

ŞUBĤĪ ‘ABD AL-MUN‘IM MUĤAMMAD, *Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī: Rā‘id al-Mu‘arrikhīn al-Ĥijāzīyīn (832-775 H./1373-1429 M.)* (Cairo: al-‘Arabī lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī‘, 1997). Pp. 212.

REVIEWED BY LI GUO, University of Notre Dame

The history of Mecca, especially that of the period after the glorious years of Muḥammad’s life and activities there, has drawn increasing scholarly attention recently, after having been “strangely neglected practically,” in Franz Rosenthal’s words,<sup>1</sup> since the third/ninth century, the time of the renowned Meccan historians al-Azraqī (d. ca. 246/860) and al-Fākihī (d. after 272/885). Among the leading local historians (those belonging to the so-called “Hejazi school” in the long chain of development of historical writing), Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Makkī al-Ḥasanī al-Mālikī al-Fāsī (d. 832/1429) is without doubt one of the most original and outstanding, a pioneering sort of figure. The book under review is the first serious attempt to present this historian’s life and labor in a monograph.

Unfortunately, the scholarly value of the book is considerably limited. The major disappointment is the fact that only one manuscript (Ibn Farḥūn’s [d. 799/1397] *Naṣīḥat al-Mushāwir*) has been consulted in this pioneering study—if one may call it that, in view of a lack of other publications on the subject. While use is made of some well-known primary and secondary sources in Arabic, western scholarship on the subject is largely ignored, except for brief mentions of Carl Brockelmann’s *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, Franz Rosenthal’s *A History of Muslim Historiography* and Heinrich Ferdinand Wüstenfeld’s 1859 work *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*. (I doubt the original German text of the latter was ever consulted inasmuch as every single German word in the title given in the bibliography is misspelled [p. 212]). There are no indexes of any sort. These shortcomings, combined with the poor quality of printing and frequent typographical errors (the most awkward is the conjunction *wāw* being repeatedly set at the end of a line), make the book look less than serious.

The book is divided into two major parts, and they are preceded by a Preface and followed by Concluding Remarks. The Preface (pp. 2-6) outlines the purpose, scope, and method of the study. The author states that what made him embark upon the task is the fact that Taqī al-Dīn al-Fāsī, a leading figure in revitalizing the Hejazi historical tradition following a long decline after the third/ninth century, and one of the most prominent scholars of the ninth/fifteenth century in Mecca, has long been hidden from the limelight. He is hardly known outside the circle of

---

<sup>1</sup>“al- Fāsī,” *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 2:828-29.



a few specialists, and his achievements as well as his influence on the development of Hejazi historiography have been little studied and not fully appreciated.

Part One, "al-Fāsī's Biography" (*Sīrat al-Fāsī*), consists of four chapters: (1) "His Upbringing and Life"; (2) "His Education"; (3) "His Fellow Scholars"; and (4) "His Students" (pp. 7-66). Although the format here is typical, the content is quite insubstantial. The title of chapter 1 is rather misleading in that the chapter merely gives a list of al-Fāsī's famous family members (pp. 7-18), but nothing is said about "his upbringing and life." Given the fact that the main source for this part is al-Fāsī's own biographical work *al-'Iqd al-Thamīn*, in which he devoted considerable attention to his own autobiography, the author's failure to present a meaningful biography is regrettable.

Chapter 2 offers yet another list, this time that of al-Fāsī's teachers and his journeys in search of knowledge. Each name, and each city, is accompanied by a lengthy footnote that contains commonplace information. I do not see, for instance, the need to footnote "Mecca" (p. 19), "al-Masjid al-Ḥarām" (p. 20), "Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī" (p. 27), and many others, in this slim volume. The lengthy explanation of the meaning of "*ijāzah*" (p. 30) is redundant as well. One gets the feeling that the author is trying to expand the study into a book from the very limited original data he has collected. The name dropping is necessary only if the author demonstrates that these people's writings and teachings had significant impact on al-Fāsī's own career as an historian. But unfortunately, it is exactly at this point that the present book falls short. For instance, it is well known that the great historian Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406) was al-Fāsī's teacher and patron, and that his methods and writings profoundly influenced al-Fāsī's historical thinking and writing. Although considerable space is devoted to Ibn Khaldūn and his relationship to al-Fāsī (pp. 40-54), one finds mostly digressive passages about *Ibn Khaldūn's* biography and *his* major works. Only a few pages are left to deal with the real subject here, that is, Ibn Khaldūn's influence on al-Fāsī's writing (pp. 50-54); even this little space is filled with citations from al-Fāsī's own works where he mentioned Ibn Khaldūn as his source. There is no synthesis, let alone analysis.

The same method and style continue in chapter 3 (pp. 55-60), which deals with al-Fāsī's fellow scholars, among whom the most intriguing is Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (d. 852/1449). The chapter turns out to be primarily a biography of *Ibn Ḥajar* and a list of *his* works. Nothing is said about his dealings with, and influence on, al-Fāsī. Chapter 4 follows suit, with more name dropping and no discussion. Oddly, only at the end of Part One is there passing mention of al-Fāsī's career as the Mālikī chief judge in Mecca, a position that provided him with a great deal of firsthand information on the city, its institutions, and its people, giving his accounts of the history of the city a certain sense of authenticity. This point, unfortunately, is not elaborated by the author. One also wonders why this

portion, which is essential to a better understanding of al-Fāsī's world view and his sources, should be given so little attention and be put here, disjointedly, at the very end of his biography.

Part Two, "al-Fāsī and His Labors in Historical Writing" (*al-Fāsī wa-Juhūduhu al-Tārīkhīyah*), is the better and more substantial and informative segment of the book (pp. 68-192). It has five chapters: (1) "al-Fāsī's works"; (2) "The Hejazi School of Historical Writing"; (3) "The Features of Historical Writing in al-Fāsī's Time and Their Impact on His Works"; (4) "al-Fāsī's Framework of Historical Inquiry" (*Iṭār al-Baḥth al-Tārīkhī*); and (5) "al-Fāsī's Influence on Later Historiography."

Chapter 1 lists al-Fāsī's major works with information on the manuscripts and publication records of these titles. Twenty titles, with several additional miscellanies, are listed; among them the two most important and original are *Shifā' al-Gharām bi-Akhhār al-Balad al-Ḥarām*, a history of Mecca, and *al-'Iqd al-Thamīn fī Tārīkh al-Balad al-Amīn*, a biographical dictionary of the people associated with Mecca, including the author's own autobiography. Of the former, only the old 1956 edition is mentioned, while the new 1996 Mecca edition (edited by Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ et al.) failed to make the list. This is the part from which the reader would naturally crave more information, since this is the first effort ever to study al-Fāsī's works in a comprehensive way, but it falls short on detail. The majority of the entries are only given as titles, without any additional information; as for the titles that do get some attention, the information is usually brief (pp. 68-72). As if to compensate for the dearth of substance in this section, the author has devoted a longer segment (pp. 73-79) to quoting citations that praise al-Fāsī's writings. However, these citations are mainly stock clichés common in medieval Muslim scholarly critique, and they are all quoted from al-Fāsī's own *al-'Iqd al-Thamīn*.

Chapter 2 deals with an interesting topic, that is, the Hejazi school of historical writing. Leaning heavily on Brockelmann, Rosenthal, and Shākir Muṣṭafá, the author first gives a detailed overview of the development of historical thinking and writing in Mecca and Medina in the early Islamic era. The main thesis is that the awareness of Muslim historical writing started as early as the beginning of Islam, when Mecca was the center of Muslim learning. While early authors focused on broader themes concerning *maghāzī*, or early Muslim conquests, and *ḥadīth* transmission, it was not until the third/ninth century, when the Hejaz was less in the spotlight in the Islamic political arena, that we see historians like al-Azraqī and al-Fākihī engage in recording *akhhār* about the holy city Mecca *itself* as well as giving descriptions of its topography. The motive for such pursuits seems to have stemmed from the desire among the local 'ulamā' to bring back to the Muslims' collective consciousness the importance of the holy places, to remind Muslims of their duties of pilgrimage to these places, and to provide guides for

such visits. Later authors of the "Hejazi school" did not exceed this scope until the ninth/fifteenth century, when al-Fāsī emerged as an "historian" in the real sense, whose writings combined clearly executed chronicles with in-depth historical analysis, not only bringing the "Hejazi school" back on the map of Muslim historiography, but also influencing later historians in the Hejaz and elsewhere.

Chapter 3, which deals with the specifics of the historical writings of al-Fāsī's time and their influence on al-Fāsī, is a natural continuation of the previous chapter. It is also of special interest for Mamluk scholars in that this chapter touches upon some important issues in Mamluk historiography as a whole. According to the author, the historical writing in al-Fāsī's time, i.e., the ninth/fifteenth century, can be characterized by five phenomena regarding themes, methodology, approach, etc., and they are: (1) quoting (*al-naql*) from other sources; (2) writing epitomes of existing works (*al-talkhīṣ wa-al-ikhtīṣār*); (3) writing continuations (*al-tadhīl*) of existing works; (4) autobiography; and (5) local history. Each of these categories is treated in detail, placing al-Fāsī's writing, which reflects in various ways all these facets, within the context of mainstream historiography in Egypt and Syria, whose leading figures include al-Maqrīzī, Ibn Ḥajar (al-Fāsī's friend), al-'Aynī, Ibn al-Ṣayrafī, al-Sakhāwī, al-Suyūṭī, Ibn Taghrībirdī, and Ibn Iyās, among others.

More discussion of al-Fāsī's own historical writings continues in chapter 4, where several issues pertaining to al-Fāsī's historical methodology, his major achievements, and the continuity and discontinuity of his own works as well as those of the "Hejazi school"—as opposed to those "common features" nourished through the labors of the Egyptian and Syrian masters mentioned above—are addressed. Among many issues dealt with here, students of Mamluk history may be particularly interested in learning more about al-Fāsī's two masterpieces, which represent, respectively, the two major genres of historical writing of his time: his biographical dictionary of the learned persons of Mecca (*al-'Iqd al-Thamīn*) and his local history of Mecca (*Shifā'*). Fortunately, nearly half of the book (pp. 115-80) is devoted to these two works. In discussing *al-'Iqd*, the author first presents a layout of the structure and main contents of the work; some textual aspects such as the alphabetical order of arranging the 3,500 plus entries (p. 117) as well as other principles that guided the organization of this bulky work (pp. 118 f.) are given special attention. The author points out that this alphabetical order is also found in Ibn Ḥajar's biographical work *al-Iṣābah fī Tamīz al-Ṣaḥābah*, which follows a model set by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 733/1332) and other earlier authors such as Abū 'Abd Allāh ibn Mundah (d. 395/1005), Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 462/1070), and others. As regards the content of the work, the author calls attention to the fact that the biographical section proper is preceded by an introduction of the *faḍā'il* genre, or praise for the virtues of a city, which is itself a summary of

al-Fāsī's history of Mecca, the *Shifā'*. Furthermore, this introduction is sometimes considered as an independent work by the title of *al-Zuhūr al-Muqtaṭafah min Tārīkh Makkah al-Musharrafah* (p. 127). The author then moves on to a detailed discussion of the composition of a typical biographical entry in the work (pp. 129-37). The significance of studying such entries is highlighted, as "these biographies have preserved for us a picture of the intellectual and cultural life of the era" by showing vividly the network that ties the '*ulamā'* with their teachers, students, and most importantly, their peers, depicting these people's friendship, fellowship, rivalry, and competition "in a way that is no less revealing and nuanced than that of political histories" (p. 129). For those familiar with Michael Chamberlain's work on Damascene '*ulamā'*', al-Fāsī's biographical dictionary seems to offer an analogy, or a mirror, of the same kind of struggle, or civil *fitnah*, but this time in a Hejazi context.

Source criticism is another issue that is noteworthy (pp. 138-45). In addition to conventional literary sources, al-Fāsī, we are told, also utilized material evidence, such as that of ruins, inscriptions, etc., as well as documents, such as official communiqués, letters, speeches, etc., in his work. This method was advocated by his mentor Ibn Khaldūn, whose influence on the younger al-Fāsī manifested itself in many ways in the latter's work. This last point is addressed in some detail in the following section on the "historical critique" (*al-naqd al-tārīkhī*) in *al-'Iqd* (pp. 147-52). The main conclusion is that al-Fāsī practiced what his teacher Ibn Khaldūn preached in that his critical spirit as a true historian is seen not only in his method of establishing sound chains of transmitting historical data, his careful treatment of sources, and his cautious handling of conflicting accounts and stories, but also his speaking his mind in the practice of the methodology of *al-jarḥ wa-al-ta'dīl*, i.e., critique, verifying reliable accounts and disputing false statements.

The discussion of al-Fāsī's history of Mecca, the *Shifā'*, follows the same style and format (pp. 153-80). A description of the structure and composition of the work (pp. 154-56) is followed by a lengthy source "criticism" (pp. 156-75), which turns out to be a long, and unnecessary, list of the literary sources mentioned by al-Fāsī, with a brief description of the documents utilized in the work and citations of poems found in the book. Like many of the previous segments, there is very little analysis but rather merely digressive listing and citations. Several issues are in order here. First, regarding the development of the writing of Meccan local history, the author is of the commonly-held opinion that al-Fāsī followed the pattern established by al-Azraqī and al-Fākihī, that is, a work that combines topography, legends of pre-Islamic Mecca, and history per se. It is noted that al-Fāsī did not employ the conventional annalistic form in writing his chronicles; in other words, his "history" is thematically arranged, a form that is not widely represented in Mamluk historiography. Of special interest for students of the

Mamluks will be the author's discussion of the Mamluk documents preserved in local archives that are not found in other sources, such as personal letters exchanged between the *'ulamā'* concerning the riots led by Egyptian pilgrims in Mecca in 730/1329 (pp. 172-73), and the official decrees dealing with personnel changes at the office of the governor (*wilāyah*) in Mecca.

Speaking of the poetry in al-Fāsī's historical work, the author has rightly observed that many of the poems found in al-Fāsī's history are *not* related to the events of the narrative line (p. 175). This is by no means something unique to al-Fāsī's work. As I have discussed elsewhere, by the time of the so-called "Syrian school of historical writing," i.e., that of the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth century Syrian authors al-Birzālī, al-Yūnīnī, and al-Dhahabī (from whom al-Fāsī evidently quoted heavily), the notion that a *tārīkh* is not only a record of factual events, but a register of Muslim religious learning and a selective anthology of Arabic cultural and literary heritage appears to have gained a considerable following.<sup>2</sup> It is assumed that the poems found in a historical work need *not* necessarily be relevant to the narrative line. Al-Fāsī's case provides another piece of evidence that this notion was widely accepted, and practiced, by later Mamluk historians, including those who were as far away as the Hejaz.

The book concludes with a chapter on al-Fāsī's influence on the development of the "Hejazi school" of historical writing. According to the author, al-Fāsī's importance as a role model for later Meccan historians manifests itself in several aspects: his methodology (*manhajīyah*), his style (*uslūb*), and his approach (*ṭarīqah*), that is, his way of classifying major themes, laying out the contents, setting the goal of each work by an explicit introduction, and presenting historical events in a thematic rather than annalistic form. Special emphasis is placed on al-Fāsī's attentiveness to field work in his effort to verify facts from various sources, and his critique of conflicting accounts. In this connection, the chapter leaves much to be desired. A discussion, for instance, of the common elements and differences between this "Hejazi school" as compared to other "schools" in the Mamluk period, such as those of Syria and Egypt, would be most welcome. Regarding the genre of autobiography, a genre that did not advance itself very much in the Mamluk period, it is well known that al-Fāsī wrote his autobiography in the third person as part of his biographical dictionary *al-'Iqd*, but what can one say about it as compared to other contemporary autobiographies, if there were any? What was its influence on later similar attempts (such as the famous one by al-Suyūṭī [d. 911/1505], who credited al-Fāsī as the inspiration for his effort) in terms of format, structure and method?

---

<sup>2</sup>*Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography* (Leiden, 1998), 1:96.

Overall, the book is useful for those who are interested in general Mamluk historiography and the local history of Mecca, especially that of the Mamluk period. But great effort is needed to extract information and insight from this book, which is long on citation, often unnecessary, and short on synthesis and analysis.

IBN QĀDĪ SHUHBĀH, *Tārīkh Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah*, Volume Four, Edited by Adnan Darwich (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1997). Pp. 767.

REVIEWED BY DAVID C. REISMAN, Yale University

Twenty years after the publication of the first volume of the critical edition of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's abridgement (*mukhtaṣar*) of his "Dhayl," Darwich has finally brought to a conclusion his superlative endeavor with the publication of volume four. Darwich entitled the work *Tārīkh Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah*, but this is somewhat misleading. The work edited by Darwich is actually an abridgement of a larger history entitled "Dhayl," an historical record originally begun by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's master Ibn Ḥijjī, but later expanded by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah. A holograph manuscript (Chester Beatty 5527) of the "Dhayl" was discovered three years ago in Dublin, Ireland, and was subjected to a detailed analysis in the pages of this journal by the present reviewer.<sup>1</sup> The publication of volume four of the "Tārīkh" (hereafter referred to as the "abridgement") by Darwich provides the opportunity to make some additional comments about Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's historical production as well as observations on Darwich's editorial techniques.

This final volume covers the years 801-8. By far the most important of these years was 803, in which Timur entered Syria from Anatolia and laid siege to Aleppo and Damascus among other cities. The significance of this campaign for the population of Syria and consequently for the historians Ibn Ḥijjī and Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah is reflected in the lion's share of space Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah allots to that year in his abridgement. Of the eight years recorded in volume four, 803 receives some one hundred pages of the printed edition. The other years are dispatched in some fifty pages each. The year 808, the last year for which there are extant manuscripts of the abridgement, is summarily and incompletely treated in a mere seven pages. It is unlikely that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah would have divided a year across volumes; this fact suggests that the holograph manuscript of the abridgement

---

<sup>1</sup>"A Holograph MS of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's 'Dhayl,'" *Mamlūk Studies Review* 2 (1998): 19-49.

that Darwich used is incomplete. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's student's copy (the other manuscript used for volume four of the edition) ends abruptly even earlier: in the midst of the biographies for the year 806 (p. 390 n. 1).

