the *nazar al-ahbâs al-mabrûrah* instead of Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Bannâ following the latter’s death [7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; Ist.19 **59a**/Ist.B2 130b]

– ID/Al-Muntaqâ: Badr al-Dîn al-‘Ayntâbî was nominated to the *nazar al-ahbâs al-mabrûrah* instead of Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn al-Bannâ [199b]

– Maq.: [1080]

– IH: [7]

¹³² This report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹³³ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- IQS: [2nd. 239b/TIQS 258]
- AJ: [138]
- ABM: [71]
- IY: [643]

RL14. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqā]** Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad al-‘Amûrî [?] headed for Damascus [12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]

RL15.– **[IQS]** [In Damascus], Badr al-Dîn ibn al-Mûsilî was removed from his position of *muhtasib* and was replaced by a Persian man who worked for Sûdûn Bâq and whom the Turks made fun of [12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1st. 255b¹³⁴/2nd. 240a¹³⁵/TIQS 259]

- HI: Badr al-Dîn ibn al-Mûsilî was removed from his position of *muhtasib* [132b, 133a]

RL16.– **[HI]** ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ibn al-Bâniyâsî was appointed *nâzir* [of the Omeyyad mosque], a position he was appointed to at the time of Tanbak [12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]

- IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. 240a/TIQS 259]

RL17.– **[HI]** {Continuation of the story concerning Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn al-Jawâshinî} [13th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]

- IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. 240a]

RL18.– **[Maq.]** Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbâs al-Ṣaltî, the deputy of the Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât* of Gaza, was nominated *qâdî al-quḍât* of Damascus, instead of Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn al-Akhnâ‘î [15th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1081]

- IH: [5]
- ABM: [71]
- IY: [644]

RL19.– **[HI]** {Emir Baysaq, who had been sent to Mecca to build the Ḥaram, sent a letter informing the Damascenes that his funds were finished. Measures to raise funds were discussed} [26th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a-b]

- IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. 240b/TIQS 259]

RL20.– **[HI]** {Arrival of Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Jawâshinî the new Ḥanafî *qâdî al-quḍât* [3rd of Jumâdâ al-Ūlá; 133b]

- IQS: [1st. 256a/2nd. 240b/TIQS 260]

RL21.– **[HI]** {A letter that arrived from Egypt purportedly had the dismissed *qâdî al-quḍât* of Gaza, ibn ‘Abbâs, nominated to the Shâfi‘î seat of Damascus} [3rd of Jumâdâ al-Ūlá; 133b]

- IQS: [1st. 256a/2nd. 240b]

¹³⁴ Part of this report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹³⁵ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

RL22.– [HI] {The nomination papers of ibn ‘Abbâs al-Saltî arrived} [7th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 133b]

– IQS: [1st. 256a]

RL23.– [HI] A letter arrived from the sultan ordering the arrest of Ibn al-Akhnâ’î and the investigation of the ill doings attributed to him, such as taking over *waqfs*, properties and alms monies. After a proclamation for his arrest was read, scores of people came and complained about him [12th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]

– Maq.: [1081]

– IH: [5-6]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 241b/TIQS 260]

– ABM: [72]

– IY: [644]

RL24.– [HI] {A proclamation for the arrest of Ibn al-Akhnâ’î was read in al-Sâlihîyah and in the eastern parts of the city, and then a counsel was organized at the viceroy’s, which was attended by qadis and Ibn Hijjî, and during which accusations were instructed and laid against him} [15th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]

– IH: [During the counsel], Ibn al-Akhnâ’î was scolded [6]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 241b/TIQS 260]

RL25.– [HI] The order for the removal of the Hanbalî Qadi Ibn al-Munajjâ and his replacement by al-Nâbulsî was contained in the letter from Qarâbughâ, the *hâjib*, which arrived with the same post rider who brought the sultan’s instruction to investigate al-Akhnâ’î [15th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]

– IH: [6]

– IQS: Shams al-Dîn al-Nâbulsî replaced Taqî al-Dîn ibn al-Munajjâ [1st. 256b/2nd. 241b/TIQS 260]

RL26.– [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] {A *fatwâ*, written by Zayn al-Dîn Tâhir ibn Habîb, was issued regarding the building of the Haram} [20th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 200a]

– IQS: [2nd. 240b¹³⁶]

RL27.– [HI] Qadi Shams al-Dîn al-Saltî arrived from Gaza in Damascus and settled along the people from Mardah¹³⁷ [26th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]

– Maq.: [1081]

– IQS: Qadi Shams al-Dîn al-Saltî replaced al-Akhnâ’î and arrived in Damascus at the end of the month [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a/TIQS 260]

– IY: [644]

RL28.– [HI] The *tawqî’* of the Hanbalî Qadi al-Nâbulsî arrived in Damascus [27th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a-b]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a]

¹³⁶ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹³⁷ A village near Nâblus in Palestine; see Sauvaire, “Description de Damas: Chapitre VI,” novembre-décembre 1894, p. 488, footnote no. 37.

RL29.– [HI] {On the 28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá, robes of investiture were bestowed upon both al-Nabulsí and al-Saltí. After the ceremony, al-Saltí nominated Ibn al-Husbânî and Ibn Híjjî as deputies, but the latter was neither there nor did he salute the new qadî, because he did not agree with what had happened}[28th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134b]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a]

RL30.– [HI] {Qadi al-Akhnâ'î was released from custody by the viceroy} [1st of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]

– Maq.: [1081]

– IQS: [1st. 256b/2nd. 242a]

– IY: [644]

RL31.– [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Qadi Jalal al-Dîn, the son of Shaykh al-Bulqînî, was appointed Shâfi'î *qadî al-quḍât* of Egypt instead of Qadi Ibn al-Sâlihî. He went down to al-Sâlihîyah and ruled there [4th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 200a/Al-Nafḥah 328]

– HI: [134b¹³⁸]

– 'Aynî: Qadi Jalal al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahmân, the son of Shaykh Sirâj al-Dîn 'Umar al-Bulqînî was appointed *qadî al-quḍât* of Egypt instead of Qadi Nâsir al-Dîn ibn al-Sâlihî following the latter's removal from office [5th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; Ist.19 59a/Ist.B2 130b]

– Maq.: [1082-3]

– IH: + [He obtained the nomination] after paying a great deal of money by means of Sûdûn Tâz, something which angered Jakam. When the new nominee went to Jakam's house, the latter ill spoke to him, thus prompting the father of Jalâl al-Dîn to soothe the emir [8-9]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242a/TIQS 261]

– IT: + This was Jalal al-Dîn's first nomination to this post [221]

– AJ: [138]

– ABM: [73]

– IY: [646-7]

– Anon.: [336a]

RL32.– [HI] {Al-Saltí, the new Shâfi'î *qadî al-quḍât* of Damascus, went to the *khânaqâh* of the Tawâwîs¹³⁹ where he ruled. That same day he appointed three deputies}[4th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242a-b]

RL33.– [HI] {Complaints were filed against al-Akhnâ'î as al-Saltí settled in a new home} [4th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]

– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242b]

¹³⁸ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹³⁹ On this *khânaqâh* located outside of the walls of Damascus, see Sauvaire, "Description de Damas: Chapitre VIII," mars-avril 1895, pp. 282-4.

RL34. – [HI] {News about the Hanbalî and Shâfi'î *quḍât al-qadâ*'s selection of deputies, some of which were reported first hand by Ibn Hijjî} [12th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 134b-135a]

– IQS: {The Shâfi'î *quḍât al-qadâ*' selected deputies}[1st. 257a/2nd. 242b/TIQS 261]

RL35. – [HI] News arrived in Damascus about the nomination of Jalâl al-Dîn, the son of Shaykh al-Bulqînî, as Shâfi'î *qâḍî al-quḍât* in Cairo on the 5th of the month [25th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 135a]

RL36. – [HI] {Arrival in Damascus of Husâm al-Dîn ibn Nashwân al-Barîdî al-Halabî carrying with him a number of nomination documents to one political and to many religious positions in Syria: Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Barîdî, as *nâ'ib al-qal'ah*; Sharaf al-Dîn Mas'ûd, as Shâfi'î *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Tripoli; Najm al-Dîn Ibn Hijjî, as Shâfi'î *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Hama; ibn al-Mughlî, as Hanbalî *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Aleppo; etc.} [29th of Jumâdâ al-Âkhirah; 135b¹⁴⁰]

– IH: [15]

– IQS: [1st. 257b/2nd. 243a/TIQS 262]

RL37. – [HI] {The new Shâfi'î *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Damascus held court at the al-Qaşab mosque in order to endear himself to the people} [3rd of Rajab; 135b]

– IQS: [1st. 257b/2nd. 243b]

RL38. – [IQS] “The Shâfi'î *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Damascus removed from office his deputy Shihâb al-Dîn al-Husbânî, so Qadi Shihâb al-Dîn Ibn Hijjî refrained from judicial ruling [During the middle decade of Rajab; 2nd. 244a]

– HI: “On Tuesday the 18th, I abandoned judicial ruling, and they were told [?] that Ibn al-Husbânî had been removed from office.” [18th of Rajab; 136a¹⁴¹]

RL39. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Qadi Jamâl al-Dîn al-Bisâtî was nominated Mâlikî *qâḍî al-quḍât* of Cairo instead of Ibn Khaldûn [24th of Rajab; 200b]

– IQS: [2nd. 244b/TIQS 263-4]

– Anon.: [336a]

RL40. – [HI] {Shihâb al-Dîn ibn al-Harrânî al-Hanbalî, who had occupied that position before Tamerlane's invasion, replaced Ibn al-Mûsilî as *muhtasib* of Damascus} [27th of Rajab; 136b]

– IQS: [1st. 258a/2nd. 244b/TIQS 264]

RL41. – [IQS] Qadi Muhyî al-Dîn, the son of Qadi Najm al-Dîn al-Hanafî arrived in Tripoli after he had left Tabriz where he was a captive of Tamerlane. He came to Aleppo and then to Tripoli wherefrom he sent a letter to Cairo telling about his arrival [1st. 258b/2nd. 244b-245a/TIQS 264]

