

An Analysis of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī al-Malaṭī’s Description of the Year 848: On the Process of Writing History in the Late Fifteenth Century

INTRODUCTION

In the field of Islamic historical studies, the Mamluk era offers a relatively vast amount of material. In recent times, many historical sources and some revised editions of these sources have been published. It is thus becoming easier to study the Mamluk era from a variety of perspectives. However, other historical materials, such as *waqf* documents, require further attention. In addition, systematic analysis of a broad range of sources requires close attention to how the texts were produced.

The focus of this article is the process by which ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī (844–920/1440–1514) wrote his historical work *Al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim fī Hawādith al-‘Umr wa-al-Tarājim* (hereafter referred to as *al-Rawḍ*). The manuscript deals with the period between the mid and late ninth century/the mid fifteenth century. I look specifically at the descriptions of the year 848 (20 April 1444–8 April 1445). In order to show how ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ used other historical sources in writing his book, his descriptions in *al-Rawḍ* will be compared with notes he made in the margins of another manuscript. Then, in order to understand how his book was received, I will examine how the information in his book was transmitted to the next generation.

THE AUTHOR OF AL-RAWḌ AND THE METHOD FOR ANALYZING HIS WRITING PROCESS

Ghars al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn al-Zāhirī (813–73/1410–68), father of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī, wrote a well-known book titled *Zubdat Kashf al-Mamālik*. According to Ibn Iyās, Khalīl had an exceptional career, considering he was one of the descendants of the mamluks (*awlād al-nās*). He also obtained an *ijāzah* in hadith from Ibn Ḥajar.¹ His son, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ ibn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn, was born in 844 in Malaṭīyah, a town in Asia Minor, where his father Khalīl served as *nā’ib*. ‘Abd

© Middle East Documentation Center. The University of Chicago.

¹J. Gaulmie and T. Fahd, “Ibn Shāhīn,” *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 3:934. The life of Ghars al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn al-Zāhirī was addressed in my article “My Father Khalīl ibn Shāhīn—Comparative Study of Descriptions by ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī” (in Japanese), *Seinan Asia Kenkyū* 47 (1997): 53–73, which is a comparative study of *al-Rawḍ*’s description of 873, the year that Khalīl died. Ibn Iyās, *Badā’i’ al-Zuhūr wa-Waqā’i’ al-Duhūr*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (Wiesbaden, 1960–75), 3:25 (hereafter referred to as *Badā’i’*).



al-Bāsiṭ accompanied his father to his various posts in such places as Tripoli, Damascus, and Cairo, and on his pilgrimages. At the age of 28, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ left for the Maghrib and al-Andalus to study medicine (866–71/1462–67). Later, he resided in Cairo and became acquainted with a number of intellectuals there. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote several books on Hanafi law, medicine, and history. He died in 920/1514 in Cairo.²

As mentioned above, the main focus of this article is ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s al-Rawḍ. The extant manuscript is preserved in the Vatican Library and is bound in two volumes (Vatican Arabo 728, 729). A filmed version of this manuscript is preserved in the Egyptian National Library (Dār al-Kutub MS 2403 tāriḫ Taymūr). The manuscript in the Vatican Library was not given much attention when it was bound, with the result that the folios were not arranged according to their page numbers. However, the pages of the filmed version in the Egyptian National Library were arranged correctly.³

This two-volume manuscript contains information about events spanning the 30-year period from 844 to 874 (1440–69/70). However, there is a considerable gap in the chronology. The first volume contains only six years, from 844/1440 to 850/1446–47, and the second volume contains only nine years from 865/1460–1 to 874/1469–70. Thus, coverage of fourteen years (i.e., 850–64) is missing from the two volumes. Each year comprises two sections: a chronicle section and an obituary section. The description of only one year is complete in the first volume.⁴

²Robert Brunschvig, *Deux récits de voyage inédits en Afrique du nord au XV siècle* (Paris, 1936; repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1994); G. Levi Della Vida, “Il regno di Granata nel 1465–66 nei ricordi di un viaggiatore egiziano,” *Al-Andalus* 1 (1933): 307–34. These are editions and translations of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s descriptions of his travel to the Maghrib and al-Andalus found in al-Rawḍ. Zakī Muḥammad Ḥasan, *Al-Raḥḥālah al-Muslimūn fī al-‘Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā* (Cairo, 1945); I. Y. Kratchkovskiy, *Arabskaya Geograficheskaya Literatura*, vol. 4 of *Izbrannye Sochinenia* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1957), translated by ‘Uthmān Hāshim as *Tārīkh al-Adab al-Jughrafi al-‘Arabī*, 2nd ed. (Beirut, 1987); ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥamīdah, *A’lām al-Jughrafiyīn al-‘Arab* (Damascus, 1416/1995; 1st ed., 1984). On the importance of al-Rawḍ as a historical source, see Carl F. Petry, *Twilight of Majesty: the Reigns of the Mamlūk Sultans al-Ashraf Qāyṭbāy and Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī in Egypt* (Seattle, 1993), 8–9; Li Guo, “Mamluk Historiographic Studies: the State of Art,” *Mamlūk Studies Review* 1 (1977): 21; Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn ‘Izz al-Dīn, *‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanaḥī Mu’arrīkhan* (Beirut, 1410/1990).

³MS 2403 tāriḫ Taymūr is bound in four volumes. In this version Vatican Arabo 728 was arranged chronologically from fol. 1r to fol. 19v, and fol. 48r to fol. 66r (the end of Vatican Arabo 728), and then fols. 20r to 47v (there is a missing part between fol. 39v and fol. 40r), and re-paginated. In this article, the folio number is quoted from Vatican Arabo 728.

⁴Vatican Arabo 728 consists of a chronicle and a part of the biographies of 844, a part of a chronicle and biographies of 845, a part of a chronicle of 846, a chronicle and biographies of 848, a chronicle and part of the biographies of 849, and a chronicle and part of the biographies of 850.