The various elements of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's technique as an historian are conveyed in a most direct way in his retelling of the events of 803. A broad typology of sources can be discerned. And while no attempt is made to weave the various sources into a narrative whole, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's frank commentary on those sources proves to be more than adequate recompense for that lack. His information for events in Egypt is still drawn from the as yet unidentified Egyptian history that he shares with al-Maqrīzī.<sup>2</sup> His sources for the invasion of Syria by Timur, and especially Timur's entrance into Damascus and the events that followed, include Ibn Ḥijjī's original rough notes and an unnamed eyewitness account. In this regard, the publication of the final volume of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's abridgement brings to light a hitherto unnoted fact: neither Ibn Ḥijjī nor Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah was present in Damascus during Timur's occupation. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah tells us that Ibn Ḥijjī left Damascus for Zura' on 23 Rabī' II 803 and consequently he "wrote very little on this *fitnah*" (p. 161-62); he then states that his additional material comes from the written source of "a trustworthy friend" (p. 162). This last statement, along with the absence of any first person accounts from Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah, clearly indicates that he had himself left the city prior to Timur's arrival.

Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's confidence in this trustworthy eyewitness occasionally wanes. He concludes a brief account of the destruction wrought by Timur's troops by noting that "the period of time was too short for precise reports, but general accounts by both the elite and the commoner, those present and those absent, are in accord" (p. 169). His eyewitness's report of the fall of the citadel in Damascus he deems too simple; he says "it was more complicated than that" (p. 175). He makes up for the occasional deficiencies in this source by including a wealth of other material, including synopses of Timur's various proclamations (pp. 148, 167, 179). A marginal note in the "Dhayl" (Chester Beatty 5527) indicates that he drew on Ibn 'Arabshāh's biography of Timur<sup>3</sup> for his announcement of the latter's death in 807 (p. 425). However, he was not aware of Ibn Khaldūn's *Autobiography*; neither of the reports about the meeting between Timur and Damascene scholars accords Ibn Khaldūn the central and singular role Ibn Khaldūn accorded himself

---

<sup>2</sup>Both Ibn Duqmāq and Ibn al-Furāt have been tentatively suggested as that common source; see Reisman, *ibid.*, 39, 42. It is worth noting that this source appears hostile to Ibn Khaldūn; a certain malicious glee can be detected in the explanation of why Ibn Khaldūn was divested of his judgeship (p. 143), an explanation absent from Maqrīzī's account (*Sulūk*, ed. Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Āshūr [Cairo, 1972], vol. 3, pt. 3, 1027).

<sup>3</sup>Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Ajā'ib al-Maḳdūr fī Akhbār Tīmūr*, ed. Jacobus Golius (Leiden, 1636).



in his *Autobiography*.<sup>4</sup> For Timur's sack of Baghdad in Dhū al-Qa'dah 803, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah drew on "a native of Damascus taken captive who knew Turkish" (p. 191). Finally, it is now clear that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah drew on Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī for a number of biographies of these later years;<sup>5</sup> in one of his biographies for the year 806, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah states that "[this] biography comes from the death notices that Ibn Ḥajar wrote for me" (p. 392).

This brief source analysis suggests that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's abridgement will prove important to the study of Timur's campaign in Syria. And while there is much unmined material that remains in the larger "Dhayl" (Chester Beatty 5527) for the years that overlap between the "Dhayl" and its abridgement, Darwich has done such a superlative job in editing the abridgement that immediate attention should now be directed to an edition of those years not covered in the abridgement but found in the "Dhayl": 809-10.

Darwich made use of every manuscript of the abridgement at his disposal for his complete edition. The remaining years (801-8) of the abridgement to survive are to be found in two manuscripts: the author's holograph (Asad Efendi 2345), completed according to Darwich sometime before 840; and a copy made by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's student Khaṭṭāb ibn 'Umar al-Ajlūnī (Paris 1098-9) made from "fascicles" (*karārīs*) around 840.<sup>6</sup> A comparison of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's holograph of the larger "Dhayl" with the holograph abridgement indicates that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah made additions to the latter from the former sometime after his student had made his copy. Interestingly, Darwich's critical apparatus indicates that certain of these additions were made by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah both in his holograph and in his student's copy (see pp. 7, 8, 172, 192, 196, 293, 301, 309, 340, 343, 346, 347), and that other additions were made by him in his student's copy but not in his own holograph (see pp. 353, 358, 360, 365, 372, 373, 376). The first set of marginal additions, in both MSS, can be accounted for if Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah made corrections to his student's copy after the latter had completed it. The implication of the

<sup>4</sup>In fact, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah received his information on the meeting from Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-'Izz (d. 837/1433) who was himself present. And while Ibn al-'Izz provides a parallel account of some of the conversation that Ibn Khaldūn recorded in his *Autobiography*, it is clear that Ibn Khaldūn was not alone with Timur for the conversation and so contradicts Ibn Khaldūn (see pp. 167, 182). There is an English translation of the relevant part of Ibn Khaldūn's *Autobiography* by Walter J. Fischel entitled *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952).

<sup>5</sup>In MSR 2, 44, the present reviewer noted that Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī cited Ibn Ḥijjī's "Dhayl" for biographical information (in the former's *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*), and Li Guo (MSR 1, 19) signalled the existence of a manuscript of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī's continuation of his own *Durar* that has marginal notes in Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's hand. The relationship of borrowing amongst these three scholars should be investigated more fully.

<sup>6</sup>For Darwich's hypothesis concerning composition and copy dates for these manuscripts, see vol. 2, pp. 57ff., and vol. 4, notes to pages 172, 192, 196, 211, 213, 291, 368.

second set of marginal notes, found only in his student's copy, will require further analysis; perhaps Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah wanted to work with a clear copy of the abridgement in his process of revision? Further, these additions are not limited to material from the "Dhayl". One surprising observation that can now be made with the edited text of the abridgement at hand is that after 840 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah seems to have concentrated his efforts on providing a version of the abridgement that would supersede the larger history known as the "Dhayl." This is evident from the fact that some of the marginal material found in the abridgement is not to be found in the "Dhayl" (see for instance a biography, pp. 251 ff., and additional lines, p. 59, lines 13-14).

These observations about the interrelationship of the two copies of the abridgement and the holograph manuscript of the "Dhayl" can only be made from the very detailed notes in Darwich's critical apparatus. Indeed, his comments about the student's copy (Paris 1098-9) extend beyond a record of textual variants to include observations of a broader importance, for instance, the fact that al-Ajlūnī did not accord Ibn Ḥijjī the rank of "*ḥāfiẓ*," for in each instance that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah had so distinguished his master, al-Ajlūnī revised that title to "*al-shaykh*" (e.g. p. 216, n. 3), and that al-Ajlūnī often took it upon himself to revise Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's Middle Arabic (pp. 21, n. 2, and 166, n. 2). The benefits to be had from such a detailed record of the two manuscripts thus supersede the rule regarding the elimination of secondary exemplars in the art of textual criticism. However, at least part of that rule still applies: Darwich need not have expended such energy in recording the minor errors of reading al-Ajlūnī committed, and thereby could have reduced some of the clutter of his critical apparatus.

Other material extraneous to the critical apparatus includes the citation of sources Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah used for his history, and observations of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's editorial methodology in using those sources. A future modification would be to separate comments on the text and comments on the sources into two apparatuses. Finally, the fact that line numbers were employed for Darwich's edition should have eliminated the need for superscript footnote references; this elimination would have greatly reduced the clutter of the text. The significance of these suggestions is far outweighed by the admiration that must be accorded Darwich as an historian of the Mamluk period. His profound grasp of the language and literature of the period is evident on every page of his edition, from his references to other sources (not limited to published texts) in the footnotes to the extensive vowelization of the text (the vocalizations of Turkish names are almost always correct).<sup>7</sup> On the rare occasions in which Darwich has made additions to

---

<sup>7</sup>Such detailed vowelization is rarely seen in editions of historical texts; typographical errors, while present, are minimal (e.g. read "al-fitnatu" for "al-fitnati," 187:ult.).

the text, his surmises are independently corroborated by the Chester Beatty manuscript of the "Dhayl" (which was not known to him).<sup>8</sup>

As with the other volumes of his edition, Darwich has included in volume four an analytical section that briefly recounts major events of each year, divided into political, legal, intellectual, economic, social, and natural phenomena sections. Readers of Darwich have also come to expect the detailed indices found in each volume; these include people (those subject to death notices and those not), geographical and topographical names, technical terms, peoples and groups, and an index of works mentioned by the author. The usefulness of the people index extends beyond the reading of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's history, thanks to Darwich's inclusion of basic biographical data under each name, often with a citation of another external source in addition to references to Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's work. Minor errors and omissions have occasionally crept into these indices; for instance, references to Burhān al-Dīn Ibn Muflīḥ are also found on pp. 167 and 171; the reference to page "9" under Taymūr (Timur) should read "19;" and page 63 under the same entry is incorrect. In his introduction to volume two of his edition, Darwich promised a "glossary" for the whole of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's work which has yet to materialize.

Students and scholars of Mamluk history have reason to celebrate the conclusion of Darwich's edition of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's abridged history. In the second volume of his edition (French Avant-propos, p. 8), Darwich noted that the critical editing [of medieval Arabic texts] is a difficult undertaking and one which requires a clear vision of the whole civilization of a given epoch. With this final volume of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's history, Darwich has admirably demonstrated just what can be accomplished with such a vision.

#### CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE ARABIC TEXT

Some of the lacunae in the abridgement and some of the passages that Darwich found difficult to read in his two exemplars can be filled and read through recourse to the Chester Beatty MS 5527 of the "Dhayl." Page, line and footnote numbers refer to Darwich's volume four.

174.19. بَيْتِي read Darwich: undotted in MSS Asad Efendi, Paris, and Chester Beatty : تَبْنِي read Reisman.

235.3. انتهى ووالده توفى في رجب سبع وخمسين add. Chester Beatty 5527.

402.8. أقمشة add. Chester Beatty 5527.

402.13. . . . خمس Darwich : خمسمائة نفس من Chester Beatty 5527.

<sup>8</sup>For instance, his addition of "[al-nās]," p. 183, is corroborated by Chester Beatty MS 5527.

419. note 1. No lacuna.  
 419. 5. بَكْتَمِر الركني add. Chester Beatty 5527.  
 419. note 2. No lacuna.  
 425.7. يعنى : read Darwich : Chester Beatty 5527.  
 425.15. على صبايئهم إنهم معك : read Darwich : . . . أنعم فقبل . . . Chester Beatty 5527.  
 444.10. صالح الاشنهي add. Chester Beatty 5527.  
 453.14. الشهبي add. Chester Beatty 5527.  
 453.16. المحط الرحالي تارة add. Chester Beatty 5527.  
 453.18. شرفه add. Chester Beatty 5527.  
 457.3. المنال الجاير add. Chester Beatty 5527.

‘ADNĀN Muḥammad Fāyiz al-Ḥārithī, *‘Imārat al-Madrasah fī Miṣr wa-al-Ḥijāz fī al-Qarn 9 H./15 M.: Dirāsah Muqāranah* (Mecca: al-Mamlakah al-‘Arabīyah al-Sa‘ūdīyah, Wizārat al-Ta‘līm al-‘Ālī, Jāmi‘at Umm al-Qurā, Ma‘had al-Buḥūth al-‘Ilmīyah wa-Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-Islāmī, 1997). Two volumes.

REVIEWED BY DORIS BEHRENS-ABOUSEIF, University of Munich

This work consists of two volumes, the second of which is entirely dedicated to the illustrations, plans, and photographs. The subject defined by the author in his title is a comparison of madrasah architecture in Egypt and the Ḥijāz during the Mamluk period.

The study is divided into three parts. In the first part of his investigation al-Ḥārithī describes three madrasahs in Cairo: the madrasah-*khānqāh* of Faraj Ibn Barqūq, the madrasah of al-Ashraf Barsbāy in Cairo’s center, and that of Qāyṭbāy in the cemetery. The subject of the second part is the madrasahs of the Ḥijāz: the Bāsiṭīyah at Mecca and the Bāsiṭīyah at Medina, both built in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and the madrasah of Qāyṭbāy in Mecca. The third part includes an analysis of and comparison between the Egyptian and the Ḥijāzī madrasah plans followed by a description of architectural and decorative elements of Mamluk (Cairene) madrasah architecture.

The study begins with a short discussion of the theories dealing with the origins of madrasah architecture (K. A. C. Creswell, G. Makdisi, O. Aslanapa, ‘A.

Ḥilmī, Ḥ. al-Bāshā, M. al-Kaḥlāwī), upon which the author comments that even though each of them has a certain validity, they do not take into consideration the variety of plans involved in madrasah architecture. It should be added that this variety of plans is even more pronounced in the period on which this study concentrates, which is the fifteenth century, when the Mamluk madrasah had already lost many of its earlier features in form as well as in function. In fact, none of the three Egyptian cases discussed was a madrasah in the classical sense, but rather a combination of *khānqāh* and madrasah; that of Qāyṭbāy was not a madrasah at all, but a Friday mosque with Sufi functions. The author does note the fluidity in the Mamluk terminological definition of these institutions as well as the flexibility of their function in the late period, but his interest is focused on the variety of plans used in late Mamluk religious architecture rather than on the architecture or the evolution of the madrasah as such, or on the relationship between form and function. It should be noted, however, that some functions, such as whether the madrasah was also a *jāmi'* (the presence, especially outside of Cairo, of a minaret is sometimes the decisive clue) and whether it also included a Sufi community (as did the madrasah of Barqūq), might be of relevance to the architectural layout of the complex. It is the author's opinion that if the function (madrasah, *khānqāh* or *jāmi'*) of an institution is defined by its inscriptions differently from the *waqf* deed, the inscription should be trusted (pp. 284f.). This view can by no means be supported, since the *waqf* deed not only names the type of foundation involved, but also describes its curriculum as well as the functions of the personnel attached to it; these are specific criteria for the definition of the institution which cannot be disregarded.

The architectural survey of all six buildings, which I will not discuss here, proceeds on the basis of an element-by-element formal description, as given in *waqf* documents, with the difference that the author indicates measurements. Al-Ḥārithī tells us that the two Bāsiṭiyah madrasahs of Mecca and Medina which are still extant have undergone only minor alterations. It is regrettable, however, that he does not seem to have visited them himself, as he bases his descriptions of their present state on oral communications by other scholars, using in addition literary and visual material. His reference to other Ḥijāzī monuments is mostly indirect, relying on other studies without the support of illustrations.

Information about Qāyṭbāy's madrasah in Mecca, which did not survive and for which no *waqf* deed is known, is provided from literary sources as well as from historic views and photographs in addition to an Egyptian survey map predating the Saudi destruction of the building. On the basis of this material the author

presents a reconstruction of the plan and elevation of this madrasah. No *waqf* document seems to exist for any of the Ḥijāzī foundations discussed by the author.<sup>1</sup>

In the third part of the book, which deals with analysis and comparison, al-Ḥārithī comes to the conclusion that the madrasahs of the Ḥijāz, while influenced by Egyptian architecture, developed their own local patterns based on the *hujrah*, which is a simple room used for the gatherings related to the institution's functions, instead of the *iwān* or the arcaded hall. This *hujrah* is represented in the two madrasahs built by Qādī 'Abd al-Basīṭ in Mecca and Medina, an observation that is also applicable to Mamluk Syrian architecture. It should be noted here that a characteristic function of the foundations attached to the mosques of Mecca and Medina, like Qāyṭbāy's madrasah in Medina, was that of a hospice for pilgrims.

The final chapter deals with the architectural and decorative elements of the Mamluk madrasah with some interesting information on libraries and the location of the living units.

In spite of its comparative outlook this study focuses heavily on Cairene architecture, which the author seems to know better than the Mamluk architecture of Mecca or Medina of which, moreover, little has survived. Although the Mamluks' patronage in the provinces, especially the Holy Cities, was substantial, their buildings outside Cairo did not belong to the same architectural school as those of the capital. In spite of undeniable mutual influences between Cairo and Syria, Cairene Mamluk architecture was not really duplicated elsewhere in the empire (not even in the Egyptian provinces themselves), with the exception of Qāyṭbāy's buildings in Jerusalem and the Ḥijāz, which were erected by Cairene teams of master-builders and masons. One would have expected the author to recognize that the madrasah of Qāyṭbāy in Mecca was closer to Cairene tradition than other buildings because exceptionally, and like that of Medina, it was built by an Egyptian master-builder and Egyptian craftsmen. It would be interesting to investigate whether Ḥijāzī Mamluk architecture was related to that of the Syrian provinces.

Another aspect which should have been considered in a discussion of plans is the role of the urban setting which, as is well known, played a role in the design of Mamluk urban architecture, where the founder's mausoleum—mostly absent in provincial architecture—occupied a prominent place. In the cases of Mecca and Medina, where the founders had an obvious preference for close proximity to the sanctuary (thus limiting the choices of available plots), adjustments to the plans must have been inevitable, as is evident in the Mamluk buildings around the Ḥaram of Jerusalem.

---

<sup>1</sup>The *waqf* deed of Qāyṭbāy's madrasah in Medina has been discussed by me in *Mamlūk Studies Review* 3 (1999).

The illustrations in the second volume are of rather poor quality, and they deal essentially with Cairene architecture. The five historic photographs of Mecca and Medina from the collection of Sultan ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd and Muḥammad Ṣādiq Pasha are interesting.

