

Book Reviews

AḤMAD IBN ‘ALĪ AL-MAQRĪZĪ, *Al-Mawā‘iz wa-al-I‘tibār bi-Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*. Edited by Muḥammad Zaynhum and Madīḥah al-Sharqāwī. Ṣafaḥāt min Tārīkh Miṣr, no. 39 (Cairo: Maktabat Madbūlī, 1998). Three volumes.

REVIEWED BY FRÉDÉRIC BAUDEN, University of Liège

For those who are familiar with Claude Gilliot’s reviews of books published in Egypt, regularly appearing at the end of the *Mélanges de l’Institut Dominicain d’Études Orientales*, Muḥammad Zaynhum (sometimes Muḥammad Zaynhum Muḥammad ‘Azab) is almost a celebrity. His critical editions (*taḥqīq*) are generally based on previous ones published by the Būlāq press, or on a single manuscript preserved in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah. Unsurprisingly, most of them are strongly criticized by Gilliot. Now, Zaynhum has decided to tackle the problem of a critical edition of al-Maqrīzī’s *Khiṭaṭ*. It is a well-known fact that the Būlāq version, with its impractical format, numerous defects, and the poor typography, has remained since its appearance in 1853 the standard edition, although some attempts were made to provide scholars with a better one. Several editions have appeared in the course of the last century, but a complete critical edition, based on several manuscripts, was still seriously needed. This is finally the case, with Ayman Fu’ād Sayyid’s project, which will be completed by the time this review is printed.¹ Compared to the latter, the Zaynhum edition must be categorized among the commercial shenanigans to which the Maktabat Madbūlī is accustomed. The new series, in which this book appears, is full of reprints of older editions almost without any modification. This is also the case here. Probably taken from the Būlāq edition, the text is presented in a more agreeable format in three volumes with a readable font. It is hard to know whether the text has been set up again or if an Optical Character Recognition process has been used. Be that as it may, the result is a disaster: no introduction, no bibliography, no indexes; footnotes limited to the identification of Quran verses, persons, and places in a rather erratic way ending with p. 498 of vol. 1; mistakes added to the Būlāq version (like al-Musabbīḥī’s name becoming al-Mashīkhī! (2:113). A collation of the beginning revealed the following errors : 1:5, line 3: يتقبلون for يتقبلون; line 15: مضى وعبر for مضى وعبر. To conclude, this edition should not find its way onto the shelves of any library and this is even more the case because of the appearance of A. F. Sayyid’s critical edition.

¹London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 2002. Three vols. published so far. See my forthcoming review of vols. 1 and 2 in *Journal of Islamic Studies*.



‘ĀDIL SHARĪF ‘ALLAM, *Al-Nuṣūṣ al-Ta’sīsīyah ‘alā al-‘Amā’ir al-Dīnīyah al-Mamlūkīyah al-Bāqīyah bi-Madīnat al-Qāhirah* (Dār al-Thaqāfah lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa-al-Nashr, 2001). Pp. 453, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY DINA GHALY, University of Toronto

This book is a catalogue of the foundation inscriptions of the standing Mamluk religious buildings in Cairo. Studies on foundation inscriptions are rare, and there are only two other major systematic works that cover, within their broader scope, the material of the book under review. The first is Max Van Berchem’s *Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum (CIA)*, and the second is the *Repertoire chronologique d’épigraphies arabes (RCEA)*, which is a collaboration of several authors. The former is so far unsurpassed in its scope and methodology, while the latter, which is focused on cataloguing the inscriptions without any further analysis of the context, is still incomplete. Therefore, a study in this category is always welcome.

The book, as outlined by the author in his preface, consists of an introduction, four chapters and a summary of results. The introduction provides a brief review of the earliest foundation inscriptions in Islamic architecture in Egypt. It also provides a useful list of the different building materials used for the inscriptions. Unfortunately, no reference is given for the trade terminology the author uses for the different stone types (p. 11).

The first three chapters follow a typological division of the different building types: the first covers madrasahs, the second mosques and the third the rest of the religious foundations such as *khānqāhs*, *zāwīyahs*, and *ribāṭs*. This division is practical and facilitates systematic comparison within each group. The fourth chapter is an analysis of the catalogued inscriptions, with a comparison between the content of the inscriptions and the data available from the sources and *waqf* documents.

For each building listed, the author gives the foundation inscriptions, their location within the building, and a transcription in Arabic. Some of the inscriptions offer revisions made to previously published ones. Unlike the *RCEA*, which only gives the reference to the Quranic citations found in the inscriptions, the author reproduces Quranic texts in full. This is one of the positive aspects of the book. However, some of his revisions to the *RCEA*, which is a reference conspicuously absent from his bibliography, are not properly explained. For instance, for the Madrasah al-Bunduqdārīyah, he says that Wiet added two words to the text, but the reader is left to guess whether he means that the two words were there when recorded by Wiet and are no longer there now, or whether Wiet made a mistake adding those two words.

Other problems include the wrong references he gives to the *RCEA* for many

foundation inscriptions. For example, the reference he gives for the Madrasah al-Bunduqdārīyah is to vol. 12. Vol. 12 ends with the year 680/1281–82, while the madrasah dates to 683/1283–84 and is found in vol. 13, n. 4874. He also does not include inscription n. 4872 at the base of the dome, but adds one inscription stating the date. Another example is the reference for the Madrasah al-Jāwilīyah (pp. 186–87), which he gives as vol. 13, p. 5, when in fact it is p. 245, n. 5163 (he did not provide the catalogue number in this case). Furthermore, other inscriptions in this building are not mentioned at all. The author is also inconsistent in giving the corresponding *RCEA* reference for many of his catalogue entries (e.g., pp. 51, 188–89). One important aspect provided in the *RCEA* but missing in this book is the extensive bibliography that follows each catalogue entry.

There are useful additions and revisions for some inscriptions. For instance, the author adds the date to an inscription in the *khānqāh* of Baybars al-Jāshankīr, which is missing in the *RCEA*, as well as the name of the sultan in another inscription (pp. 188–89). Another example is the date he adds for an inscription in the *khānqāh* of Mughulṭāy. However, the lack of explanation of why or how this information was added when it has been missing in earlier publications raises doubts as to the validity of this data and makes it difficult to use the text.

For the madrasah of Īnāl al-Yūsufī, the author gives only the foundation inscription on the façade and ignores the inscription on the *sabīl*, published earlier by Van Berchem (*CIA* n. 190). In addition, the inscription he provides differs from the one published earlier by Lamei and Creswell, whom he does not mention. In this case, the author fails to provide any reference to previously published inscriptions. Furthermore, although the author discusses this building again in the fourth chapter, p. 234, and provides a partial transcription of its *waqf* manuscript in the appendix on pp. 312–17, no cross-reference to these two sections can be found in the main catalogue entry of the monument (p. 56).

In Chapter 4, “Analytical Studies,” (pp. 223 f.) the author attempts to analyze the relationship between the foundation inscriptions and the function of the buildings. In this chapter, the author also provides a comparison between the architectural planning of the buildings and the information available from the sources and *waqf* documents. For this purpose, he reproduces plans—all were published earlier—for all the buildings he discusses, although the figure numbers are missing for most of them.

For each building type, the author attempts to organize the different designs adopted into categories, e.g., four-*īwān* plans, two-*īwān* plans, etc. Within each plan type, a list of the monuments that follow the specified type is provided. Under madrasahs, a curious plan type is his no. 8, “the *riwāq* plan without a courtyard or a *durqā‘ah*,” under which he gives the Madrasah al-Bunduqdārīyah as an example. This is not accurate, since the only surviving parts of the building

are the two mausolea. The central part of the building, on which he based his plan type, is of later construction of unknown date and does not relate to the foundation inscription provided by the author. In addition, the reader is disappointed when no analysis is given showing how a specific plan type relates to the foundation inscription, as the author promised to do. In fact, since there is no relationship between building function and specific plan type, it is hard to understand the necessity of the detailed categorization the author provides.

The author explains, through the study of *waqf* documents, the intended functions of the building, and how these functions were to be carried out. Although this shows the relationship between the architecture and the *waqf*, it does not explain the particular plan type as categorized by the author. The obvious conclusion one can reach from the author's search for a relationship between foundation inscriptions and building designs is that there is none. Plan types, such as the *īwān*-plan, and building function, whether it is a mosque, a madrasah, or a *khānqāh*, became increasingly interchangeable in the Mamluk period and were not related to the foundation inscriptions. In other words, the exercise conducted by the author to compile his plan types seems unnecessary and irrelevant to the purpose of the chapter and the book.

An analysis of plan types in Mamluk architecture has already been successfully attempted by Meinecke in his *Mamlukische Architektur*, who also provided a reason and context for their development. Obviously, the development of plan types was subject to various urban and other criteria and was unrelated to the intended function of the building.

The author notes that the madrasahs that have a mosque function do not have minarets. However, the madrasah he mentions in the preceding paragraph, that of *Īnāl al-Yūsufī*, which had a mosque function as he himself explains, does have a minaret (p. 234).

The author quotes extensive excerpts from several *waqf* documents in support of the description of the buildings' functions. He also appended several of these buildings' *waqf* texts to the book, which he considers one of the achievements of this publication. However, he only reproduced the sections relevant to his study and not the entire manuscripts. The sections dealing with the buildings' description and location, as well as the income producing properties allocated to the building, are not provided. The manuscripts are only transcribed and not edited.

One valid conclusion the author arrives at is that when the word "madrasah" is included in the foundation inscription, the plan follows the *īwān*-plan consistently.

Editorial mistakes abound in this publication. First, a table of contents is conspicuously missing, as well as an index. The photographs are of such poor printing quality that they are entirely useless. Chapter one, the one cataloguing madrasahs, lacks a title.

More importantly, there are numerous spelling mistakes that hamper the soundness of the inscriptions. For example, p. 42, n. 7: "Allāh *illā* ilāh *illā* huwa," which is again repeated for n. 8. Uljāy al-Yūsufī is printed "Uljāy ila Ūsufī" and Qānībāy is printed "Qātbāy." Such mistakes are so frequent, occurring in monument names as well as personal names, that they constitute a real obstacle, especially for someone unfamiliar with the material. In addition, there are numerous grammatical and language mistakes which render the author's intent at times incomprehensible. Footnote references do not correspond to the correct footnotes (wrong numbering). Also, mistakes in dates can be found, as on p. 251 where the date is given as 13862. Pages 254–55 are repeated on pp. 256–57, while the correct two pages are missing. In these two pages, we miss the categorization of the author's mosque plans.

Overall, this book, which would have been a practical reference for the study of Cairo's religious architecture, does not replace the major references in this field with respect to Mamluk religious architecture. It offers some revisions to previously published inscriptions but must be consulted with other reliable references.

The Dîvân of Qānsûh al-Ghûrî. Edited by Mehmet Yalçın (Istanbul: Bay, 2002). Pp. 203.

Kansu Gavri'nin Türkçe Dîvânı. Edited by Orhan Yavuz (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, Türkiye Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2002). Pp. 376.