The two-volume manuscript is unique, and assumed to have been written during the period between 887 and 890.⁵

‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ made notes in the margin of another manuscript, the “Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Anbā’ al-‘Umr,” Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi kütüphanesi MS Ahmet III 2941/2, the famous chronicle written by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (hereafter referred to as Inbā’[T]). The notes in the margins of the first volume, MS Ahmet III 2941/1, are quoted in the annotations of the edition published in Damascus, but they have not been studied in detail.⁶ The catalog of manuscripts preserved in the Topkapı Library shows that this manuscript was written in 880/1475 and that it ends in the year 849.⁷ In fact, the final folio (198r) of Inbā’(T) has more information added at the end. While two other editions—the Cairo edition and the Hyderabad edition—end in the chronicle section in Muḥarram of the year 850,⁸ Inbā’(T) has three added lines that give an account of Monday, 12 Rabī’ I 850, as well as some concluding sentences. Then, biographies of five people who died in that year are

However, Vatican Arabo 729 ends with the biographies of 874, and in this part at least one folio between a biography of Yashbak min Ḥaydar al-Ashrafī and a biography of the historian Yūsuf ibn Taghrībirdī is missing.

⁵‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote about a person in fol. 48v of Vatican Arabo 728: “I will write about the man who died in (8)87, the year I started writing this book;” cf. al-Rawḍ, fols. 18v, 52r. In fol. 260r, the final folio of Vatican Arabo 729, there is the sentence “I finished writing the second volume on Monday 18 Rabī’ I 890,” although “the second volume” is written in red and is unclear. After this sentence though, there is writing that indicates the year 895, but the meaning is uncertain. (Brunschvig, *Deux recits*, 10, does not mention this writing.)

⁶Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Anbā’ al-‘Umr*, ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān, vol. 1 (Damascus, 1399/1979).

⁷F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Arapça Yazmalar Kataloğu* (Istanbul, 1966), 3:391.

⁸Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Anbā’ al-‘Umr*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (Cairo, 1969–98), hereafter referred to as *Inbā’(C)*; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Anbā’ al-‘Umr fī al-Tārīkh* (Hyderabad, 1967–76; repr. Beirut, 1406/1986), hereafter referred to as *Inbā’(H)*. The manuscripts that were the basis of these two editions are as follows: *Inbā’(H)* was edited by using the manuscript in al-Maktabah al-Sa‘īdiyyah Library in Hyderabad as the main text, and comparing it with the manuscript in the Egyptian National Library and two manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, although the numbers of these manuscripts are not quoted. *Inbā’(C)* was edited using al-Maktabah al-Zāhirīyah MS 231 tārīkh as the main text, comparing it with seven additional manuscripts: (1) Maktabat al-Azhar MS 710 tārīkh (2) MS Ahmet III 2942/1 (3) Bibliothèque nationale MS 1601 (4) al-Maktabah al-Sa‘īdiyyah MS 94 tārīkh (5) a manuscript in Medina, MS 523 Madīnah (6) a manuscript in Ṣan‘ā’ of which a microfilm copy is in the Egyptian National Library (7) British Museum MS 1601. Manuscripts (3), (4), and (6) are thought to be used for both editions. The second volume of the manuscript (2), MS Ahmet III 2942/2, is not used. According to Dr. Ḥasan Ḥabashī, an editor of the Cairo edition, *Inbā’(C)*, manuscript (4) includes notes by al-Biqā‘ī, while the editor of the Hyderabad edition, *Inbā’(H)*, did not identify the author of these notes but noted the differences in the texts of the manuscripts in his footnotes.

given, followed by additional concluding remarks. At the very end, there is a sentence which states that this is the end of the second volume, with the date Tuesday, 6 Rabī‘ II 886. This is 34 years after the author, Ibn Ḥajar, passed away and one year before ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ began to compose al-Rawḍ. A variety of notes are found in the margins of the manuscript Inbā’(T), some of which are signed ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī. Other notes are not signed and seem to have been written by different people. A careful comparison between these notes in the margins of Inbā’(T) and the text of al-Rawḍ provides a clear insight into ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s writing process. (The part on which this article is based is from fol. 192r to fol. 194v of al-Inbā’[T].)

THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF WRITING AL-RAWḌ

At the beginning of al-Rawḍ, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote:

I started writing this history with a description of the year 844, the year I was born. This is to accurately depict the chronicle sections (*al-ḥawādith al-mutajaddidāt*) and the obituary sections of people who died in the same year (*al-wafayāt*). I decided to describe daily events, noteworthy happenings, and biographies (*tarājim*) of famous people in this era and obituaries (*wafayāt*) in detail. I sometimes deviate from the main topics, especially in biographies or appointments to offices or other accounts, and I tell life stories and careers of famous living people. I tried not to treat anything lightly but tried to describe their biographical information carefully in detail. I also made some notes (*ta’līq*) with red ink in the margins (*hāmish*) which show the contents of biographies and obituaries in order for people who want to know the details to find corresponding accounts easily. I instructed scribes of this book not to forget to write these notes for easy searching of information.

We hope that this history book will be a continuation (*dhayl*) to the great useful famous history books written before: the two great history books by Chief Qadi Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī, a history book by Shaykh al-Islām Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Aṣr Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, a history book by al-Taḳī al-Maqrīzī, and many other great history books written by many masters. Although I am hoping that this book will be a continuation to the aforementioned historical books, I think it is appropriate for me to cover the same several years that have already been covered in those books. In my book I added useful information to the narratives in these overlapping years. When this method was carried out and complete and this book came to fruition,

I named this book "Al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim fī Ḥawādith al-‘Umr wa-al-Tarājim."

In this book I tried to include information which has been transmitted by reliable masters, events that I myself witnessed, and detailed accounts of transmitted information that are worthy of belief. God—praise to Him—please help me to accomplish my purpose. Almighty God, please lead me to use appropriate language, not to defame people, not to hold prejudiced views, and not to misunderstand matters. Please also help make me [by writing this book] entitle all the appropriate people with appropriate rights, bring prestige to appropriate people, and lead us away from vices committed by people who led shameful lives. These are the purposes of my writing this book. (al-Rawḍ, fols. 1v–2r)

In the statement above, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ named master historians whose examples he followed. His explanation of why he started his book in the year he was born and why his book should be a continuation (*dhayl*) to past history books is especially influenced by Ibn Ḥajar, who had started his book from the year 773, the year he was born.⁹

The method described in this preface can be found strictly observed throughout his work. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ quoted details of daily events from previous historians, whose names he mentions. When he did not mention his sources by name, he began his quotations with "one man wrote," mostly specifying where they were from. As he wrote in the preface, some chronicle sections contain events that he witnessed himself, information that he heard from his acquaintances, and biographical information of people related to these events. Similar to other history books written in the same era, he tried to organize the chronicle by month, date, and day of the week.