The author, who used for his study an important number of literary sources, *waqf* documents, and many recent Arabic studies including unpublished M.A. and Ph.D. theses from Cairo is, on the other hand, poorly informed about research done in European languages, except for his short mention of Creswell’s ideas on the origins of the madrasah; not even the *Corpus Inscriptionum* has been consulted in the context of epigraphy. His very short bibliography of Western literature (which does include, however, references on Persian and Sassanian architecture) contains mistakes to the extent of being unintelligible. In this regrettable shortcoming al-Ḥārithī is not alone; rather, he represents a large part of scholarship on Islamic art history written in Arabic. Of course it is also true that Western scholars in this field have entirely disregarded recent art historical studies in Arabic, which despite their provincial character and, as a result, methodological weaknesses, can be useful to the Western reader. Islamic art history is a very young discipline in Arabic scholarship; unless it interacts with Western scholarship it will remain deficient.

Any information dealing with Mamluk architecture in the Holy Cities is of interest, since these buildings are not accessible to the non-Muslim scholar. Although this book is focused on Cairene Mamluk architecture, al-Ḥārithī does draw attention to the Mamluk buildings in Mecca and Medina. One should look forward to more material and more research on religious patronage and medieval architecture in the Ḥijāz.

FĀDĪ ILYĀS TAWWĀ, *Al-Manākh wa-al-As‘ār wa-al-Amrād fī Bilād al-Shām fī ‘Ahd al-Mamālīk (642-922 H./1250-1516 M.)* (Beirut: n.p., 1998). Pp. 590.

REVIEWED BY WILLIAM TUCKER, University of Arkansas at Fayetteville<sup>1</sup>

The present volume constitutes both a valuable addition to the historiography of the Syrian lands in the Mamluk period generally and a major contribution to the ecological and demographic history of the Mamluk realm in particular. Consisting

---

<sup>1</sup>I wish to thank my student, Farid al-Salim, for his assistance in sifting through the wealth of material presented in this volume.

of a brief introduction and three large chapters, as well as numerous charts and graphs, Tawwā's study focuses upon the climate, agrarian commodity prices, and disease patterns in greater Syria between 1250 and 1517. As his introduction indicates, the author's methodology reflects the theories of *Annales* historians such as E. Le Roy Ladurie, Fernand Braudel and, in Ottoman history, Daniel Panzac. Beginning with brief examinations of geographical features (e.g., relief, crops, forests, etc.), climate, and population, the introductory section continues with a survey of the techniques of climatic history, such as dendrochronology, phenology, and glaciology. The author concludes the first part of the initial chapter with remarks about climatic data as well as a set of tables of yearly weather data by seasons, climatic zones, and an outline of such weather phenomena as droughts, cold waves, floods, hail and snow.

The second part of Chapter 1 incorporates a detailed investigation of drought, especially three major waves (1292-98, 1304-20, 1359-89), and the effects of these water shortages upon agricultural production and livestock resources. Tawwā then examines episodes of cold and snow, torrential rains and floods, heat waves, and winds both hot and cold. Crop damage, human and animal mortality, infrastructural damage, and epidemic diseases are all noted as major by-products of these weather events. Chapter 1 concludes with a schematization of climatic fluctuations in the region during the Mamluk period (e.g., 1280-1320, warm winters; 1370-1440, warm winters) and the deduction that these fluctuations were consistent with what was happening elsewhere in the world at the time.

The second chapter of the book is devoted to an examination of grain and bread prices in Mamluk *Bilād al-Shām*. The author shows how weather conditions, wars, insect infestations, and the political elite's manipulations of supplies and storage all affected the prices of wheat and bread. Important data in the text and tables demonstrate price fluctuations and their causes; for instance, plague and drought caused bread prices to soar between 1370 and 1400. In 1466 prices tripled because of harsh climatic conditions and an invasion of mice. Similar information is forthcoming about barley prices, but, interestingly enough, Tawwā points to the added factor that the demand for barley increased during times of war, when it was used for animal feed. Spiraling prices of wheat and barley are also shown to have stimulated price escalation of other commodities, such as meat, vegetables, fruits, etc. The section ends with a treatment of famines stimulated by rising prices and shortages and the linkage in such cases with malnutrition, disease, and the incidence of epidemics.

In the concluding chapter of his study, Tawwā examines the diseases and epidemics which attacked Mamluk Syrian territory. He devotes a good deal of attention to the various plague epidemics, which he divides into periods of one century each. Although he writes at length about the pandemic of 1347-49, he



also scrutinizes carefully the other major plague events, i.e., those of 1361-64, 1369, 1372, 1374, 1393, and 1459. The discussion continues with a consideration of factors leading to the development and proliferation of diseases such as plague and other maladies, including smallpox, malaria, and even epizootic (animal) diseases. Hygienic and personal habits had a significant role, according to the author. Limited cleanliness, wearing clothes of the deceased victims of contagious diseases, and crowding at prayers are all noted as factors in the spread of sickness.

The second part of the last chapter centers upon the demographic effects of the fifty-eight waves of plague which hit Syria during the Mamluk era. Tawwā concludes that *Bilād al-Shām* lost between 250,000 and a million people to plague during the relevant period. Peasants and middle-class urban dwellers were especially hard hit, and those whose professions brought them into contact with these groups (bakers, merchants, water carriers) also suffered disproportionately. The author argues that notables and government officials were less affected because of their possible isolation.

Finally, Tawwā analyzes the relationship between climate and plague occurrences. Drought, heat, and humidity apparently facilitated the spread of plague, as did the movement of people related to seasonal change. Plague also resulted in famine, price increases, and rural depopulation.

Unfortunately, the discussion of plague and other diseases, while interesting and carefully conceived, suffers from a lack of attention to important English-language studies of disease and plague, such as those of Michael Dols, William McNeill, Lawrence Conrad, and J. D. F. Shrewsbury, among others.<sup>2</sup> The important, albeit brief, article on epidemics by Boaz Shoshan is also missing, and this study might have been of use as regards chronology and original sources not utilized in the present work.<sup>3</sup>

In one of the most intriguing features of his volume, Tawwā offers, between pages 419 and 477, tables and graphs illustrating the life expectancy in *Bilād al-Shām* during the Mamluk period. These statistical illustrations unfortunately, but not unexpectedly given the source materials, provide information for male notables only. The materials indicate, according to the author's analysis, that life expectancy decreased from an earlier high of 73 to 60.91 years in 1348/49 and then reached its lowest point, 59.15 years, in the late fourteenth century. Life expectancy rose in the fifteenth century but remained below 70. The author suggests,

---

<sup>2</sup>Michael W. Dols, *The Black Death in the Middle East* (Princeton, 1977); William McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (New York, 1976); Lawrence I. Conrad, "The Plague in the Early Medieval Near East" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1981); J. D. F. Shrewsbury, *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* (Cambridge, 1970).

<sup>3</sup>Boaz Shoshan, "Notes sur les epidemies de peste in Egypte," *Annales de démographie historique* (Paris, 1981): 387-404.

incidentally, that this latter figure compares favorably with the current life expectancy in Lebanon, which he puts at 66 years. Not surprisingly, the data show that notables could secure a higher level of health protection and nutrition, enjoying higher life expectancy than the lower classes. One may, of course, question the nutritional quality of consumption related to affluence, more luxurious consumption not necessarily equated with nutritional advantage, although increased quantity could also have been a factor here.

All in all, this book is extremely useful and stimulating for anyone engaged with environmental, medical, economic, or simply Mamluk history. One may argue that the lack of familiarity with numerous English-language studies deprives the work of greater theoretical or comparative perspective. For instance, one might wish to assess the relationship between caloric intake and resistance to disease and the consequent relationship between food consumption levels and epidemic disease.<sup>4</sup> Also, questions arise about the absence of certain primary works, especially the history of Birzalī, which might have provided even more data and insight for the author.

In the final analysis, however, Tawwā is to be commended for the careful, painstaking, and systematic study he has produced. The illustrative tables, graphs, charts, etc., are in themselves valuable contributions, but in fact this volume offers the reader far more than that! It constitutes a major addition to the emerging field of disaster research in the Middle East.

SHAMS AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD IBN ‘ALĪ IBN ṬŪLŪN, *Inbā’ al-Umarā’ bi-Inbā’ al-Wuzarā’*.  
Ed. by Muhanná Ḥamad al-Muhanná (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmīyah,  
1998). Pp. 128.

REVIEWED BY STEPHAN CONERMANN, University of Kiel

Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Ṣāliḥī al-Dimashqī al-Ḥanafī, better known as Ibn Ṭūlūn, belongs to the species of “quilldrivers.” His urge to write may have been innate but in the end, Ibn Ṭūlūn just wanted to match his adored teacher al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), whose titles, as is well known, number more than seven hundred.

---

<sup>4</sup>For some of the issues associated with malnutrition, immunity, and epidemics, see my article, “Environmental Hazards, Natural Disasters, Economic Loss, and Mortality in Mamluk Syria,” *Mamluk Studies Review* 3 (1999), especially 119-23.

Ibn Ṭūlūn was born in 880/1473 in al-Ṣāliḥīyah, near Damascus. At the age of eleven he received a scholarship to study jurisprudence at the Madrasah al-Māridānīyah. After completing some higher studies in Cairo he went back to the former Umayyad capital. There he found a job as a teacher of grammar, *tafsīr*, and hadith at the Madrasah al-Ṣāliḥīyah. Subsequently he held several other teaching and administrative posts, but never rose to higher ranks. Ibn Ṭūlūn died, more than seventy years of age, in 953/1546.

Although his contemporaries considered him an expert in *fiqh* and Tradition, only his historical writings have attracted the attention of modern specialists. This is probably due to the fact that these writings describe in detail the important change from Mamluk rule to Ottoman domination in Syria. Thus only a small number of his many extant works (from an original total of 750 titles) have been published, and only a very few have been the subject of scholarly studies.<sup>1</sup> Now Muḥanná Ḥamad al-Muḥanná presents us with his edition of Ibn Ṭūlūn's *Inbā' al-Umarā' bi-Abnā' al-Wuzarā'*, which is based on the only existing manuscript, now in Berlin.<sup>2</sup>

Inspired by the Quranic verses "Appoint for me a minister (*wazīran*) from my household, Aaron, my brother. Gird by him my strength, and associate him in my affair. That we may glorify Thee often and make remembrance of Thee often. Verily Thou hast become of us observant,"<sup>3</sup> Ibn Ṭūlūn thought it a good idea to write a small book about the lives of thirty-two viziers. This genre was not altogether unknown, as exemplified by Muḥammad al-Ṣūlī's (d. ca. 336/947) *Kitāb al-Wuzarā'*, Ibn al-Jarrāḥ's (d. 296/908) *Kitāb al-Wuzarā'*, al-Jahshiyārī's (d. 331/942) *Kitāb al-Wuzarā' wa-al-Kuttāb*, al-Tha'ālibī's (350-429/961-1038) *Kitāb al-Wuzarā'*, al-Ṣābī's (359-448/970-1056/57) *Kitāb al-Wuzarā'*, and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī's (463-542/1071-1147) *Al-Ishārah ilá Man Nāla al-Wizārah*.

In his *Inbā' al-Umarā' bi-Abnā' al-Wuzarā'* Ibn Ṭūlūn gives his readers more or less important, but above all entertaining, information about some illustrious persons. Thus, we find al-Qāsim ibn Wahb (258-291/872-904),<sup>4</sup> vizier to the Abbasid caliphs al-Mu'taḍid (279-289/892-902) and al-Muktafi (289-295/902-908),

<sup>1</sup>The most important editions are *Mufākahat al-Khillān fī Ḥawādith al-Zamān*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafá (Cairo, 1962-64); *Al-Qalā' id al-Jawharīyah fī Tārīkh al-Ṣāliḥīyah*, ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān (Damascus, 1949-56); and his autobiography *Al-Fulk al-Mashḥūn fī Aḥwāl Muḥammad ibn Ṭūlūn* (Damascus, 1929). Of his *I'lām al-Warā' bi-Man Waliya Nā' iban min al-Atrāk bi-Dimashq al-Shām al-Kubrā* we have a French translation by Henri Laoust, *Les gouverneurs de Damas sous les mamlouks et les premiers Ottomans* (Damascus, 1952).

<sup>2</sup>Wilhelm Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften*, vol. 9, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlischen Bibliothek zu Berlin (Berlin, 1897), no. 9880.

<sup>3</sup>Surah 20, verses 29-35 (Bell's translation).

<sup>4</sup>No. 2, pp. 25-29.

and the three famous ministers of the Barmakid family during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd (170-193/786-809): Yaḥyá ibn Khālid (d. 190/805),<sup>5</sup> who remained in office for seventeen years (170-187/786-803), and his two sons al-Faḍl (d. 193/808)<sup>6</sup> and Ja‘far (d. 187/803),<sup>7</sup> who frequently presided with Yaḥyá and also appear to have been styled *wazīr*. The end of this triad is all too well known: in January 187/803 the caliph suddenly decided to put an end to “the reign of the Barmakids” (*sulṭān Āl Barmak*). He had Ja‘far executed; al-Faḍl and Yaḥyá were brought to al-Raqqah, where they both died in prison.

Also included in this work are, for example, al-Muḥallabī (291-352/903-963), the prominent vizier to the Buyid amir of Iraq Mu‘izz al-Dawlah (334-356/945-967) from 339/950 until his death in 352/963, and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Gharnābī Lisān al-Dīn (713-776/1313-1375),<sup>8</sup> better known as Ibn al-Khaṭīb. During the reigns of Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf ibn Ismā‘īl (733-755/1333-1354) and Muḥammad V al-Ghanī billāh (first reign 755-760/1354-1359; second reign 763-793/1362-1392), Ibn al-Khaṭīb not only held the office of chief administrator but also assumed the honorary title of *Dhū al-Wizāratayn*.

We furthermore encounter such celebrities as al-Ṭūsī (597-672/1201-1274)<sup>9</sup> and Ibn Sīnā (370-428/980-1037).<sup>10</sup> Al-Ṭūsī was in the service of the Mongol Khan Hülāgū (654-663/1256-1265) during the sack of Baghdad in 1258 and later retained his office in the reign of Abaqa (663-681/1265-1282), while Ibn Sīnā was appointed vizier several times by various local rulers. The famous scholar, physician, and philosopher spent his last fourteen years at the court of ‘Alā’ al-Dawlah Muḥammad (d. 433/1041) in Isfahan.

Muhanná Ḥamad al-Muhanná gives the reader of Ibn Ṭūlūn’s *adab* work a short introduction and adds some useful notes to the text. In sum, this is a good work, but considering the numerous writings of Ibn Ṭūlūn still awaiting publication one might say about this edition: nice to have, but nothing more and nothing less.

---

<sup>5</sup>No. 3, p. 30.

<sup>6</sup>No. 4, pp. 31-32.

<sup>7</sup>No. 5, pp. 33-35.

<sup>8</sup>No. 21, pp. 78-83.

<sup>9</sup>No. 26, pp. 97-101.

<sup>10</sup>No. 32, pp. 124-126.

NAJM AL-DĪN ‘UMAR IBN FAHD, *Ithāf al-Warā bi-Akhhār Umm al-Qurā*, vols. 1-3 edited by Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt, vol. 4 edited by ‘Abd al-Karīm ‘Alī al-Bāz, vol. 5 (Indexes) prepared by Muḥammad Ismā‘īl al-Sayyid Aḥmad and Ṣādiq al-Bīlī Abū Shādī (Mecca: al-Mamlakah al-‘Arabīyah al-Sa‘ūdīyah, Jāmi‘at Umm al-Qurā, Ma‘had al-Buḥūth al-‘Ilmīyah wa-Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-Islāmī, Markaz Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-Islāmī, 1983-1990).

REVIEWED BY LI GUO, University of Notre Dame

Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar, known also as Muḥammad Ibn Fahd (812/1409-885/1480), was a member of the prominent Ibn Fahd family in Mecca and the author of a history of the city entitled *Ithāf al-Warā bi-Akhhār Umm al-Qurā*. The current complete edition of the work is a welcome addition to the expanding library of the key texts on the history of the Holy City of Islam in the aftermath of its glorious earlier days.

Unlike many medieval Arabic “universal histories,” which usually begin with the Creation, Ibn Fahd’s History of Mecca begins with the birth of the Prophet Muḥammad and runs to 885/1480, the year of the author’s death. The main value of the work, which is a continuation of al-Fāsī’s earlier history of Mecca and the basis of a later history of Mecca by the author’s son ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, rests on the author’s account of the period of his own lifetime, which is covered in vol. 3 (601/1204-830/1426) and vol. 4 (831/1427-885/1480) of the present edition (vol. 4 was in fact a dissertation submitted to the University of Umm al-Qurā in Mecca). The edition, based on manuscripts from libraries in Cairo, Mecca, and Medina, is skillfully executed. The indexes (vol. 5), including the Quran, hadith, poetry, men’s and women’s names, place names, and bibliographical references, are very serviceable. However, the reader will find the edition less than user-friendly insofar as the pages are not marked by headers (e.g., the year in question), although each volume concludes with a detailed table of contents.

*Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, edited by Julie Scott Meisami and Paul Starkey (London and New York: Routledge, 1998). Two volumes.

REVIEWED BY TH. EMIL HOMERIN, University of Rochester

Begun in 1990, the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature* aims to catalog writers and trends of Arabic literature from its beginnings until the late twentieth century.

Over one hundred individuals contributed entries to this work and its target audience of “students and academics working in Arabic language and literature and, more generally, in the fields of Middle Eastern culture, history and philosophy . . . , other Middle Eastern literatures . . . , comparative literature, non-western literatures and world literature.”<sup>1</sup> The editors note further that they have sought “to emphasize the state of the art of current scholarship on Arabic literature, relying on recent research and less on received traditional opinion.”<sup>2</sup> A fine product of these goals is Julie Scott Meisami’s detailed entry for Abū Tammām, which cites five critical editions of his work and thirteen secondary sources in Arabic, French, German, and English. Unfortunately, not all entries meet this high standard including, surprisingly, Meisami’s own entry for Ibn al-Fāriḍ, which lacks reference to any of more than a dozen scholarly books and articles on the poet and his verse published since 1980. There are other serious omissions: in T. Bauer’s entry “al-Mu‘allaqāt” one finds a citation to A. J. Arberry’s uninspiring translations in *The Seven Odes*,<sup>3</sup> but not to Michael Sells’ exquisite versions in his *Desert Tracings*,<sup>4</sup> while Renate Jacobi in her article on the *qasīdah* fails to cite even one of Jaroslav Stetkevych’s essential writings on the subject.