¹⁴⁰ This report is written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's hand in the top margin of this folio

¹⁴¹ This report is written in Ibn Qâḍî Shuhbah's hand in the margin of this folio

– HI: Muhyî al-Dîn Mahmûd al-Hanafî arrived in Tripoli after he had left Tabriz and gone to Aleppo [136a¹⁴²]

RL42. – [HI] Ibn Hġijġ received a letter from Qadi ‘Alam al-Dġn ibn al-Qafsġ with news that he had been appointed Mġlikġ *qġdġ al-quġġt* in Damascus on the 5th of the previous month. Ibn Hġijġ heard that the incumbent, Sharaf al-Dġn ‘ġsġ’, went to the viceroy, told him that al-Qafsġ was his nemesis and asked him not to accept his appointment. ‘ġsġ did not quit his job but ended up going to Jerusalem [14th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 258b/2nd. 245b]

RL43. – [HI] {Story surrounding the nomination of Ibn Hġijġ as *nġzir al-haramayn* by the Shġfġ‘ġ *qġdġ al-quġġt*, Sharaf al-Dġn Ibn ‘Abbġs al-Saltġ, a decision which was confirmed by other qadis} [14th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 258b/2nd. 245b/TIQS 265]

RL44. – [HI] {Story about the lectures attended by Ibn Hġijġ and others, at al-Ghazġlġyah *madrasah* of which Ibn Hġijġ was in charge} [17th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 258b/2nd. 245b/TIQS 265]

RL45. – [HI] The viceroy, who was away from the city, sent a letter to Shihġb al-Dġn ibn al-Harrġnġ al-Hanbalġ nominating him *nġzir* of the Omayyad mosque instead of Ibn al-Bġniyġsġ after the latter’s withdrawal [18th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 245b/TIQS 265]

RL46. – [HI] {Friday prayer was held at the Omayyad mosque and was attended by the Shġfġ‘ġ *qġdġ al-quġġt*, the *hġjib*, and numerous people after a proclamation was read inviting them there} [26th of Sha‘bġn; 137b]

– Maq.: Friday prayer was held at the Omayyad mosque which was badly damaged following its torching by Tamerlane’s forces. Because proclamations were made inviting people there, it was well attended [1082]

– IH: [15]

– IQS: [1st. 258b-259a/2nd. 245b/TIQS 265]

– ABM: [75]

– IY: [26th of Jumġdġ al-ġkhirah; 645-6]

RL47. – [HI] {Friday prayer was also held at the mosque of Tankiz} [26th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 245b/TIQS 265]

RL48. – [HI] News of Ibn Khaldġn’s replacement as Mġlikġ *qġdġ al-quġġt* by ibn al-Bisġtġ reached Damascus [27th of Sha‘bġn; 137a]

– IH: [15]

– IQS: [1st. 259a]

¹⁴² This report is written in Ibn Qġdġ Shuhbah’s hand in the margin of this folio

RL49. – [HI] A man called Ibn al-Safadî arrived from Cairo with documents nominating him as *wakîl bayt al-mâl* in Damascus, in replacement of Ibn ‘Adnân [At the end of Sha‘bân; 137b]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a /TIQS 265]

RL50. – [HI] {Friday prayer was held for the second time at the Omayyad mosque and was attended by the Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât*, the *hâjib*, a number of *fuqahâ*’ and numerous people} [4th of Ramadân; 137b]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a /TIQS 266]

RL51. – [HI] {Friday prayer was held for the third time at the Omayyad mosque} [11th of Ramadân; 137b]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a /TIQS 266]

RL52. – [HI] Shihâb al-Dîn al-Dhahabî went to Cairo to seek the help of the grand emirs in rebuilding the Omayyad mosque [11th of Ramadân; 137b-138a]

– IQS: [1st. 259a]

RL53. – [HI] {Arrival of al-Mûsilî on board of a caravan from Egypt} [15th of Ramadân; 138a]

RL54. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] Shams al-Dîn al-Shadhilî was nominated *muhtasib* of Cairo instead of Shams al-Dîn al-Bakhânîsî [?] [29th of Ramadân; 138a]

– IQS: [2nd. 246b/TIQS 266]

RL55. – [ABM] {Completion of the dome Nawrûz al-Hâfizî had built over the *madrasah* al-Shaykhûniyah} [During Ramadân; 76]

– IY: [648]

RL56. – [HI] {Ibn Hijjî received a letter from his brother informing him of his arrival in Hama on the third of Shawwâl and of his taking office as Shâfi‘î *qâdî al-quḍât*, on the 5th. The letter detailed his welcoming reception outside of the city} [n.d.; 138a]

– IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248a-b/TIQS 269]

RL57. – [ID/Al-Muntaqâ] The *mahmil* went to al-Raydânîyah and left Cairo on the 25th of the month [22nd of Shawwâl; 203a]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 60b]

– Maq.: + It was led by *amîr al-hajj* Nakbây al-Azdamurî, an emir of forty [1086]

– IQS: [2nd. 249a/TIQS 270]

– AJ: [143]

– IY: [654-5]

– Anon.: ... *amîr al-hajj* Nakbây al-Azdamurî, an emir of one hundred [339b]

RL58. – [**‘Aynî**] {Hasan al-Âmadî, a man who dressed as a soldier and pretended to be one, was nominated head of the Siryâqûs *khânaqâh*} [6th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.19 60b/Ist.B2 131b]

- Maq.: [1087]
- IH: [8]
- IQS: [2nd. 251a¹⁴³]
- AJ: [144]
- ABM: [78]
- IY: [655]

RL59. – [**‘Aynî**] “Nâsir al-Dîn al-Tanâhî, one of the sultan’s *imams*, was appointed *nâzir al-ahbâs* instead of the author of these lines [i.e. al-‘Aynî].” [24th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; Ist.19 61a/Ist.B2 132a]

- Maq.: [1088]
- IH: [7]
- AJ: [145]
- IY: [656]

RL60. – [**HI**] {Upon his arrival in Damascus, the new viceroy Shaykh al-Mahmûdî appointed as *qâdî al-‘askar* Taqî al-Dîn Yahyâ, the son of Shaykh Shams al-Dîn al-Kirmânî, who had come with him from Tripoli, in replacement of Ibn al-Zuhrî} [14th of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 139b]

- Maq.: He appointed a group of his friends to a number of positions [1088]
- IH: [19]
- IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 251b/TIQS 272]
- IY: [656]

RL61. – [**HI**] {The *nazar* of the Mâristân was given to a man called ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Nadîm in replacement of the Shâfi‘î qadî who occupied the position by virtue of the *wâqif*’s will [14th of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 139b]

- IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 251b/TIQS 272-3]

*RL62. – [**IQS**] Yashbak al-Sha‘bânî, the *dawâdâr*, was appointed *nâzir al-ahbâs* [16th of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 2nd. 251b]

- ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 61a]
- Maq.: [1088]
- IQS: [2nd. 251b]
- AJ: [145]
- IY: [655]

*RL63. – [**IQS**] Sûdûn al-Mârdînî, the *ra’s nawbah*, became *nâzir* of the *khânaqâh* al-Shaykhûniyah by virtue of the *wâqif*’s will [19th of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 2nd. 251b]

¹⁴³ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

RL64. – **[HI]** The viceroy of Damascus nominated an Egyptian who had accompanied him from Tripoli as *muhtasib*. After he wore the robe of investiture, he settled in Ibn al-Mûsilî's house [24th of Dhû al-Hijjâh; 140a]

– IQS: The viceroy of Damascus nominated an Egyptian known as Zayn al-Dîn Mubârak, who had accompanied him from Tripoli, as *muhtasib* [1st. 260b/2nd. **251b**]

*RL65. – **[IQS]** Ibn Khaldûn returned to his position of Mâlikî *qâdî al-quḍât* in replacement of Jamâl al-Dîn al-Bisâtî [26th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 2nd **251b/TIQS 273**]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.B2 132a/Ist.19 61a]

– Maq.: [1088]

– IH: [22-3]

– AJ: [146]

– ABM: [79]

– IY: [657]

RL66. – **[‘Aynî]** Nakbây al-Azdamurî, an emir of forty, led to *hajj* from Egypt. No one went on pilgrimage from either Syria or Iraq because of the price increases and the insecurity brought about by Tamerlane [During this year; Ist.19 **61a**/Ist.B2 132a]

– Maq.: [1089]

– IT: [226]

– AJ: [146]

– ABM: [79]

– IY: [657]

Social History/Miscellany [SHM]

SHM1. – **[ID]** The year 804 began [*Al-Nafḥah* 326]

SHM2. – **[HI]** {Listing of the first day of Muḥarram and its equivalent in other calendars} [129b]

– Maq.: The month of Muḥarram started on Thursday [1076]

– IQS: [1st. 253a/2nd. 236a]

– IY: [638]

SHM3. – **[ID/*Al-Muntaqá*]** {News about the Nile} [1st of Muḥarram; 197b]

– Maq.: [1076]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a]

– ABM: [68]

– IY: [638]

SHM4. – **[Maq.]** {Monetary and economic data} [1076]

– ‘Aynî: [Ist.19 61a¹⁴⁴]

– ABM: Prices were high [68]

– IY: [638-9]

SHM5. – **[‘Aynî]** Nawrûz al-Ḥâfizî, the *amîr kabîr*, organized a banquet at the house of Ibn Shaykhûn, at al-Rumaylah, during which three hundred sheep and ten horses were slaughtered. His bride was the daughter of Barqûq and the sister of al-Nâsir Faraj from another mother [21st of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a]

– Maq.: [1076]

– IH: [1]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a¹⁴⁵/*TIQS* 254]

– AJ: [134]

– ABM: [68]

– IY: [639]

– Anon.: Emir Nawrûz al-Ḥâfizî married the sister of Faraj, Barqûq’s son [336a]

SHM6. – **[‘Aynî]** Nawrûz al-Ḥâfizî consummated his marriage during the night of the 22nd of Muḥarram [22nd of Muḥarram; Ist.19 58a]

– IQS: [2nd. 236a/ *TIQS* 254]

– ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: [Middle decade of Muḥarram; 197b]

– AJ: [134]

SHM7. – **[HI]** {Listing of this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [1st of Ṣafar; 130b]

– IQS: [1st. 254a/2nd. 236b]

¹⁴⁴ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

¹⁴⁵ This report is written in the margin of this folio.