REVIEWED BY ROBERT DANKOFF, University of Chicago

These are two editions of the Turkish poetry of Sultan Qānşūh (or Qansu, or Qānīşawh, or Qanīsav) al-Ghawrī (or al-Ghūrī), d. 1516, hereafter in this review referred to by his Turkish *maḥlaş* as Gavri. Of these, the one by Yavuz is superior on the grounds of accuracy and comprehensiveness. The one by Yalçın does have the feature of an English rendering of the text, and so may be useful to someone who does not know Turkish but wishes to gain an idea of what the ill-fated sultan wrote poems about in that language (he also wrote poems in Persian and Arabic). The introductions of the two editions cover more or less the same ground—life, times, works, description of the manuscript—and both books include a facsimile of the unicum. Yavuz adds some poems drawn from other texts, plus a long and detailed analysis of the language of the poems; this analysis (pp. 159–282) may have some utility for Turcologists, although it struck this reviewer as largely

unnecessary since Gavri's language is generally simple and straightforward and departs in no way from standard Ottoman Turkish; also the analysis is skewed as based on a corpus that includes verses definitely not by Gavri (see below).

The unicum in question (Staatsbibliothek, Marburg, or. oct. 3744) has been known for some time and was described by Manfred Götz (*Türkische Handschriften* II [Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1968], 207–8) and used by Barbara Flemming in several of her articles devoted to Turkish literary activities in the late Mamluk period. The title, *Dīwān-ı Qānsūh al-Ghawrī*, refers to the first 87 folios out of a total of 236, but even this part contains *ghazals* of other poets (see below). The rest contains poems of Aḥmed Paşa (d. 1497) and 'Adnī (Maḥmūd Paşa, d. 1474) and several treatises on 'arūz metrics.

The first part of the manuscript is incomplete, since there are clearly folios missing. What remains are roughly seventy poems attributed to Gavri. Yavuz counts 71, Yalçın 68. The discrepancy is accounted for as follows:

1. Yalçın omits a poem (XLVI in Yavuz's edition) which in the manuscript bears an attribution to Şeyḫī, but although Şeyḫī is mentioned in the poem it is clearly by Gavri.
2. Yavuz includes an elegy (*merḫiye*; LII in his edition) for the Amir Yaşbek which is incomplete and which there is no reason to assign to Gavri.
3. Yavuz includes a long but incomplete *kaşīde* as the last of Gavri's poems in this collection (LXXI in his edition), apparently because the previous folio ends with an attribution to Gavri, but clearly at least one folio is missing in between, since the acephalous *kaşīde* begins with the second hemistich of a verse; also the style is very Persianate and completely different from Gavri's style, and furthermore the poet refers to himself as Aḥmed in the second-to-last extant verse. In fact, this is a portion of a well-known *kaşīde* by Aḥmed Paşa dedicated to the Ottoman sultan Meḥemmed II Fātīḥ (see *Ahmed Paşa Divanı*, ed. Ali Nihad Tarlan [Istanbul, 1966], poem no. 13; Götz, *Türkische Handschriften*, 207, had already identified this properly).

Thus, by my reckoning, the Marburg manuscript contains 69 poems of Gavri. To these Yavuz appends nine others from four other manuscripts; five of these are by a certain Derviş Aḥmed who also signs himself Gavri but is clearly a different poet; the other four can confidently be assigned to Sultan Gavri (one—LXVIII in Yavuz's edition, Poem 66 in Yalçın's—is from his Arabic *dīwān* and can be seen as balancing out the one Arabic poem in his Turkish "diwan").

One further discrepancy must be noted: Yavuz's edition skips two pages of the original text, apparently corresponding to one opening that was skipped in the photograph of the manuscript which he used. The omission occurs after the first

two verses of no. IX in his edition. For the missing nine verses, see Yalçın, Poem 9. From this point also the enumeration of the folios is off by one in the two editions; thus Yavuz's 14b = Yalçın's 15b, etc.

The contents of the first eighteen poems can be roughly characterized as "religious," including praise of God, the Prophet, and the Companions; Sufi-style sentiments; and expressions of remorse for sin. The remainder of the poems sound the familiar *ghazal* themes of wine and love, and it is these that often appear in the manuscript together with counterparts (*naẓīre*) in the same meter and rhyme by other poets, including Aḥmedī (d. 1413), Nesīmī (d. ca. 1404), Aḥmed Paşa (d. 1497), and Cem Sultan (d. 1495). In the case of his contemporaries it appears that sometimes Gavri was responding to one of theirs, sometimes vice versa, although the question needs more study. Yavuz gives the text of these interspersed poems in footnotes to his edition or else in his introduction, thus permitting us to witness this *naẓīre* phenomenon at work; Yalçın omits them, thus giving us a distorted view of the original text.

At the end of two *ghazals* Gavri names Şeyhī (d. 1431) as the one he is emulating: "O Gavri, if Şeyhi heard your verse he would cock his ear, saying, 'Apparently shahs and sultans have favored you'" (Yavuz, XLI = Yalçın, Poem 41); "If your poetry does not match that of Şeyhi, go and give up Turkish!" (Yavuz, LX = Yalçın, Poem 58; reading: *Ermediyise şan'at ile Şeyhiye şî'rüñ / Var Türkiyi terk et*).

We cannot date any of Gavri's poems, nor are there internal indications as to whether any one was composed before or after he became sultan. The only exception is the *ghazal* elegizing the Amir Yaşbek, presumably written shortly after he died in 1489 (Yavuz, LI = Yalçın, Poem 50). During his sultanate (1501–16) Gavri also sponsored the monumental Turkish translation of Firdawsī's Persian epic, the *Shāh-nāmah*, completed by the poet Şerīf (also known as Şerīfī) in 1511. This has recently been published in four volumes as *Şerīfī: Şehnâme Çevirisi*, edited by Zuhâl Kültürâl and Latif Beyreli (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1999). Şerīf clearly gives his patron's name as Ğavrī Kānışav (vol. I, p. 14, verse 00335), confirming the interpretation of his name as Tk. *kaṃı sav* or *kaṃı sağ* meaning "the one of sound blood."

Four of Şerīf's *ghazals* written in honor of his patron are found toward the end of Gavri's "diwan" (text in Yavuz, pp. 31–34). Şerīf states that Gavri's verses have given great pleasure to the people of Egypt (*Sözinden Ğavrīnüñ el-ḥaḳ katı zevḳ itdi Mışr ehli*), and that his own have garnered respect because of Gavri's (*Şerīf üñ sözleri buldı şeref Ğavrī kelâmından*), indeed that it was Gavri's verse that made him, Şerīf, incline to poetry at all (*Ğavrīnüñ nazmı-durur meyl itdüren şî're beni*). He praises Gavri's justice as giving rise to a peaceable kingdom where ducks and geese nest together with falcons (*'Adlünden ördek kaz-ıla uçup konarlar*

bāz-ıla)—the same image is found in the introduction to his *Shāh-nāmāh* translation (vol. I, p. 15, verse 00382: *Ḳucaqlar ḳaz-ıla ördekleri bāz*).

Annemarie Schimmel, in her foreword to Yalçın's edition, points out that Turkish was the preferred language for poetical activities of most of the rulers of this period, including the Safavid Shah Ismail, Hussain Baiqara of Herat, and Babur conqueror of India; the only exception, paradoxically, is the Ottoman Sultan Selim I, who wrote poems only in Persian. Ottoman, or Anatolian, Turkish was cultivated as a literary language by the later Mamluk amirs and sultans, as Barbara Flemming especially has pointed out. The quality of Gavri's verse is not high: it is competent but pedestrian, for the most part, and would hardly be of much interest except that the poet was also a sultan.

I pointed out above the superiority of Yavuz's edition of Gavri's poetry. Disregarding the unfortunate omission of nine verses and the unfortunate inclusion of a *ḳaṣīde* by Aḫmed Paṣa as though it were by Gavri, Yavuz's edition is nearly flawless. The remainder of this review contains critical notes on the book of Yalçın.

The Dîvân of Qânsûh al-Ghûrî was originally a Harvard dissertation, completed in 1993. The 2002 publication is unrevised, with the exception of substituting *é* for *i* in the text edition to represent the Turkish closed e-vowel. This is a welcome innovation; but in the one place where it really matters—distinguishing *éṣ* "peer, equal" from *iṣ* "thing, work" (Poem 11, lines 2a, 7a, etc.)—he fails to make the distinction. Some of the cross-references were not changed to accord with the printed format; thus in note 99 on p. 32 the reference to "p. 5 n. 11" should be to p. 14 n. 10.

Some of the most flagrant misreadings of Gavri's text are the following (reference is to poem number followed by line number):

- 2.2a derkidür ⇒ deriñdür
- 2.8a kelîmdür ⇒ kelîmüm dér
- 3.14b ve'n-nâr-ı 'âtî ⇒ ve'nnâzi'âti (i.e., Quran 79:1)
- 6.3a ördi ⇒ urdı
- 6.6b size vâr-ı ⇒ sezâvâr-ı
- 9.7b yansın ⇒ yanasın
- 9.8a yalhiyetüñ ⇒ yâ lihyetüñ
- 10.11b lâli ⇒ le'âli
- 14.5a Tevbe a'yân ⇒ "Tûbû" 'ayân
- 23.4b özene ⇒ uzana

- 45.3a şefatinuñ [hem] ⇒ şefeteynüñ
 54.4a ḥaddidir ⇒ ḥaddi dër
 65.7a merhametüñle ⇒ raḥmetüñle

Many corrections need to be made in the English translations as well. Here are a few:

- 1.11b His treasury is filled with darkness and empty of actions ⇒ Devoid of good deeds, his treasure filled with wrong-doing
 2.2a Whoever ponders upon comprehending His Essence, it is a contemplation to which intelligence cannot reach ⇒ Who can ponder His essence? It is too deep for intellect to reach
 2.8a He is the interlocutor to Moses ⇒ He calls Moses "my interlocutor"
 4.7a the fish ⇒ the height of heaven
 9.5b the shawl in front of you has no value for you ⇒ the shawl on your back is a great load
 9.8a your state were white ⇒ or your beard was white
 10.9a The heavens put the sandals upon his face ⇒ He put his sandal upon the face of heaven
 12.10b Anything other than You is worthless ⇒ Anything else is self-regard. For Your sake, God!
 20.8b feast ⇒ trumpet
 26.2b a savaged heart replaces it ⇒ "he comes with a pure heart" (i.e., Quran 26:89)
 26.3a I have no reason to let go the hem of your skirt after dying ⇒ I have no desire to let go the hem of your skirt until I die
 36.5a God's verse of *Nûr* ⇒ the verse: "God is Light"
 37.3 protect ⇒ pity
 39.1a The boat has fallen ⇒ Let the boat sink
 41.7a the Sheykh ⇒ Şeyhî (cf. 58.7a)
 52.3b Have pity for the lover come, do not do it ⇒ Do not sacrifice the lover
 53.2a put love's fire into my heart ⇒ love's fire is a glowing ember on my heart
 58.7a give up composing poetry and Türkü ⇒ give up Turkish

‘ABBŪD QARAH, *Ādāb al-Furūsīyah ‘inda al-‘Arab* (Damascus: Dār al-Malāyīn, 2000). Pp. kaf, 474.

MUḤAMMAD IBN MANKALĪ AL-NĀSIRĪ, *Al-Ḥiyal fī al-Ḥurūb wa-Fath al-Madā’ in wa-Ḥafẓ al-Durūb*. Edited by Nabīl Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Aḥmad (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah, 2000). Pp. 444.