Perhaps oversights are to be expected in such an ambitious encyclopedic project though, fortunately, they are few in the nearly one hundred entries on writers living during the Mamluk period. These subjects are “writers” broadly defined by the editors for the medieval period, where “the scope of ‘literature’ has not been restricted to belles lettres but has been extended to other types of writing—history, biography, geography, philosophy and so on—as medieval writers and readers did not make the same distinctions between various types of ‘literature’ as do modern ones.”<sup>5</sup> This definition allows for a wide range of authors, from religious figures including ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshānī, Ibn Taymīyah, and al-Nawawī, to historians and secretaries such as Abū al-Fidā, al-Maqrīzī, and al-Qalqashandī. Many of these entries (nearly 30%) have been competently compiled by C. E. Bosworth, R. Irwin, A. Knysh, and D. S. Richards, and the vast majority of entries will be appreciated for their citation of recent text editions and studies of their respective subjects. Still, when one sifts through these entries of individuals, one finds too few poets and writers of belles lettres, in all about a dozen, including authors from the Maghrib and Andalusia. Among these, al-Būshīrī and Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī are the most frequently mentioned in the *Encyclopedia*, with the individual

---

<sup>1</sup>P. x.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>(London, 1957).

<sup>4</sup>(Middletown, CT, 1989).

<sup>5</sup>P. xi.

entry for each being written by C. E. Bosworth. Bosworth's short entry for al-Būṣīrī focuses exclusively on the poet's celebrated ode in praise of Muḥammad, the *Qasīdat al-Burdah*; there is no mention of other verse by al-Būṣīrī, such as his scathing poems against the Copts and corrupt officials, or even a citation to a text edition of his *Dīwān*. Bosworth does direct his reader to relevant entries in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, and to J. W. Redhouse's 1881 English translation of the poem, though not to Stefan Sperl's more recent translation and insightful comments on the ode.<sup>6</sup> Bosworth's entry for Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī is longer and more thorough, and he points out al-Ḥillī's importance to the study of popular Arabic poetic forms and colloquial poetry in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. However, here again, Bosworth does not cite any published edition of the poet's *Dīwān* or Arabic studies of the poet, including those by 'Allūsh, al-Ayyūbī, and M. Rizq Salīm.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, readers should find both entries thoughtful and useful, particularly in comparison to D. J. Wasserstein's paragraph "Ibn al-'Afīf al-Tilimsānī." Wasserstein cropped his brief entry from J. Rikabi's more extensive article in *EI*<sup>2</sup>, which Wasserstein cites while omitting Rikabi's concise description of the poet's elegant style, which avoided the mannerism of the time, as well as his popular nickname of "al-Shābb al-Zarīf" (imagine an article on Samuel Clemens without "Mark Twain"). Further, Wasserstein does not provide a bibliography, which should have included, minimally, Shākir Hādī Shukr's edition of al-Shābb al-Zarīf's *Dīwān*<sup>8</sup> and, perhaps, also 'Umar Mūsá Bāshā's chapter on the poet in his *Tārīkh al-Adab al-'Arabī: al-'Asr al-Mamlūkī*.<sup>9</sup> A glance at this latter source also reveals several noted poets of the Mamluk period who deserve a place in any comprehensive work on Arabic literature, namely al-Ashraf al-Anṣārī, al-Talla'farī, Ibn Mulayk al-Ḥamawī, and 'Ā'ishah al-Bā'ūniyah, though they and others are absent from the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*.

Turning from entries on individuals to those on thematic subjects, one generally finds a fair representation of authors from the Mamluk period. References to relevant Mamluk examples are to be found, for instance, in entries for biography, Cairo, Damascus, didactic literature, Egypt, exegesis, geographical literature, grammar, historical literature, Syria, and travel literature. This is also the case for more specifically belles lettres subjects including *adab*, *'ajā'ib* literature, allusion and intertextuality, *badī'*, *badī'iyāt*, *khamrīyah*, literary criticism, love theory,

<sup>6</sup>Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackleton, eds., *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa* (Leiden, 1996), 2:388-411; 470-76.

<sup>7</sup>Jawād Aḥmad 'Allūsh, *Shi'r Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī* (Baghdad, ca. 1959); Yāsīn al-Ayyūbī, *Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī* (Beirut, 1971); Maḥmūd Rizq Salīm, *Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī* (reprint, Cairo, 1980).

<sup>8</sup>(Beirut, 1985).

<sup>9</sup>(Beirut, 1989), 241-74.

*lughz*, *maqāmah*, *mu‘āraḍah*, *muzdawijah*, *naẓm*, and *zajal*. Further, exceptional coverage is given to the popular literature of the period, especially in the contributions of Shmuel Moreh, who pays particular attention to issues of medieval drama and acting. Moreh provides detailed entries and bibliographies on subjects including “acting and actors, medieval,” “khayāl,” “shadow-play,” and “theatre and drama,” and to this should be added his entry on the actor Ibn Mawlāhum al-Khayālī, and Everett Rowson’s entries on the playwrights Ibn Sūdūn and Ibn Dāniyāl.

Surprisingly, the Mamluks and their writers are not mentioned in entries for the crusades, *futūḥ*, or patronage, nor do they figure in entries on the important poetic genres of *fakhr*, *ghazal*, *madīḥ*, *qasīdah*, or *ritha’*; these latter entries effectively end around the year 1000 C.E. though, of course, Arabic poetry did not. Overall, the contributions to Arabic poetry and belle lettres made by the elite of the Mamluk domains are underrepresented in the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, though Robert Irwin’s excellent entry “Mamlūks” goes far to correct this shortcoming. Irwin cites Arabic poetic activity and patronage by specific Mamluk sultans and amirs, as well as several entertaining anthologies composed during this period on life’s pleasures, whether permissible or forbidden. Irwin mentions some of the historians and encyclopedists for which the Mamluk era is best known, but he also takes care to note the panegyric and devotional verse popular at the time, along with poetic treatises on law, grammar, love, and other subjects. Naturally, he discusses Ibn Dāniyāl and the shadow play, together with popular romances, such as ‘Antar. Irwin then draws attention to al-Subkī’s *Kitāb Mu‘īd al-Ni‘am* and the *al-Madkhal* of Ibn al-Hājj as important sources for probing Mamluk life and times. He concludes with reference to several occult works composed during this period, while offering the opinion that the Mamluk era was “not a great age for Sūfī literature,”<sup>10</sup> which strikes me as a rather premature conclusion given that most such literature—including *dīwāns* by several students of Ibn al-Fāriḍ, as well as commentaries on his work and that of Ibn al-‘Arabī—lies unedited and, for the most part, unread in manuscript. Irwin provides a useful bibliography citing pertinent studies in both English and Arabic, thus rounding out his concise and balanced entry on the literature and culture of the Mamluk age for the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*.

---

<sup>10</sup>Vol. 2, p. 503.



‘IṢĀM MUḤAMMAD SHIBĀRŪ, *Al-Salāṭīn fī al-Mashriq al-‘Arabī: Ma‘ālim Dawrihim al-Siyāsī wa-al-Ḥaḍārī: Al-Mamālīk (648-923 H./1250-1517 M.)*. (Beirut: Dār al-Nahḍah al-‘Arabīyah, 1995). Pp. 264.

REVIEWED BY STEFAN WINTER, The University of Chicago

*Al-Mamālīk* follows *Al-Salājiqah/al-Ayyūbiyūn* (Beirut, 1994) in Shibārū’s two-part study in the political history of medieval Egypt and Syria. The volume is a handsomely produced paperback, and includes six maps; detailed analytical indices; tables of reigning Mamluk sultans, Khwarazm-Shahs, and Ilkhans; and an appendix of eleven samples (from previously published sources) of Mamluk diplomatic correspondence with Mongols, Byzantines and Crusaders.

The author introduces each sultanic regime with a chronological account of its rise and salient military ventures, followed by a chapter on the distinguishing features of its administrative system. This format seems to work better in the first volume, where it helps the reader sort out the muddle of Fatimid, Saljuq, Burid, Zangid, Crusader and Ayyubid potentates who controlled different parts of Egypt and Syria to varying degrees between 1055 and 1250. In the volume devoted entirely to the Mamluks, Shibārū takes six chapters to evoke one sultan after the other; each one apparently of interest only in so far as he did battle with the Mongols, Crusaders, Cypriots, or Ottomans.

Among the more interesting sections is Shibārū’s detailed account of the rise of the Mongols (chapter two). Emphasizing (perhaps excessively so) the importance of the *yasa* law code, he is at pains to explain the Mongols’ success in terms of their superior organization, not their barbaric savagery. Through this sympathetic look at the Mongols, the achievement of the Mamluks at ‘Ayn Jālūt appears all the greater; the author treats neither the question of Mongol influence in the Mamluk system nor David Ayalon’s criticism regarding the *yasa*’s abiding importance. Also novel is Shibārū’s assertion (pp. 78-79) that the destruction of Baghdad in 1258, far from visiting disaster on Muslim civilization, actually facilitated the revival of culture and learning in the new, more dynamic capital of Cairo.

The book’s bibliography basically consists of the standard “Top 40” of published narrative sources. Shibārū sprinkles footnote references to these liberally throughout those sections dealing directly with the Mamluks. But given the broad sweep of his presentation, it is unfortunate that he does not discuss the secondary literature or any diverging interpretations, particularly in the well-written chapters on the Mongols and on the Ottomans. (Much of the former seems to be more directly inspired by Grousset’s *L’empire des steppes* than the odd footnote reference allows.) As is evident also in the first volume, the author is less sure-footed in European

history, apparently confusing several terms for the same Crusading order (pp. 28-9) and wrongly thinking that the 1311 council of Vienne was convened for the sake of planning a new attack on Egypt, but failed because Europe was "moving toward laicisation and secularisation" and had no more use for holy war (p. 89). But these are minor objections; the author's overall command of the history not only of the central Islamic core-lands, but also of the Turco-Mongol and Frankish invaders, is laudable.

Shibārū's analysis of the Mamluks' major foreign wars is highly nuanced and intelligent, bringing out the diplomatic intrigues that broke the Mongol-Crusader-Armenian alliance in 1260, probing the Mamluks' reticence in using firearms on the battlefield in 1516 though they had preceded the Ottomans in the adoption of siege artillery, and so on. It is thus regrettable that the author does not put his talents toward elucidating more of the inter-factional conflicts that so characterized the Mamluk system. In the ninth and final chapter, he does provide a competent overview of the Mamluk civil and military administration, covering the composition of the sultanic and provincial armies, the significance of *furūsīyah*, the institutionalization of four *madhhabs*, etc. By way of diachronic historical interpretation, however, Shibārū suggests only that the discipline of the Mamluk barracks began to deteriorate with the advent of the Burji regime, leading ultimately to the fall of the sultanate at the hands of the Ottomans.

The more specialised reader may regret further omissions, individual errors of detail, or the occasional inaccuracy of *hijrī* to *milādī* conversion. The primary appeal of this work is its broad perspective which, because it encompasses the rule of sultans in the Near East from the Saljuqs onward, transcends a simple panegyric to, or denunciation of, the Mamluk regime. In the first volume, Shibārū shows skillfully how neither racial nor religious affinities inevitably determined diplomacy and politics among the sultans, Crusaders, and Mongols, but concludes that the divide between Turkish and Kurdish rulers and the Arab populace facilitated the deposition of both the Abbasid and Fatimid caliphates. What is it then that links together the sultans from the Saljuqs to the Mamluks, but excludes the Ottomans? The author's underlying ideological position becomes clear only in the unexpectedly bizarre and disappointing conclusion: citing Quranic verses and *hadith* to demonstrate that only Arabs qualify to be caliph, Shibārū commends the foreign-blooded sultans for their service to Islam in protecting the Arab caliphs before Ottoman Turks usurped and falsified that office in the sixteenth century. If one can disregard this dissatisfying conclusion, then the two volumes of Shibārū's thoughtful, ambitious and eminently readable work together should make for a good introduction to the political history of medieval Syria and Egypt, of interest primarily to the Arabophone student and general reader, and perhaps also to the specialist concerned with contemporary Mamlukist historiography.

*Sylloge Numorum Arabicorum Tübingen. Ḥamāh IV c Bilād aš-Šām III* (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth Verlag Tübingen, 1998). Edited by Lorenz Korn. Forward by Lutz Ilisch. Pp. 58.

REVIEWED BY WARREN C. SCHULTZ, DePaul University

Specialists in the field of Mamluk numismatics know that the basic reference work in the field, *The Coinage of the Mamluk Sultans of Egypt and Syria*, by Paul Balog (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1964; commonly referred to by the siglum MSES), has a distinct Egyptian bias in terms of the mints of origins for the coins described therein. This bias is both in number and in type, and is especially so for the copper *fulūs*. In his unpublished contribution to the Balog Memorial Symposium held in Israel in 1988, Lutz Ilisch, the director of the Forschungsstelle für islamische Numismatik, Tübingen (henceforth FINT), described this bias, and mentioned how Syrian Mamluk coins had become increasingly available on the coin market in the years since the publication of the MSES. Until the appearance of the volume under review, however, these Syrian coins remained relatively inaccessible for study. For this reason and others, its publication is thus a most welcome and important development.

By definition, a sylloge provides both illustrations and descriptions of each coin specimen preserved in a specific collection. This book is the fourth volume of a planned multi-volume series devoted to the massive and important holdings of pre-modern Islamic coins preserved at the FINT. It is the first FINT volume to address a mint city of the Mamluk Sultanate; previous volumes covered the mints of Palestine, Eastern Khorasan, and Northern and Eastern Central Asia. The work contains 21 plates illustrating both sides of 708 coins, 552 of which are Mamluk. (As Lorenz Korn points out in his brief and lucid introduction, Ḥamāh was an active mint from the late sixth to mid-ninth Muslim centuries. The volume thus describes 147 Ayyubid and 9 Mongol coins minted there as well.)

The basic arrangement of this sylloge is chronological, following standard numismatic conventions for coins that are anonymous, feature incomplete dates, or have no date at all. Since it is restricted to the FINT coins, it should be noted that this volume does not contain a complete mint series for this city. Thus, as is pointed out on p. 32, Mamluk gold coins from Ḥamāh are extremely rare, and none are found in this collection. This observation in no way detracts from the usefulness of this work, however, for as the noted Islamic numismatist Stephen Album has pointed out, the volume does present "virtually a complete catalogue" of everything known to have been minted at Ḥamāh.

The beauty of this work lies in its plates. The photography is uniformly excellent. The photographs are on a 1:1 scale, with clear and precise reproduction.

The value of the sylloge to the researcher is that the poor- as well as the well-struck coin is illustrated. And since the former seem to predominate in Mamluk coinage, a newcomer to the field of Mamluk monetary history would benefit from a perusal of the plates alone. Thus, for example, until the appearance of the FINT volumes for the mints of Aleppo, Tripoli, Cairo, and Alexandria, this volume will be the sole easily accessible resource for the as yet not fully understood "*fals khafīf*" series from the reigns of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and before. Similarly, by including many "overstrikes," in which an existing coin has been struck again with another set of dies (c.f. the many examples on plate 19), this volume sheds some light on an important subfield of Mamluk numismatics: these overstrikes have been used to solve some thorny chronological problems of sequence for the copper coins in particular.

This work is more than pictures, however. A succinct yet thorough description of each coin is provided. The abbreviations used in these descriptions are easily mastered. Every coin has been weighed and measured. Die linkages between coins are pointed out. A list of basic legends is included. Omissions or gaps in legends and dates are noted and a provenance has also been given for each coin. In short, the information necessary to make sense of the coin illustrations has been provided. All reflect the cumulative expertise of those who have worked to make this collection available to a wider audience.

There remains one terminological quibble. Several silver coins in this sylloge are described as "half-*dirhams*." (See nos. 159, 165, 217, 218, 252, 256, 324, 335, 345, 356, 360, 433, 435, 471, 558, and 570.) In the wider context of Mamluk coinage, I find this term problematic, primarily for metrological reasons. Until the silver of Barsbāy and the later Circassian sultans, the many surviving specimens suggest strongly that Mamluk silver coins were prepared with only the most general and imprecise attention to a weight-standard. The coins in question here all share the fact that they weigh less than two grams. Yet this sample itself varies in weight from around 1.20 to 1.70 grams. When doubled, such "half-*dirhams*" yield quite different "full" *dirham* weights and values. Similarly, there are other coins in the sylloge that are less than two grams, yet are not labeled as "half-*dirhams*." (See nos. 221, 272, 343, 411, 419, 536, 537, 620, 684-6.) Such lightweight coins are clearly fractional *dirhams*, but to label them "half-*dirhams*" suggest a denominational precision not found for most of the Mamluk era. (Actual denominational terms like half, or quarter [*dirham*] do not appear on Mamluk coins until the mid-ninth/fifteenth century.) Something more than light weight is needed to justify the label. Otherwise the term becomes so imprecise as to be meaningless. There do exist, for example, small silver coins from the reigns of Baybars and his sons, struck with smaller dies featuring a design and legend different from the larger, "full" *dirhams*. While no denominational notation is

found in those die legends, the consistently smaller and lighter qualities of these coins combined with their special dies would seem to deserve the label. All the coins mentioned above, however, are struck with the same dies as the heavier coins which surround them. Little utility is gained from labels such as “half-*dirham*” in this context.

This observation does not detract from the overall importance of this book. It is a fundamental research tool for Mamluk monetary history, and a copy should be in every research library.

ḤAYĀT NĀṢIR AL-ḤAJJĪ. *Al-Sulṭah wa-al-Mujtama‘ fī Salṭanat al-Mamālīk: Fatrat Ḥukm al-Salāṭīn al-Mamālīk al-Bahrīyah min Sanat 661 H./1262 M. ilá Sanat 784 H./1382 M.* (Kuwait: Jāmi‘at al-Kuwayt, Lajnat al-Ta’līf wa-al-Ta’rīb wa-al-Nashr, 1997). Pp. 220.