- SHM8. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Emir Ínâl Bâý ibn Qijmâs consummated his marriage to the sister of the sultan [6th of Safar; 197b¹⁴⁶]
 – IQS: [2nd. 237a/TIQS 255]
 – IY: [640]
 – Anon.: [336a]
- SHM9. – **[HI]** {Meteorological and astrological data about the beginning of autumn}[5th of Safar; 130b]
- SHM10. – **[HI]** {In Damascus, because of the change in their value, the dirhams fell in disuse contrary to the *fulûs*, which became very popular. People benefited from the drop in the prices of foodstuff} [5th of Safar; 130b-131a]
 – IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 237b/TIQS 256-7]
- SHM11. – **[HI]** {Story about the death of a young son of Taghrîbirdî whose date of birth and death coincided with that of a son of a local qadi, Shams al-Dîn al-Shâfi‘î} [18th of Safar; 131a]
 – IQS: ...Qadi Shams al-Dîn ibn al-Akhnâ‘î [1st. 254b/2nd. **238a**] [?]
- SHM12. – **[HI]** Swarms of locusts flew and inflicted great harm in Syria [28th of Safar; 131a]
 – IH: [6]
 – IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 238a]
- SHM13. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** Incident between the *zu‘‘ar* who assembled by the Great Maydân and some emirs and the *wâlî* of Cairo who attacked the former group and imprisoned its members [Last decade of Safar; 198b]
 – IQS: [2nd. 238a]
- SHM14. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {News about the Nile} [Last decade of Safar; 198b]
- SHM15. – **[HI]** {Listing this day and its equivalent in another calendar} [131b]
 – Maq.: [1079]
 – IQS: [1st. 254b/2nd. 238b]
 – IY: [642]
- SHM16. – **[HI]** {Story about the first rain of the year} [2nd of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 131b]
 – IQS: [1st. 254b-255a]
- SHM17. – **[HI]** {Astrological data about this day} [6th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 131b]
- SHM18. – **[HI]** {Listing of this day and its equivalents in other calendars} [19th of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]

¹⁴⁶ This report is written in the margin of this folio

- SHM19. – **[HI]** {Story about a cold spell, rain and snowfall} [21st of Rabî‘ al-Awwal; 132a]
- SHM20. – **[IQS]** {Listing of this day and its equivalents in other calendars} [1st of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 1st. 255a/2nd. **239b**]
 – HI: [132b]
 – Maq.: [1080]
 – IY: [643]
- SHM21. – **[HI]** After Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad ibn Yahyâ al-Dumayrî was found murdered at al-Sâlihîyah, a suspect was arrested. Shihâb al-Dîn’s brother Shams al-Dîn had died during the days of [...?] [2nd of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 132b]
 – IQS: [1st. 255a]
- SHM22. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** {A huge swarm of locusts invaded Egypt and was followed by a cold spell} [At the beginning of the month of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199a]
 – IQS: [2nd. 240a]
- SHM23. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** {Monetary and economic data} [At the beginning of the month of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 199b]
- SHM24. – **[HI]** {Astrological data about this day} [Night of the 7th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 132b]
- SHM24’. – **[HI]** {First heavy rainfall of the year and other meteorological details} [12th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 132b]
 – IQS: [1st. 255a-b]
- SHM25. – **[HI]** {Listing of these two days and their equivalent in other calendars} [20th and 24th of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133a]
- SHM26. – **[HI]** {The arrival of large quantities of wheat from Egypt in Tripoli and Beirut had a positive impact on the population} [At the end of Rabî‘ al-Thânî; 133b]
 – IQS: [1st. 255b/2nd. 240b/TIQS 259]
- SHM27. – **[IQS]** {Many astrological details this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [1st of Jumâdâ al-Ûlâ; 2nd. **241a**/1st. 256a]
 – ID/Al-Muntaqâ: The month began on a Thursday [199b]
 – HI: [133b]
- SHM28. – **[HI]** {An edict from the sultan forbidding constructions outside of Damascus was read, as people had built extensively there to increase their income through rent, and had taken over *waqf* properties} [2nd of Jumâdâ al-Ûlâ; 133b]
 – IQS: [1st. 256a/2nd. 241a/TIQS 260]
 – IH: [5]
 – ABM: [72]

- SHM29. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day} [7th of the month of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]
– IQS: [1st. 256a]
- SHM30. – **[HI]** A lot of rain fell this day [7th of the month of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]
– IQS: [1st. 256a]
- SHM31. – **[HI]** A lot of rain fell this day [21st of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134a]
- SHM32. – **[HI]** {Listing of these two days and their equivalent in other calendars} [25th and 26th of Jumâdá al-Úlá; 134b]
- SHM33. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day and its equivalents in other calendars}[1st of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242a]
- SHM34. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about this day} [1st of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
– IQS: [1st. 257a/2nd. 242a]
- SHM35. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day} [6th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
- SHM36. – **[HI]** A lot of rain fell this day [13th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
- SHM37. – **[HI]** {Listing of days between the 14th and 17th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah} [14th - 17th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
- SHM38. – **[HI]** Snow fell [18th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 134b]
- SHM39. – **[HI]** {Listing of these two days and the equivalent of the former in another calendar}[22nd and the 26th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
- SHM40. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about this day}[26th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
- SHM41. – **[HI]** {Listing of this day}[28th of Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 135a]
- SHM42. – **[HI]** {Listing of this day and its equivalent in other calendars}[1st of Rajab; 135b]
– IQS: [1st. 257b/2nd. 243b]
- SHM43. – **[HI]** {Beginning of the season of al-Raghâ'ib [?]. Details about the price increase of ingredients used in the making of sweets} [6th of Rajab; 135b-136a]
– IQS: [1st. 257b-258a/2nd. 243b-244a/TIQS 263]
- SHM44. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day} [7th of Rajab; 136a]
- SHM45. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details concerning days between the 7th and 11th of Rajab} [7th-11th of Rajab; 136a]

- SHM46. – [HI] {Details about the bountifulness of wheat and other foodstuff that lead to a drop in their prices in Syria} [During these days; 136a]
 – ID/*Al-Muntaqá*: The *qarârah*¹⁴⁷ of wheat in Damascus reached one thousand one hundred dirhams [n.d.; 200b]
 – IH: [15]
 – IQS: [1st. 258a/2nd. 244a/*TIQS* 263]
 – ABM: [74]
- SHM47. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {Al-Maqrîzî told Ibn Duqmâq a story related to him by Fath al-Dîn, the *kâtib al-sirr*, that three thousand camels loaded with wheat that had arrived in Sha‘sha‘ in Syria, vanished following a great flash flood. After news of this incident reached Damascus, the price of a bushel of wheat that had been one thousand one hundred dirhams, went up to one thousand four hundred and fifty} [20th of Rajab; 200b]
 – IQS: [2nd. 244a]
- SHM48. – [HI] {A number of home invaders from al-Mansar, Talfitâ, al-Durayj and other places were arrested and executed in the harshest manner. Description of their *modus operandi* and their punishment} [23rd and 26th of Rajab; 136a-b]
 – IH: [15]
 – IQS: [1st. 258a/2nd. 244a/*TIQS* 263]
 – ABM: [74]
 – IY: When the sultan heard about the actions of the viceroy [concerning the capture of the thieves], he sent him a robe of honour [646]
- SHM49. – [HI] {Listing of these days and their equivalent in another calendar} [22nd and 26th of Rajab; 136b]
- SHM50. – [HI] {Equivalent of this day in the Gregorian calendar and meteorological details about the following three nights} [27th to 29th of Rajab; 136b]
- SHM51. – [HI] {A proclamation by the sultan ended *al-jinâyât* because of the fiscal abuses they engendered on the part of holders of power} [27th of Rajab; 136b¹⁴⁸]
 – IQS: [1st. 258a-b/2nd. 244b]
- SHM52. – [ID/*Al-Muntaqá*] {Sighting of a comet in Egypt} [Last decade of Rajab; 200b/*Al-Nafhah* 328]
 – IH: {The appearance of the meteor was interpreted by people as a sign of the rising star of Sultan Shaykh al-Mahmûdî who, after occupying keys positions in Syria, eventually became ruler of the sultanate} [17]
 – IQS: [2nd. 244b/*TIQS* 264]
 – ABM: [74]

¹⁴⁷ For the equivalent of this and other units of measure, see E. Ashtor, “Makâyil, Mawâzîn,” in *EI*², vol. 6, pp. 117-121.

¹⁴⁸ The last two of this three and a half line long report are written in the hand of Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah and end in the margin of this folio.