REVIEWED BY JO VAN STEENBERGEN, K. U. Leuven–FWO-Flanders (Belgium)

Ever since the rise of Islam, the *jāhilīyah*-rooted concept of *furūsīyah* or “horsemanship” has remained an intrinsic part of Muslim society. Yet changing contexts and settings blurred its conceptual usages to such an extent that, e.g., the Mamluk historian and alleged *furūsīyah* expert Abū al-Maḥāsīn ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1469) thought it necessary to precisely define its true nature, emphasizing that “*furūsīyah* is something different from bravery and intrepidity, for the brave man overthrows his adversary by sheer courage, while the horseman is one who handles his horse well in the charge and in the retreat, and who knows all he needs to know about his horse and his weapons and about how to handle them in accordance with the rules known and established among the masters of this art.” Indeed, theory and practice had grown apart, so that apart from its strictly technical meaning, only known to “military” experts like Ibn Taghrībirdī, in every day use *furūsīyah* had often become synonymous with “bravery,” even “chivalry.”¹ This ambiguity was also extant in the age-old literary production on the subject, with, on the one hand, works of lexicography and *adab*, setting the technicalities of horsemanship within the framework of (Islamic) virtue, heroism, and chivalry, and on the other hand, the treatises on *furūsīyah*, mostly dating from the late Middle Ages and very technical by nature and content. Unlike the former sort, the majority of these treatises on horsemanship and supplementary military aspects were drawn up by practising experts, “men of the sword” rather than “men of the pen,” though by tradition they as well liked to show off their erudition by punctuating their handbooks with quotes from classical Arabic literature.²

¹Abū al-Maḥāsīn ibn Taghrībirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah*, ed. Ibrāhīm ‘Alī Ṭarkhān (Cairo, 1963–72), 14:131; David Ayalon, “Notes on the *Furūsīyya* Exercises and Games in the Mamluk Sultanate,” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 9 (1961): 34-35; reprinted in idem, *The Mamluk Military Society* (London, 1979), 2:34-35; idem, “Furūsīyya - In the Mamlūk State,” *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 2:954; the translation is taken from Ayalon. Very illustrative in this respect is also the fact that in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* one is referred to the lemma “*furūsīya*” for information on both “horsemanship” and “chivalry” (“horsemanship,” *EI*², 3:536; “chivalry,” *EI*², 2:32).

²G. Douillet, “Furūsīyya,” *EI*², 2:952-53.

This conceptual dichotomy and its omnipresence throughout Islamic history happens to find a very enlightening illustration in the two works that are the subject of this review. For, on the one hand, ‘Abbūd Qarah’s *Ādāb al-Furūsīyah*, published on the brink of the twenty-first century, is a clear exponent, both in title and content, of the ancient “chivalrous” branch of *furūsīyah* literature, while, on the other hand, the first critical edition of *Al-Ḥiyāl fī al-Ḥurūb wa-Faṭḥ al-Madā’ in wa-Ḥafẓ al-Durūb*, a fourteenth-century treatise on weaponry and warfare, is a prime example of this literature’s technical branch.

As indicated by its title, Qarah’s *Ādāb al-Furūsīyah* deals in detail with the manners and customs that characterize the classical standard of Arab “horsemanship,” “i.e., good manners and the doing of noble deeds by which the Arab horseman has distinguished himself since ancient times and that have become exemplary, including the keeping of a promise, patience in bad times, the protection of those who seek refuge, the protection of women and children and of the weak, modesty and courage, generosity, openmindedness and liberality, forgiveness whenever possible, and, last but not least, all noble deeds man has extolled over the course of time” (p. 24). He traces the origins of this moral horsemanship among the Arabs long before the rise of Islam, analyzes the factors that caused it to be an exclusively Arab phenomenon, and presents its constituent parts, ranging from the breeding of horses to the proverbial Arab hospitality. All these elements are presented in a way reminiscent of classical Arabic texts, making and illustrating his points through examples, stories, and quotations that stem from the Arabs’ rich cultural background. Unfortunately, the richness of his material sometimes also happens to make the author indulge in details and arguments the relevance of which is not always clear. Thus, e.g., he consistently tries to argue that Europe only managed to rise from its “dark” Middle Ages thanks to the practices and principles of Arab *furūsīyah*, with which it became acquainted during the Crusades. As for the field of Mamluk studies, regrettably this book’s argumentation does not go beyond the twelfth-century example of Arab-Muslim unity set by Saladin and it is therefore of only limited relevance for anyone particularly interested in Mamluk *furūsīyah*.

For obvious reasons, the latter observation does not hold for the fourteenth-century military treatise entitled *Al-Ḥiyāl fī al-Ḥurūb wa-Faṭḥ al-Madā’ in wa-Ḥafẓ al-Durūb* that has now for the first time been carefully edited by Dr. Nabīl Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, a *furūsīyah* expert in his own right.³

This work consists of two parts that are further divided into nine chapters (*abwab*), subdivided into numerous paragraphs (also *abwāb*). In the first part,

³He graduated from Cairo University (1972) with an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation on Mamluk *furūsīyah*, entitled “Nashr wa-Taḥqīq Makḥṭūṭah: Nihāyat al-Su’l wa-al-Umnīyah fī Ta’līm A’māl al-Furūsīyah ma’a Muqaddimah Tārīkhīyah ‘an Niẓām al-Furūsīyah fī ‘Aṣr Salāṭīn al-Mamālīk.”

different sorts of swords and shields, and bows, strings, and arrows are dealt with in every possible detail of fabric and use, followed by an excursus on different types and applications of glues and oils. The second part continues on bows and arrows, now concentrating on their construction; this is followed by a detailed and illustrated chapter on the construction of water wheels. The book concludes with two chapters on strategies and stratagems before, during, and after battle, including firm recommendations for commanders and the intricacies of besieging a city.

This entire treatise is presented as an amalgamate of different parts of text that were picked from a general guideline for rulers, written by Alexander the Great for his son, and that had been recovered from the ruins of ancient Alexandria by the Arabs, who had translated it into Arabic (pp. 192–93, 230). Hence the continuous use of the imperative masculine singular throughout the entire work and the unusually direct and plain way of writing. Yet the particularity of certain specific military terminologies and other at times rather anachronistic references, e.g., to Quranic verses (p. 23), suggests this alleged origin is nothing but a fabrication of style. Nevertheless, the attribution to Alexander is said to be a known phenomenon for a number of *furūsīyah* texts, suggesting that a link with certain Greek originals should not be excluded.⁴

At the same time, this particular setting has caused some confusion with regard to the identity of the treatise's author. For already in 1929, Ritter questioned its attribution to the known *furūsīyah* author and soldier in the Egyptian *ḥalqah*, Muḥammad ibn Mankalī, whose literary production is said to have flourished during the reign of the Mamluk sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Sha'bān (764–78/1362–76).⁵ Unfortunately, the editor, Dr. Nabīl Muḥammad 'Abd al-'Azīz, makes no mention of this discussion, nor does he substantiate why he attributed this work to Muḥammad ibn Mankalī, though his name remained unnoticed in any of the manuscripts of the work that were used.

As for the latter, this edition is based on three fourteenth-century manuscripts, the oldest of which dates from the year 757/1356, which may serve as a *terminus ante quem* for the treatise.⁶ They are consistently and with great care referred to

⁴V. Christides, "Naft," *EI*², 7:886.

⁵H. Ritter, "La Parure des Cavaliers und die Literatur über die ritterlichen Künste," *Der Islam* 18 (1929):151; Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (Leiden, 1938): S2:167. On Muḥammad ibn Mankalī, see Gerhard Zoppoth, "Muḥammad ibn Māngli: Ein ägyptischer Offizier und Schriftsteller des 14. Jh.s," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 53 (1957): 288–99.

⁶MS Ahmet III 3469, Al-Khizānah al-'Āmmah bi-al-Ribāṭ MS 43 *jīm*, and Al-Khizānah al-Malikīyah bi-al-Ribāṭ MS 285 (2712); the editor acknowledges having failed to get access to a number of other manuscripts, mentioning MSS Aya Sofia 3086, 3087, and Leiden MS 949 (pp. 7–9).

by the editor every time textual differences occur. On top of that, it is one of this edition's major merits that the editor actively applied his scrutiny, erudition, and familiarity with the subject, its sources, and its academic production to try to solve the large number of difficulties of both technical and lexicographical nature which the specific character of this treatise poses to a modern reader. This not only enhances its accessibility to non-specialists, it would also allow specialists in related fields to make active use of this sort of source material. However, due to the unfortunate absence of a detailed index, this edition fails to measure up to the standard one expects of a properly executed edition.

However, this first and careful edition of *Al-Ḥiyal fī al-Ḥurūb* by Dr. Nabīl Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz is a major stepping stone for our understanding of the technical branch of *furūsīyah* literature. For, as David Ayalon already observed more than forty years ago, to date this literature remains not only in want of a careful and critical edition of its texts, but also of a lexicographic elimination of the semantic obstacles that continue to obstruct much of their profitable utilization.⁷

MUḤAMMAD IBN ‘AZZŪZ, *Madrasat al-Ḥadīth fī Bilād al-Shām khilāla al-Qarn al-Thāmin al-Hijrī: ‘Aṣr al-A’immat Ibn Taymīyah wa-al-Mizzī wa-al-Dhahabī wa-al-Barzālī* (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmīyah, 1421/2000). Pp. 696.

REVIEWED BY MICHAEL B. SCHUB, Trinity College, Hartford

In the Mamluk period a number of religious schools flourished under the general name of “Houses (*dūr* or *buyūtāt*) of Hadith in the greater Shām (approximately: Syrian) area, the most famous of which was founded in Damascus by Atabeg Nūr al-Dīn (d. 560/1173). In the eighth/fourteenth century, thousands of scholars (including some women) lived righteous lives investigating and memorizing the traditions of the Prophet which had been *grosso modo* collected by al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), Muslim (d. 261/875), and the four other editors of the canonical collections of acceptable hadiths for Sunni Muslims (“The Six Books”), i.e., about six hundred years previously.

This work is the outcome of the author’s doctoral dissertation, which was accepted in Rabat, Morocco in 1419/1998. After a pedestrian survey of the historical

⁷Ayalon, “The *Furūsīyya* Exercises,” 31–32; J. D. Latham and W. F. Paterson, *Saracen Archery: An English Version and Exposition of a Mameluk Work on Archery (ca. AD 1368) with Introduction, Glossary and Illustrations* (London, 1970), xxxii–xxxiii.

background of the period, the author begins what can only be called a hagiography. He lists the ancestors, teachers, children, students (sometimes supplying genealogical charts), etc., of a few hundred *muḥaddiths*, and repeats the encomia (often in verse) of these scholars reported in previous biographical works. No critical scholarly analysis sullies the pages of this worshipful catalog.

Only nine citations from the Quran and fourteen from the hadith are present, and those only *in passing*. Jacob Neusner would include this work in the genre of *Listwissenschaft*. One can only appreciate it as such.

FRANÇOIS CHARETTE, *Mathematical Instrumentation in Fourteenth-Century Egypt and Syria: The Illustrated Treatise of Najm al-Dīn al-Miṣrī*. Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Science, Texts and Studies, 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2003). Pp. xxi + 422 + 136, illustrations.