REVIEWED BY ANNE FALBY BROADBRIDGE, University of Chicago.

From the title of Ḥayyāt Nāṣir al-Ḥajjī’s latest work, the reader might expect a towering essay addressing sweeping themes and grand ideas. A first glance at the text, however, reveals a book explaining why Mamluk society fell into disarray during the *later* Bahri period. Upon further inspection it becomes clear that al-Ḥajjī is actually condemning the moral corruption of the military elite while investigating Mamluk financial troubles throughout the fourteenth century, especially the various ways the ruling elite tried to cope with problems of cash flow and revenue. Al-Ḥajjī does go on to discuss social, economic, and moral changes in Mamluk society, but her overwhelming focus is on high-level fiscal disorder and ethical decay as the catalysts for all other societal problems.

To begin, al-Ḥajjī suggests that by the Mamluk period Islamic society had lost its adherence to religious notions of proper government. By these al-Ḥajjī specifies the concepts of taking counsel (*shūrā*) and [dispensing] justice (*‘adl*). Al-Ḥajjī also addresses the ruler’s obligation to guarantee the populace its rights to protection (*amān*) and freedom (*ḥurrīyah*). Although a grandly conceived investigation of the moral basis for societal decline, al-Ḥajjī’s theory falls a bit short in places—she neglects to define her understanding of the idea of freedom, for example, the use of which smacks of anachronism. Her essay also hints at an attempt to discuss history as it should have been (in moral terms) rather than as it perhaps was, for al-Ḥajjī posits a kind of Ideal Age of Islamic rule—corresponding approximately to that of the earliest caliphs—which did not last.

Al-Ḥajjī goes on to suggest that Mamluk society entered its period of deterioration after 740/1341 precisely because al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's heirs neglected these basic Islamic principles of government. Specifically, power struggles among the amirs and within the house of Qalāwūn itself led to faulty, un-Islamic and short-sighted policies, which in turn led to oppression, financial ruin and moral disarray throughout society. Unfortunately al-Ḥajjī does not seem to be familiar with the work of Amalia Levanoni, who located the roots of decline in al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's own day.<sup>1</sup> One wonders what al-Ḥajjī might have made of Levanoni's argument and conclusions had she encountered them.

After establishing her theory of disintegrating ethics, al-Ḥajjī devotes the rest of the book to an analysis of the specific financial ways in which things fell apart. (It should be noted, however, that her treatment of fiscal and societal issues covers the entire Bahri period, even though by her own argument decline did not really set in until the 740s/1340s.) In this section al-Ḥajjī focuses overwhelmingly on the policy of the *muṣādarah*, or governmental seizure of an individual's property and assets. Al-Ḥajjī illustrates her detailed discussion of kinds of *muṣādarāt* with a wealth of examples; this is the strongest section of the book. She focuses on the types of people likely to be targeted (amirs, administrative officials, prosperous individuals) and the reasons prompting the seizure of assets (genuine wrongdoing, political machinations, sultanic or amiral grudges, a need for ready cash). Finally she investigates the way this process changed over time throughout the century, which is really quite absorbing. After this lengthy discussion of the *muṣādarah* itself, al-Ḥajjī devotes the rest of the work to a follow-up examination of the economic, administrative, social, and moral repercussions of this type of fiscal reordering. Although parts of these later sections are interesting, they are not up to the level of her work on the *muṣādarah*. Consequently these chapters suffer from a certain repetition of both material and points, as well as an uneven application of supporting evidence from the sources.

Nevertheless, although al-Ḥajjī's detailed discussion of the *muṣādarah* and its ramifications is interesting, one cannot help but wonder whether other factors might not also have contributed to economic stagnation and social and moral disarray during the second half of the fourteenth century. Al-Ḥajjī does not seem to be interested in natural disasters, for example, and thus fails to mention either the bubonic plague pandemic of 748-49/1347-48 with its accompanying devastation of society, or the thirteen secondary plague epidemics that followed it over the

---

<sup>1</sup>Amalia Levanoni, *A Turning Point in Mamluk History: The Third Reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (1310-1341)* (Leiden, 1995).

course of the next 50-odd years. One doubts that al-Ḥajjī has read Michael Dols' seminal work<sup>2</sup> on the subject, since he is not mentioned in the bibliography.

Nor, despite her focus on the political elite, does al-Ḥajjī always give equal attention to all of their actions. Thus, for example, she spends little time on the brief and ultimately unsuccessful reign of al-Nāṣir Aḥmad (742/1341-42), despite the fact that he reportedly absconded to Karak with the entire extensive contents of the royal treasury, none of which was ever recovered.<sup>3</sup> One wonders whether the disappearance of so much wealth from ruling hands might not have been a factor in the shortage of cash al-Ḥajjī claims Mamluk sultans faced in the 740s/1340s and which she attributes solely to their excessive and immoral spending on luxury goods and services. In a discussion of decay stemming from financial mismanagement, such an omission is baffling.

On a minor and more technical note: al-Ḥajjī's work seems to have lacked a good editor, as the book suffers from numerous typographical errors and an over-reliance on multiple exclamation points. The single paragraph that stretches from pages 107-10 should have been broken into several smaller units. Al-Ḥajjī's bibliography is quite lengthy, but it suffers from the above-mentioned omissions as well as some other peculiarities. At times it hints at a curiously purist tendency, since she read some of the Arabic sources in manuscript form—al-Shujā'ī, Ibn al-Suqā'ī, al-'Umarī's *Masālik al-Abṣār*—even though edited versions of those works do exist. Al-'Aynī is incorrectly identified as Muḥammad, not Maḥmūd. Also, al-Ḥajjī refers to the MS of Baybars al-Dawādārī al-Manṣūrī's *Zubdat al-Fikrah fī Tārīkh al-Hijrah*, but oddly does not seem to have read the same author's *Al-Tuḥfah al-Mulūkīyah fī al-Dawlah al-Turkīyah*.

In sum, al-Ḥajjī's work purports to be a comprehensive investigation of decline in the fourteenth century, but is really more a statement about Mamluk morality, venality, and resulting societal disarray, all supported unevenly with evidence from the sources. The work is most valuable for al-Ḥajjī's detailed investigation of the *muṣādarah* and its myriad permutations and results. Given the exclusivity of her focus on financial policy and the moral decisions of a corrupt ruling elite, however, some of her conclusions must be taken with a grain of salt. Nevertheless al-Ḥajjī does the field the service of raising numerous questions about the ways in which Mamluk society functioned, particularly fiscally. Some of these she does indeed answer; the remainder she leaves open for the reader to ponder.

<sup>2</sup>Michael W. Dols, *The Black Death in the Middle East* (Princeton, 1977).

<sup>3</sup>Shams al-Dīn al-Shujā'ī, *Tārīkh al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn al-Ṣāliḥī wa-Awlādihi*, ed. Barbara Schaëfer (Weisbaden, 1977), 216-17. Shujā'ī mentions household furnishings, 1,000,000 *dīnārs*, 2,000,000 *dirhams*, 180 chests of robes of honor, 15,000 *irdabbs* of wheat, livestock, and so on. Al-Ḥajjī mentions none of this. For an interesting treatment of the incident and its repercussions, see Levanoni, *Turning Point*, 180-81.

AYMAN FU'ĀD SAYYID, *Al-Taṭawwur al-'Umrānī li-Madīnat al-Qāhirah mundhu Nash' atihā wa-ḥattá al-Ān* (al-Dār al-Miṣrīyah al-Lubnānīyah, 1997). Pp. 132.

REVIEWED BY LEONOR FERNANDES, American University in Cairo

This book proposes to survey the urban evolution of Cairo from its foundation to modern times. Despite its ambitious topic, the author succeeds in providing the non-specialist with a good overview of the expansions of the city. The book is roughly divided into three main sections covering the urban developments which took place from the conquest of Egypt to the post-World-War-II period; touching briefly upon the most recent transformations of the city.

The first section, which occupies roughly one third of the book, covers the period from the foundation of al-Fuṣṭāṭ to the creation and expansion of al-Qāhirah under the Fatimids. Rather than bore the reader with detailed plans of the city and its quarters, the author chose to focus on the history of the Fatimids and their architectural legacy: mosques, palaces, mausolea, walls, and gates. Sayyid, who mentions al-Maqrīzī, Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Armanī, and Ibn Jubayr, often provides quotes. However, one may question the relevance of such inclusions in a survey work written for non-specialists. Since the proper bibliographical references fail to accompany the quotes or authors' names their presence is equally of little use to the specialized scholars. The omission of the proper bibliographical information accompanying the names/quotes could perhaps be justified by the decision of the author to add at the end of each section, sometimes even at the end of each paragraph, a short bibliography on the subject discussed.

The second section of the book covers the expansion of Cairo under the Ayyubids and the Mamluks. The brief discussion of the Ayyubids' achievements centers primarily on their military architecture, mainly the Citadel that became the seat of their government. According to Sayyid, as the Ayyubids moved their residence to the Citadel, al-Qāhirah proper lost its exclusive character and became the locus of religious foundations and a center for commercial activities and artisanship (pp. 30, 33). As mentioned by the author, the shift from Shi'ism to Sunnism during the Ayyubid period motivated them to build schools—thirty-two of them—to counter the Fatimid *da'wah* (p. 30). The presence of madrasahs and commercial foundations in what was once the heart of Fatimid Cairo brought about a change in the urban structure of the capital which was now opened to the common people (p. 33).

The change in the nature of the urban network was felt more strongly in the Mamluk period, during which the capital saw its greatest expansion. The expansion of Cairo under the Mamluks receives the most attention, and in this sub-section the author makes the best use of the primary and secondary sources at his disposal.



As a result, he succeeds in providing the reader with a good historical overview of the period. The reader is also able to appreciate the Mamluks' architectural additions to the city; the latter's urban topography, the successful program of urbanization adopted by rulers like al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, and the contributions of his successors are highlighted and solidly documented. Perhaps as a tribute to the wealth of studies done on the Mamluk period, the reader is provided with a state of the art survey of the city's religious buildings, commercial constructions, and palaces. The expansion of the city outside the southern gate, its northeastern extension, and the big project of Amir Azbak are all given proper attention, and the addition of a number of plates benefits the reader.

The last section of the book covers the period from the Ottomans to modern times. Sayyid points out that during that period, urban expansion was in the direction of the south and west of the Khalīj. He links this expansion to demographic changes, which pointed to an increase in the population. Such an increase, he says, prompted the elites of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to move away from the heart of al-Qāhirah and the area around the Citadel to areas located further to the south and in particular around Birkat al-Fīl. Such a shift in urban expansion was made possible by the relocation of the tanneries, which took place at that time. In the eighteenth century, the elite settled in areas to the west of the Khalīj, more specifically around the Birkat al-Azbakīyah (p. 62).

The last ten pages of the book are dedicated to the study of the changes which took place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The rule of Muḥammad 'Alī and his successors and their efforts to modernize Cairo are surveyed briefly. The author points out that in the first half of the nineteenth century the bulk of the urban changes took place in the following quarters: the Citadel, Birkat al-Azbakīyah, Būlāq, and Shubrā, where the pasha erected for himself a palace. Sayyid shows how Ismā'īl's dream of transforming the capital into a modern city and his use of European experts such as Haussmann, Berillet, and Grand greatly altered the topography of this Islamic capital. By the end of the nineteenth century and thanks to the tireless efforts of 'Alī Bāshā Mubārak, minister of public works, Cairo had acquired a new set of street networks, the great garden of Azbakīyah to replace the old pond, new bridges, and new palaces. Finally, the twentieth century saw the formation of new quarters such as Zamalek (1905), Garden City (1906), Heliopolis (1906), and Maadi (1907).

This survey of the urban expansion of the city of Cairo is easy to read and the presence of a number of illustrations allows the reader to get a good picture of the changes which occurred throughout the centuries. The book could equally be useful to students since it provides them with a lengthy bibliography, which includes primary as well as secondary sources. One welcomes such concise works, which give a quick survey of a city's development without encumbering the

reader with too many specific details or big theories. A number of unfortunate typographical errors could have been avoided. A careful spelling of foreign names would have helped. On the whole the book represents an interesting contribution to the field.

ILYĀS AL-QAṬṬĀR, *Niyābat Ṭarābulus fī ‘Ahd al-Mamālīk (688-922 H./1289-1516 M.)*, Manshūrāt al-Jāmi‘ah al-Lubnānīyah, Qism al-Dirāsāt al-Tārīkhīyah, 43 (Beirut: Dā’irat Manshūrāt al-Jāmi‘ah al-Lubnānīyah, 1998). Pp. 752.

REVIEWED BY JOHN L. MELOY, American University of Beirut

Ilyās al-Qaṭṭār has provided the field of Mamluk studies a great service by authoring this comprehensive study of the province or vice-regency (*niyābah*) of Tripoli during the Mamluk period, starting from its roots as a county in the Crusader period until the Ottoman conquest. The author argues that during the Mamluk period Tripoli experienced an awakening (*nahḍah*) in a variety of fields—society, economy, urban development, military, demography—due in large measure to the attention the city received from the Mamluk state. The historical significance of the province not only lies in the multi-faceted growth it underwent until the mid-fourteenth century but, he argues, also is due to the fact that Tripoli was inextricably tied to the countryside. Al-Qaṭṭār makes the point that the *niyābah*, centered in Tripoli, was established to control the religious minorities in the region so that the city provided a locus of communication between these groups. Consequently, the study brings “the countryside from the margins of Arab-Islamic history and places it in the sphere of interest of power” (pp. 701-2). Historiographically, a study of the province of Tripoli serves as a means to combine the traditional urban orientation of Mamluk history with a view of the geographical and social margins of the state.

In spite of its rapid growth early in the Mamluk period, Tripoli never became one of the main metropolitan centers of the Mamluk state. Nonetheless, al-Qaṭṭār’s study demonstrates that it should be the object of modern scholarly attention since it affords the opportunity to examine inter-community relations and urban-rural connections, thus broadening and deepening our understanding of Mamluk history. Confessional and local sources from this region, of course, provide the opportunity to investigate inter-community relations. For example, the author uses the marginalia found in the Rabbula Gospel text, which comprise a record of the endowment deeds of the See of the Maronite Patriarchate from 1154 to 1522, as well as the

more widely known Maronite and Druze chroniclers. The author recognizes the limited scope of such sources and for a broader view of Tripoli's history he relies on the standard sources used by Mamluk historians.

The division of the book, to use the author's expression, is "classical" (p. 32). He starts with a lengthy introduction discussing the geographical setting of the city and the region, which includes a considerable amount of geological detail, the relevance of which is not altogether apparent. Subsequent chapters cover the following topics: (1) politics and the military, including extensive discussions of the Mamluk campaigns against the Crusaders and Ismailis and the campaigns into the Kisrawān region of Mount Lebanon; (2) society, including discussions of the Maronite, Ismaili, and Nusayri communities; (3) administration, including highly detailed descriptions of official positions in the provincial bureaucracy; (4) urban development, including descriptions of architectural and urban units; and (5) economy, ranging from the economic setting (sections on the plague, locusts, wind storms, etc.) to industry, maritime trade, revenue assignments, and other topics. Many of these chapters contain long series of sub-sections rather monotonously describing particular items or phenomena; e.g., commodities, building types, administrative districts, etc. Of course, the drawback of this encyclopedic scheme of organization is that the tremendous amount of detailed information can overshadow the valuable arguments expressed in his concluding remarks. However, this style, which is by no means unusual, should not be allowed to detract from the author's contribution. Throughout the text, al-Qaṭṭār briefly explores a number of substantive issues, including discussions on the nature of cities in the province, the role of villages, modes of research in Islamic urbanism, and an especially interesting set of remarks on the nature of the relationship between the provincial administration and the local population. These and other discussions may be of concern to Islamic historians in general, and will certainly be of interest to scholars of the Mamluk period in particular.

Al-Qaṭṭār's bibliography is quite extensive, although two entries are incomplete. Complete bibliographic information on the Rabbula text mentioned above, as well as the epigraphic data preserved on Tripoli's buildings, would have been helpful, rather than the brief descriptions provided under the rubric of "Archives" (p. 703, and see the description of his sources on pp. 26-27). This oversight is indeed curious since the study as a whole is thoroughly documented; citations for these "archival" sources are contained, one might even say buried, in the notes of the respective chapters.

To a great extent Ilyās al-Qaṭṭār has anticipated Stephan Conermann's call, issued in the last volume of *Mamlūk Studies Review* (pp. 257-60), for studies taking on a microhistorical approach. Historians of the Mamluk Sultanate will appreciate al-Qaṭṭār's monograph on the province of Tripoli, particularly for its

wealth of information on this important but often overlooked medieval city and its hinterland.

AḤMAD IBN ‘ALĪ IBN ḤAJAR AL-‘ASQALĀNĪ, *Tarjamat Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah*, edited by Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Sa‘īd Ma‘shashah (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1419/1998). Pp. 76.

REVIEWED BY JON HOOVER, University of Birmingham

The Shafi‘i scholar Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852/1449) is best known for his commentary on al-Bukhārī’s hadith collection, *Fath al-Bārī*. Among his numerous other writings is *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, a biographical dictionary devoted solely to important persons of the eighth Islamic century. This dictionary allots a considerable sixteen pages to the Hanbali jurist Ibn Taymīyah (d. 728/1328). The booklet under review prints only Ibn Taymīyah’s biography as found in a manuscript isolated from the rest of *Al-Durar* and located in the Kuwaiti Markaz al-Makḥṭūfāt. The editor gives the source of the manuscript as the Dār al-Kutub in Egypt, but he does not tell us more about its origin or its transmission apart from the remainder of *Al-Durar*.