– IY: [647]

SHM53. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [1st of Sha‘bân; 136b]

– IQS: [1st. 258b/2nd. 245a]

SHM54. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {Story about an elephant whose drowning became a spectacle in Cairo} [1st of Sha‘bân; 200b]

– HI: [137b]

– IH: [16]

– IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 245a/TIQS 264]

– ABM: [75]

– IY: [648-50]

– Anon.: The elephant that Tamerlane had sent to sultan with Qânîbây al-Nawrûzî... [336b-337b]

SHM55. – **[HI]** {Heavy rains between these two days} [4th-7th of Sha‘bân; 136b]

SHM56. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day} [7th of Sha‘bân; 136b-137a]

SHM57. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about this day. A man was killed when hit by thunder below the citadel in Damascus} [10th of Sha‘bân; 137a]

– IH: [15]

– IQS: A man was killed when hit by thunder below the citadel in Damascus [1st. 258b/2nd. 245a/TIQS 265]

– ABM: [75]

– IY: [Jumâdá al-Âkhirah; 647]

SHM58. – **[HI]** {Various data about this day} [18th of Sha‘bân; 137a]

SHM59. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqá]** {Re-sighting of the comet that had appeared in Rajab} [18th and 20th of Sha‘bân; 200b]

– IQS: [18th, 19th and 20th; 2nd. 245a]

SHM60. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about the 22nd of Sha‘bân and the equivalent in other calendars of the 22nd, the 24th and the 25th of Sha‘bân} [22nd, 24th and 25th of Sha‘bân; 137a]

SHM61. – **[HI]** {Arrest of highway robbers operating east of Damascus and recovery of their loot} [24th of Sha‘bân; 137a]

– IQS: [1st. 258b/2nd. 245b]

SHM62. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about this day} [26th of Sha‘bân; 137a]

SHM63. – **[HI]** {While praying at the Khâtûnîyah,¹⁴⁹ Ibn Hîjjî was accosted by Emir Muhammad ibn Manjak who showed him a bunch of wheat ears two hundred of which were produced by one grain} [27th of Sha‘bân; 137b]

- IH: [15]
- IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 245b-246a/TIQS 265]
- ABM: [75]
- IY: [647]

SHM64. – **[Maq.]** All of the city of Damascus was in ruins, empty of inhabitants. People had built their homes outside of the walls by carting away all stones they could find, so that little remained of the traces of the fires. As a result, Damascus became a *kîmân* [?] [n.d.; 1082]

- IY: [646]

SHM65. – **[HI]** {Listing of this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [1st of Ramadân; 137b]

- IQS: [1st. 259a/2nd. 246a]

SHM66. – **[HI]** {Meteorological details about these days}[1st, 4th and 5th of Ramadân; 137b]

SHM67. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day}[9th of Ramadân; 138a]

SHM68. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** Emissaries from Genoa arrived in Cairo regarding the accusation levelled against some Genoese of having allegedly stolen a ship owned by Muslim merchants; the envoy [?] turned to be the thief, and he was arrested and imprisoned [12th of Ramadân; 201a]

- IQS: [2nd. 246b¹⁵⁰]

SHM69. – **[HI]** {Story about the price of roses in Damascus}[28th of Ramadân; 138a]

- IQS: [1st. 259a-b]

SHM70. – **[HI]** {The equivalent of this day in other calendars} [1st of Shawwâl; 138a]

- IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 247a]

SHM71. – **[HI]** {In his letter to Ibn Hîjjî, the latter’s brother noted that prices of various products in Hama had gone down}[n.d.; 138a, 138b]

- IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b/TIQS 270]

SHM72. – **[HI]** {Astrological details about this day} [10th of Shawwâl; 138a-b]

¹⁴⁹ The text could be referring to either a *madrasah* or a *khânaqâh*, the former within the city walls and the latter outside; see Sauvaire, “Description de Damas: Chapitres III et IV,” respectively, mai-juin 1894, p. 418, and septembre-octobre 1894, p. 256.

¹⁵⁰ This report is struck through in the body of the text.

- SHM73. – [HI] {News about the price and availability of apricots} [11th of Shawwâl; 138b]
– IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b]
- SHM74. – [HI] {Details about the price of cereals in Damascus} [During those days; 138b]
– IQS: [1st. 259b/2nd. 248b/TIQS 270]
- SHM75. – [HI] {The equivalent of this day in another calendar} [23rd of Shawwâl; 139a]
- SHM76. – [HI] {Details about the price of apricots and raspberries (“tûr”) in Syria} [29th of Shawwâl; 139a]
– IQS: [1st. 260a/TIQS 269]
- SHM77. – [HI] {The equivalent of this day in other calendars} [1st of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a]
– Maq.: The month of Dhû al-Qa‘dah started on a Saturday [1st of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 1086]
– IQS: [2nd. 250a]
- SHM78. – [HI] {Astrological details about this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [11th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139a]
– IQS: [2nd. 250a¹⁵¹]
- SHM79. – [HI] {Listing of this day} [23rd of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139b]
– IQS: [2nd. 250a¹⁵²]
- SHM80. – [HI] {Listing of this day} [29th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 139b]
– IQS: [2nd. 250a¹⁵³]
- SHM81. – [HI] {Listing of this day and its equivalent in other calendars} [1st of Dhû al-Hijjah; 139b]
– IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 251b]
- SHM82. – [HI] {Astrological details about this day} [14th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 139b]
- SHM83. – [HI] {News about a bazaar located by the Zalâbiyah¹⁵⁴ bridge, the construction of which ended at the end of the year} [At the end of the year; 140a]
– IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 252a/TIQS 273]

¹⁵¹ This report is written in the margin of this folio

¹⁵² This report is written in the margin of this folio

¹⁵³ This report is written in the margin of this folio

¹⁵⁴ A bridge over the Baradâ River the exact location of which is unknown; Brinner, *A Chronicle of Damascus*, p. 45 footnote no.278.

SHM84. – **[HI]** A lot of buildings were constructed north, east and west of the fortifications the rents of which were very high. The rents of the older stores also doubled manifold. [During this period; 140a]

– IQS: [1st. 260b/2nd. 252a *TIQS* 274]

SHM85. – **[IH]** Al-Sâlimî ended the meat distribution [?] [During this year; 21]

Foreign Affairs [FA]

FA1. – **[HI]** Arrival in Damascus of envoys from Ibn ‘Uthmân and Qarâ Yûsuf [17th of Muharram; 58a]

– IQS: [1st. 253b/2nd. 236a]

FA2. – **[ID/Al-Muntaqâ]** News arrived in Egypt that Tamerlane had died; so both Ahmad ibn Uways [the ruler of Baghdad], and [the Turcoman leader from Iraq] Qarâ Yûsuf, the son of Qarâ Muhammad, returned to their respective homelands. [Letters also arrived from Ibn ‘Uthmân, Ahmad ibn Uways and the viceroy of Damascus. It was reported that Tamerlane had died from the measles, which he contracted when in Syria and which remained in his body until it killed him¹⁵⁵][Middle decade of Shawwâl; 203a]

– Anon.: + It was reported that a dog-like barking sound could be heard emanating from his tomb. Someone said that he had seen smoke coming out of his tomb {Verse} [19th of Shawwâl; 339a-b]

FA3. – **[HI]** The envoys of Ibn Uways, the ruler of Baghdad, arrived to Damascus and settled in a tent at al-Maydân for nine days after which they left [20th of Shawwâl; 138b]

– IQS: [1st. 260a/2nd. 249a]

*FA4. – **[IQS]** Envoys from Qân Ahmad ibn Uways [the ruler of Baghdad] arrived in Cairo bearing a gift for the sultan consisting of five horses [17th of Dhû al-Qa‘dah; 250b]

– ID: [*Al-Nafhah* 331]

FA5. – **[Maq.]** A letter was sent to Emir Qarâ Yûsuf, giving the choice of a number of locations where he and his entourage could seek refuge. Presents were sent to him, his son and his two brothers} [1st of Dhû al-Hijjah; 1088]

– IQS: [*TIQS* 272]

– IY: [656]

FA6. – **[HI]** Rumours circulated amongst people that Tamerlane had arrived in Sîwâs; some said that he was heading for Ibn ‘Uthmân, others said otherwise [24th of Dhû al-Hijjah; 140a]

– Maq.: [News arrived] that Tamerlane had come to Sîwâs [1089]

– IH: [20]

– IQS: + it turned out that he was heading for Ibn ‘Uthmân [1st. 260b/2nd. 252a*TIQS* 273]

– IT: [226]

– IY: [657]

FA7. – **[IH]** {News about the end of the Maznî dynasty in the Maghrib} [During this year; 20-1]

FA8. – **[IH]** {Report about the whereabouts of Tamerlane following his departure from Damascus, culminating with the sack of Baghdad in Dhû al-Hijjah 803} [n.d.; 23-26]

¹⁵⁵ The passage in brackets is written in the margin of fol. 203a.

TABLE III. 1. B.

ID <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
PMA:	PMA:	PMA: PMA1 PMA2	PMA: PMA1	PMA: PMA1	PMA:	PMA:	PMA: PMA1	PMA:	PMA: PMA1 PMA2	PMA:	PMA: PMA1	PMA:	PMA:	PMA:
PMA4		PMA5	PMA6	PMA6 PMA7 PMA8	PMA3 PMA6 PMA7 PMA8	PMA5	PMA4 PMA5 PMA6	PMA4 PMA5 PMA6	PMA5		PMA6 PMA7 PMA8		PMA3 PMA6 PMA8 PMA9 PMA10 PMA11	
PMA9 PMA10 PMA11	PMA12	PMA12 PMA13		PMA11	PMA11	PMA12	PMA9 PMA10	PMA9 PMA10		PMA12		PMA12		
PMA14 PMA15			PMA14	PMA14	PMA14		PMA12 PMA13	PMA12 PMA13	PMA12 PMA13		PMA14		PMA14	
		PMA16 PMA17 PMA18					PMA16 PMA17	PMA16 PMA17	PMA16 PMA17 PMA18					
	PMA20		PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23 PMA24	PMA20		PMA20		PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22 PMA23	PMA20 PMA21 PMA22	PMA19 PMA20 PMA21 PMA22	PMA20
	PMA22					PMA23 PMA24		PMA22				PMA24	PMA24	PMA22
PMA27		PMA24 PMA25 PMA26	PMA27	PMA27	PMA27	PMA27 PMA28	PMA24 PMA25 PMA26 PMA27	PMA24 PMA25 PMA26 PMA27	PMA24 PMA25 PMA26	PMA27	PMA27	PMA27	PMA27	
PMA29							PMA29 PMA30 PMA31	PMA29						
PMA31	PMA30			PMA31	PMA31	PMA31		PMA31	PMA30		PMA31		PMA31	