Following the chronicle sections, the biographies of people who died in the year are recorded alphabetically according to their *ism*, which is written in red. In some cases, he added the titles of offices and various pieces of information about living sons and grandchildren of the individuals mentioned in these sections. Because he began his work from the year he was born, he had personal contacts with individuals who were contemporaries with, and had direct knowledge about, his subjects. One of the characteristics of his writing is, as explained in the

⁹*Inba’(C)*, 1:3–5. See Caesar E. Farah, *The Dhayl in Medieval Arabic Historiography* (New Haven, 1967) on the category of *dhayl*, and Wadad al-Qadi, "Biographical Dictionaries: Inner Structure and Cultural Significance," in *The Book in the Islamic World*, ed. G. N. Atiyeh (Albany, 1995), 93–122, on the changes in the content of biographical information in the field of biography studies.

preface, that in both the chronicle and the biography section, notes and personal names are indicated in red in the margins.

Another characteristic is that he added aspects of his own personal history to some narratives.¹⁰ In a chronicle section, he described his journey to the Maghrib and al-Andalus among other events, which were also arranged by dates.

ANALYSIS OF THE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE YEAR 848

A reliable method by which to analyze the process of al-Rawḍ's composition would be to compare descriptions in al-Rawḍ and those in Ibn Ḥajar's history, especially before and after 850, with other historical sources written in the same era, such as al-Sakhāwī's book. This article deals with the year 848 for two reasons: first, only the description of the year 848 has a complete chronicle section and obituary section for the whole year. Second, I hope to establish a model for 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's process for treating events before 850. Many important events occurred in 848, which had significant historical consequences. In addition, Ibn Ḥajar, al-Sakhāwī, and 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ himself all went through several important personal experiences in that year. The descriptions of the year 848 start at 20r and end at 31r in the manuscript of al-Rawḍ.¹¹

I have compared the chronicle section of al-Rawḍ with the following sources: accounts in Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbā'*, which 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ hoped to continue (the two editions published in Hyderabad and Cairo, *Inbā'* (H) and *Inbā'* (C), and the Topkapı manuscript *Inbā'* [T]), and notes in the margins of *Inbā'* (T), most of which were signed by 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ himself at the end; accounts in Ibn Taghrībirdī's *Al-Nujūm* and *Ḥawādith*; accounts in al-'Aynī's *Iqd*; accounts in *Nuzhah* by Ibn Dāwūd al-Ṣayrafi; accounts in *Al-Tibr* by al-Sakhāwī; and accounts in *Badā'i'* by Ibn Iyās.¹²

¹⁰Cf. Otfried Weintritt, "Concepts of History as Reflected in Arabic Historiographical Writing in Ottoman Syria and Egypt (1517–1700)," in *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*, ed. Thomas Philipp and Ulrich Haarmann (Cambridge, 1998), 188–204; *Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition*, ed. Dwight F. Reynolds (Berkeley, 2001), 80–82, 241.

¹¹In the margin above the main text of 20r, there is a note reading, "And al-Sirāj ibn al-Mulaqqan" in handwriting different from that of the main text. This seems to be a catchword indicating that this part is followed by 19v. If we consider the contents of 19v, however, which are biographies for the year 844, 19v cannot follow 20r; cf. above, n. 3.

¹²Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* (Cairo, 1963–72), hereafter referred to as *Al-Nujūm*; idem, *Ḥawādith al-Duhūr fī Madā al-Ayyām wa-al-Shuhūr*, ed. Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn 'Izz al-Dīn (Beirut, 1410/1990), hereafter referred to as *Ḥawādith*; idem, *Al-Dalīl al-Shāfi 'alā al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi*, ed. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt (Mecca, 1399/1979; repr. Cairo, 1998), hereafter referred to as *Al-Dalīl*; idem, *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa-al-Mustawfā ba'da al-Wāfi*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn (Cairo, 1985–2002), hereafter referred to as *Al-Manhal*; al-'Aynī,

The analysis of information gained from these sources indicates how ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ crafted his own work. He first added notes in the margins of *Inbā’*(T) based on the accounts from *Al-Nujūm*, *Ḥawādith*, and al-‘Aynī’s *‘Iqd*, and also added original information he obtained himself, before beginning to write al-Rawḍ. It seems that *Nuzhah* and *Al-Tibr* were being written around the same time. I will also analyze how the information by ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ was transmitted to *Badā’i’*.

I will discuss several events that happened in the year 848 to illustrate characteristics of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s writing process. This year started with an epidemic which had begun the previous year. In al-Rawḍ, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote,

The *dīwān al-mawārīth al-ḥashrīyah* reported 120 people died per day in Cairo, but it was said that 200 more people died and these numbers were not reported to the *dīwān*. I personally think that there were more deaths because many of the dead people were children and slaves and the *dīwān* did not know the conditions of most children or slaves. This means that 300 or 400 people died. The situation grew worse and after the pilgrims returned [from Mecca] at the end of this month, many children and slaves in the caravan died of the epidemic. 1000 people died in one day.¹³

From this account, we can tell that ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ used a brief description from the *Inbā’* and referred to *Al-Nujūm*, *‘Iqd*, and other materials for additional information.¹⁴

At that time Ibn Ḥajar, author of *Inbā’*, was Shafi’i chief qadi. In his own book, he recounts that he became sick. The same description can be found also in al-Rawḍ and *Al-Tibr*. Ibn Ḥajar wrote about the epidemic in a book completed in that year.¹⁵ According to many accounts, he started working actively again after he

‘Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān, ed. ‘Abd al-Rāziq al-Ṭanṭāwī al-Qarmūṭ (Cairo, 1406–9/1985–89), hereafter referred to as *‘Iqd*; Ibn Dāwūd al-Sayrafī, *Nuzhat al-Nufūs wa-al-Abdān fī Tawārīkh al-Zamān*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (Cairo, 1970–94), hereafter referred to as *Nuzhah*; Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī, *Al-Tibr al-Mashbūk fī Dhayr al-Sulūk* (Būlāq, 1896; repr. Cairo, 1974), hereafter referred to as *Al-Tibr*; idem, *Al-Ḍaw’ al-Lāmi’ fī Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi’*, ed. Ḥusām al-Dīn al-Qudsī (Cairo, 1353–55/1934–36; repr. Beirut, n.d.), hereafter referred to as *Al-Ḍaw’*; idem, *Al-Dhayl al-Tāmm ‘alā Duwal al-Islām lil-Dhahabī*, vol. 1, ed. Maḥmūd al-Arnā’ūṭ et al. (Beirut and Kuwait, 1992); idem, *Wajīz al-Kalām fī al-Dhayl ‘alā Duwal al-Islām*, ed. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf et al. (Beirut, 1416/1995), hereafter referred to as *Wajīz*.