This copy of Ibn Taymīyah’s biography does not appear to differ substantially from that found in the edition of *Al-Durar* printed in Hyderabad in 1348/1929-30 (vol. 1, 144-60). In his footnotes, the editor lists numerous minor discrepancies between his manuscript and a copy of *Al-Durar* printed in Egypt. I did not have access to the Egyptian edition, but it appears there are also slight differences between this and the Hyderabad edition.

The editor’s purpose in publishing this booklet is expressly apologetic. In his introduction, he notes that some unnamed elements in our time have taken it upon themselves to brand as unbelievers (*taḳfīr*) scholars like Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīyah, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, and Ibn Taymīyah. Ibn Ḥajar’s biography of Ibn Taymīyah then serves as a refutation of this charge because the great Shafi‘i hadith scholar refused to call Ibn Taymīyah an unbeliever. Moreover, the biography reveals that even many of those who differed with the Hanbali jurist admired him and acknowledged his deep piety, extensive knowledge, and defense of Islam against heresy. In short, the editor sets forth a highly respected figure in Islamic religious sciences to testify on Ibn Taymīyah’s behalf against his modern detractors.

After the introduction, the editor supplies us with a short biography of Ibn Ḥajar. Brief notes on the manuscript and editorial method follow, as do pictures

of the first and last manuscript pages. Then comes the text of the biography. This is liberally supplemented with footnotes devoted to textual variants, identification of personalities appearing in the text, and correction of factual errors in Ibn Ḥajar's account.

As biographies of Ibn Taymīyah go, Ibn Ḥajar's account is highly unusual. It contains claims that come as a surprise to anyone familiar with Ibn Taymīyah's life and writings. Without explanation, Ibn Ḥajar tells us Ibn Taymīyah recanted from his doctrine of God's attributes during his trials of 705/1306 and a report was written to the effect that he had said he was an Ash'arī. At another point, we find Ibn Ḥajar has Ibn Taymīyah confessing to be a Shafi'i.

As the editor indicates, it would seem the traditionalist Ibn Ḥajar was trying to ameliorate the bad reputation Ibn Taymīyah had in some Shafi'i quarters by bringing him into conformity with the orthodoxy of the time. Yet I am not sure this interpretation is adequate because the cost entailed in Ibn Ḥajar's reworking of Ibn Taymīyah's story is so high that one begins to wonder whether it might be a form of satire. Contrary to what one might expect from someone writing an apology, Ibn Ḥajar turns Ibn Taymīyah into a groveling wimp, and the editor himself devotes considerable effort to correcting this image in his footnotes. In any case, the reasons for Ibn Ḥajar's odd portrayal of the Hanbali jurist remain unclear, and this suggests an intriguing avenue for further inquiry.

The editorial work and the printing of this biography are superb. Yet it remains only a printed edition of a single manuscript about whose provenance we know little. The primary significance of this little booklet is the reminder that some curious puzzles remain to be solved in the legacy of one of Islamic history's most controversial figures.

ḤUSNĪ MUḤAMMAD NUWAYŞIR, *Al-'Imārah al-Islāmīyah fī Mişr: 'Aşr al-Ayyūbīyīn wa-al-Mamālīk* (Cairo: Maktabat Zahra' al-Sharq, 1996). Pp. 724.

REVIEWED BY NASSER RABBAT, MIT

In its architectural heritage, Cairo is unquestionably one of the world's richest cities. Its monuments run the gamut of styles from the seventh to the twentieth century that we now call "Islamic." The most spectacular, however, date from the Mamluk period (1250-1517), which created a wealth of structures that synthesized the achievements of earlier times and symbolized the image of the city for centuries to come. The Mamluk period also produced the largest and most complete study

of a city in Islamic history, Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī's *Al-Mawā'iz wa-al-I'tibār bi-Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*. Composed between 1415 and 1439-40, it records with loving care each and every street and every important structure in Cairo and, to a lesser degree, other Egyptian cities up to Maqrīzī's own time. This encyclopedic book has remained extremely influential for more than five centuries, not only because of its expansive range, but also, and perhaps more powerfully, because of its intense emotional charge as an expression of Maqrīzī's filial affinity with his city and his country.

It is not surprising, then, that most modern Egyptian architectural historians have focused on the Mamluk period and that so many among them have come under Maqrīzī's intellectual and rhetorical sway. Some even come across as his modern, visually-oriented heirs. Like him, they weave together architectural descriptions with historical sketches and anecdotes about the patrons, users, and builders (when they are known). And like him their narrative is more diachronic than synchronic.<sup>1</sup> Others adopt either a typological or a chronological approach, though they still depend on Maqrīzī's data, structure, and prose.<sup>2</sup> For all of them, however, Maqrīzī provides an essential pretext to a scholarly tradition that presents Cairo's architectural history as an endogenous development which unfolds over time with minimal interaction with the outside world, and which is suffused with self-conscious patriotism.

The most recent entry in this category is Ḥusnī Muḥammad Nuwayṣir's *Al-'Imārah al-Islāmīyah fī Miṣr: 'Aṣr al-Ayyūbīyīn wa-al-Mamālīk*. Though the title mentions Egypt, the book only deals with the Islamic architecture of Cairo in the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods. In three unequal sections—on the Ayyubids (114 pp.), the Bahri, or Turkish, Mamluks (110 pp.), and the Burji, or Circassian, Mamluks (494 pp.)—a selection of monuments is listed, their architecture described in varying degrees of detail, and, when available, their *waqfs* quoted to elucidate their forms and functions. This last aspect is probably the most significant and beneficial addition that this book brings to the usual survey of Cairene architecture. It also gives the book a stronger Maqrizian flavor than its predecessors since both authors, Nuwayṣir and Maqrīzī, insert *waqf* texts into their descriptions to lend them a more authoritative tone.

The book, however, lacks a clear criterion for its selection of representative buildings; those chosen vary in relevance from one historical period to the next. The list of Ayyubid monuments is fairly complete, although there are some historical

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Ḥasan 'Abd al-Waḥḥāb, *Tārīkh al-Masājīd al-Āthārīyah Allatī Ṣallā fihā Farīdat al-Jum'ah Ḥaḍrat Ṣāhib al-Jalālah al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Fārūq al-Awwal* (Cairo, 1946; reprint 1994).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Aḥmad Fikrī, *Masājīd al-Qāhirah wa-Madārisuhā*, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1962-69); Aḥmad 'Abd al-Razzāq Aḥmad, *Tārīkh wa-Āthār Miṣr al-Islāmīyah* (Cairo, 1977; reprint 1993).

problems in including the mausoleum of the Abbasid caliphs and that of the Sultana Shajar al-Durr in that category—the former because the building is most probably early Mamluk, although the first tomb under its dome dates back to the late Ayyubid period (1242); the latter because Shajar al-Durr is considered by most historians to be the first Mamluk ruler, although she was the consort of al-Šāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb. The list of the Bahri Mamluk buildings, on the other hand, gives only 7 examples out of almost 100 structures still standing today in part or in toto, and is therefore too limited and arbitrary to allow the reader any general observations on the period's architectural characteristics or its main achievements. A somewhat better ratio obtains with the treatment of Burji (or Circassian) monuments: 28 out of a total of almost 150 still standing. Here, Nuwayšir is at his best: his descriptions are careful and detailed and supported by *waqf* information in 20 of the 28 monuments covered (especially in the last part which covers Qāyṭbāy's buildings, the subject of Nuwayšir's Ph.D. dissertation).

Given the disparity between the three sections, one is inevitably led to see the book more as an excursion into the Ayyubid and Mamluk architecture of Cairo, in a way reminiscent of the much earlier *Rambles in Cairo* (Cairo, 1931) by Mrs. Devonshire, than as a comprehensive study. This impression is further confirmed when one considers the book's structure: it has no preface and no conclusion summarizing its method and goals. Only the Ayyubid section has a brief introduction. It begins with a comment on the neglect that the architecture of the Ayyubids suffered at the hands of the "Orientalists," purportedly "because of their religious biases against Šalāḥ al-Dīn." This is patently untrue, and the point is embarrassingly belied by the fact that the author heavily depends for his text, and especially for his figures, on K. A. C. Creswell's *Muslim Architecture of Egypt* (Oxford, 1959), a dependence that is never acknowledged. Moreover, the copying appears to have been done in haste, for the author does not seem to have checked some of the Arabic names in the English transliteration, so that the name of the Abbasid envoy to the last Ayyubids, Abū Naḍlah, is rendered with a *dāl*, following the anglicized form, when the original was with a *ḍād* (pp. 100 and 104, figs. 5 and 6).

The book nonetheless provides fairly complete architectural descriptions of a number of key Cairene monuments, especially those of the late Burji period, which are not covered in Creswell's still magisterial survey (it had stopped in 1311, and we are still waiting for Christel Kessler's promised continuation). The book also fills a niche in the Arabic language market, in which inexpensive architectural surveys are otherwise unavailable. It is therefore regrettable that the numerous figures, borrowed from a medley of sources, are so badly reproduced and in such a maddening variety of scales as to be totally useless.

But what is really unfortunate, to this reviewer at least, is the persistence of the endogenous Maqrizian model, which might have been admirable in a pre-

nationalist fifteenth-century treatise, but not in this late twentieth-century survey—all the more because the last major study of Mamluk architecture, Michael Meinecke's *Die Mamlukische Architektur in Ägypten und Syrien* (Glückstadt, 1992), had already broken with the cosmocentric archetype to posit instead a framework of regional exchange. Having long suffered from an exclusivist and now largely discarded conception of Western architecture as having developed with little or no interaction with other traditions—including its own—the study of Islamic architecture, or any subcategory thereof, should embrace architectural and cultural interconnectedness as its interpretive credo.

*Slave Elites in the Middle East and Africa: A Comparative Study*, edited by Miura Toru and John Edward Philips (London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 2000). Pp. 248

REVIEWED BY WARREN C. SCHULTZ, DePaul University

This volume contains eleven papers presented at "The Slave Elites Workshop" organized by the Islamic Area Studies project of the University of Tokyo. The workshop was organized to move beyond symposia focused only on the Mamluk Sultanate and to "elucidate the transregionality and commonality of the slave-elite system in West Africa and the Middle East by paying attention to their similarities and differences" (p. xi). The book thus aims for a wider audience than Mamlukists. Indeed, several of the contributors call for more comparative studies with slave systems outside the Islamic world. It is to be hoped that it receives this wider audience, for a recurrent theme in several of the papers is that many of the theories and theses for analyzing slavery developed by scholars concerned with the Atlantic or East Asian slavery systems are of limited (if that) applicability to the many types of slavery found in the Islamic world.

The book is organized into three parts sandwiched between an introduction and conclusion: Part One: Origins (papers 1-3); Part Two: Power and Networks (4-7); and Part Three: Transitions (8-11). The contents include: the introduction "Slave Elites in Islamic History" by Sato Tsugitaka; "The Turkish Military Elite of Samarra and the Third Century Land Tenure System" by Matthew Gordon; "Slave Elites and the *Saqāliba* in al-Andalus in the Umayyad Period" by Sato Kentaro; "The Location of the 'Manufacture' of Eunuchs" by Jan S. Hogendorf; "My Slave, My Son, My Lord: Slavery, Family and State in the Islamic Middle East" by Dror Ze'evi; "The Changing Concept of *Mamlūk* in the Mamluk Sultanate in Egypt and



Syria" by Nasser Rabbat; "Waqf as an Instrument of Investment in the Mamluk Sultanate: Security vs. Profit?" by Carl F. Petry; "The Power of Knowledge and the Knowledge of Power: Kinship, Community and Royal Slavery in Pre-Colonial Kano, 1807-1903" by Sean Stilwell; "The Concept of Slavery in Ottoman and Other Muslim Societies: Dichotomy or Continuum" by EHUD R. TOLEDANO; "Mawlay Isma'il's *Jaysh al-'Abīd*: Reassessment of a Military Experience" by Fatima HARRAK; "Comrades in Arms or Captives in Bondage: Sudanese Slaves in the Turco-Egyptian Army, 1821-1865" by Ahmad Alawad Sikainga; "The Persistence of Slave Officials in the Sokoto Caliphate" by John Edward Philips; and the concluding remarks "Slave Elites in Japanese History" by Miura Toru.

Despite the comparative emphasis stressed in the preface, introduction, and conclusion, the bulk of these contributions are focused studies on specific cases in particular regions. While not specifically about the Mamluks, Hogendorn, Ze'evi, Toledano, and Philips do place their essays in wider contexts, and all refer at least in passing to the Mamluk Sultanate. Only the chapters by Rabbat and Petry are specifically devoted to matters Mamluk, with Petry raising comparative issues in the final section of his article. Given the nature of this journal and its primary audience, I will restrict my comments to these six essays, as individual readers will find the remaining chapters of value or not depending on their own interests in and needs for comparative examples.

Hogendorn's contribution is bleakly fascinating as the author sketches out the nuts and bolts of the trade and manufacture of eunuchs in the Muslim Mediterranean world. It argues that economic factors—based mainly on the high post-operative death rates—are crucial to understanding why castration centers were located so far from final markets. Wide-ranging in terms of chronology, this chapter is based primarily on sources later than the Mamluks, with a heavy emphasis on the nineteenth century. The discussion of eunuchs in the Mamluk sultanate is primarily of a historical contextual nature, and is based on the work of Ayalon.

Ze'evi's contribution is a short interpretive essay based on existing scholarship, in which he promises to look at familiar matters in a new way. He argues that in the Islamic world, it was necessary for future elite slaves to pass through a period of "social slumber" as full members of the master's household before moving on to bigger things. Its greatest value, I believe, may be to the non-Islamicist reader, for he delivers a brief yet cogent analysis of the inapplicability for Islamic contexts of several aspects of Orlando Patterson's thesis of slavery as social death. The inadequacy of Patterson's central metaphor for the many types of Ottoman slavery is eventually endorsed by Toledano as well, although the latter specifically approves the value of approaches like Patterson's which stress the "mutually conditioning effect of the owner-slave relationship" (p. 166). He ultimately favors a "continuum based model" for understanding owner-slave relationships over the simple

dichotomy of free/slave. Toledano also provides a useful overview of the wider field of slavery studies, identifying several possible reasons why to date many "comparative" studies of slavery have not included slavery in Muslim societies.

Philips' essay is much broader than the title suggests. It is not just a case study of the Sokoto Caliphate's eventual re-adoption of slave officials and soldiers after coming to power with an ideology condemning their use as un-Islamic, although that in itself is valuable enough. Weaving between issues of theory and evidence-based analysis, he deftly links his case study to the wider issue of the ubiquity of slave officials in the pre-modern Muslim world, reaching the conclusion that this institution was ineluctable (pp. 232-33). This frank, even iconoclastic, essay will certainly provoke thought.

The above-mentioned essays all reinforce the basic yet important point that many of our undergraduates have never realized, that not all slave systems are the same. Rabbat's contribution illustrates for non-Mamlukist readers that not all mamluk systems are the same. Even though Rabbat reminds us that the sources available are not particularly forthcoming as to how the transition took place, the mamluk system established by Baybars and Qalāwūn and lasting into the fourteenth century was very different from the mamluk system of, say, the Abbasids or the Seljuqs. Mamluk mamluks were no longer life-long slaves, subjugated to their masters, but a "caste" of free individuals, with shared experiences and overlapping loyalties, to name but a few differences.

Petry's essay is of a more foundational nature, exploring the convoluted details of that essential financial phenomenon, the *waqf*. After discussing the probable reasons for the popularity of *waqfs* among the Mamluk elite, Petry presents a detailed overview of the assets listed in the major *waqf* deeds of the penultimate Mamluk sultan, Qanṣūh al-Ghawrī. From the detailed lists of real estate, he teases out the conclusion that al-Ghawrī's investments favored stability and reliability over profit and risk. He goes on to explore some potential ramifications of this observation. Petry has thus identified another important thesis against which other endowment deeds should be checked. Given that several hundred of these complex deeds survive from the Mamluk period, this would be a tedious task, but nevertheless a valuable one.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that this workshop was held in October 1998; the editors are to be commended for bringing the proceedings to publication so rapidly.

MUḤAMMAD IBN IBRĀHĪM AL-JAZARĪ, *Tārīkh Ḥawādith al-Zamān wa-Anbā' ihī wa-Wafayāt al-Akābir wa-al-A'yān min Abnā' ihī: al-Ma'rūf bi-Tārīkh Ibn al-Jazarī*. Edited with introduction by 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmurī (Sidon/Beirut: al-Maktabah al-'Aṣrīyah, 1998). Three volumes.

REVIEWED BY LI GUO, University of Notre Dame

For students of the early Mamluk era, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Jazarī (d. 739/1338) is our own al-Ṭabarī. Enough has been said about the originality and significance of this Damascene historian who is hailed as the father of early fourteenth-century Syrian as well as Egyptian (!) historical writing. His principal work *Ḥawādith al-Zamān wa-Anbā' uhu wa-Wafayāt al-Akābir wa-al-A'yān min Abnā' ihī* (*Events and News of the Time with Obituaries of Worthies and Notables*)<sup>1</sup> is regarded by medieval and modern scholars as one of the main sources on the reigns of Qalāwūn, al-Ashraf Khalīl, Kitbughā, Lājīn, and al-Malik al-Nāṣir. Unfortunately, the work has survived only in fragments, few of which have been published so far.<sup>2</sup> The current complete lavish edition of the extant fragments is, therefore, most welcome.<sup>3</sup>

Volume one is based on the famous Paris MS Bibliothèque Nationale arabe 6739 (wrongly given as 6379 in the Introduction), which was the basis of Sauvaget's masterly French summary (covering the years 689/1290 to 699/1299)<sup>4</sup> as well as of my partial edition, supplemented with the parallel text of al-Yūnīnī's *Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān* (covering the years 697/1297 to 699/1299).<sup>5</sup> In his brief introduction, the editor, after comparing it to al-Jazarī's *al-Mukhtār*, an epitome of the work edited by al-Dhahabī, noted that the Paris MS is neither the *Mukhtār*, nor the original of the *Ḥawādith* per se, but rather "another epitome of the work." And this assessment prompted him to postpone his comprehensive introduction to the work until Volume 2, which is believed to be part of "the original" (pp. 5-6).