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
PMA32 PMA33 PMA34 PMA35 PMA36			PMA33 PMA34 PMA35	PMA33 PMA34 PMA35	PMA33 PMA34 PMA35	PMA36		PMA33			PMA33 PMA34 PMA35		PMA33 PMA34 PMA35	
PMA39 PMA40	PMA39 PMA40		PMA38 PMA40	PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	PMA37 PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	PMA38	PMA38 PMA39 PMA40 PMA41	PMA40 PMA41	PMA41	PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	PMA37 PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	PMA38 PMA39 PMA40	
PMA43		PMA41 PMA42					PMA43 PMA44	PMA43						PMA44
PMA47		PMA44 PMA45 PMA46			PMA44		PMA47 PMA48 PMA49 PMA50	PMA48 PMA49 PMA50	PMA44 PMA45 PMA46				PMA48 PMA49 PMA50	PMA48 PMA49 PMA50
PMA51 PMA52 PMA53		PMA48 PMA49 PMA50	PMA51 PMA52 PMA53	PMA51 PMA52 PMA53	PMA51 PMA52 PMA53 PMA54	PMA48	PMA52 PMA53 PMA54 PMA55 PMA56	PMA48 PMA50	PMA48 PMA49 PMA50	PMA50	PMA51 PMA52 PMA53	PMA50	PMA51 PMA52 PMA53 PMA54	
PMA56 PMA57	PMA56	PMA54 PMA55					PMA57 PMA58 PMA59	PMA56 PMA58					PMA56 PMA57 PMA58	PMA56 PMA57 PMA58
PMA62		PMA57 PMA58 PMA59 PMA60	PMA57 PMA58	PMA57 PMA58	PMA57 PMA58	PMA57	PMA62 PMA63 PMA64	PMA57 PMA58					PMA57 PMA58	PMA57 PMA58
PMA64 PMA65			PMA62 PMA64	PMA62 PMA63 PMA64	PMA62 PMA63 PMA64		PMA62 PMA64 PMA65	PMA62 PMA64		PMA61 PMA62	PMA62 PMA63 PMA64		PMA62 PMA63 PMA64	

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
		PMA66 PMA67 PMA68					PMA67	PMA67	PMA66 PMA67 PMA68					
		PMA70 PMA71			PMA70 PMA71	PMA70 PMA71	PMA70 PMA71	PMA70 PMA71	PMA70 PMA71	PMA69		PMA70 PMA71	PMA70	
PMA73			PMA73	PMA73	PMA73 PMA74 PMA75	PMA73 PMA74	PMA73 PMA74 PMA75 PMA76 PMA77 PMA78	PMA73 PMA74 PMA76	PMA73 PMA74 PMA76 PMA77 PMA78	PMA72 PMA73	PMA73	PMA73 PMA74	PMA73 PMA74 PMA75	
PMA75		PMA74	PMA75	PMA75							PMA75			
		PMA76 PMA77 PMA78												
		PMA80					PMA80		PMA80	PMA79				
					PMA81					PMA81		PMA81	PMA81	
		PMA82 PMA83 PMA84 PMA85 PMA86 PMA87						PMA83 PMA84 PMA85 PMA86 PMA87	PMA82 PMA83 PMA84 PMA85 PMA86 PMA87					
PMA88 PMA89														
		PMA90							PMA90					
PMA91 PMA92														
		PMA93 PMA94							PMA93 PMA94					
PMA95 PMA96 PMA97			PMA96	PMA96	PMA96	PMA96 PMA97 PMA98 PMA99	PMA96 PMA97 PMA98 PMA99	PMA96 PMA97 PMA98 PMA99	PMA96 PMA97 PMA98 PMA99	PMA96	PMA96	PMA96	PMA96	PMA95 PMA96
PMA99		PMA97 PMA98 PMA99										PMA99	PMA99	

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
PMA100 PMA101		PMA101			PMA101	PMA101	PMA100 PMA101 PMA102 PMA103 PMA104	PMA100 PMA101 PMA104	PMA101 PMA103 PMA104 PMA105			PMA101	PMA100 PMA101	PMA100 PMA101
PMA106		PMA103 PMA104 PMA105 PMA107 PMA108					PMA106 PMA107 PMA108		PMA107 PMA108				PMA106	
PMA109		PMA110					PMA110 PMA111	PMA110 PMA111	PMA110					
PMA111 PMA112 PMA113							PMA113 PMA114 PMA115 PMA116 PMA117	PMA113 PMA114 PMA116	PMA114 PMA115 PMA116					PMA113
PMA117		PMA118							PMA118					
PMA119 PMA120		PMA121 PMA122			PMA122	PMA123	PMA119 PMA120 PMA121 PMA122	PMA119 PMA121 PMA122	PMA121 PMA122			PMA122 PMA123		
PMA124 PMA125 PMA126							PMA124 PMA125 PMA126		PMA127					
PMA128		PMA127 PMA129 PMA130 PMA131 PMA132					PMA128 PMA129 PMA130 PMA131 PMA132		PMA129 PMA130 PMA131 PMA132					
			PMA133	PMA133	PMA133	PMA133				PMA133	PMA133	PMA133	PMA133	PMA133 PMA134

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.	
PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA134	PMA136	
PMA135	PMA135		PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135	PMA135		
PMA136			PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136	PMA136		
PMA137								PMA137	PMA137						
PMA138	PMA138			PMA138	PMA138	PMA138	PMA138	PMA138	PMA138		PMA138	PMA138	PMA138		PMA138
PMA139								PMA139							
PMA140	PMA140			PMA140	PMA140	PMA140	PMA140	PMA140			PMA140	PMA140	PMA140		PMA140
PMA141	PMA141			PMA141	PMA141	PMA141	PMA141	PMA141	PMA141		PMA141	PMA141	PMA141		PMA141
PMA142	PMA142							PMA142							PMA142
			PMA143					PMA143		PMA143					
			PMA144					PMA144		PMA144					
PMA145	PMA145			PMA145	PMA145	PMA145	PMA145	PMA145	PMA145		PMA145	PMA145	PMA145		PMA145
PMA146	PMA146										PMA147				PMA146
				PMA147	PMA147		PMA147								
PMA148							PMA148								
PMA149							PMA149	PMA149					PMA149		
PMA150							PMA150		PMA150				PMA150		
PMA151	PMA151						PMA151								
PMA152							PMA152								
PMA153	PMA153		PMA153	PMA153	PMA153	PMA153	PMA153	PMA153		PMA153	PMA153	PMA153	PMA153		
PMA154			PMA154	PMA154	PMA154		PMA154	PMA154		PMA154	PMA154	PMA154	PMA154		
		PMA155							PMA155						
		PMA156				PMA156	PMA156	PMA156	PMA156						
PMA157			PMA157	PMA157	PMA157	PMA157	PMA157	PMA157		PMA157	PMA157		PMA157		
PMA158	PMA158		PMA158	PMA158	PMA158	PMA158	PMA158	PMA158		PMA158	PMA158	PMA158	PMA158		
PMA159							PMA159								
PMA160	PMA160		PMA160	PMA160	PMA160	PMA160	PMA160	PMA160		PMA160	PMA160		PMA160		
PMA161			PMA161	PMA161	PMA161		PMA161	PMA161		PMA161	PMA161		PMA161		
		PMA162					PMA162		PMA162						
PMA163	PMA163		PMA163	PMA163	PMA163	PMA163	PMA163	PMA163		PMA163	PMA163	PMA163	PMA163		
PMA164	PMA164		PMA164	PMA164	PMA164	PMA164	PMA164	PMA164		PMA164	PMA164	PMA164	PMA164		
	PMA165		PMA165	PMA165	PMA165	PMA165	PMA165	PMA165		PMA165	PMA165	PMA165	PMA165		
		PMA166					PMA166		PMA166						
		PMA167				PMA167	PMA167		PMA167						

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
	PMA172	PMA173 PMA174			PMA171	PMA171	PMA168 PMA169 PMA170 PMA171 PMA172 PMA173	PMA168 PMA170		PMA171		PMA171	PMA171	
		PMA176 PMA177	PMA175	PMA175	PMA175		PMA175	PMA175	PMA173 PMA174	PMA175	PMA175	PMA175	PMA175	
		PMA179	PMA178	PMA178	PMA178		PMA177 PMA178 PMA179	PMA178	PMA176 PMA177	PMA178	PMA178	PMA178	PMA178	PMA178
		PMA181 PMA182		PMA180	PMA180 PMA181	PMA181	PMA180 PMA181 PMA182 PMA183 PMA184	PMA181	PMA179		PMA180		PMA180 PMA181	
		PMA185	PMA184	PMA184	PMA184 PMA185		PMA184 PMA185		PMA185	PMA185	PMA184	PMA184 PMA185	PMA184 PMA185	
	PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187 PMA188 PMA189 PMA190 PMA191 PMA192	PMA186 PMA187 PMA188 PMA189		PMA186 PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	PMA187	PMA186 PMA187	
	PMA189			PMA189	PMA189	PMA189	PMA189 PMA190 PMA191 PMA192 PMA193 PMA194 PMA195				PMA189		PMA189	PMA189
		PMA194	PMA193	PMA193	PMA193 PMA194	PMA194	PMA193 PMA194 PMA195	PMA193 PMA194	PMA194	PMA193	PMA193		PMA193 PMA194 PMA195 PMA196 PMA197	
		PMA197	PMA195	PMA195 PMA196	PMA195 PMA196 PMA197	PMA197	PMA197 PMA198 PMA199 PMA200	PMA197 PMA199 PMA200	PMA197	PMA197				
			PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	PMA199 PMA200	PMA199 PMA200		PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	PMA199 PMA200 PMA201		PMA199 PMA200 PMA201	