¹³See Michael W. Dols, *The Black Death in the Middle East* (Princeton, 1977), 169–85, for mortality figures.

¹⁴*Inbā’* (H), 9:219–20; *Inbā’* (C), 4:224; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:359; *‘Iqd*, 619.

¹⁵Franz Rosenthal, “Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī,” *EF*, 3:776–78; *Al-Tibr*, 87; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Badhl al-Mā’ūn fī Faḍl al-Tā’ūn*, ed. Ibrāhīm Kīlānī Muḥammad Khalīfah (Ṣan‘ā’ and Beirut, 1413/1993), 231; *Al-Tibr*, 87.

recovered from the disease. In al-Rawḍ, there is another interesting account that Ibn Ḥajar attempted to obtain the release of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s father Khalīl when he was arrested and put in prison. However, neither *Inbā’* nor *Al-Tibr* record this incident, so it is not clear whether it is true or not. Al-Sakhāwī only wrote that Khalīl was dismissed from office and expelled on 4 Rabī‘ II. He did not mention the attempt to release him, despite the fact that in *Al-Tibr* he remarked on other personal affairs such as his marriage to a merchant’s daughter on 8 Rabī‘ II in the presence of his teacher, Ibn Ḥajar.¹⁶

Regarding the Mamluk expeditionary force sent to Rhodes, al-Rawḍ has more detailed descriptions than any other historical work. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ first wrote that *Inbā’* claims 22 Muḥarram as the date of departure of the expeditionary vessels, but that this was a misunderstanding (*wahm*) by his teacher Ibn Ḥajar, and the real month of departure was Rabī‘ I. Al-Sakhāwī referred to the date of the expedition based on *Inbā’* while al-Rawḍ is based on Ibn Taghrībirdī’s accounts.¹⁷ The information about this expedition seems to have been gathered from the letters of Burhān al-Dīn al-Biqā‘ī, a historian who joined the expeditionary force.¹⁸ The descriptions of the battles are very lively compared to other histories.

This expedition was planned following the success of the expedition the previous year to the small island of Qashtīl (Castellorizzo) located east of Rhodes. After the expedition force arrived in Rhodes in August, 1444, they besieged the fortress in vain for 40 days. This failure led to the conclusion of a peace treaty the following year, ending Mamluk attempts to expand their military power to Rhodes.¹⁹

‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote vividly about the arrival in Cairo of a delegation from the Timurid ruler Shāh Rukh between Sha‘bān and Ramaḍān of 848. They had an audience with Sultan Jaqmaq in the citadel and presented him with the *kiswah*. When this was revealed, mamluks and citizens were roused to anger. The delegation was attacked and their lodging house was looted. Al-Sakhāwī wrote in *Al-Tibr* that a famous qādī accompanied this delegation and that he was present when Ibn Ḥajar gave this qādī an *ijāzah*, but in *Inbā’* Ibn Ḥajar did not mention this audience at all. In the margin of *Inbā’*(T), ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote of the approval the sultan

¹⁶*Al-Tibr*, 93.

¹⁷*Al-Tibr*, 87; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:360–63; *Ḥawādith*, 1:104.

¹⁸*Inbā’* (H), 9:223–24; *Inbā’* (C), 4:226–27. Dr. Ḥasan Ḥabashī quotes al-Biqā‘ī’s private notes in the footnotes of his edition, which shows that he did not consider them part of the main text of *Inbā’*. However, since the editor of *Inbā’* (H) did not recognize that these notes were written by al-Biqā‘ī, they are included in the main text.

¹⁹Ettore Rossi, “The Hospitallers at Rhodes, 1421–1523,” in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. H. W. Hazard (Madison, 1975), 3:319–20; Hassanein Rabie, “Mamluk Campaigns Against Rhodes (1440–1444),” in *The Islamic World*, ed. Clifford Edmund Bosworth et al. (Princeton, 1989), 281–86.

had given the previous year, which was quoted from *Al-Nujūm*. In al-Rawḍ, he also added that the sultan was enraged and chastised the viceregent (*walī al-salṭānah* [sic]). This information was gathered from a witness who happened to be there.²⁰

In *Inbā'*, there is no description of the campaign to Varna (10 November 1444), in which Murad II defeated the Hungarian and Slavic army. The note in the margin of *Inbā'*(T) is quoted exactly from *Al-Nujūm*.²¹ It was written in al-Rawḍ that a delegate of al-Malik Murād ibn 'Uthmān, who was the ruler (*mutamallik*) of Adrianople (Edirne), Bursa, and the land of Rum behind Adrianople and Bursa, arrived and was said to have defeated the *Banū al-Aṣfar* known as al-Anukrus (Hungarians). It was also written in al-Rawḍ that the sending of prisoners would be described later, but no description of their arrival in Dhū al-Ḥijjah is found.²² Other historical sources, however, have descriptions of the arrival of many gifts and prisoners that the Ottomans sent to flaunt their power.²³ The Ottomans sent many gifts and prisoners to the Aqqyunlu and the Timurids. This campaign was considered the first move toward the conquest of Constantinople (857/1453).²⁴ This battle as well as the failure of the Rhodes expedition had a great impact on the future of the Mamluks.

There is no mention in *Inbā'* about the above-mentioned events, except a simple description of the expedition to Rhodes. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ gathered new information related to these events, added it in the margin of *Inbā'*(T), and arranged it in al-Rawḍ. Toward the end of *Inbā'*, we find only short and simple descriptions.

Notes written in the margins of *Inbā'*(T) tell us that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ gathered information from either *Al-Nujūm*, *Ḥawādith*, or *'Iqd*. In the descriptions of the appointments and dismissals of government officials, the content and order of sentences are exactly the same as in *Al-Nujūm*, but they are not attributed to *Al-Nujūm*. On the other hand, information quoted from *'Iqd* is followed by the phrase "as al-'Aynī wrote."²⁵ Quotations are found throughout the period from Ṣafar to the end of the year, but more quotations are made in the months after

²⁰*Al-Tibr*, 96; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:364.