<sup>1</sup>I use Little's translation of the title; see Donald Little, "Historiography of the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk Epochs," in *Cambridge History of Egypt*, ed. Carl Petry (Cambridge, 1998), 428.

<sup>2</sup>For modern scholarship on al-Jazarī, see Jean Sauvaget, *La Chronique de Damas d'al-Jazarī (Années 689-698 H)* (Paris, 1949); Ulrich Haarmann, *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit* (Freiburg, 1970); Donald Little, *An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography* (Montreal, 1970); idem, "Historiography," 427-30; Numan Jubran, "Studien zur Geschichte und Sozialgeographie von Damaskus im Ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert: mit einer Teiledition der Chronik Šams ad-Dīn Muḥamad [sic] al-Ġazarīs," Ph.D. diss., Freiburg, 1987; Li Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: al-Yūnīnī's Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān* (Leiden, 1998), especially 1:41-59.

<sup>3</sup>Another edition is being prepared by Numan Jubran, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

<sup>4</sup>Sauvaget, *La Chronique*.

<sup>5</sup>Guo, *Al-Yūnīnī*, vol. 1, translation, vol. 2, Arabic text.

This is interesting but by no means a surprise insofar as the Paris MS bears another title, *Jawāhir al-Sulūk fī al-Khulafā' wa-al-Mulūk*, and has been identified by modern scholars as representing a recension of the acclaimed *Ḥawādith al-Zamān*, or *Tārīkh al-Jazarī* (not "Ibn al-Jazarī," as Haarmann repeatedly pointed out).

To review the edition, I did a spot check of the years 697 to 699 A.H., comparing it to the Paris MS, the microfilm of which is at my disposal, as well as my own edition of this portion where al-Yūnīnī's and al-Jazarī's versions run parallel, nearly identical, to each other.<sup>6</sup> It reveals that as far as the history section is concerned, Tadmurī's and my editions, based on the same manuscript, are nearly the same; but there are some different readings of poetry, the most thorny task in the editing process. One example must suffice here: on pp. 387-88 (the events of the year 697 A.H.), a panegyric poem celebrating Sultan Lājīn's recovery from an accidental injury was mistaken in Tadmurī's edition as prose.<sup>7</sup> Since these two editions are likely to be the only ones available for some time to come, I therefore offer the appended list of these different readings. Comments will be made only when errors, either Tadmurī's or mine, are obvious. Otherwise I leave the judgment to the reader. In the following list, T stands for Tadmurī's edition, and G for Guo's.

T	G
397:20 جوى	14:15 حوى
404:10 خيرة	20:1 حيرة
404:11 سعي سعيا	20:2 سعيا
405:12 تُسرُّ	21:12 نسرُّ
405:23 أكتم	22:8 أ أكتم
406:4 لقولي	22:14 لقلبي
406:5 عنك	22:15 عندك
406:8 لقومي	22:18 لقوم
406:11 لإسهامه	23:2 لا سهامه
406:13 ولائمة	23:4 فلائمة
أتنني	انثنني
ظننت	ظنت
406:15 العذائر	23:6 الغدائر

<sup>6</sup>Guo, *Al-Yūnīnī*, 2:1-99.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Guo, *Al-Yūnīnī*, 2:4, 1:99; also Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar wa-Jāmi' al-Ghurar*, ed. Ulrich Haarmann (Cairo, 1971), 8:371-72.

406:16 قديما	23:7 قد نما
406:17 اخضر	23:8 أخضر
406:24 جيرة	23:15 حيرة
406:27 ظبي	23:18 طي
407:2 لا مني	23:20 لامني
407:7 جسد end of 1st hemistich	24:5 جسد beginning of 2nd hemistich
صدورك	صدودك
407:11 أنني beginning of 2nd hemistich	24:9 أنني end of 1st hemistich
407:22 بالنفسج	25:9 البنفسج
407:25 غي	25:12 في
408:5 دلت	26:3 ولت
408:8 صيد	26:9 صد
408:9 تول (تولى)	26:10 قول
408:11 وفيك	26:12 ونيل
408:15 لنا end of 1st hemistich	27:3 لنا beginning of 2nd hemistich
408:18 الهدى (this seems to be right, given the context here)	27:9 الهوى
408:19 وكيف لا	27:10 وكيف ولا
408:20 والبركم	27:11 بالبركم
408:23 خرفا	27:14 حرفا
408:25 بالدر	27:16 بالذر
409:1 شهد	27:17 شهداء
411:15 يجمعنا	30:13 بجمعنا
411:18 رمزنا شيء	30:16 رمزنا شيء
411:19 تجرم	31:1 الجرم
411:21 مخلصا beginning of 2nd hemistich	31:3 مخلصا end of 1st hemistich
412:13 نبي ذو أبة	32:2 بني دوابه
412:14 عرار	32:3 غرار
412:16 بغرير	32:6 بعزير
413:8 صبا و	33:3 صبابة
413:9 وأنزه	33:4 أنزة
413:11 أعظمته	33:6 أعظمه

414:5	عرفت	34:4	غرقت
414:13	مغلق	34:12	متعلق
414:17	مخالطه	34:16	فخالطه
414:21	وليس	35:2	فليس
414:25	وجهة حياتي (this is obviously incorrect, because the poem is rhymed in ني)	35:6	وجهه حيّاني
415:12	الاجر ع	36:2	الاجز ع
415:13	للطب	36:4	للقلب
415:19	beginning of 2nd hemistich	36:10	ففي end of 1st hemistich
415:20	كاظمة	36:11	وكاظمة
415:21	بكم end of 1st hemistich	36:12	بكم beginning of 2nd hemistich
415:24	عين	36:15	يمين
415:25	حبهم بكي	36:16	حيهم يكن
416:3	غنيت فأعد	37:5	عنيت وأعد
416:4	تطوي	37:6	يطوي
416:12	أسى	37:17	أمسى
416:13	تذوق	38:1	يذوق
416:22	قل لي (قلي in MS)	38:14	قلبي
416:24	الى من beginning of 2nd hemistich	38:16	الى من end of 1st hemistich
417:1	شقاء	39:1	شفاء
417:5	فعليه	39:5	لعليه
417:8	كما	39:11	كم
417:19	رسالة مشتاق	40:15	رسالة
418:1	نحبي	41:4	بحبي
418:11	السرى in two hemistichs أنوح	41:14	السرى end of 1st hemistich أبوح
418:12	سيد نفحها in two hemistichs	41:15	سينفحها beginning of 2nd hemistich
418:16	الرند أيحكي in two hemistichs	42:1	الرندا يحكي in two hemistichs
418:18	لما	42:4	كما

418:20 السير	42:6 للسير
418:25 فما end of 1st hemistich	42:11 فما beginning of 2nd hemistich
419:2 فما beginning of 2nd hemistich	42:14 فما end of 1st hemistich
419:6 أعيدك	43:3 أعندك
تريح	ترنج
419:7 للطاعين	43:4 للطاعين
419:15 أحبابي	43:13 أحبائي
419:16 وإن لهم beginning of 2nd hemistich	43:14 وإن لهم end of 1st hemistich
419:17 حبا	43:15 حيا
419:19 عسى beginning of 2nd hemistich	43:17 عسى end of 1st hemistich
419:23 وحدي	44:7 وجددي
419:26 حشاشتي	44:10 حشا شتي
420:2 ودلني beginning of 2nd hemistich	44:12 ودلني end of 1st hemistich
448:16 حرقتي	81:6 خرقتي
448:17 تخفي	81:7 يخفي
448:22 أميرا كمل	81:12 أمير أكمل
449:7 يكتب	82:3 يكتب
449:10 دمه end of 1st hemistich	82:6 دمه beginning of 2nd hemistich
449:16 شمرفته تيهها	83:1 شمرفته تيهها in two hemistichs
450:8 وعد مؤمن	83:13 رعد موهن
450:9 زار	83:14 زار
450:11 يجاوره	84:2 تجاوره
450:14 تعباً	84:5 تقباً
450:17 يقل	84:8 تقل
450:23 رفعت	85:1 رفقت
يديك	نديك
453:3 لي	86:12 بي
453:7 شدا	87:4 شذا
453:10 الصدغ	87:7 الصدع
اللاحظ	الللحظ
453:12 مرنج غربة	87:9 مريخ غرته
453:13 ينثني	87:10 يتثنى
453:20 معتمدي	87:17 معتهدي

تمضي	يمضي
453:21 يواري	87:18 تواری
454:1 الفرس	87:19 الغرس
459:6 مضى لا مضى لي لا	93:15 مضى بي لا
459:7 ذكراك	93:16 ذكرك
459:10 ملك	94:1 مللت
460:16 نشتاق	95:6 تشتاق
460:20 beginning of 2nd hemistich وينقضي	95:10 end of 1st hemistich وينقضي

Volumes 2 and 3 present the text of the Istanbul MS, Köprülü 1037, which covers the years 725/1325 to 738/1338. This is the first complete edition, to my knowledge, of this portion of al-Jazarī's work.<sup>8</sup> For the reasons mentioned above, a lengthy introduction is provided here, in Volume 2. It includes (1) a general description of the manuscript (pp. 5-7), (2) re-pagination of the misplaced folios (pp. 8-18), (3) an overview of the contents of the manuscript (pp. 18-20), (4) al-Jazarī's method (pp. 20-23), (5) source criticism (pp. 24-29), (6) discussion of al-Jazarī's reliance on 'Alam al-Dīn al-Birzālī (pp. 29-34), and (7) al-Jazarī's biography (pp. 34-41). The somewhat repetitive introduction does offer a great deal of information. However, for those familiar with earlier works by Cahen, Sauvaget, Haarmann, and Little on the subject, very little can be found that is new.

The edition of the three volumes is overall competent. The editor has supplied headings (marked with brackets) to each cluster of the text. Some additional contents, drawn from other contemporary or later sources, are provided as well (marked with brackets). The editor also thought fit to add to Volume 1 appendixes that contain quotations of al-Jazarī's "original" from parallel sources, some still in manuscript (al-Fayyūmī's [d. 1369] "Nathr al-Jumān fī Tarājim al-A'yān," Dār al-Kutub MS 1746), that are missing from the Paris MS (pp. 469-79). The footnotes include grammatical corrections as well as variant readings from parallel sources. The indexes include Quran and hadith quotations and poems, as well as the table of contents and bibliographical references. But there is no index of proper names of persons and places, which is inconvenient.

<sup>8</sup>For the Istanbul MS, see Haarmann, *Quellenstudien*, 48-50.



SAMIRA KORTANTAMER, *Bahrî Memlûklar' da Üst Yönetim Mensupları ve Aralarındaki İlişkiler* (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 1993). Pp. 208.

REVIEWED BY STEFAN WINTER, The University of Chicago

To many scholars in Turkey today, medieval Islamic history is of interest simply as a backdrop to the emergence of the early Turkmen beylicates in Anatolia. A noteworthy exception is Samira Kortantamer, lecturer in the Literature Faculty at Aegean University in Izmir, who treats the phenomenon of Qipchak Mamluk rule in Egypt and Syria first and foremost as a remarkable and unique episode in Middle Eastern and comparative political history. Her past contributions have included articles both on Mamluk historiography and on the Mamluk bureaucratic apparatus, as well as Turkish translations of key essays by David Ayalon and P. M. Holt (see the on-line Mamluk Bibliography).<sup>1</sup> In this monograph, Kortantamer sets out to explore the informal relations, sympathies, and personal rivalries between high government officials in order to explain the human and social dynamics that underpinned this sui generis form of rule.

Following Ibn Abī al-Faḍā'il's *Al-Nahj al-Sadīd* (a portion of which the author edited and translated for her University of Freiburg dissertation in 1973), the members of the administration are defined here as the sultan, the caliph, the high amirs, the four head qadis, and the vizier. Kortantamer does not so much analyze the Mamluk system of government as provide an anthology of textual passages illustrating individual office holders' mutual interactions. Her sources are limited in essence to Ibn Abī al-Faḍā'il and Maqrīzī's *Sulūk*. While the citations are generally evocative and colorful, and are supplemented by extensive footnotes on technical terms and biographical references, one almost wishes the author had also developed a deeper, more essayistic interpretation of her subject.

After a brief overview of the genesis of Mamluk rule, the first section treats the sultans' relations with their wives, sons, and daughters. Much of this is used to relate the story of Shajar al-Durr which, sensational as it may be, hardly typifies family relations in Mamluk-era aristocratic households. The author is then left to demonstrate that the women are really only mentioned in the sources in the context of royal weddings, the births of heirs, and occasionally pilgrimages. The situation is naturally different with respect to sons, and Kortantamer provides a few lively examples of some sultans' attempts to get their offspring recognized as their political successors, and of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's increasingly frustrated efforts to have his son and prospective heir Anūk give up his girlfriend.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/su/mideast/MamBib.html>.

The discussion turns to the sultans' relations with other state functionaries, beginning with the caliph. After reproducing Maqrīzī's account of the caliphate's transfer to Cairo, the author describes how the Mamluks' respect for the institution gradually deteriorated to the point that individual caliphs could be deposed and exiled by the sultans, even against the wishes of the religious judges. Next comes the sultans' relationships to the leading Mamluk amirs, which the author classes according to whether the incumbent sultan was strong or weak. The prototype of the former—al-Nāṣir Muḥammad—showered favors on his mamluk Tankiz until he wearied of his arrogance and set about to destroy him. For another example of a strong sultan's wrath against his Mamluks, the author devotes ten pages to al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's attempts to have agents assassinate Qarāsunqur and Ākkūsh al-Afram in Ilkhanid Iran. In contrast, weak or youthful sultans, such as al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's son Barakah, were constrained to do the powerful amirs' bidding. The qadis, on the other hand, had no political role at all, other than attending a new sultan's enthronement and legitimizing his rule. Utilized to manifest the Mamluks' respect for the religious law, the qadis could in fact be ignored or overruled in important matters such as the succession to the caliphate. Another position which lost much of its importance under the Mamluks was that of vizier. While political affairs became the sole prerogative of Mamluk military officers such as the *nā'ib*, the civilian vizierate saw its area of responsibility reduced to finance. Incumbents were frequently Coptic converts and invariably wealthy, which, as Kortantamer illustrates with the case of Ibn Zunbūr, made them especially susceptible to spectacular instances of divestment, torture, and expropriation.

Chapter II is devoted to relations from the caliph's point of view and inevitably reiterates much of what was stated under sultan-caliph relations in Chapter I. Kortantamer quotes at length the passages describing the inductions of the first and second caliphs, contrasting this with al-Manṣūr 'Alī's abrupt dismissal of al-Mutawakkil in 1377. No matter how much religious prestige the caliphs were made to embody, the author concludes again, a strong sultan could always impose his choice for the office even against the opposition of the qadis.

The most stimulating excerpts are perhaps those presented in the final chapter, which deals with the high amirs' relations to the sultan and to each other. The author begins by describing how slaves were imported and integrated into the military aristocracy of Egypt, while remaining rooted in their Turkish cultural background. Loyalty to one's original master (and his household) was the highest moral value within Mamluk circles and thus a *sine qua non* for a successful political career. The only tie stronger than this was the Mamluk's to his *khushdash*, or brother-in-arms. Kortantamer again categorizes Mamluk peer relations according to whether the sultan was weak or strong, as illustrated by the story of the amirs Qawṣūn and Bashtāk. Even on his deathbed, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad could still

pledge his two leading Mamluks to mutual loyalty. Afterwards, however, Qawṣūn succeeded in manipulating the ineffectual new sultan in order to eliminate his rival. Only when he thus overplayed his hand did the other amirs rally around the newly influential Aydughmish and topple Qawṣūn, with the term "Qawṣūnī" going down in popular parlance as an insult.

If Kortantamer's sources are already well-known to specialists, her selection of passages certainly captures much of the intrigue of "the Mamluk phenomenon." As a pioneering work in the arena of Turkish-language Mamluk studies, Kortantamer's contribution should do much to spark further interest and research.

SHAI HAR-EL, *Struggle for Domination in the Middle East: The Ottoman-Mamluk War, 1485-1491* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1995) Pp. 238.

REVIEWED BY W. W. CLIFFORD, The University of Chicago

More than twenty years ago Andrew Hess challenged us to think of the early sixteenth/tenth century Mediterranean world not as geographically unitary but, rather, culturally differentiated. Hess believed his post-Braudelian "new segregation" of Mediterranean life could best be discerned at the fringe of its most antagonistic cultural zone—Ottoman-Habsburg North Africa. Fueling cultural segregation along this "archetypal" frontier was a mid-fifteenth/ninth century convergence of technological and political change into a military revolution benefiting Iberian expansion into the Western Islamic lands. Beset by structural bottlenecks, Andalusian and Maghribian states proved unable to replicate Iberian advantages in administrative centralization and military specialization. Even the Sa'dian dynasty, after a credible start, failed ultimately to harness the "unique combination of firepower, mobility and political unity" which made the Ottomans so competitive in the struggle for leadership within the Maghrib—just as it had made them in the Levant. For like the North African Sa'dians, the Levantine Mamluks had seemingly also failed to master the "new style of warfare." Despite its segregated, post-tribal, urban-based, institutional structure, the early sixteenth/tenth century Mamluk state was unmistakably "in the throes of its own decline," according to Hess, owing to its failure to "restructure [its] armies to fit the new (gunpowder) technology."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andrew C. Hess, *The Forgotten Frontier: A History of the Sixteenth-Century Ibero-African Frontier*. (Chicago and London, 1978); idem, "Firearms and the Decline of Ibn Khaldun's Military Elite," *Archivum Ottomanicum* (1973): 173-200.