REVIEWED BY IRINA LYUTER, Dibner Institute, MIT

This volume is representative of a growing trend in publications devoted to science and technology in the Mamluk period, including the mathematical instrumentation of that period. It contains a critical edition with English translation of the *Kitāb fī al-Ālāt al-Falakīyah* (Charette's title), a richly illustrated Arabic treatise in 122 chapters concerning the construction of over one hundred different mathematical instruments. The value of the text lies in its detailed descriptions of instruments that are either insufficiently documented in the medieval Arabic technical literature as a whole, or indeed even absent from it. Taking into account the unprecedented number of its illustrations, it would be no exaggeration to describe the treatise as unique in its genre. The text was composed in Cairo around 730/1330 and has come down to us in two anonymous manuscripts.

Charette deserves recognition for his work. He has undertaken a profoundly professional linguistic and historical investigation to identify the author of the treatise as Najm al-Dīn al-Miṣrī, a little-known practical astronomer who spent most of his active life in Cairo; and he has presented convincing arguments for this authorship. Charette is ideally situated for this task, having previously studied three other works by Najm al-Dīn: two short treatises on spherical astronomy and approximate methods of finding the prayer times; and a huge compendium of tables.

The illustrated treatise of Najm al-Dīn was written as a reference manual for intermediate students and thus differs from works by Najm al-Dīn's contemporaries

written on the use of instruments. It is in fact a compendium of instructions on how to construct a large variety of instruments by ruler and compass, sometimes by methods unique to the author. These instructions are concentrated exclusively on the mathematical aspects of the construction without discussions of a theoretical nature (for example, spherical trigonometry and gnomonics) or of more practical details of the construction (such as constructions of alidades and sights), the knowledge of which is implicitly assumed of the reader.

During the period of Mamluk rule, instrumentation became localized within the frame of a new subdiscipline of astronomy, the science of astronomical timekeeping (*'ilm al-mīqāt*). From the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century, this subdiscipline encompassed all aspects of practical astronomy (spherical astronomy, time keeping, astronomical instrumentation, qiblah computation, chronology and prediction of lunar crescent visibility), in other words, those aspects that were of direct relevance to the Islamic community. In David King's terminology, this was "an astronomy in the service of Islam." This orientation stipulated a new category of professional astronomers—the *muwaqqits*, employed by a mosque or madrasah and responsible for establishing the times of prayer, computing the qiblah, and constructing instruments.

In his Introduction, Charette evaluates these radical changes in the practice of astronomy in order to define the place, role, and virtues of instrumentation in the context of Egyptian and Syrian societies of the Mamluk period. The increasing significance of the practical and useful aspects of astronomy (as opposed to the theoretical) specified a change in the practice and transmission of science. Among the peculiarities of Mamluk *mīqāt* literature, evident in both the concerns of its authors and the requirements of the religious institutions, Charette identifies the interaction of "folk" and mathematical astronomies; the predominance of approximate methods of solving problems for the needs of practical astronomy; the universality of methods for designing and developing instruments without the cost of approximation; the compilation of universal auxiliary tables; and the use of lists of so-called formulae accompanied by the mostly didactic character of the literature.

In this connection, and of particular importance for the history of mathematical sciences, Charette identifies a significant innovation that he deems "an important step away from the hold of the rhetorical and toward a greater symbolic abstraction" (p. 23). This innovation, appearing first in the encyclopaedia of *mīqāt* entitled *Jāmi' al-Mabādi' wa-al-Ghāyāt* by the seventh/thirteenth century astronomer Sharaf al-Dīn al-Marrākushī, consists in compiling mnemotechnic four-column tables in which each row has four quantities in which relation $a:b=c:d$ holds. A similar table, though containing fewer entries, is credited to Najm al-Dīn al-Miṣrī and investigated by Charette in the present book (Part V, pp. 7–8, Appendix B).

The work of al-Marrākushī became the standard reference work for Mamluk Egyptian and Syrian, Rasulid Yemeni, and Ottoman Turkish specialists of the subject, including Najm al-Dīn al-Miṣrī, and is the earliest and most important source for the history of astronomical instrumentation in Islam. In this connection, a remarkable contribution from Charette is the supplemental biographical information he provides on the basis of al-Marrākushī's *Jāmi'*. Moreover, Charette presents in the Introduction a list of numerous lesser- or entirely unknown authors of the seventh–ninth/thirteenth–fifteenth centuries and sketches their main contribution to this science: al-Maqsī, Ibn al-Sam'ūn, al-Mizzī, Ibn al-Sarrāj, Ibn Shāṭir, Ibn al-Ghuzūlī, al-Bakhāniqī, Ṭaybughā al-Baklamishī, Jamāl al-Māridīnī, Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, and others.

Charette's commentary on Najm al-Dīn's treatise is divided into five chapters and is a logical continuation of his Introduction. As a whole, these chapters form a groundbreaking historical-scientific essay on Islamic mathematical instrumentation during the Mamluk period. In the first part of the commentary, the author presents a classification, based on morphological and historical criteria, of the different categories of astrolabes and related instruments treated by Najm al-Dīn. The following chapters are devoted consequently to horary quadrants and portable dials, fixed sundials, trigonometric instruments, and, finally, miscellaneous instruments. This detailed historical and technical commentary is further characterized by Charette's analysis of a large number of both previously studied and unstudied manuscript sources on instrumentation from the period 800–1500 C.E. Charette also adds commentaries treating the mathematical aspects of the subject in order to aid the reader in grasping the main ideas and achievements of Najm al-Dīn as well as his predecessors and contemporaries. In some cases, Charette provides quite new and useful perspectives on the mathematical peculiarities of the constructions. For example, in the chapter on various-shaped horary quadrants and portable dials, Charette considers these instruments "in the light of the history of nomography" (p. 113) since they undoubtedly bear in modern terms the graphical representation of function of one or more parameters on a two-dimensional surface with a certain scale. What makes this particular chapter of special importance is the fact that earlier textual sources on such instruments are brief and scanty (not to mention that most are still unpublished), whereas Najm al-Dīn's information on them, as demonstrated by Charette, surpasses even the best-known account of al-Marrākushī.

Despite the textual problems inherent in the treatise (the instructions are obscure and indirect, explanations of the technical terminology are absent, and the language of the treatise is Middle Arabic), Charette has succeeded in producing an excellent *editio princeps* and a qualified English translation of this treatise. One small remark on Charette's translating technique may be in order. While the use of

modern terms like “tangent” and “cotangent” for the corresponding medieval trigonometric functions *ẓill mankūs* and *ẓill mabsūt* for the purpose of distinguishing them from proper vertical and horizontal shadows seems quite reasonable, the frequent use of the term “function” strikes one as overly modern for the medieval context. This is a relatively minor quibble given Charette’s achievement. The present volume is truly a wonderfully realized edition and translation and a masterful example of sound scholarship. This young author deserves high praise for his devotion to and absorption in the history of Islamic mathematical and technical sciences. I wholeheartedly recommend the present work to historians of Islamic and Western science, specialists of historical scientific instruments, as well as specialists of the Mamluk period. Charette announces future publications in the pages of this book; we await them eagerly.

KHALĪL IBN AYBAK AL-ŞAFADĪ, *Al-Kashf wa-al-Tanbīh ‘alā al-Waṣf wa-al-Tashbīh*. Edited by Hilāl Nājī and Walīd ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī (Leeds: Majallat al-Ḥikmah, 1420/1999). Pp. 530.

NABĪL MUḤAMMAD RASHĀD, *Al-Şafadī wa-Sharḥuhu ‘alā Lāmīyat al-‘Ajam: Dirāsah Taḥlīlīyah* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ādāb, 1421/2001). Pp. 424.

REVIEWED BY EVERETT K. ROWSON, New York University

Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Şafadī (d. 764/1363) is in need of no introduction to readers of this journal. His massive biographical dictionary, *al-Wāfi bi-al-Wafayāt*, is a fundamental reference for all students of medieval Islam, and his wide-ranging literary production in other areas assures his status as a key figure for anyone concerned with the history and culture of the early Mamluk period in particular. Burgeoning interest in this period, both in the Middle East and in the West, has meant burgeoning interest in al-Şafadī, and the two recent publications under review here—one a critical edition of a previously unpublished text of his, and the other a focused study of what is perhaps his most interesting work—are welcome additions to our library of Şafadiana.

Al-Şafadī was, above all, an *adīb*, a littérateur, and his *oeuvre* includes a series of monographs on aspects of rhetoric. Those on the two most important tropes in the poetry of his time, paronomasia (*jinās*) and (roughly) double-entendre (*tawriyah*), have been available for some time—the former, indeed, appears to

have been the first of his works to find its way into print¹—and the latter has been the subject of a fine analytical study by Seeger Bonebakker.² Now the redoubtable Hilāl Nājī, to whom we owe so much for his multitudinous critical editions of previously unavailable *adab* texts, has, with his collaborator Walīd al-Zubayrī, offered us the *editio princeps* of al-Şafadī’s work on similes (*tashbīh*), essentially a poetic anthology but prefaced by not one but *two* theoretical introductions.

In their own introduction to the text, the editors provide a fairly conventional sketch of al-Şafadī’s life and career, including notes on his interactions with fellow littérateurs (Ibn Nubātah in particular, although no sustained attempt is made to work out the details of the stormy relationship between the two). To this is appended what may be the most complete list to date of al-Şafadī’s works, with full bibliographical information on eighteen published, thirty-four extant in manuscript, and fifteen apparently lost, as well as five red herrings that are not al-Şafadī’s at all. There are a few minor slips in this list, however, and in a few places it is already out of date. The *Rashf al-Zulāl fī Waşf al-Hilāl* is included among the published works, although the editors themselves point out that this is a mistake (it is extant in manuscript). The *Ikhtirā’ al-Khurā’* has now been published; to describe it as “an explanation of two obscure verses” is not inaccurate, but obscures the fact that the verses are nonsense and the entire work is a parody of scholarly practice (as noted already by Brockelmann). Several more volumes of the *Wāfi* have appeared since the editors’ tally of the progress in its publication. Whether one can conclude that al-Şafadī put together his own *dīwān* (now lost) from Ibn Taghrībirdī’s statement that “his poetry is copious (*shī’ruhu kathīr*)” seems problematical.

Discussing the text itself, the editors cogently argue for its authenticity on the basis of both external and internal evidence. They also offer an illuminating quotation from Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1369) on al-Şafadī’s composition techniques: having borrowed from al-Şafadī one volume of his multi-volume commonplace book, the *Tadhkirah*, at the time that he was in the course of composing his work on similes, al-Subkī noticed a notation to the effect that “this volume has been gone through for material for the *tashbīh* book (*najiza al-tashbīh minhu*)”—and promptly composed a three-line poem in praise of the author cleverly playing off this phrase. Nājī and al-Zubayrī then provide a literary context of sorts for the work in the form of a list of ten earlier works on *tashbīhāt* (several of them

¹*Jinān al-Jinās fī ‘Ilm al-Badī’* (Istanbul, 1881) (with al-Biṣṭāmī, *Manāhij al-Tawassul fī Mabāhij al-Tarassul*); I have not seen the recent edition by Samīr Ḥusayn Ḥalabī (Beirut, 1987).