²¹*Al-Nujūm*, 15:366.

²²The details of this campaign were described in the account of the conversion to Islam of the prisoners who were sent to Cairo in early Muḥarram of the next year, 849. (al-Rawḍ, fols. 31r–32v); Ibn Iyās also briefly mentioned the prisoners' conversion in the same month. See *Badā'i'*, 2:247.

²³*Ḥawādith*, 1:112; *'Iqd*, 2:631–32; *Nuzhah*, 4:311–12; *Al-Tibr*, 98–99.

²⁴Deno J. Geanakoplos, "Byzantium and the Crusades, 1354–1453," in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Hazard, 3:96–97; Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300–1481* (Istanbul, 1990), 129–36.

²⁵The same method of quotation is also used in al-Rawḍ. When raising objections, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ sometimes mentions Ibn Taghrībirdī by name. Other times he simply writes, "someone says the following."

Ramaḍān.²⁶ Since the main text of fol. 193v of *Inbā'*(T) is about the events which happened in Dhū al-Ḥijjah, the text of fol. 193r is filled with information about events before Dhū al-Ḥijjah, actually leaving no blank space. And this may be the reason why accounts of happenings after Ramaḍān are dated only as "the same day," "the same month," or "the same year." This careless dating method seems to be one of the causes for mistakes in *al-Rawḍ* when quoting information from the margins of *Inbā'*(T).

Comparing the notes in the margins of *Inbā'*(T) with *al-Rawḍ*, it is clear that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ tried to fix the exact dates of incidents to avoid mistakes by using phrases such as "in the same month, that is, [the name of the month]." Some accounts in the margins of *Inbā'*(T) cannot be found in the corresponding parts of *al-Rawḍ*, which means that these accounts might have been left out or moved to other places in *al-Rawḍ*. For example, the biographies of individuals found in the margins of the chronological section of *Inbā'*(T) were moved to the obituary sections of the years of their deaths.

The dates of all the events after Rajab 848 in *al-Rawḍ*, with only one exception, match exactly with other historical sources. The only exception is the campaign against the Bedouins of al-Buḥayrah. In the margin of *Inbā'*(T), 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote that this happened on 16 Dhū al-Ḥijjah, but in *al-Rawḍ*, the date given is the 26th. This is probably due to a slip of the pen while writing the Arabic numeral.

There are great differences between *al-Rawḍ* and other historical sources, however, in their descriptions of the three months of Rabī' II, Jumādā I, and Jumādā II. Ibn Taghrībirdī included no event for Jumādā I and Jumādā II, noting that nothing worth mentioning happened in these months.²⁷ In *al-Rawḍ*, on the other hand, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ described the details of his father Khalīl's dismissal and arrest, a very important event in 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's life.

As will be shown below, it seems that many accounts of events which occurred in Rabī' II were dated after Jumādā I. I now will analyze the descriptions of these dating differences.

First, the date of the Nile inundation is given as Tuesday, 9 Rabī' II in *Inbā'*(H), but both in *Inbā'*(C) and in the main text of *Inbā'*(T), it is written as Tuesday, 19. In *al-Rawḍ*, however, the date is 19 Jumādā II. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ always wrote notes in the margins when he had to add new information to the main text of *Inbā'*(T). However, he did not write a note for a change of the month for this entry. This means that the date of the Nile inundation in *al-Rawḍ* should have been Tuesday, 19 Rabī' II. It is likely, therefore, that probably he or his scribe

²⁶The notes in *Inbā'*(T), fol. 193r are the quotations from *Al-Nujūm*, 15:363–67.

²⁷*Hawāḍith*, 1:107.

made a mistake in writing and misdated it as 19 Jumādā II. *Badā'i'* also has this event misdated as Jumādā II, which indicates that this date in *Badā'i'* was taken from al-Rawḍ.²⁸

Next, there are two accounts that were written by 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ himself in the margin of *Inbā'*(T). The first account is the appointment and dismissal of the *nā'ib* of the Damascus citadel. The second account is the appointment and dismissal of the *nā'ib* of Malaṭīyah, which is thought to have resulted in the incident related to his father Khalīl. Both the appointments and dismissals are dated 3 Rabī' II. But in al-Rawḍ he dated them in Jumādā I and Jumādā II.

The date of these two accounts can be analyzed by considering his style in other parts of his book. When 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ changed the date or contents of the notes in the margins of *Inbā'*(T), he wrote special notices in al-Rawḍ. The description of how the fleet departed for Rhodes from the port of Alexandria is one example. This account is not found in the main text of *Inbā'*. However, in the margin 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ included this account under 16 Rabī' I. In al-Rawḍ 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ dated this departure 17 Rabī' I and began his description by saying that "on Saturday, 17, which Ibn Taghrībirdī wrote as 16."²⁹ This shows clearly that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ at first gathered information from Ibn Taghrībirdī's description and corrected the date when he wrote al-Rawḍ.

The description of the appointment and dismissal of the *nā'ib* of the Damascus citadel can be analyzed in the same way. In al-Rawḍ he wrote "On Monday, 2 Jumādā I, which a man miswrote as 3." The man he was referring to was Ibn Taghrībirdī. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, therefore, corrected this date from 3 to 2. Ibn Taghrībirdī included the description of this incident under the date 3 Rabī' II. He also wrote the description of the appointment and dismissal of the *nā'ib* of Malaṭīyah under the same day.³⁰ The next problem is the difference of the month between 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's account and the accounts of Ibn Taghrībirdī and other historians. That is, when did the incident happen, in Rabī' II or Jumādā I?

In his *Nayl*, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ organized the events and obituaries according to month, and did not write dates and days of the week. Although the dating is sometimes obscure, the date for the appointment and dismissal of the *nā'ib* of Damascus is clearly written as Rabī' II.³¹ The fact that he gave the exact date of this incident, therefore, means that he changed it from 3 Rabī' II to 2 Rabī' II.

²⁸*Inbā'*(H), 9:222–23; *Inbā'*(C), 4:226; *Inbā'*(T), fol. 192v. It seems that it was forgotten, and 'asharah (10) was written between the lines above 9; *Badā'i'*, 2:242.

²⁹*Al-Nujūm*, 15:360.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 363; *Hawādith*, 1:105; cf. *Al-Tibr*, 90.