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
RL:	RL:	PMA206	RL:	RL:	PMA202 PMA204 PMA205	PMA202	PMA202 PMA203 PMA204	PMA202 PMA204		PMA202 PMA204 PMA205			PMA202 PMA204 PMA205	RL:
RL5		RL1 RL2 RL4 RL6 RL7	RL3 RL5	RL3 RL5	RL3 RL5	RL3 RL5	RL6 RL7 RL8	RL6 RL7 RL8	RL1	RL4	RL3 RL5	RL5	RL3 RL5	
RL9		RL10			RL8	RL8	RL10 RL11	RL10 RL11		RL10		RL8		
RL11			RL11 RL12 RL13	RL11 RL12 RL13	RL11 RL12 RL13	RL11 RL13	RL15 RL16 RL17	RL15 RL16			RL11 RL12 RL13	RL13	RL11 RL12 RL13	
RL13 RL14		RL15 RL16 RL17			RL18	RL18	RL19 RL20 RL21	RL19 RL20		RL15 RL16 RL17		RL18	RL18	
RL26		RL19 RL20 RL21 RL22 RL23 RL24 RL25			RL23	RL23 RL24 RL25	RL23 RL24 RL25 RL26	RL23 RL24 RL25		RL19 RL20 RL21 RL22 RL23 RL24 RL25		RL23	RL23	
		RL27			RL27		RL27	RL27		RL27			RL27	

ID <i>Al-Muntaqá</i>	ID <i>Al-Nafhah</i>	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS <i>TIQS</i>	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
RL31	RL31	RL28 RL29 RL30 RL31 RL32 RL33 RL34 RL35 RL36 RL37 RL38	RL31	RL31	RL30 RL31	RL31	RL28 RL29 RL30 RL31 RL32 RL33 RL34	RL31	RL28 RL29 RL30 RL31 RL32 RL33 RL34	RL31	RL31	RL31	RL30 RL31	RL31
RL39		RL40 RL41 RL42 RL43 RL44 RL45 RL46 RL47 RL48 RL49 RL50 RL51 RL52 RL53				RL36	RL36 RL37 RL38 RL39 RL40 RL41 RL42 RL43 RL44 RL45 RL46 RL47	RL36 RL39 RL40 RL41	RL36 RL37 RL40 RL41 RL42 RL43 RL44 RL45 RL46 RL47					RL39
RL54					RL46	RL46	RL46 RL47 RL48 RL49 RL50 RL51	RL46 RL47 RL49 RL50 RL51	RL46 RL47 RL48 RL49 RL50 RL51			RL46	RL46	
RL57		RL56 RL60 RL61	RL58 RL59	RL57 RL58 RL59	RL57 RL58 RL59 RL60	RL58 RL59 RL60	RL54 RL56 RL57 RL58 RL60 RL61	RL54 RL56 RL57	RL56 RL57 RL60 RL61		RL57 RL58 RL59	RL55 RL58	RL55 RL57 RL58 RL59 RL60	RL57

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
				RL62	RL62		RL62 RL63 RL64 RL65		RL64		RL62		RL62	
SHM:	SHM: SHM1	SHM: SHM2	SHM: RL65 RL66	SHM: RL65 RL66	SHM: RL65 RL66	SHM: RL65	SHM: SHM2 SHM3	SHM: RL65	SHM: SHM2	SHM: RL66	SHM: RL65 RL66	SHM: RL65	SHM: RL65 RL66	SHM :
SHM3				SHM4	SHM2 SHM3 SHM4 SHM5		SHM5 SHM6 SHM7 SHM8		SHM7		SHM3 SHM4 SHM5	SHM2 SHM3 SHM4 SHM5		
SHM6		SHM7		SHM5 SHM6		SHM5	SHM5 SHM6	SHM5 SHM6			SHM5 SHM6		SHM5	SHM5
SHM8		SHM9 SHM10 SHM11 SHM12					SHM10 SHM11 SHM12 SHM13	SHM8 SHM10	SHM7 SHM10 SHM11 SHM12				SHM8	SHM8
SHM13 SHM14					SHM15		SHM15		SHM15 SHM16				SHM15	
SHM22 SHM23		SHM15 SHM16 SHM17 SHM18 SHM19 SHM20 SHM21			SHM20		SHM20 SHM22	SHM15 SHM20 SHM21	SHM15 SHM16				SHM20	
		SHM24 SHM24' SHM25 SHM26					SHM26	SHM26	SHM26					

ID Al- Muntaqá	ID Al- Nafhah	HI	'Ayní Ist.B2	'Ayní Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.	
SHM68		SHM61 SHM62 SHM63			SHM64	SHM63	SHM61	SHM63	SHM61			SHM63	SHM64		
		SHM65 SHM66 SHM67					SHM65		SHM65						
FA: FA2	FA: FA4	SHM69 SHM70 SHM71 SHM72 SHM73 SHM74 SHM75 SHM76 SHM77 SHM78 SHM79 SHM80 SHM81 SHM82 SHM83 SHM84	FA: FA1	FA: FA3	FA: FA5 FA6	FA: FA6 FA7	SHM68	SHM71	SHM69 SHM70 SHM71	FA: FA1	FA: FA3	FA: FA5 FA6	FA: FA5 FA6	FA: FA2	
		SHM73 SHM74					SHM73 SHM74		SHM76						SHM73 SHM74
					SHM77		SHM77 SHM78 SHM79 SHM80 SHM81		SHM81						
						SHM85	SHM83 SHM84	SHM83 SHM84	SHM83 SHM84						

ID	ID	HI	'Aynf Ist.B2	'Aynf Ist.19	Maq.	IH	IQS 2 nd	IQS TIQS	IQS 1 st	IT	AJ	ABM	IY	Anon.
ID Al-Muntaqá	ID Al-Nafshah					FA8								

TABLE III. 2. A.

III. 2. A. i. a.

Ibn Duqmâq - <i>Al-Muntaqâ</i>		
SHM3	SHM27	PMA145
PMA4	PMA88	PMA146
PMA9	PMA89	PMA148
PMA11	PMA91	PMA149
PMA14	RL26	PMA150
PMA15	PMA92	PMA151
SHM6	RL31	PMA153
PMA10	PMA95	PMA152
Obituaries	PMA96	PMA154
SHM8	PMA100	PMA160
RL9	PMA106	FA2
PMA27	PMA99	PMA157
PMA33	PMA97	PMA158
PMA34	PMA101	PMA161
PMA35	PMA109	PMA159
PMA36	PMA111	PMA163
RL5	PMA112	RL57
PMA29	PMA113	PMA164
PMA31	SHM46	
PMA32	SHM47	
PMA39	RL39	
SHM13	SHM52	
SHM14	SHM54	
PMA40	PMA117	
PMA43	PMA119	
PMA47	SHM59	
PMA51	PMA120	
PMA52	PMA124	
PMA53	PMA125	
RL11	PMA126	
PMA57	PMA128	
PMA56	SHM68	
Obituaries	RL54	
PMA64	PMA134	
RL13	PMA135	
PMA62	PMA136	
PMA65	PMA137	
SHM22	PMA138	
SHM23	PMA139	
RL14	PMA140	
PMA73	PMA141	
PMA75	PMA142	

III. 2. A. i. b.

Ibn Duqmâq- *Al-Nafhah*

SHM1
PMA12
PMA20
PMA22
PMA40
PMA39
PMA56
RL31
SHM52
PMA134
PMA135
PMA138
PMA140
PMA141
PMA142
PMA145
PMA146
PMA151
PMA153
PMA160
PMA163
PMA165
PMA164
PMA158
PMA172
PMA187
FA4
PMA189
Obituaries

III. 2. A. ii.

Ibn Hijji – Tārīkh Ibn Hijji

PMA1	PMA60	RL27	PMA114	Obituaries	Obituaries
SHM2	Obituaries	RL28	PMA115	SHM70	PMA206
PMA2	SHM20	RL29	RL41	RL56	SHM83
PMA5	SHM21	SHM32	SHM48	SHM71	SHM84
RL1	PMA66	PMA93	SHM49	PMA143	
Obituaries	SHM24	PMA94	SHM50	SHM72	
RL2	PMA67	SHM33	RL40	SHM73	
FA1	PMA68	SHM34	SHM51	Obituaries	
PMA12	SHM24'	RL30	SHM53	SHM74	
PMA13	PMA70	RL32	PMA116	SHM71	
RL4	PMA71	RL31	PMA118	PMA144	
PMA16	RL15	RL33	SHM55	PMA155	
PMA17	RL16	SHM35	SHM56	PMA156	
RL6	RL15	SHM36	SHM57	PMA162	
PMA18	Obituaries	SHM37	RL42	PMA134	
Obituaries	RL17	SHM38	RL43	FA3	
SHM7	PMA74	RL34	RL44	PMA166	
PMA24	SHM25	PMA103	SHM58	PMA167	
SHM9	PMA76	PMA97	RL45	SHM75	
PMA26	PMA77	PMA98	SHM60	SHM76	
SHM10	RL19	PMA99	SHM61	PMA173	
PMA25	PMA58	PMA101	SHM62	PMA174	
RL7	PMA78	PMA104	RL46	SHM77	
SHM11	SHM26	PMA105	RL47	PMA176	
PMA30	SHM27	Obituaries	RL48	PMA177	
SHM12	SHM28	PMA107	SHM63	PMA179	
PMA41	PMA80	Obituaries	RL49	PMA181	
RL10	RL20	SHM39	SHM54	PMA182	
PMA42	RL21	SHM40	PMA121	SHM78	
SHM15	PMA82	RL35	PMA122	PMA185	
SHM16	PMA83	SHM41	SHM65	SHM79	
PMA44	PMA84	RL36	SHM66	Obituaries	
PMA45	SHM29	Obituaries	RL50	SHM80	
PMA46	SHM30	SHM42	RL51	SHM81	
SHM17	RL22	PMA108	RL52	Obituaries	
PMA48	PMA85	PMA110	PMA127	SHM82	
PMA50	RL23	RL37	SHM67	PMA194	
PMA49	RL24	SHM43	RL53	RL60	
PMA54	RL25	SHM44	PMA129	RL61	
SHM18	PMA86	SHM45	PMA131	Obituaries	
SHM19	PMA87	SHM46	PMA130	RL64	
PMA55	SHM31	Obituaries	SHM69	PMA197	
PMA59	PMA90	RL38	PMA132	FA6	