²*Faḍḍ al-Khitām ‘an al-Tawriyah wa-al-Istikhdam*, ed. al-Muḥammadī ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ḥināwī (Cairo, 1979); S. A. Bonebakker, *Some Early Definitions of the Tawriya and Şafadī’s Faḍḍ al-xitām ‘an at-tawriya wa-’l-istixdam* (The Hague, 1966).

explicitly acknowledged as sources by al-Ṣafadī), although they make no attempt to analyze this material or chart a development of the genre. The edition itself is based on a unique Paris manuscript, briefly described and illustrated with four extremely dark and muddy photographs. Most disconcerting is the editors' bald statement that the work's second volume has been lost. While this seems likely enough—the text as published stops without any real ending, and another entire volume with other "themes" is easy to envisage—we are nowhere vouchsafed the grounds for this succinct pronouncement. (Something in the manuscript itself? We are not told).

Certainly the most interesting parts of the *Kashf* itself are its introductions. Why there are two of these rather than one is not entirely clear, although the first is on the whole more general and diffuse and the second highly technical. The ten chapters of the first introduction include, among other topics, a word-study of the root *sh-b-h* (with, inevitably, a review of interpretations of the famous "obscure verses" [*mutashābihāt*] of Quran 3:7); a discussion of the imaginative (*mukhayyilah*) faculty of the brain, complete with diagram (and betraying a very superficial knowledge of the philosophical tradition); a first pass (followed up in the second introduction) at an analytical parsing of different kinds of similes, with a spirited attack on Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (d. 637/1239) in defense of al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (d. 596/1200);³ and a list of thirty poets who were particularly good at employing similes, about half of them "post-classical," which gives us valuable insight into al-Ṣafadī's perception of the canon of Arabic poetry in his day. The second introduction, in twenty-four chapters, lists a variety of definitions of *tashbīh*, and distinguishes it carefully from the related concepts of *mathal*, *tamthīl*, and *majāz*, but is mostly devoted to working through a tree of subvarieties of simile, differentiated by various combinations of such aspects as concrete/abstract, unrestricted/restricted, single/multiple, and reversible/irreversible. The editors offer us no guidance for situating al-Ṣafadī's views here in their context, in terms either of sources or of responses to earlier opinions; but then one cannot demand that a text edition also be a study.

The bulk of the book itself, after the introductions—what al-Ṣafadī calls the "*natījah*"—consists of an anthology of verses deploying similes, arranged thematically. There are sixty-five chapters, beginning with celestial phenomena (sky, stars, and Milky Way; Pleiades; moon; etc.), shifting to meteorology (thunder and lightning; snow and hail; rainbow; etc.), then moving on to gardens (with some twenty chapters on individual flowers, including rich material on the famous

³Al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil was of course a literary icon in al-Ṣafadī's day, whereas Ibn al-Athīr seems to have been a personal bugbear of his, as emerges most clearly in his *Nuṣrat al-Thā'ir*, written in support of and supplementing *Al-Falak al-Dā'ir*, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd's (d. 656/1258) attack on Ibn al-Athīr's *Al-Mathal al-Sā'ir*.

debate between the rose and the narcissus), fruits, vegetables (briefly, but eggplant gets inordinate attention), desserts and other foods, and beer. With bathhouses, followed by tree branches and birds, the principle of organization becomes a bit foggier; and the abrupt ending with birds certainly does suggest more topics to come. The poems presented, mostly of two to four lines, but occasionally longer, are rarely commented on, although al-Şafadī does like to offer “chains” of lines, tracing back through the tradition the use of a specific simile (*akhadhahu min*, “he took [this image] from”). Poets from all periods are represented, although there is relatively little pre-Abbasid verse; quite a lot of Andalusian poetry is included. Al-Şafadī sporadically includes as well some of his own verses, usually at the end of a chapter.

The edition is on the whole meticulous and intelligent (with full attention to the text’s making sense, to the prosody of the verse, and so forth). The relatively copious and at times quite valuable notes mainly focus on parallel texts, often with variant readings, but do not attempt any real analysis of al-Şafadī’s use of his sources. There are a few problems. Typographical errors occur in the first third of the book at a rate of about one every nine pages, hardly optimal but not an unfamiliar problem; but then from about page 148 this rate increases to about one every three pages, through to the end of the text, a fairly intolerable rate in particular for a text consisting mostly of poetry, not the least because most of these errors produce real words (and in some cases must be editors’ rather than printers’ errors); the misreading *aşfar* for *aşghar*—and vice versa—is especially frequent. Furthermore, page 148 itself is an erroneous duplication of page 149, and the proper text for that page is missing; the same thing happens at page 329 (duplicating page 339, with its own material omitted). There is also a bit of bowdlerization; although the *Kashf* is certainly not one of al-Şafadī’s racier books, the editors have felt compelled to suppress three single words and two lines of verse in the first introduction, as well as several words from a line of verse about eggplant in the *natījah*. Less problematical, if not entirely justified, are the editors’ relatively frequent interpolations of additional lines of verse from parallel sources, always, however, carefully noted.

The end matter provided is not really very satisfactory. We are given sixty pages of capsule bio-bibliographies of poets who appear in the work, alphabetically by *ism*, but not all of the latter appear and the basis for inclusion is not at all clear. This is followed by the bibliography, arranged alphabetically by title, consisting almost entirely of primary sources, and exclusively in Arabic, and a detailed table of contents. Distressingly, there are no indices, despite the obvious value both an index of proper names and one of verses would have had for readers and researchers.

Still, it is a joy to have this book in print—although it could hardly be claimed that it is al-Şafadī’s most scintillating achievement. Twelve solid pages of verses

(mostly one- and two-liners) on the Pleiades can become a bit wearisome—and such dogged thoroughness betrays a weakness of al-Şafadī's that was noted even by medieval readers. Nabīl Muḥammad Rashād, in the second of the two publications to be considered here, has reproduced a telling comment by Ibn Taghrībirdī, praising al-Şafadī's literary accomplishments but noting that "I have observed, reading his verse in his own hand, that when he emulates (*yu'ārid*) one of the illustrious poets among his predecessors on a particular clever topos (*ma'ná*) he takes that topos or twist (*nuktah*) and renders it himself in two lines of verse, often quite good ones, but then adds two more lines on the same topos, and then two more, and two more, relentlessly continuing to versify the topos while saying 'and I said (*wa-qultu anā*),' until the eye gets bored, the mind gets fed up, and the ear rejects it; if he had abandoned such a procedure and been a little more discriminating in presenting us with his own verse, he would be (considered) one of the great poets. . . ."⁴

On the other hand, al-Şafadī could be exquisitely sensitive to readers' short attention spans, and nowhere more than in his *Al-Ghayth al-Musajjam fī Sharḥ Lāmīyat al-'Ajam*, a sort of *tour de force* of digression, in which commenting a celebrated 59-line poem becomes a vehicle for a two-volume work consisting mainly of extended disquisitions on the most varied topics imaginable. The *Ghayth* has been available in print since 1887, although never critically edited. It is a pity that the late Franz Rosenthal never devoted a sustained study to this work, despite his obvious enchantment with it, which is clear from any number of his articles (including his relatively recent entry on al-Şafadī for the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*). Now we do have such a sustained study, from Nabīl Muḥammad Rashād, and if it is disappointing in some important respects it is nevertheless gratifying to see attention devoted to such a rich, erudite, and entertaining monument of Arabic literature.

Rashād's study began as an M. A. thesis under Muḥammad Zaghlūl Sallām, whose surveys of the later periods of Arabic literature, supplemented by an array of text editions, are fundamental for anyone pursuing further research in the field. This is, not surprisingly, a less mature work, and while Rashād has read the *Ghayth* carefully, and on the whole intelligently, his vision is in some ways severely circumscribed. Not only is he oblivious to Western scholarship (his references throughout are exclusively Arabic), he appears to be unaware of Arabic scholarship outside Egypt as well, citing two unpublished Egyptian dissertations of relevance to the *Ghayth* but ignoring two relatively recent published studies by

⁴Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Al-Manhal al-Şāfi*, vol. 5, ed. Nabīl Muḥammad 'Abd al-'Azīz (Cairo, 1988), 257, cited by Rashād, p. 79.

Syrian scholars.⁵ And while quite a lot of valuable contextualizing information is provided for both the author and his book, the “analysis” promised in Rashād’s title appears only sporadically, and many of the more interesting and important questions about both author and book are either not answered or not posed.

Predictably, the first two of Rashād’s five chapters are devoted to “Intellectual Life in the Period” and “al-Şafadī’s Cultural Accomplishments (*thaqāfat al-Şafadī*).” In the former he is at pains to stress (and perhaps overstress) the support offered to arts and letters by the Mamluks themselves, and makes clear his vision of this period in Arabic literary history as one of retrenchment and preservation, after the disastrous Mongol invasions of the previous century; the prominence of “the encyclopedic impulse” in the “renaissance” (*naḥdah*) of Arabic learning and literature in Mamluk Egypt (and, distinctly secondarily, Syria) is explained on this basis and lauded in explicitly nationalistic terms. An excursus on accomplishments in the secular sciences (alchemy, medicine, and others) suffers from a certain naivete, but does avoid (as does the book as a whole) the traditional and now much contested view of the period as one of decadence. Rashād notes, correctly, the extraordinary prominence of the homoerotic *ghazal* and explicit sexuality (*mujūn*) in the material he is discussing, and while bowing to contemporary mores in generally avoiding extensive citation from these genres he laudably refuses to bowdlerize such quotations as are essential to his presentation. His discussions of the popularity of rhetorical tropes in general, and especially *jinās*, *tawriyah*, and *taḍmīn* (quotation), of the importance of Sufism in the culture of the period, and of the role of Andalusian and Maghribi immigrants in Mamluk culture generally are interesting, and his portrayal of the popularity of literary “debates” offers some truly fascinating material (including al-Şafadī’s rather jaundiced views on Ibn Taymīyah).

Chapter 2, on al-Şafadī himself and his “culture,” stresses the breadth of the latter, rather severely overestimating al-Şafadī’s expertise in science and philosophy and with some attendant confusion over the distinctions to be made between the realms of philosophy, theology, and science. The section on al-Şafadī as *adīb* is, on the other hand, quite rich, particularly with regard to his relationships with such fellow *udabā’* as Ibn Nubātah, al-Subkī, and the Andalusian Abū Ḥayyān (d. 745/1344).

⁵He notes Manāhil Fakhr al-Dīn Fulayḥ, “Nashāt al-Şafadī fī al-Naqd wa-al-Balāghah,” a 1977 Ph.D. dissertation in the Faculty of Letters at Cairo University, and Ibrāhīm Muḥammad Maṣṣūr, “Shurūḥ Lāmīyat al-‘Ajam, Dirāsah Taḥlīlīyah Naqdīyah,” a 1998 M.S. thesis in the Faculty of Letters at Tanta University. Unnoted are Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Sulṭānī, *Al-Naqd al-Adabī fī al-Qarn al-Thāmin al-Hijrī bayna al-Şafadī wa-Mu‘āşirīhi* (Damascus, 1974, published in the wake of his edition of the *Nuṣrat al-Thā’ir* [Damascus, 1972]), and Ḥasan Dhikrī Ḥasan, *Şalāḥ al-Dīn al-Şafadī wa-Minhajuhu fī Dirāsāt al-Naṣṣ al-Adabī wa-Naqdihi* (Cairo, 1988).