³¹'Abd al-Bāsiṭ, *Nayl al-Amal fī Dhayl al-Duwal*, ed. 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmūrī (Beirut and Sidon, 2002), 5:188 (hereafter referred to as *Nayl[T]*).

The descriptions of the appointment and dismissal of the *nā’ib* of Malaṭīyah and the *atābak* of Aleppo are found under 3 Rabī‘ II (*Nujūm*, *Ḥawādith*, *Nuzhah*) or 4 Rabī‘ II (*‘Iqd*, *Al-Tibr*).³² These accounts are not found in the main texts of *Inbā’*(T), *Inbā’*(C) or *Inbā’*(Ḥ). In the margin of *Inbā’*(T), ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ dated these two incidents as 3 Rabī‘ II. He also added about his father Khalīl, the former *atābak* of Aleppo, that “my father was put in prison without any reason.”

But in al-Rawḍ he did not include these three accounts under Rabī‘ II, although he recorded them under 2 Jumādā II and added that Qānbāy al-Ḥamzāwī, a *nā’ib* of Aleppo, slandered Khalīl and made allegations to the sultan, resulting in his dismissal as *atābak* of Aleppo and his imprisonment in the jail of the citadel.³³ In his *Nayl* ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ gives short accounts of the same appointment and dismissal, as well as his father’s arrest, under Jumādā II. *Badā’i’* includes the account of this appointment and dismissal only under Jumādā II, without mentioning the former *atābak* of Aleppo, Khalīl. Therefore, it can be presumed that Ibn Iyās, author of *Badā’i’*, got his information from al-Rawḍ.³⁴

These analyses prove that the three accounts of appointment and dismissal of the *nā’ib* of the Damascus citadel, the *nā’ib* of Malaṭīyah, and the *atābak* of Aleppo in Rabī‘ II were divided into an account under Jumādā I and two accounts in Jumādā II in al-Rawḍ. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ added the incident involving his father under Jumādā II.

There are some indications of how ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ gathered information for his book and how these incidents related to his own life. Ibn Ḥajar was dismissed from the chief judgeship in Rabī‘ II. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt al-Haythamī,³⁵ a Shafī’i deputy judge (*nā’ib*), approved the matter. The sultan, however, was dubious about his decision, and summoned witnesses who were involved in the case. These witnesses were astonished that they were summoned, and changed their testimony. The sultan, therefore, decided to punish the deputy judge, and put him in prison. Because he was Ibn Ḥajar’s deputy judge, Ibn Ḥajar was ordered to stay in his house, which was tantamount to dismissal from office. Ibn Ḥajar was later given an opportunity to plead his case. After listening to his plea, the sultan made him promise that the number of deputy judges would not exceed ten, and reinstated him. This case was closed when the sultan also reinstated the deputy judge after a recommendation from Ibn Ḥajar. The detailed descriptions of this

³²*Al-Nujūm*, 15:365; *Ḥawādith*, 1:106; *‘Iqd*, 623; *Nuzhah*, 4:302; *Al-Tibr*, 93.

³³Regarding this incident, Dr. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmūrī indicates a different reason in another source in *Nayl*(T), 1:14–15.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 5:190; *Badā’i’*, 2:242.

³⁵Only *Nayl*(T), 5:187, and *Badā’i’*, 2:242, referred to this person as Shams al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt al-Haythamī.

incident and the punishment of the deputy judge are not found in Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbā'* (*H*) and *Inbā'* (*C*).³⁶ In the margin of *Inbā'* (*T*), however, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ quoted sentences from *Iqd*, which mention al-'Aynī's name, and wrote about the penalty that the sultan imposed on the deputy judge, i.e., to remove his turban and walk to the citadel gate to be handed over to the chief of police (*wālī al-shurṭah*) and enter the felony prison.³⁷ 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ continued with the quotation of a related account and then his own comment in the margin: as someone who served the sultan, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ added how much the sultan was enraged. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ ended with a comment that al-'Aynī described this incident well. This is an example of his attitude toward his writing: he contacted witnesses and confirmed information. In *al-Rawḍ*, however, the information from the witness and his own comment on this incident are not included.

How the sultan issued and retracted his order is interesting. The order to keep Ibn Ḥajar confined to his house was conveyed by one of the sultan's mamluks (*khāṣṣakīyat al-sultān*) of the executive secretary's assistants (*al-dawādārīyah al-ṣighār*). Then, Shams al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Rūmī, an attendant (*jalīs*) who also served the sultan, visited Ibn Ḥajar and told him how sorry the sultan felt about his dismissal, and ordered him to visit the sultan early the next morning.³⁸ This attendant, according to the notes in the margin of *Inbā'* (*T*), served Sultan al-Zāhir Ṭaṭar before his enthronement and also served Sultan Jaqmaq. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote that he was not very knowledgeable but was a very good negotiator. He also wrote that the man was well acquainted with his father, depicting him favorably.

Descriptions of the following incident are found in all the sources referred to in this article, with the exception of Ibn Taghrībirdī's books. The detailed descriptions are found only in *Nuzhah*. According to its author, Ibn Dāwūd al-Sayrafī, this incident happened when a rich man died and left a large inheritance to his heirs. Since his children were young, the matter was brought before a Shafi'i deputy judge. This judge approved the request for a bride price (*ṣadāq*) to one of the wives of the deceased. One of the trustees of the will raised an objection and petitioned the sultan for a ruling. Ibn Dāwūd al-Sayrafī remarked on how strange it was that this deputy judge did not resign his office even though he was said to be rich, earning 600 dirhams a day.³⁹

At the end of this year, the sultan heard a rumor about al-Furriyānī (or al-Ghurriyānī), a self-proclaimed Mahdi, and sent a letter to the *nā'ib* of Jerusalem

³⁶*Inbā'* (*H*), 9:221–22; *Inbā'* (*C*), 4:225–26.

³⁷*Iqd*, 2:622.

³⁸*Nuzhah*, 4:300–1 has a different explanation: after the incident, Ibn Ḥajar resigned on his own, and when the sultan heard about the resignation he despatched al-Rūmī.