Despite its rather obvious importance, Islamicists have been generally reticent about Hess's revisionism. Typically perhaps, while the author of the book under review, Shai Har-El, affects some knowledge of Hess's work, he addresses it only tangentially in the end. This is all the more regrettable as his own thesis about the "defensive strategic principles" driving late Mamluk foreign policy largely parallels Hess's belief about the decline of Mamluk political and military power over the course of the fifteenth/ninth century. What analysis Har-El does provide of this decline constitutes little more than a potted summary of David Ayalon's traditional views on the systemic collapse of Mamluk civilization. Concerning the role of Hess's "new technology" in Mamluk decline, Har-El acknowledges only that there existed within the late Mamluk military an "insufficient use of firearms and new methods of warfare" (pp. 28, 54-55). Indeed, from Har-El's narrative of the decisive frontier battle at Ağa-Çayır (1488/893) one infers that Mamluk victory was based less on their non-use of the "new technology" than their ability simply to frustrate Ottoman tactical deployment of their own. Despite its apparent validation of *furūsīyah*, Ağa-Çayır was nevertheless a "hard lesson" to some in Cairo about the shortfall in Mamluk military preparedness, including Sultan Qāyrbāy, who in its aftermath began inducting the arquebus formally into the Mamluk military arsenal (pp. 201-2).

While much of Har-El's book is filled expectably by traditional military-diplomatic narration, it is not entirely the kind of *l'histoire événementielle* about which Braudel liked so much to fret. At the outset Har-El attempts to center the usual story of Mamluk-Ottoman relations in a novel heuristic framework of interlocking regional "subordinate system[s]." Already embedded in a "Mediterranean subordinate system," the Mamluk and Ottoman states found themselves, according to Har-El, unavoidably entangled in the struggle for control of an Anatolian "subordinate frontier system" adrift since the collapse of Mongol authority in west Asia. Despite the successful evolution of a "balance of power system," which employed "shifting alliances" to limit "the amount of violence," traditional statecraft could not ultimately overcome regional centrifugal tendencies. The final collapse of the Anatolian frontier system into a post-Aqquyunlu "power vacuum" coincided with a sudden waning of Mamluk and waxing of Ottoman military capabilities. The concomitant differentiation between Cairo's "status quo" policy and Istanbul's increasingly "imperialist" one engendered an uncontrollable conflict that would achieve denouement not on the plains of Cilicia but in the Nile river valley itself. Thus was sown at Ağa-Çayır (1488/893), Har-El seems to be intimating, the crop bitterly reaped at Raydānīyah (1517/923).

Indeed, the effectiveness of Har-El's study of the 1488/893 campaign cannot be divorced from his fine, antecedent geo-political analysis of Cairo's "status quo" policy. Briefly, in an effort to consolidate their post-Mongol strategic-commercial

position in the Near East, the Mamluks absorbed in 1375/776 the Little Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, inaugurating a "new epoch" which was to bring Cairo "into a confrontation with the growing power of the Ottomans." To forestall this inevitable conflict, the Mamluks assembled an elaborate "defense-in-depth system" anchored by natural defensive barriers, i.e. the Anti-Taurus and Amanus mountains, as well as man-made ones, i.e. historic "frontline" (*thughūr*) and "rearline" (*awāṣim*) military infrastructures. Layered into these relatively stable geo-strategic echelons were more frangible political sub-systems, i.e. "outer" buffer-client principalities (Karaman and Kadi Burhan al-Din) as well as "inner" ones (Ramadan and Dulkadir). While the Mamluks themselves guaranteed "basic security" against theater invasion, the Turkman buffer-clients were tasked to deal with border provocations. It was a break-down in this "current security" mission on the "inner" frontier after 1464/868 that would effectively doom the classical Mamluk state.

In general Har-El's taxonomy helps to impose a certain meaningful order on the jumble of military-diplomatic events characteristic of this period. Some concepts, though, appear to have greater integrative value than others. His "buffer-client system," for instance, seems a less affected and more dynamic heuristic structure than his quasi-stable, inter-regional "subordinate systems." Har-El has furthermore an effective grasp of regional geography. Particularly valuable is his terrain overview of the Cilician campaign, giving readers a good feel for the operational problems confronting both Mamluk and Ottoman war planners. Ağa-Çayırı, by the way, is "a plain roughly mid-way between Adana and Tarsus." Har-El has moreover sensibly buttressed his written descriptions with a variety of maps, an important inclusion too often omitted by scholars.<sup>2</sup>

A significant if somewhat undeveloped subplot in Har-El's story of terrestrial conflict in Cilicia is that of maritime warfare, particularly the risky Ottoman projection of naval power onto the Mamluk littoral. Har-El draws attention principally to an important contemporary Ottoman naval *defter*, not much studied over the last half century, which lists the naval armament employed in the Ottoman flotilla.<sup>3</sup>

The *defter* notes intriguingly what appear to be two large, heavily-gunned, carrack-rigged sailing vessels—*bârças* (*barza*). But aside from associating these vessels with the Ottoman sea-*ghāzī*, Burak Reis, who a decade later at the battle of Zonchio would command another of these experimental sailing warships, Har-El

---

<sup>2</sup>While the book can rightly be praised for its map production, the same cannot be said for editorial control over errata, of which there is a great deal.

<sup>3</sup>Haydar Alpagut, *Denizde Türkiye* (Istanbul, 1937), 627; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilâtı* (Ankara, 1948), 512-13.

adds little to the historical appreciation of his own document.<sup>4</sup> This is not wholly surprising as his own secondary sources, while venerable, are quite dated. Absent, for instance, is Svat Soucek's seminal, modern study of late medieval Ottoman naval terminology.<sup>5</sup>

And while any organized discussion of contemporary Ottoman sea-going artillery is difficult to discern in the secondary literature, Har-El's own characterizations seem unaccountably problematic. The *prangi*, for instance, which figures prominently as the most numerous type of gun counted in the *defter*, is described by Har-El merely as "certain firearms." In fact the *prangi* was a small-caliber swivel gun and a standard piece of Ottoman secondary naval armament. Har-El also defines the somewhat larger caliber swivel guns, *zarbazans*, as "mortars," a confusing appellation. Is he perhaps conflating the term with the smaller Spanish bow swivel gun (*mortere*) or with a siege mortar-bombard, or does he mean to suggest that the Ottomans had successfully mounted sea-going mortars on their warships two centuries before the accepted advent of a dedicated bomb vessel? Har-El's own illustration of the Ottoman flotilla (p. 182) is a curious pastiche of round-bottomed, oared, single-masted, and square-rigged ship types, none visibly mounting, by the way, any of the guns listed in the *defter*. Har-El might have done better simply to re-read John Guilmartin, who not only describes but correctly illustrates some of these Ottoman gun tubes (pp. 158-72; 301-2).

While perhaps technical, the issue of naval artillery is not entirely scholastic. As a purpose-built, sailing gun-platform, the *pârça* did not long survive the fifteenth/ninth century to provide the Ottomans a possible blue-print for their own version of the "fast and maneuverable carriers of artillery" they would soon face in the Atlantic-style galleons.<sup>6</sup> We possess, then, in this contemporary naval *defter* a rare snapshot of an evolutionary dead-end in Ottoman naval development, one which was to have momentous historical repercussions for the Ottoman retention of strategic control of the early modern Mediterranean. While Har-El's evaluation of both the operational and tactical significance of the Ottoman flotilla in the overall Cilician campaign is satisfactory, he might have brought greater historic insight to this important puzzle.

---

<sup>4</sup>Har-El, *Struggle*, 173-74; John Francis Guilmartin, *Gunpowder and Galleys: Changing Technology and Mediterranean Warfare in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1974), 86-88; see also Andrew C. Hess, "The Evolution of the Ottoman Seaborne Empire in the Age of the Oceanic Discoveries, 1453-1525," *American Historical Review* 75 no. 7 (1970): 1905, who notes Burak Reis's appearance in Ottoman service somewhat later than Har-El.

<sup>5</sup>Svat Soucek, "Certain Types of Ships in Ottoman-Turkish Terminology," *Turcica* 7 (1975): 233-49.

<sup>6</sup>Guilmartin, *Gunpowder*, 158-72, 301-2; see also idem, "The Early Provision of Artillery on Mediterranean War Galleys," *Mariner's Mirror* 50 (1973): 257-80; Soucek, "Certain," 244.

Concerning the demise of the Ottoman fleet off Cilicia, its foundering and partial capture in August 1488/Ramādan 893 after a sudden storm—possibly a seasonal *khamsīn*—Har-El's short account (pp. 181-83) fails to appreciate fully the special characteristics of the local maritime environment. It is curious that his close attention to the geographical does not seem to extend "offshore," as it were, to the hydrological or meteorological. Ottoman naval planners would almost certainly have known that Cilician waters posed a serious natural obstacle. Counter-clockwise currents, high waves, and katabatic squalls descending the Taurus range made even the summer months unfavorable, even dangerous, for sea-borne operations.<sup>7</sup>

It is sometimes claimed conveniently by Ottomanists, including Har-El (p. 192), that the unsuccessful campaign of 1488/893 was a token military gesture. Yet, how likely is it that Ottoman war planners would have jeopardized such a large, well-equipped fleet, including expensive "capital" ships (*pârças*) in such a high-risk maritime environment and at such extreme operational range without serious expectation of strategic dividends? Upon reflection, Bayezid II's naval descent on Ayas (1488/893) seems no more whimsical than his father's (Mehmed II) sea-borne gambit at Otranto (1481/885).

From the Mamluk maritime perspective, one transcendent question emerges: Where was the Mamluk navy in 1488/893? Cilicia was still within operational range of Mamluk flotillas well into the early sixteenth/tenth century. Even the Ottoman naval force commander (*kapudan*) (and Sultan Bayezid's son-in-law), Hersek-oğlu Ahmed Paşa, feared a Mamluk amphibious landing in Cilicia (pp. 177-78). Moreover, the fifteenth/ninth century had already witnessed the highly competent exercise of Mamluk *Seemacht* in the eastern Mediterranean, one which would be extended just a few years later into the Indian Ocean. Unfortunately, the mystery of the Mamluks and their relationship with firearms is surpassed in Har-El's scholarship only by the puzzle of their relationship with naval vessels. And, as with firearms, Har-El is content to invoke *ipse dixit* David Ayalon's rambling commentary on Mamluk naval history as answer (pp. 58-9).

Finally, the generally positive results of Har-El's campaign study are somewhat spoiled by his over-calculated historical summation. His claim, for instance, that the aftermath of Ağa-Çayırı, including the peace treaty of 1491/896, somehow "saved [Sultan Bayezid's] prestige" and gave the Ottomans "a symbolic victory" (p. 212) is unconvincing. Certainly, it diverges in sum and substance from the

---

<sup>7</sup>See for instance John H. Pryor, *Geography, Technology and War: Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean 649-1571* (Cambridge, 1988); idem, "Winds, waves, and rocks: the routes and the perils along them," *Maritime Aspects of Migration* (1989): 71-85; Victor Goldsmith and Stan Sofer, "Wave climatology of the Southeastern Mediterranean," *Israel Journal of Earth Sciences* 32 (1983): 1-51.

interpretation given recently by Carl Petry, whose biography of Sultan Qāyṭbāy Har-El seems to have entirely overlooked.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, Har-El's contention that the subsequent Mamluk "shift from neutrality in [the] Ottoman-Safavid conflict" led to an actual "military alliance" between Cairo and Tabriz after 1514/920 also does not jibe. Though preliminary strategic talks were held, Mamluk-Safavid summitry ultimately derailed on their mutual struggle for symbolic diplomatic precedence.<sup>9</sup>

This all suggests a certain *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy underpinning Har-El's basic historical reasoning. Despite the generally sensible integration of geo-politics into his study, there lingers a faint reductionist whiff of Turnerian physiography-as-history in his stress on the inevitability of some final reckoning between the proximal Mamluk and Ottoman states. Clearly, Har-El has unsuccessfully eluded the historicist embrace of Turkish nationalist scholarship, which has long held a belief in the mythic expansion of the frontier march (*uc*) as a primary source of Ottoman values and institutions. Yet, the violence of Ottoman-Mamluk encounters after Ağa-Çayırı, notably at Raydānīyah, should be interpreted as neither redemptive by Ottomanists nor apocalyptic by Mamlukists.

MUḤAMMAD 'ABD AL-GHANĪ AL-AŠHQAR, *Tujjār al-Tawābil fī Miṣr fī al-'Aṣr al-Mamlūkī* (Cairo: al-Ḥay'ah al-Miṣrīyah al-'Āmmah lil-Kitāb, 1999), Pp. 571.

REVIEWED BY HAYRETTIN YUCESÖY, The University of Chicago

This study was originally a doctoral dissertation submitted to Ayn Shams University in Egypt. It treats the emergence, development, and demise of the spice trade in Egypt known as Kārimī. It comprises seven chapters, an introduction, a conclusion, and appendices (a list of Kārimī merchants during the Mamluk period, maps showing the trade routes and major centers, and charts depicting the family trees of two prominent Kārimī merchants).

As one may expect, al-Ashqar begins his study with a consideration of two central issues: the origins and etymology of the name Kārimī, and the circumstances of the rise of Kārimī commercial activity. His discussion of the first problem, in

<sup>8</sup>Carl F. Petry, *Twilight of Majesty: The Reigns of the Mamluk Sultans al-Ashraf Qāyṭbāy and Qanṣūh al-Ghawrī in Egypt* (Seattle and London, 1993), especially 88-103.

<sup>9</sup>W. W. Clifford, "Some Observations on the Course of Mamluk-Safavi Relations (1502-1516/908-922): I & II," *Der Islam* 70 no. 2 (1994): 272-74.



which he compares and contrasts the main theories on the subject (such as that of Ṣubḥī Labīb [who has authored the article in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*], of Goitein, and of al-Shātir Buṣaylī), concludes, unfortunately, without any new suggestions. Likewise, the author's conclusion that the Kārimī emerged as a group of merchants who had been known to operate locally up until the eleventh century, when they gradually expanded their horizons and began to engage in long-distance trade between the Indian Ocean and the coasts of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, is a recapitulation of previous conclusions of scholarship.

Al-Ashqar pays due attention to the relationship between the high volume-big profit trade and the ruling institution, and highlights the benefits of the cooperation between the Kārimī merchants and the Mamluks in fostering trade on the one hand, and for stabilizing the Mamluk ruling apparatus, and launching large-scale military, architectural, and administrative projects on the other. His awareness of the role that European powers and merchants played in the Kārimī trade, and especially of the Mongol-European alliance and of the attempts to exclude the Mamluks from the east-west trade (a project that ended in the fourteenth century) show al-Ashqar's interest in considering the larger picture of the spice trade. However, one would expect to see a reference to Janet Abu-Lughod's study *Before European Hegemony*, a knowledge of which could have greatly improved his treatment. His disinterest in the theoretical dimensions of his subject is also evident in other chapters.

For instance, al-Ashqar deals with the social status and role of Kārimī merchants, categories of financial transactions, commercial and financial institutions, commodities, routes, centers, vessels, and seasons of Kārimī trade. He discusses how the Kārimī merchants realized very early their unique position and formed an intercontinental and long-lasting connection among themselves and how, by virtue of their wealth, organization, and control of Kārimī commodities, for which there was a high demand, they became a significant part of Mamluk economy, politics, and society. He also emphasizes the Kārimīs' skills and world-view which allowed them to master languages, chivalry, social manners, trade laws, taxation, astronomy, arithmetic, seafaring, etc. However, there is no attempt whatsoever to initiate an informed theoretical discussion about the role of Egypt in the crucial economic changes that took place globally in the period from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. In particular, a discussion of the rise of capitalism in Western Europe vis-à-vis the economic context of the Middle East, would have been desirable. It is perhaps asking too much to expect al-Ashqar to discuss the theoretical implications of the trade boom, capital accumulation, group solidarity, and international outlook of the Kārimīs and of the ways in which they might have affected the configuration and outlook of Mamluk society. After all, if he is silent on these matters, so is the mainstream of historical scholarship.

Al-Ashqar's explanation of the decline of the Kārimī trade hurts his study, rather than helping it reach a convincing conclusion. His division of the causes of decline into "external" and "internal" is artificial and is based on a perspective other than that of the Kārimīs themselves. It shatters the whole notion of the intercontinental scope and sophistication of the spice trade, thus giving the wrong impression that internal and external causes can be separated. Al-Ashqar seems to have gathered material and presented it as a cause for decline without much analysis or attention to the time-frame in which events took place. It is neither appropriate nor convincing to string together "causes" spanning from the beginning of the fourteenth century to the sixteenth century (the papal boycott, for example, the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope and the following Portuguese monopoly of the spice trade in the period between 1499-1509, and Qāytbāy's confiscation of the property of the Kārimīs in the beginning of the sixteenth century). He does not mention the specific conditions which caused some recurring phenomena throughout two centuries, (e.g., confiscation of property, the papal boycott, pirate activity, etc.) to be crucial factors in the collapse of the Kārimī trade in the late fifteenth century.

All in all, al-Ashqar makes extensive use of sources in his study, consults contemporary scholarly literature—not necessarily the most recent, however—and incorporates some of their arguments in his research primarily to verify his suggestions or to argue a point. One could wish he had provided the reader with a brief assessment of the scholarly literature on his topic and then highlighted his own contributions. Despite all the shortcomings of the study and the lack of new insights for specialists on the Kārimī merchants, just to see ideas substantiated by evidence taken from primary sources and enriched by examples, without unnecessary and misleading rhetoric of religiosity and nationalism, is refreshing. To be sure, there is repetition and needless digression in some parts; the print is not reader-friendly, nor are the maps and charts. There are many spelling mistakes where the Latin alphabet is used, and yet more embarrassingly there is a missing signature of sixteen pages between pages 193 and 208. One must point out also that his description of trade routes is less than adequate. Also, al-Ashqar would have done a much better job had he included legible maps and better studied the commercial centers in terms of their specific value for Kārimī trade. Chapter Six, which discusses how the Kārimīs deployed their intercontinental potential to connect distant territories by acting as envoys, missionaries, and patrons of art and learning, could have been integrated into the previous three chapters, since it deals with many of the subjects treated in Chapters Three, Four and Five. One would say in conclusion that the book makes an acceptable "inflated version" of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* article "Kārimī," albeit in a not very attractive form.