II. 2. A. iii. a.

Al-'Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – Ist.B2

PMA1	PMA158
PMA6	PMA160
RL3	PMA163
PMA14	PMA161
RL5	PMA164
PMA19	PMA165
PMA20	PMA175
PMA21	PMA178
PMA22	RL58
PMA23	PMA186
PMA34	PMA184
PMA38	PMA187
PMA33	RL59
PMA27	PMA193
PMA35	PMA195
PMA40	RL65
PMA52	PMA200
PMA51	PMA199
PMA53	PMA201
RL11	RL66
PMA57	Obituaries
RL12	
PMA62	
RL13	
PMA64	
PMA73	
PMA75	
RL31	
PMA96	
PMA133	
PMA134	
PMA135	
PMA136	
PMA138	
PMA140	
PMA141	
PMA145	
PMA147	
PMA153	
PMA154	
PMA153	
PMA157	
PMA154	

II. 2. A. iii. b.

Al-'Aynî – *Iqd al-Jumân* – Ist.19

PMA1	PMA140
PMA6	PMA141
PMA7	PMA145
PMA8	PMA147
RL3	PMA153
PMA11	PMA154
SHM5	PMA153
SHM6	PMA154
PMA14	PMA157
RL5	PMA154
PMA19	PMA158
PMA20	PMA160
PMA21	PMA163
PMA22	RL57
PMA23	PMA164
PMA34	PMA161
PMA38	PMA164
PMA31	PMA165
PMA33	PMA175
PMA27	PMA178
PMA35	RL58
PMA39	PMA180
PMA40	PMA186
PMA52	PMA184
PMA51	PMA187
PMA53	RL59
RL11	PMA189
PMA57	PMA193
PMA58	RL62
RL12	PMA195
PMA62	PMA196
PMA63	RL65
RL13	PMA200
PMA64	PMA199
PMA73	PMA201
PMA75	RL66
RL31	SHM4
PMA96	Obituaries
PMA133	
PMA134	
PMA135	
PMA136	
PMA138	

II. 2. A. iv.

Al-Maqrîzî – Kitâb al-Sulûk

SHM2	PMA62	PMA171
SHM3	PMA63	SHM77
SHM4	RL13	PMA175
PMA3	PMA64	PMA178
PMA6	RL18	RL58
PMA7	PMA73	PMA180
PMA8	PMA75	PMA181
RL3	PMA70	PMA185
PMA11	PMA71	PMA186
SHM5	PMA74	PMA184
PMA14	PMA81	PMA187
RL5	RL23	RL59
PMA19	RL27	PMA189
PMA20	RL30	FA5
PMA21	PMA99	PMA193
PMA22	PMA101	PMA194
PMA23	RL46	RL60
RL8	SHM64	RL62
PMA34	PMA122	PMA195
PMA31	PMA130	PMA196
PMA38	RL31	RL65
PMA33	PMA96	PMA200
PMA27	PMA133	PMA199
PMA35	PMA134	PMA201
PMA37	PMA135	PMA202
PMA39	PMA136	PMA205
PMA40	PMA138	PMA204
PMA24	PMA140	PMA197
SHM15	PMA141	FA6
PMA44	PMA145	RL66
PMA48	PMA153	Obituaries
PMA49	PMA154	
PMA50	PMA153	
PMA52	PMA157	
PMA51	PMA154	
PMA53	PMA158	
RL11	PMA160	
PMA54	PMA163	
PMA57	RL57	
PMA58	PMA161	
SHM20	PMA164	
RL12	PMA165	

II. 2. A. v.

Ibn Hajar – *Inbâ' al-Ghumr*

SHM5	PMA165	RL60
PMA12	PMA140	PMA197
PMA20	PMA153	FA6
PMA5	PMA134	FA7
PMA12	PMA135	PMA28
PMA23	PMA136	SHM85
PMA38	PMA138	PMA186
PMA24	PMA140	PMA187
PMA130	PMA141	PMA189
PMA70	PMA145	RL65
PMA71	PMA153	PMA200
PMA74	PMA157	PMA199
PMA81	PMA187	PMA201
PMA130	PMA158	FA8
PMA28	PMA187	Obituaries
SHM28	PMA160	
RL18	PMA164	
RL23	PMA163	
RL24	PMA164	
RL25	PMA98	
RL5	PMA97	
SHM12	PMA99	
RL8	PMA101	
PMA27	PMA167	
PMA52	RL36	
PMA53	SHM46	
RL3	SHM48	
RL13	SHM57	
RL59	RL46	
PMA73	SHM63	
PMA31	RL48	
RL11	SHM54	
PMA57	PMA123	
PMA36	PMA156	
PMA96	SHM52	
RL58	PMA171	
RL31	PMA202	
PMA133	PMA194	
PMA141	PMA181	
PMA134	PMA202	
PMA147	PMA20	
PMA133	PMA48	
PMA134	PMA194	

II. 2. A. vi. a.

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah – 2 nd . recension of Ibn Hiji's <i>Târîkh</i>						
PMA1	PMA48	RL23	SHM47	PMA130	PMA169	PMA202
SHM2	PMA50	RL24	PMA113	PMA132	PMA170	PMA197
SHM3	PMA49	RL25	RL38	RL54	PMA171	FA6
PMA4	PMA52	PMA86	PMA114	PMA137	PMA172	PMA203
PMA5	PMA53	PMA87	PMA115	Obituaries	PMA173	PMA204
PMA6	PMA54	PMA88	SHM48	SHM70	Obituaries	SHM83
RL1	RL11	PMA92	RL39	PMA134	SHM77	SHM84
FA1	PMA55	PMA90	RL40	PMA135	SHM78	Obituaries
PMA9	PMA56	RL27	SHM51	PMA136	SHM79	
PMA10	PMA57	RL28	SHM52	PMA138	SHM80	
SHM5	PMA59	RL29	RL41	PMA139	PMA177	
SHM6	Obituaries	PMA94	Obituaries	PMA140	PMA178	
PMA12	SHM20	PMA89	SHM53	PMA141	PMA175	
PMA13	PMA64	Obituaries	SHM54	PMA142	PMA179	
RL6	PMA62	SHM33	PMA116	PMA145	PMA180	
PMA16	RL13	SHM34	PMA117	PMA148	PMA181	
PMA17	PMA65	RL30	PMA119	PMA149	PMA182	
Obituaries	PMA67	RL31	SHM57	PMA150	PMA183	
SHM7	SHM22	RL32	PMA119	PMA151	PMA184	
RL8	PMA70	RL33	RL42	PMA153	FA4	
SHM8	PMA71	PMA95	RL43	PMA152	PMA185	
PMA24	RL15	PMA96	RL44	PMA154	PMA186	
PMA26	RL16	PMA100	SHM59	PMA160	PMA187	
PMA27	RL17	RL34	SHM61	RL56	PMA188	
PMA39	PMA73	PMA103	RL46	PMA144	PMA189	
SHM10	PMA74	PMA97	RL47	PMA143	RL58	
PMA25	PMA75	PMA98	RL45	SHM73	Obituaries	
RL7	PMA76	PMA99	SHM63	SHM74	SHM81	
SHM11	PMA77	PMA101	RL49	SHM71	PMA190	
PMA29	PMA58	PMA104	PMA120	PMA156	PMA191	
PMA31	PMA78	PMA106	PMA121	PMA157	PMA192	
PMA38	RL19	PMA101	PMA122	PMA158	PMA193	
SHM13	RL26	PMA102	Obituaries	PMA159	PMA194	
PMA40	SHM26	PMA107	SHM65	PMA161	RL60	
SHM12	Obituaries	RL36	PMA124	PMA162	RL61	
PMA41	SHM27	Obituaries	RL50	FA3	RL62	
RL10	SHM28	SHM42	RL51	PMA163	RL63	
PMA43	PMA80	PMA108	PMA126	RL57	RL64	
PMA30	RL20	PMA110	PMA128	PMA164	PMA195	
Obituaries	RL21	PMA111	PMA125	PMA166	RL65	
SHM15	PMA83	RL37	PMA129	PMA167	PMA198	
PMA44	PMA84	SHM43	SHM68	PMA168	PMA199	
PMA47	PMA85	SHM46	PMA131	PMA165	PMA200	

II. 2. A. vi. b.

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah – *TIQS*

PMA4	PMA58	RL47	FA5
PMA5	PMA114	RL45	PMA193
PMA6	RL19	SHM63	PMA194
PMA9	SHM26	RL49	RL60
PMA10	SHM28	PMA121	RL61
SHM6	RL20	PMA122	RL65
SHM5	PMA83	RL50	PMA199
PMA12	PMA92	RL51	PMA200
PMA13	RL23	PMA130	PMA202
RL6	RL24	RL54	PMA197
PMA16	RL27	PMA134	FA6
PMA17	RL25	PMA138	PMA204
SHM8	PMA87	PMA141	SHM83
PMA24	PMA94	PMA145	SHM84
PMA26	PMA89	PMA150	Obituaries
SHM10	RL31	PMA149	
PMA20	RL34	PMA153	
PMA22	PMA95	PMA154	
PMA25	PMA96	PMA160	
PMA33	PMA100	PMA157	
PMA27	PMA104	PMA158	
RL7	PMA97	PMA161	
PMA29	PMA99	PMA163	
PMA31	PMA101	PMA164	
PMA40	RL36	PMA168	
PMA41	PMA110	PMA187	
PMA43	PMA111	PMA168	
RL8	SHM43	PMA165	
PMA48	SHM46	RL56	
PMA50	PMA113	PMA137	
RL11	SHM48	SHM76	
PMA56	RL39	SHM74	
PMA64	RL40	SHM71	
PMA62	SHM52	PMA156	
RL13	RL41	RL57	
PMA67	SHM54	PMA170	
RL15	PMA116	PMA178	
RL16	PMA119	PMA175	
PMA70	SHM57	PMA181	
PMA74	RL43	PMA186	
PMA73	RL44	PMA188	
PMA76	RL46	PMA189	

II. 2. A. vi. c.

Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah – 1st. recension of Ibn Hijjî's *Târîkh*