³⁹*Ibid.*

ordering him to bring this man to Cairo. He was supported by the Bedouins of Jibāl Nābulus (Jabal Ḥumaydah). He presented himself to the *nā’ib*, after which he stopped his activity and was not brought to Cairo, thus ending the matter. This man was born in Tunis in 780 and later stayed in Cairo, where he provided al-Maqrīzī with some information about the Maghrib. He was, therefore, mentioned in many sources.⁴⁰ *Inbā’ (H)*, *Inbā’ (C)*, and *Al-Tibr* describe his stay in Cairo before going to Jibāl Nābulus.⁴¹ However, the notes in the margins of *Inbā’ (T)* continue the story of this man’s life after he stopped his activities. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ quoted the same stories from these notes in al-Rawḍ. According to these descriptions, this man moved between Damascus and Tripoli, and in Tripoli always stayed at the house of Sharaf al-Dīn Mūsā ibn Yūsuf,⁴² an army inspector (*nāzir al-jaysh*), who treated him kindly. Many of his books were stored in this house. It is also mentioned that he died in Latakia in 862.⁴³ The reason why ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ was able to obtain such details is that his father Khalīl was living in Tripoli with his family when he was an amir of twenty. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ was 18 years old and probably remembered stories of this man vividly. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ added in al-Rawḍ that this man knew a great deal about the Mahdist movement of ‘Ubayd Allāh and Muḥammad ibn Tūmārt in the Maghrib.

Adding a bit of his own family history, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote that the sultan had the exchequer give his father Khalīl Madīnat Qāqūn as *iqṭā’* and the village named Yaṭṭah bi-Murabba‘ah (?) as *rizqah* to compensate him after being falsely accused and imprisoned. The family later sold these lands at a comparatively low price of 1,000 dinars, though the annual profit was about 800 dinars at the time. In the year 848 ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ was four years old. There is a note in the margin of *Inbā’ (T)* that he was stabbed in the chest this year, but this description is not included in al-Rawḍ. He probably considered this incident too personal.

Next I will analyze the obituary section (biographies) of nineteen people listed in al-Rawḍ. Among historical sources, al-Sakhāwī’s *Al-Tibr* included the largest number of people (thirty-six people) in the obituaries. It is written in *Inbā’* and in

⁴⁰*Al-Ḍaw’*, 7:67–70; *Al-Dalīl*, 2:600; *Al-Manhal*, 9:308–9.

⁴¹*Inbā’ (H)*, 9:226–28; *Inbā’ (C)*, 4:228–29; *Al-Tibr*, 102–3.

⁴²According to *Al-Ḍaw’*, 10:192, he came from a Christian family in al-Shawbak and was an army inspector in Tripoli. The relationship with this person is not mentioned; *Al-Tibr*, 422. For his death in 862, see ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ, “Nayl al-Amal fī Dhayl al-Duwal,” Bodleian Library MS Hunt 610, fols. 121r–v (hereafter referred to as *Nayl*); *Nayl(T)*, 6:41; *Al-Dalīl*, 2:754; *Wajīz*, 2:714.

⁴³*Al-Rawḍ*, fol. 26r. On the other hand, it is written in *Nayl*, fol. 56r, that this man died in Bilād Ṭarābulus after 860. In *Nayl(T)*, 5:198–99, the name of this man involved in the incident of the year 848 appears as al-Ghurriyānī. In the later part of *Nayl(T)*, 6:32, there is an obituary of the man named al-Furriyānī in the year 862 without mentioning of the place of his death. There is no indication of any connection between these two similar names.

al-Rawḍ that four more people died or were said to have died this year. If these four were added, the total would have been forty (cf. the Appendix).

First, in analyzing how ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ composed his biographies, I will compare al-Rawḍ with two editions of *Inbā’*, namely *Inbā’ (H)* and *Inbā’ (C)*, and the main text and notes in the margins of *Inbā’ (T)*. I would also like to discuss the characteristics of two editions of *Inbā’* and their problems.

Inbā’ itself does not contain much information in the obituary section. The main text of *Inbā’ (T)* includes the obituaries of only three people. *Inbā’ (H)* includes accounts of only six people. *Inbā’ (C)* has accounts of ten people, among whom nine died in the year 848. About the manuscript of *Inbā’* which includes notes by al-Biqā‘ī, Dr. Ḥasan Ḥabashī, the editor of *Inbā’ (C)*, says that there are biographies of only four people. He included all the names found in eight manuscripts that he used to edit this book and explained the differences among these eight manuscripts in the footnotes. This example can be found in the obituary of Abū Bakr ibn Ishāq in *Inbā’ (C)*. Other historical sources date this man’s death to 847. *Inbā’ (C)* itself gives his obituary under 847. But in one manuscript his death was dated 848, so the editor of *Inbā’ (C)* quoted this in the main text and explained the details in the footnote. *Inbā’ (H)* annotated these differences in the footnotes for 847. These footnotes of the two editions reveal the relationships among the manuscripts of *Inbā’* and provide useful clues as to how this information is related to the composition of al-Rawḍ.⁴⁴

In comparing *Inbā’ (T)* and al-Rawḍ and analyzing how ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ composed the obituary section, the entry for Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad that appears in the first part of the obituary section of al-Rawḍ proves that *Inbā’ (T)* was the book that ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ read and relied upon for his description.⁴⁵ In al-Rawḍ, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote, “Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, while Ibn Ḥajar inadvertently miswrote (*sahá*) Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl.” Neither *Inbā’ (H)* nor *Inbā’ (C)* has this description.⁴⁶ According to the footnotes of these two editions, there is no manuscript which contains the name Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl. *Inbā’ (T)*, however, has exactly the same sentence in its main text. This means the signature “‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī” in the margins of this manuscript was written by ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī himself. This man, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, was a Maliki qadi and the older student of Ibn Ḥajar. His life is described in detail by al-Sakhāwī in *Al-Tibr* and *Al-Ḍaw’*.⁴⁷ In al-Rawḍ, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ consulted an acquaintance of this person and corrected his birthdate in al-Sakhāwī’s book.

⁴⁴*Inbā’ (C)*, 4:230; *ibid.*, 218; *Inbā’ (H)*, 9:215.

⁴⁵Al-Rawḍ, fol. 26r; *Inbā’ (T)*, fol. 193v.

⁴⁶*Inbā’ (H)*, 9:239–40; *Inbā’ (C)*, 4:240.

⁴⁷*Al-Tibr*, 106–7; *Al-Ḍaw’*, 2:69–70.

The nineteen obituaries for the year 848 in al-Rawḍ can be categorized into three groups. The first group includes the biographies that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ seems to have gathered from al-Sakhāwī's book. The above-mentioned Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad is an example of the entries in this group. In most cases he did not mention the sources of his information. According to its contents, and due to the fact that there is no other clue as to the ultimate source of this information, al-Sakhāwī's book will for now be considered the source. There are ten biographies in this group.