The remaining three chapters focus on the *Ghayth* itself. Chapter 3 looks at al-Şafadī's sources, which are divided into oral and written. Al-Şafadī was generally very punctilious about his citations, and his habit of saying "I heard from X in Damascus (or Cairo, or Şafad) in the year Y" or "I read the following by X in his own hand" has much to tell us about both his personal biography and the way *adab* worked, so to speak, in his world. While presenting his material mostly in the form of lists, Rashād does manage, cumulatively, to paint a rather vivid picture of this. Had he consulted Josef van Ess's article on al-Şafadī, however, he would have been able to both sharpen and expand his presentation.⁶ In discussing interrelationships between al-Şafadī's own works, he fails to note that a passing reference in the *Ghayth* to a previously-composed opusculum (*muqtaḍab*) entitled *Al-Tanbīh 'alā al-Tashbīh* must be either the *Kashf* edited by Nājī and al-Zubayrī or at least some earlier version thereof. And he is quite wrong in assuming that the fourteenth volume of the *Tadhkirah*, of which there is a copy in the Egyptian National Library, is the last; van Ess has pointed out that al-Şafadī produced at least forty-nine volumes of this work.

Chapter 4, on al-Şafadī's methodology in the *Ghayth*, tackles the topic from a number of different vantage points. Regarding the author's motives for composing the work, Rashād specifies the excellence of the poem being commented on, the model of previous commentaries on the *Lāmīyat al-'Arab* of the pre-Islamic poet al-Shanfarā, and al-Şafadī's interest in displaying both his eloquence and his erudition; the latter point, an important one, deserves a fuller and more critical treatment than Rashād has given it. Al-Şafadī, in the introduction to the *Ghayth*, is quite explicit about his methodological aims, and Rashād pursues a "test case," examining the extent to which the commentary on the poem's first line actually conforms to them; his conclusion that it does so "perfectly" is perhaps a bit disappointing, but less so than his reluctance to analyze, rather than simply present, al-Şafadī's rather elaborate defense of his digressive style and his explicit interest in supporting "modern" poets against the prejudices of more conservative tastes. Rashād is actually a bit touchy about the former, offering a rough division of al-Şafadī's relentless digressions (*istiṭrād*) into those that are pertinent, fortuitous (not directly pertinent to the text being elucidated, but pertinent to al-Şafadī's broader pedagogical and encyclopedic aims), and unwarranted (about which Rashād's comments are distinctly ungenerous). On al-Şafadī's pedagogical aims,

⁶Josef van Ess, "Şafadī-Splitter," *Der Islam* 53 (1976): 242–66, and 54 (1977): 77–107, is, as indicated by its title, rather a hodgepodge of observations (but valuable ones), in the wake of van Ess's editing volume nine of al-Şafadī's *Wāfi*, including an extensive list of his sources for that work. Also helpful would have been Donald P. Little, "Al-Şafadī as Biographer of His Contemporaries," in *Essays on Islamic Civilization Presented to Niyazi Gerkes* (Leiden, 1976), 109–20.

on the other hand, Rashād is perceptive and cogent, offering a variety of arguments to show that the distribution of information in the *Ghayth* was unquestionably determined in large part by the author's expectation that students, or neophytes, would constitute a large proportion of its audience. Appended to this chapter is the full text of al-Ṭughrā'ī's *Lāmīyah* as it appears (59 lines, chopped up verse by verse) in the *Ghayth*, as well as an "emulation" (*mu'āraḍah*) of it (60 lines) by al-Ṣafadī, the latter absent from the *Ghayth* but happily discovered by Rashād, by chance, in a much later anthology.

In chapter 5, on "Critical and Rhetorical Views in the Commentary," Rashād picks out five literary topics for further investigation. The first of these, on the "music" of poetry, is mostly devoted to a discussion of al-Ṣafadī's arresting suggestion that al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad (d. 175/791) was influenced by Greek prosody in producing his henceforth canonical analysis of prosody in Arabic. Giving full credit to the plausibility of this proposal, Rashād nevertheless ultimately rejects it on the basis of the consensus of traditional reports to the contrary from "our forebears (*aslāfunā*)"; such credulity is unfortunately characteristic of the book as a whole. The other chosen topics—well justified by the content of the *Ghayth* itself—are al-Ṣafadī's assessment of the verse of al-Mutanabbī (staking out a middle position in the centuries-old controversy), his defense of the poet Ibn Ṣanā' al-Mulk (d. 608/1211) against an attack by a certain Ibn Jabbārah (d. 632/1235), his treatment of plagiarism (both al-Ṭughrā'ī's "thefts" from earlier poets and those by later poets from him), and his discussions of rhetorical tropes (eighteen of them altogether, with particular attention to paronomasia [*jinās*]). Of the latter perhaps the most interesting is *ikhtilāṣ*, the device of cleverly shifting a topos (*ma'ná*) from one genre (*gharaḍ*) to another (such as using love-poetry imagery in an elegy, for example); al-Ṣafadī was extremely fond of this technique, as were his contemporaries generally, but here Rashād has little to say about it beyond his quotations from al-Ṣafadī himself.

In an appendix, Rashād pulls together all of al-Ṣafadī's own verses as cited in the *Ghayth*—187 altogether, few exceeding four lines. In itself this is useful (since we lack a real *dīwān* of al-Ṣafadī's poetry), but Rashād presents the verses alphabetically by rhyme letter, with virtually no indication of their original context, which in some cases renders their point completely opaque; some of the instances of *taḍmīn* (embedding quotations from earlier poetry) elude him as well. A brief conclusion simply highlights the principal points made throughout the study, and is followed by a bibliography (all Arabic, divided into primary and secondary sources) and a detailed table of contents. Again, there are no indices.

Despite its limitations, Rashād's study is must reading for those of us with a particular interest in al-Ṣafadī, and is certainly worth the attention of anyone concerned with Arabic literature of the Mamluk period generally. Together, this

text edition and study advance our knowledge appreciably, and as indicators of a trend encourage us to look forward to more Ṣafadī, and more Ṣafadī studies, in the near future.

The Historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800). Edited by Hugh Kennedy. The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1453, no 31. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001). Pp. 269.

REVIEWED BY ANNE F. BROADBRIDGE, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

This work represents the proceedings of a conference on the Historiography of Islamic Egypt, held at the University of Saint Andrews, Scotland, from 28–31 August, 1997. Based on the generally high quality of these papers, it appears to have been a fascinating and unusually cohesive conference. All but one article are written in English; the exception is in French. This is a satisfying collection, which provides well-deserved attention to historians of Egypt, and paves the way for future work in this rich field.

The volume is arranged chronologically in sections of uneven length. Section topics include the Fatimid and Ayyubid Periods (358–658/969–1260), the Bahri Mamluk Period (648–792/1250–1390), al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) and His World, Historians of the Circassian Mamluk Period (784–922/1382–1517), and the Historiography of Ottoman Egypt. The collection concludes with a solitary article on the modern period.

Only two scholars presented on the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods, which reflects the relative paucity of that historical material. First Michael Brett uses John Wansborough's theory on diplomatic terminology as a meta-language for communication in the Mediterranean to illustrate that Fatimid chancery documents, even when inaccurate, shaped the tone and style of the chronicles that relied on them as sources. Brett also discusses the institutional continuity that allowed authors from later periods to use these documents, and theorizes briefly about reasons for the eventual disappearance of such materials. Next David Morray provides a description of the biographical dictionary of Aleppo by Ibn al-Adīm (d. 660/1262), the *Bughyat al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab*. Morray focuses on the different kinds of travel in which medieval personalities engaged, and lays the groundwork for future in-depth studies.

Given the preponderance of historical sources for the Mamluk period (648–923/1250–1517), it is no surprise that Mamluk topics dominated the

conference. In the section on the Bahri period, D. S. Richards discusses the historian Baybars al-Manṣūrī (d. 725/1325) as a person and an author, although this work has now been superseded by the introduction to his edition of Baybars al-Manṣūrī's *Zubdat al-Fikrah fī Tārīkh al-Ḥijrah* (Beirut, 1419/1998). Reuven Amitai uses six brief case studies to analyze the sources, style, strengths, and weaknesses of the little-known history of the Mongols written by the Mamluk historian Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333), which appears in his *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab*. Amitai demonstrates that al-Nuwayrī's information is often independent of the Persian histories and the anonymous *Secret History of the Mongols*, and argues convincingly that this work must be consulted by anyone seeking a fresh view of Mongol history. Robert Irwin makes a similar call for scholars to move outside the standard historical corpus. Interested in both the literary world of the Mamluk sultanate and its history, Irwin has struggled to promote Arabic literature in its own right, and as an aid to historical study.¹ This time he presents a literary analysis of an erotic text by the eighth/fourteenth-century 'Alī al-Baghdādī, which he combines with an outline of the way this fictional collection could illuminate the social history of Cairo in the 730s/1330s.

Several presenters contributed to our increasingly sophisticated understanding of scholarly biases in the sources with which we grapple. For the Bahri period, Nasser Rabbat argues that when writing, the civilian literati not only emphasized their own social class to the detriment of commoners and the military elite, but actually constructed specific and often reductionist images of these two other groups, which have affected modern views of Mamluk society. Rabbat also explores the political and social reasons for the literati's biases, and the way the literati used variations in language to further their stereotypes. For the Circassian period, Carl Petry analyzes uneven coverage of Bedouin raids in the countryside and urban crime in Cairo to reveal that historians' discussion of crime reflected their own privileged and stratified view of society, and also gave them an opportunity to issue oblique criticism of the ruling elite.

An entire section of the conference was devoted to that perennially interesting personality and topic, the famous eighth/fifteenth-century Mamluk-era historian Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442).² In the solitary article written in French, Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid provides an overview of topographical

¹See also his "What the Partridge told the Eagle: a Neglected Arabic Source on Chinggis Khan and the Early History of the Mongols," *The Mongol Empire and Its Legacy*, ed. Reuven Amitai-Preiss and David O. Morgan (Leiden, 1999): 1–11.

²Scholars interested in al-Maqrīzī will also benefit from the proceedings of a later conference devoted entirely to that historian, for which see *Mamlūk Studies Review* 7/2 (2003).

writing in Egypt (*khiṭāṭ*) both before and after the composition of al-Maqrīzī's paramount *Al-Mawā'iz wa-al-I'tibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭāṭ wa-al-Āthār*. Sayyid draws our attention to those authors whose works have been lost, and those who were members of religious minorities, among them Copts and Shi'ites. Also focusing on al-Maqrīzī, Amalia Levanoni and Irmeli Perho both employ case studies to illuminate different aspects of his writing. Levanoni uses the struggles for power by the Mamluk sultan Barqūq (r. 784–91/1382–89; 791–801/1389–99) to reveal that al-Maqrīzī's moralizing sometimes led him to present biased or inaccurate information; she also makes an important call for a reevaluation of the role of ethnicity in the transfer from Turkish to Circassian rule. Perho's case study of the treatment of common people in Cairo (*al-‘āmmah*) in the writings of both al-Maqrīzī and his student Yūsuf ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1470) demonstrates that their writing styles were shaped by their different interests and backgrounds.