PMA1	PMA70	RL31	RL50	PMA206
SHM2	PMA71	RL34	RL51	SHM83
PMA2	PMA68	PMA103	RL52	SHM84
PMA5	RL15	PMA97	PMA127	Obituaries
RL1	RL16	PMA98	PMA129	
FA1	RL17	PMA99	PMA131	
PMA12	PMA74	PMA101	PMA130	
PMA13	PMA76	PMA104	SHM69	
RL4	PMA77	PMA107	PMA132	
PMA16	PMA58	PMA105	Obituaries	
PMA17	PMA78	RL36	SHM70	
RL6	RL19	Obituaries	PMA134	
PMA18	SHM26	SHM42	RL56	
Obituaries	Obituaries	PMA108	PMA143	
SHM7	SHM27	PMA110	SHM73	
PMA24	SHM28	RL37	SHM74	
PMA26	PMA80	SHM43	SHM71	
SHM10	RL20	SHM46	PMA144	
PMA25	RL21	PMA114	PMA155	
RL7	PMA82	PMA115	PMA156	
SHM11	PMA83	SHM48	PMA162	
SHM12	PMA84	RL40	PMA134	
PMA41	SHM29	SHM51	FA3	
RL10	SHM30	RL41	PMA166	
PMA30	RL22	Obituaries	PMA167	
SHM15	PMA85	SHM53	SHM76	
SHM16	RL23	PMA116	PMA173	
PMA44	RL24	PMA118	PMA174	
PMA45	RL25	SHM57	Obituaries	
PMA46	PMA86	RL42	PMA176	
PMA48	PMA87	RL43	PMA177	
PMA50	PMA90	RL44	PMA179	
PMA49	RL27	SHM61	PMA181	
PMA54	RL28	RL46	PMA182	
PMA59	RL29	RL47	PMA185	
PMA55	PMA93	RL48	Obituaries	
Obituaries	PMA94	RL45	SHM81	
SHM20	Obituaries	SHM63	PMA194	
SHM21	SHM33	RL49	RL60	
PMA66	SHM34	SHM54	RL61	
PMA67	RL30	PMA121	RL64	
PMA68	RL32	PMA122	PMA197	
SHM24'	RL33	SHM65	FA6	

II. 2. A. vii.

Ibn Taghrîbirdî – *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah*

PMA12
 PMA20
 PMA22
 PMA21
 PMA23
 PMA38
 PMA27
 PMA39
 PMA40
 PMA52
 PMA53
 PMA50
 PMA61
 PMA62
 PMA73
 RL31
 PMA96
 PMA133
 PMA134
 PMA135
 PMA136
 PMA138
 PMA140
 PMA141
 PMA145
 PMA153
 PMA154
 PMA153
 PMA157
 PMA154
 PMA158
 PMA160
 PMA163
 PMA175
 PMA50
 PMA61
 PMA69
 PMA72
 PMA79
 PMA81
 PMA163
 PMA161

PMA165
 PMA175
 PMA178
 PMA171
 PMA185
 PMA186
 PMA187
 PMA193
 PMA200
 PMA199
 PMA201
 PMA202
 PMA205
 PMA204
 PMA197
 FA6
 RL66

III. 2. A. viii.

Al-Jawharî – Nuzhat al-Nufûs

PMA1	PMA145
PMA6	PMA147
PMA7	PMA153
PMA8	PMA154
RL3	PMA153
SHM5	PMA154
SHM6	PMA157
PMA14	PMA154
RL5	PMA158
PMA19	PMA160
PMA20	PMA163
PMA21	RL57
PMA22	PMA164
PMA23	PMA161
PMA34	PMA164
PMA38	PMA165
PMA31	PMA175
PMA33	PMA178
PMA27	RL58
PMA35	PMA180
PMA37	PMA186
PMA39	PMA184
PMA40	PMA187
PMA52	RL59
PMA51	PMA189
PMA53	PMA193
RL11	RL62
PMA57	PMA195
PMA58	PMA196
RL12	RL65
PMA62	PMA200
PMA63	PMA199
RL13	PMA201
PMA64	RL66
PMA73	Obituaries
PMA75	
RL31	
PMA96	
PMA133	
PMA134	
PMA136	
PMA138	
PMA141	
PMA164	

III. 2. A. xix.

Al-Malatī – Nayl al-Amal

SHM3	PMA122
SHM4	SHM57
Obituaries	SHM63
SHM5	RL46
RL5	SHM54
PMA12	PMA123
PMA20	PMA130
PMA21	Obituaries
PMA22	RL55
PMA48	PMA133
RL8	PMA134
PMA38	PMA136
PMA27	PMA138
PMA33	PMA140
PMA27	PMA141
PMA40	PMA145
PMA24	PMA153
Obituaries	PMA164
PMA57	PMA163
Obituaries	PMA171
RL13	PMA175
RL18	PMA178
PMA73	Obituaries
Obituaries	RL58
PMA39	PMA185
PMA50	PMA184
PMA70	PMA187
PMA71	PMA158
PMA74	PMA194
PMA81	Obituaries
SHM28	RL65
RL23	RL66
PMA99	Obituaries
PMA101	
Obituaries	
RL31	
PMA96	
PMA133	
Obituaries	
SHM46	
SHM48	
SHM52	

II. 2. A. x.

Ibn Iyâs – *Badâ'i' al-Zuhûr*

SHM2	PMA54	PMA138	PMA204
SHM3	PMA57	PMA140	PMA197
SHM4	PMA58	PMA141	FA6
PMA9	SHM20	PMA145	RL66
PMA10	RL12	PMA134	Obituaries
PMA3	PMA62	PMA149	
PMA6	PMA63	PMA150	
PMA8	RL13	PMA153	
RL3	PMA64	PMA157	
PMA11	RL18	PMA154	
SHM5	PMA73	PMA158	
PMA14	PMA75	PMA160	
RL5	PMA70	PMA163	
Obituaries	PMA74	RL57	
PMA19	PMA81	PMA161	
PMA20	RL23	PMA164	
PMA21	RL27	PMA165	
PMA22	RL30	PMA171	
PMA23	PMA99	PMA175	
PMA48	PMA101	PMA178	
PMA19	PMA56	RL58	
SHM8	RL46	PMA180	
PMA34	SHM64	PMA181	
PMA31	PMA130	PMA185	
PMA38	PMA96	PMA186	
PMA27	Obituaries	PMA184	
PMA33	SHM48	PMA187	
PMA27	RL31	RL59	
PMA35	PMA96	PMA189	
PMA39	SHM57	FA5	
PMA40	PMA63	PMA193	
PMA24	SHM52	PMA194	
SHM15	PMA106	RL60	
PMA44	PMA101	RL62	
Obituaries	PMA100	PMA195	
PMA48	SHM52	PMA196	
PMA49	RL55	RL65	
PMA50	SHM54	PMA200	
PMA52	PMA133	PMA199	
PMA51	PMA134	PMA201	
PMA53	PMA135	PMA202	
RL11	PMA136	PMA205	

III. 2. A. xi.

Anonymous – *Jawâhir al-Sulûk*

SHM5
SHM8
PMA20
PMA22
PMA56
RL31
RL39
PMA100
PMA95
PMA101
PMA96
PMA113
SHM54
PMA133
PMA134
PMA136
PMA140
PMA141
PMA142
PMA145
PMA146
PMA153
PMA149
PMA153
PMA154
PMA153
PMA154
PMA160
PMA164
PMA163
PMA157
PMA134
PMA158
PMA178
FA2
RL57
PMA189

TABLE III. 2. B.

III. 2. B. i.

<i>Al-Aynî – 'Iqd al-Jumân – Ist.19</i>	<i>Al-Maqrîzî – Kitâb al-Sulûk</i>
PMA1	SHM2
	SHM3
	SHM4
	PMA3
PMA6	PMA6
PMA7	PMA7
PMA8	PMA8
RL3	RL3
PMA11	PMA11
SHM5	SHM5
SHM6	
PMA14	PMA14
RL5	RL5
PMA19	PMA19
PMA20	PMA20
PMA21	PMA21
PMA22	PMA22
PMA23	PMA23
	RL8
PMA34	PMA34
	PMA31
PMA38	PMA38
PMA31	
PMA33	PMA33
PMA27	PMA27
PMA35	PMA35
	PMA37
PMA39	PMA39
PMA40	PMA40
	PMA24
	SHM15
	PMA44
	PMA48
	PMA49
	PMA50
PMA52	PMA52
PMA51	PMA51
PMA53	PMA53
RL11	RL11
	PMA54
PMA57	PMA57

PMA58	PMA58
RL12	SHM20
PMA62	RL12
PMA63	PMA62
RL13	PMA63
PMA64	RL13
	PMA64
PMA73	RL18
PMA75	PMA73
	PMA75
	PMA70
	PMA71
	PMA74
	PMA81
	RL23
	RL27
	RL30
	PMA99
	PMA101
	RL46
	SHM64
	PMA122
	PMA130
RL31	RL31
PMA96	PMA96
PMA133	PMA133
PMA134	PMA134
PMA135	PMA135
PMA136	PMA136
PMA138	PMA138
PMA140	PMA140
PMA141	PMA141
PMA145	PMA145
PMA147	
PMA153	PMA153
PMA154	PMA154
PMA153	PMA153
PMA154	
PMA157	PMA157
PMA154	PMA154
PMA158	PMA158
PMA160	PMA160
PMA163	PMA163
RL57	RL57
	PMA161
PMA164	PMA164

PMA161	
PMA164	
PMA165	
	PMA165
	PMA171
	SHM77
PMA175	PMA175
PMA178	PMA178
RL58	RL58
PMA180	PMA180
	PMA181
	PMA185
PMA186	PMA186
PMA184	PMA184
PMA187	PMA187
RL59	RL59
PMA189	PMA189
	FA5
	PMA193
PMA193	PMA194
	RL60
RL62	RL62
PMA195	PMA195
PMA196	PMA196
RL65	RL65
PMA200	PMA200
PMA199	PMA199
PMA201	PMA201
	PMA202
	PMA205
	PMA204
	PMA197
	FA6
	RL66
RL66	
SHM4	
Obituaries	Obituaries