Some took this conference as an opportunity to introduce new or little-known works. Among them was Li Guo, writing on Burhān al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Umar al-Biqā‘ī (d. 885/1480), a brilliant maverick scholar with an ugly personal life whose chronicle contributes an original view of society in the mid-ninth/fifteenth century. A welcome addition to the existing sources, al-Biqā‘ī's writing should expand our knowledge of the history and culture of this as yet understudied period. Guo also discusses al-Biqā‘ī's use of apocalyptic visions and Quranic prophecy to produce a distinctive salvation history, and places al-Biqā‘ī's work in the greater context of Islamic salvation history over the ages. Similarly, the late Ulrich Haarmann, to whom the conference proceedings are dedicated, also contributed an investigation of a misfit scholar, although this one was more bumbling than brilliant. Haarmann discussed one Abū Ḥāmid al-Qudsī (d. 888/1483), who was emotionally scarred in a nasty incident of scholarly hazing. By subsequently rejecting the norms of the social class that had rejected him, Abū Ḥāmid managed to break all literary conventions, distance himself from the tired stereotypes used for the Mamluk military elite (and aptly described by Nasser Rabbat earlier in this volume), and produce a unique and valuable set of works about life in Cairo in the later ninth/fifteenth century.

Despite the dominance of the Mamluk period, this collection also features a welcome set of articles on the historiographical wealth of Ottoman Egypt. Michael Winter provides an overview of changing attitudes towards the Ottomans displayed by Egyptian historians from the tenth/sixteenth to the fourteenth/twentieth centuries. This contribution is particularly useful for its discussion of works composed in Arabic, Turkish, and Hebrew.

Other articles on the Ottoman period propose the rethinking of current scholarly assumptions and practices. Jane Hathaway uses the example of two rival political factions in Egypt and their real or fictional ties to Yemen to call for the rehabilitation

of Yemen as crucial in understanding Egypt. She also demonstrates the localism and limitations of Ottoman-era historians by contrasting the simultaneous yet dissimilar historiographical traditions of the two regions. Daniel Crecilius also suggests a revision of scholarly assumptions. He unmasks the revered historian ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥasan al-Jabarī (d. 1237/1822) as an overly proud man who refused to acknowledge his sources, then details the way some modern scholars have been misled by al-Jabarī’s coy insistence that he worked alone. That accomplished, Crecilius rehabilitates many of the oft-ignored eleventh/seventeenth- and twelfth/eighteenth-century historians whose works al-Jabarī consulted, and suggests that we do the same.

In a similarly revisionist vein, Nelly Hanna argues that a surfeit of comparisons between Ottoman Egyptian historians and their Mamluk predecessors has divorced the Ottoman authors from the social and cultural context in which their works were produced. She rectifies this shortcoming with an analysis of that context and of the role played in it by history as art, entertainment, and education. Like Nasser Rabbat, Hanna focuses in part on language variation in the texts, which illuminate different aspects of society and culture. Hanna also provides a list of histories in manuscript from this period, which should be read with the material provided by Crecilius and by Winter for a sense of the extent and variety of Ottoman Egyptian historical sources.

The final contributor, Paul Starkey, analyzes the uses of Egyptian medieval and pharaonic history by modern authors of fiction, and spotlights the works of Jurjī Zaydān and Gamāl al-Ghīṭānī. Like Robert Irwin’s piece, this work gives us a welcome view of the shifting boundaries between history and fiction, and a reminder that history—though fascinating—is but one aspect of the extraordinary legacy of Egypt.

The editing of this collection is uneven, and the book contains some typographical errors in English and French, as well as mistakes in the transliteration of Arabic. But these are minor faults. They do not change the fact that reading such a fine collection of essays should be considered *de rigueur* for serious historians. By doing so, they will gain a new and subtle vision of the works on which we all depend.

MUḤAMMAD IBN AḤMAD AL-FĀSĪ, *Shifā' al-Gharām bi-Akḥbār al-Balad al-Ḥarām*. Edited by 'Ādil 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-'Adawī and Hishām 'Abd al-'Azīz 'Aṭā under the supervision of Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ. Mawsū'at Makkah wa-al-Madīnah, no. 2 (Mecca-Riyadh: Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafá al-Bāz, 1417/1996). Two volumes.

IDEM, *Al-Zuhūr al-Muqtaṭafah min Tārīkh Makkah al-Musharrafah*. Edited and annotated by Adīb Muḥammad al-Ghazzāwī, preface and revision by Maḥmūd al-Arnā'ūt (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 2000). Pp. 319.

IDEM, *Al-Zuhūr al-Muqtaṭafah min Tārīkh Makkah al-Musharrafah*.¹ Edited by 'Alī 'Umar (Al-Zāhir: Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīnīyah, 1422/2001). Pp. 404.

REVIEWED BY FRÉDÉRIC BAUDEN, University of Liège

When one considers Mamluk historiography, it is now recognized that there exists a Ḥijāzī school of historians in addition to the Egyptian and Syrian ones. It remains to be determined if significant differences characterize the historians of this area as compared to their colleagues in Cairo or Damascus. It would be interesting to know whether their technique of redaction or the use they made of their sources shows similarity to the historians of the other schools. However the Ḥijāzī historians have not yet attracted sufficient interest from scholars conducting studies of this sort, which is a great pity. Only recently, a first attempt to survey all Meccan historians, from the very beginning until the nineteenth century, has appeared and should stimulate further research in this field despite its shortcomings.²

The emergence of this school during the period under consideration coincides with the activity of a Meccan scholar, although of Moroccan origin, who lived mainly during the second period of Mamluk rule, namely Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī (832/1429). Between him and the first historians of Mecca, al-Azraqī (244/858) and al-Fākihī (*adhuc viv.* 272/885), there is a gap of more than five centuries, and thus it is important to stress the fact that he can be credited with the revival of a school that had not really caught on. This does not mean that there were no other scholars who were interested in the history of Mecca, but their works were merely isolated cases in their production, while al-Fāsī devoted most of his time to the writing of historical books dealing with the Holy City. Also, the heuristic aspect

¹"Yunshar kāmilan wa-bi-fahāris shāmilah lil-marrah al-ūlā."

²See Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb al-Hīlah, *Al-Tārīkh wa-al-Mu'arrikhūn bi-Makkah min al-Qarn al-Thālith al-Hijrī ilā al-Qarn al-Thālithah 'Asharah : Jam'*, *'Arḍ wa-Ta'rīf* (London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, Makkah al-Mukarramah Encyclopaedia Branch, 1994). See my review in *MSR* 3 (1999): 223–30.

of his works is worthy of mention. Unlike many historians, he did not rely only on other written sources, although they included *fiqh* and hadith works for instance, but utilized less conventional materials such as diplomas (*ijāzah*) and dictionaries of authorities (*mashyakhah*, *mu'jam al-shuyūkh*, *thabat*). Even more intriguing is his undertaking "field work" in search of evidence, as when he personally measured the Ka'bah, comparing his results to those of his predecessors. The same inquisitiveness drove him when, as an epigraphist, he scrutinized inscriptions which he found on buildings, sometimes giving the full text. Al-Fāsī certainly deserves a study in his own right and it is to be hoped that this call will not go unheeded.³

If he won fame and inspired students, it was thanks to two of his books: a biographical dictionary of residents of Mecca from the beginning of Islam to his own time, entitled *Al-'Iqd al-Thamīn fī Tārīkh al-Balad al-Amīn*,⁴ and a history of the Holy City, the title of which is *Shifā' al-Gharām bi-Akhhār al-Balad al-Ḥarām*. Both were begun at the same time and conceived as complementary. The idea of composing such a history occurred to him after he noticed that since al-Azraqī nothing serious had been written on the subject (*Shifā'* 1:39), a lacuna even stranger in his eyes when he considered that other cities had already been the subject of this kind of work, giving as examples the *Tārīkh Baghdād* by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, the *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn 'Asākir, and the *Tārīkh Miṣr* by al-Quṭb al-Ḥalabī (1:42). He then decided to collect all he had read about this subject, including inscriptions found on marble, stones, and wood, oral information, etc. (1:40). All the material gathered on independent leaves was then reorganized, following a plan of forty chapters.⁵ It is thus clear that the *Shifā'* is not a conventional

³What is available is completely inadequate. See Ṣubḥī 'Abd al-Mun'im Muḥammad, *Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī: Rā'id al-Mu'arrikhīn al-Hijāzīyīn (775–832 H./1373–1429 M.)* (Cairo: al-'Arabī lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī', 1997). Reviewed by Li Guo in *MSR* 5 (2001): 169–75.

⁴Ed. by Muḥammad Ḥāmid Al-Fiḳī (vol. 1), Fu'ād Sayyid (vols. 2–7), and Maḥmūd Muḥammad Al-Ṭanāhī (vol. 8) (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sunnah al-Muḥammadīyah, 1962–69; repr., Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1406/1986).

⁵In a very important note added at the end of his book (2:1065), al-Fāsī recounts the history of its composition, explaining that the original work was much bigger and that he summarized it a first time in 811. Initially, it was organized in 24 chapters, but the author made important additions in 812, 813, 814, 815, and 816 which resulted in the presentation in 40 chapters as it is now. New additions were brought in 817 and 818–19. Most of these were taken from *Tārīkh Makkah* by al-Fākihī, a work which he did not get access to before, and from his own book *Al-'Iqd al-Thamīn*. Thus the actual version of the *Shifā'* appears to be in fact a summary made by the author and expanded several times. The original text is constantly referred to by the author as the *aṣl* (1:47: "as'alu min kull wāqif 'alā hādhā al-mukhtaṣar wa-aṣlihi"; 1:356: "kamā dhakartuhu fī aṣl hādhā al-kitāb wa-iqṭaṣartuhu hunā min dhālika 'alā mā dhakartuhu"; 1:380: "wa-nadhkuruhu kamā dhakira fī aṣl hādhā al-kitāb"). This version must have contained,

historical work where the data are presented according to the year or the reign. Each chapter focuses on a theme dealing with the Ḥaram (for instance, the names of Mecca, the Ḥaram, the Ka‘bah, etc.) where all periods are considered, beginning with the Jāhiliyah. For Mamlukologists, the most important parts are probably chapters 23 (on the madrasahs, *ribāṭs*, etc.) and 37 to 39 (lists of governors, and political, meteorological, and finally economic events).⁶ But substantial data can also be found scattered in other chapters. Those interested in the Fatimid period will be surprised to learn that al-Fāsī occasionally quotes the *Tārīkh* of al-Musabbihī as he had access to a resumé (*mukhtaṣar*) made by Rashīd al-Dīn al-Mundhirī (1:203), a fact that has been overlooked by historians of this period.⁷

Before the edition under discussion here, the *Shifā’* was available in the following ones:

1) It was published for the first time in 1859, but only partly, by F. Wüstenfeld, in a collection of works dealing exclusively with the Holy City.⁸

2) It was only in 1956 that the full text was made available to scholars⁹ in an edition based on an undated manuscript belonging to the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah (shelf-mark: Tārīkh 504). This edition also utilized another manuscript which was in fact a recent copy of the Cairo manuscript, and the editors also made use of other sources. The result of the collation was indicated in the footnotes, which rarely satisfy the requirements of a scientific edition.

3) Another edition was prepared by ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmurī.¹⁰ It has been criticized by al-Hīlah¹¹ as being just a copy of 2). This same author recognized the lack of a good critical edition of this important text and hoped that one would be published in the future.

This could have been the case with the present edition. Published by a committee of three persons under the supervision of Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Fattāh, it appears as no. 2 in a promising series called “Mawsū‘at Makkah wa-al-Madīnah,” where no. 1 was in fact the *Tārīkh Makkah* by al-Azraqī. It seems thus that the publisher intends to place at the disposal of scholars the most important texts dealing with the two Holy Cities. In his preface (p. 11), the supervisor stresses the fact that only a few

among other details, full chains of transmitters. It is now presumably lost.

⁶Some of these aspects have already been studied. See particularly the articles published by R. Mortel and C. Morisot.

⁷These quotations are not found in A. F. Sayyid, “Nuṣūṣ Dā’i‘ah min Akhbār Miṣr lil-Musabbihī,” *Annales Islamologiques* 17 (1981): 1–54.

⁸*Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1857–61), 2:55–324.

⁹Ed. by a board of experts, with supplements including *Al-Durrah al-Thamīnah fī Tārīkh al-Madīnah* by Ibn al-Najjār (Mecca: Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-Ḥadīthah).

¹⁰Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1405/1985.

¹¹*Al-Tārīkh wa-al-Mu‘arrikhūn bi-Makkah*, 122.

books on Mecca have been published, although many manuscripts are still waiting to be unearthed. What is curious in such a statement is why the committee decided to publish first two histories which were already available, unless it intended to prepare new critical editions. Unfortunately, as we will see with the *Shifā'*, this is far from being the case.

The introduction (pp. 13–33) contains a short biography of al-Fāsī where only his most important works are mentioned. It lacks references and contributes nothing to our knowledge of the author. In the next section (pp. 19–21 and 27–33), the manuscripts “selected” are described. The editors have relied on two manuscripts, one of them corresponding to the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah manuscript already mentioned for edition no. 2.¹² This was not chosen as the basic text; rather another manuscript preserved in the same institution under the shelf-mark Tārīkh Ṭal‘at 2067 was selected.¹³ Because it is dated 864, only 32 years after al-Fāsī’s death, it was preferred.¹⁴ Recognizing that in some places both manuscripts have blanks clearly indicated as such (*kadhā fī al-aṣl*), the editors have hastily concluded that they are copies of the author’s original, but this is not necessarily so. Both are described summarily and no other copy is referred to, although they would have learned of others had they consulted al-Hīlah’s book, which has been available since 1994 (pp. 121–22).

The edition is provided with notes indicating the results of the collation of both manuscripts, as well as others where persons and places are identified, though not systematically. For instance (1:168), in an *isnād* with eleven transmitters, only four are clearly identified. Elsewhere (1:458), Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwardī is identified as his famous namesake who died in 450/1058,¹⁵ even though he appears in an *isnād* just after Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah (d. 196/811), and is followed by three other transmitters, the last one being al-Dāraqūṭnī (d. 385/995). This was an anachronism apparently unnoticed by the editors. When the name of a person previously identified occurs subsequently, the editors have taken trouble to note

¹²Here its shelf number is given as Tārīkh M 54. However, it is clear that we are dealing with the same manuscript, as the scribe’s name that can be read on the facsimile page of the colophon (p. 33) is identical with the one mentioned in the edition no. 2.

¹³The editors also refer to a third manuscript in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyah (Tārīkh Taymūr 1463), dated to 1336 A.H. As often in the case of such recent manuscripts, they are just copies of another MS from the same institution.

¹⁴According to al-Hīlah, *Al-Tārīkh wa-al-Mu’arrikhūn bi-Makkah*, 121, there is a manuscript in the Royal Library in Rabat (al-Khizānah al-Malikīyah, no. 1911) which is the oldest copy (848 A.H.) and the most reliable one (*aṣaḥḥ*).

¹⁵Al-Māwardī in this passage must be read al-Jārūdī, a correct reading appearing in the edition no. 2 although their manuscript gave al-Māwardī. In this case, the editors could modify the reading by comparison with the source quoted by al-Fāsī.

the previous identification, but this proves useless since no cross reference is provided and because the indexes are incomplete. Moreover, no particular effort has been made to try to locate passages quoted by al-Fāsī from other sources, not even the traditions selected from canonical collections, such as al-Bukhārī, Muslim, etc., although this would surely have helped to correct some incorrect readings common to both manuscripts. I have taken some soundings which confirm my negative impression: this edition is surely not a definitive one and in many respects it has proved to be less reliable than edition no. 2, adding new mistakes. Among these, I will mention just a few, such as 1:365, where *تنحس* must be read *تنخش*; 1:397, where *منقوش* must be read *معرضة* as al-Fāsī is speaking of the *hijr* (an enclosure with a wall in the shape of a bow); 1:459, where (two occurrences) *الحافظ العراقي* is in fact *الحافظ العراقي* as is confirmed by a quotation two lines below where the name is correctly given; 2:999 (leg. *عفيف الدين الطبري*); 2:1026 (leg. *ابن مسدي*); 2:1029 (leg. *ماشخنا*). The presence of indexes should allow me to temper these criticisms, but they are deficient. All the indexes have been placed at the end of vol. 2, even though they consist in fact of separate indexes for each volume. Most of them are incomplete and are not adequate for making use of the book. In conclusion, *Al-Shifā'* still awaits a serious critical edition with full annotation and proper indexes.

Al-Fāsī prepared a resumé of the *Shifā'* that he entitled *Al-Zuhūr al-Muqtaṭafah min Tārīkh Makkah al-Musharrafah*, where most details (*isnāds*, debates) have been eliminated. It would be a mistake, however, to neglect the work on this basis, since it appears that in some cases the author has added data which are not to be found in the *Shifā'*. Besides the *Zuhūr*, he produced, as he declares in his introduction, three other books on the same subject which must also be considered resúmes of the *Shifā'*: *Tuḥfat al-Kirām bi-Akḥbār al-Balad al-Ḥarām*, *Taḥṣīl al-Marām min Tārīkh al-Balad al-Ḥarām*, and *Hādī Dhawī al-Afhām ilā Tārīkh al-Balad al-Ḥarām*.¹⁶ Except for the last work, they are preserved only in manuscript and remain unpublished. It is only recently that the *Zuhūr* has become available in several editions, among which two are under review here.¹⁷ Both are based on an important manuscript and provide us an opportunity to compare how the editors have rendered it in their work. This manuscript, dated to 825 A.H. (thus during

¹⁶ Al-Hīlah, *Al-Tārīkh wa-al-Mu'arrikhūn bi-Makkah*, 122–23, also mentions *Tarwīḥ al-Ṣudūr bi-Ikhtisār al-Zuhūr* and *Mukhtaṣar Tarwīḥ al-Ṣudūr* as resúmes of the *Zuhūr*.

¹⁷ Alī 'Umar speaks in disparaging terms (“*ṭab‘ah kathīrat al-taḥrīf wa-al-asqāt*”) of an edition published in Mecca-Riyadh (Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafá al-Bāz) in 1997 and prepared by Muṣṭafá Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Dhahabī, who based it on two manuscripts. Divergences noticed by 'Umar with this Meccan edition have been indicated in the footnotes.

the lifetime of the author, who died in 832), is in the handwriting of Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Shuwā’iṭī al-Yamanī¹⁸ and was in the library of the Kuwaiti scholar ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Khalaf al-Daḥiyyān, who bequeathed it to the Maktabat al-Awqāf al-Kuwaytīyah upon his death. Additionally, the title-page proves that the text was transmitted by well-known scholars. None of the editors has studied these notes that are transcribed here thanks to the facsimile of the title-page added in ‘Umar’s edition:

أروي هذا الكتاب من طريق شيخنا الحافظ برهان الدين الناجي¹⁹ عن المؤلف تقي الدين الفاسي
وعن شيخنا السخاوي إجازة عن شيخه ابن حجر رواية عن المؤلف
وعن شيخنا الشيخ شهاب الدين ابن الملاح المقرئ الرملاوي²⁰ بدمشق رواية عن المؤلف
أروي هذا الكتاب من طريق شيخنا القاضي سراج الدين ابن الصيرفي²¹ رواية عن المؤلف

Given its importance, a facsimile edition of the whole text was published by Muḥannā Ḥamad al-Muḥannā²² together with an introduction, notes, and indexes. ‘Umar, however, made occasional use of an additional manuscript preserved in Baghdad (al-Maṭḥaf al-‘Irāqī, no. 1385), which was previously the property of Father Anastase Marie de Saint-Élie, who bought it in 1918. It is unfortunately undated, but seems to be from the seventeenth century.²³ While al-Ghazzāwī’s edition is provided with an introduction written by the supervisor al-Arna’ūṭ (pp. 5–20), in which he discusses the author and his work and provides a cursory description of the manuscript, ‘Umar is more laconic (pp. 5–8) and speaks especially of the previous Meccan edition and of the manuscripts. Both editions are provided with footnotes, but not of the same value. Al-Ghazzāwī has tried to return to the original sources from which al-Fāsī quoted, though failing to locate the references made by the author to his other works. He also added, but rather meagerly, identifications of persons and places and explanations of lexical terms. On the other hand, ‘Umar has considered it important to faithfully indicate where he

¹⁸On him, see ‘Umar ibn Fahd, *Mu‘jam al-Shuyūkh*, ed. M. al-Zāhī (Mecca, n.d. [1982?]), 67, where it is stated that he settled in Mecca in 803 A.H. His *nisbah* designates a locality situated near Ta‘izz.

¹⁹Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Dimashqī (d. 900/1495). See ‘U. R. Kaḥḥālah, *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, n.d.), 1:106.

²⁰Unidentified.

²¹Unidentified.

²²Kuwait: Al-Ṣundūq al-Waqfī lil-Thaqāfah wa-al-Fikr, 1417/1997.

²³In one particular case, this manuscript appeared more reliable since a complete passage (pp. 133–34) was missing in the Kuwaiti manuscript.

found the references made by al-Fāsī to his other works. Yet he disregarded the identification of persons or places, which is a pity.

In summation, I believe that ‘Umar’s edition is, generally speaking, more reliable. If I should recommend one of them, I would be inclined to say that ‘Umar can be trusted in most cases, although one must be aware that his edition is not free from mistakes. His edition permits us to emend some readings in all the available editions of the *Shifā’*. The presence of numerous, reasonably reliable indexes, is another positive aspect.²⁴ In the following lines, I have given the result of my collation of some passages, where the bold version is considered the correct one, so that the reader will be able to draw his own conclusions.

	Ghazzāwī		‘Umar
p. 30	الغرب	p. 19	المغرب
ibid.	lacuna	ibid.	بالبناء
ibid.	هجر	ibid.	هجم
p. 31	خامس عشر من شوال	ibid.	خامس عشري من شوال
ibid.	منها	p. 20	lacuna
p. 32	بأبي قبيس	ibid.	lacuna
ibid.	سمي برجل من	ibid.	lacuna
	إياد وذكر الوراق أنه		
ibid.	حمامات	ibid.	حمامان
p. 35	وهو الهدة بعد	p. 22	وهو الهدة معدودان من
	ودان من أعمالها		أعمالها
p. 80	بن أبي الصغير	p. 87	بن أبي الصفراء
p. 91	شبر	p. 108	سنبر
ibid.	ضبات	ibid.	ضباب
ibid.	فتخشن	ibid.	فتنخش

²⁴Although in my copy pp. 367–84 are missing and pp. 385–404 are duplicated at the end of the book.

p. 99	منقوش	p. 124	متقوس
p. 111	ابن الحباب	p. 142	ابن الجباب
p. 112	ذو الفرس	p. 145	ذوالقرنين
p. 118	في حجرته	p. 153	مسند مكة وموثقها
p. 131	شرح الثانية	p. 167	شرح التنبيه
p. 156	علي السعداني	p. 195	علي البعداني