The second group includes the biographies that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ gathered from al-'Aynī's *Iqd* and from Ibn Taghrībirdī. He also added some information himself. There are seven biographies in this group.

The third group includes the biographies that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ selected independently. There are two of these.

Six out of ten biographies in the first group did not appear in *Inbā'*(T) and until today the information can be traced only to al-Sakhāwī's works. For example, the account of the Hanbali shaykh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh can be found only in *Al-Tibr* and *Al-Ḍaw'*.⁴⁸

Three of the biographies in the first group are found in the unsigned notes in the margin of *Inbā'*(T). Two of them are found only in *Inbā'*(C).⁴⁹ They are the Shafi'i shaykh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān and Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Bakr, a famous merchant in Syria. Their biographies appear in *Al-Tibr*, making it clear that this information was the basis of the unsigned notes in *Inbā'*(T).⁵⁰ Al-Rawḍ includes an anecdote about the famous Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Bakr that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ heard from a merchant in Tunis in 867 on his way to the Maghrib. It is also stated that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's father was on good terms with this man when he and 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ were living in Damascus. The biographical account of the Shafi'i shaykh Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyá Abū Zuhrah, who wrote many books, is not found in either *Inbā'*(H) or *Inbā'*(C), though *Al-Tibr* and *Al-Ḍaw'* have detailed descriptions of the relationship between the teacher and student. Al-Sakhāwī also wrote that he met this man's son 'Abd al-Wahhāb in Tripoli.⁵¹ 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote in al-Rawḍ that he saw the book of this Muḥammad written in his own hand and attended lectures given by his son, 'Abd al-Wahhāb, at a Tripoli mosque, when 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ's family lived in that city from 862 until approximately 865. He also added a short biography of this son and quoted a verse of his poetry,

⁴⁸*Al-Tibr*, 112; *Al-Ḍaw'*, 8:159.

⁴⁹According to *Inbā'*(C), neither of them are in the manuscript that includes notes by al-Biqā'ī. Their names do not appear in *Inbā'*(H) either.

⁵⁰*Al-Tibr*, 112, 112–13, respectively.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 113–14; *Al-Ḍaw'*, 10:70–71.

information not found in the biography of this son in *Al-Tibr*.

In the second group, two obituaries clearly show the relationships between historical sources. The descriptions of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Abī Bakr (or ‘Alī) al-Ḥamawī Zayn al-Dīn, a famous preacher, appear in the main text of *Inbā’*(T) and in the signed notes in its margin. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ started his description in *al-Rawḍ* by writing:

‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Abī Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī al-Faṭḥ ibn al-Muwaffaq al-Ḥamawī al-Qādirī al-Qāhirī al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn. Ibn Ḥajar inadvertently miswrote (*sahá*) ‘Alī for his father’s name (*ism*) and Nāṣir al-Dīn for his honorific title (*laqab*). Ibn Taghrībirdī miswrote (*wahama*) both the *ism* and *laqab* and wrote Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad.

In the main text of *Inbā’*(T), his father’s *ism* was written as ‘Alī and his *laqab* as Nāṣir al-Dīn. Both *Inbā’*(H) and *Inbā’*(C) give his father’s *ism* as ‘Alī and *laqab* as Zayn al-Dīn. This description in *al-Rawḍ* is evidence that it was *Inbā’*(T) that ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ himself read. In *Al-Nujūm* Ibn Taghrībirdī called this man Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Al-Tibr* gives the name of this man’s father as Abū Bakr, as does *al-Rawḍ*.⁵² ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ, therefore, seems to have read the main text of *Inbā’*(T) first and examined the information in *Al-Nujūm* critically, referring to sources like *Al-Tibr*, before starting to write his book. He also made notes in the margin of *Inbā’*(T) about ‘Abd al-Raḥīm’s son, Maḥmūd, and grandson, Ibrāhīm, who also acquired a good reputation. Their descriptions also appear in *al-Rawḍ* with slight differences in word order and composition.

A man named Muḥammad al-Ḥamawī appears in unsigned notes in the margin of *Inbā’*(T). These unsigned notes have two different styles. The first part of the notes gives a brief biography of this man. Then, a note in a different hand says that this is about this ‘Abd al-Raḥīm. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ, therefore, concluded that this man was ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, who is described in the previous paragraph, and did not include him in *al-Rawḍ*. In *Inbā’*(C), there is a brief biography of Muḥammad al-Ḥamawī with an editor’s footnote saying that this information was not found in the manuscript with notes by al-Biqā‘ī.⁵³ In this footnote, the descriptions in *Al-Nujūm*, which are also referred to in the previous paragraph of this article, are quoted. In the main text of *Inbā’*(C), there is a description in parentheses saying “‘Abd al-Raḥīm has previously been mentioned; his name was written already.” The editor wrote in his footnote that this sentence did not make sense. However, I

⁵²*Inbā’*(H), 9:229; *Inbā’*(C), 4:231; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:506; *Al-Tibr*, 108–9.

⁵³*Inbā’*(C), 4:231–32.

believe the biographical description under the name of Muḥammad al-Ḥamawī is the summary of a biography under the name of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm despite some differences. A difference between the two is the date of death: 2 Dhū al-Qa‘dah and Wednesday 3 Dhū al-Qa‘dah. *Iqd*, however, has the same death date of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm and even the same day of the week.⁵⁴ Thus I conclude that this was the same person. *Inbā’ (H)* does not include a biography of this person. *Nuzhah* gives a description of him under the name Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥamawī. This is probably because its author gathered information from both *Iqd* and *Al-Nujūm*, but included information primarily from *Al-Nujūm*.⁵⁵

Another typical description of this second group is Fayrūz al-Ṭawāshī, a cupbearer (*sāqī*) of Sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh. The description of this cupbearer is found in both an unsigned note and a signed note in the margin of *Inbā’ (T)*. The signed note is quoted from *Iqd*. These descriptions were arranged in al-Rawḍ in order to make its meaning clear. A part of *Al-Nujūm* is also quoted, prefaced by the phrase “Someone says that.”⁵⁶

The third group contains obituaries of two people. Neither of them are found in the main text or the margin of *Inbā’ (T)*, in *Inbā’ (H)*, or in *Inbā’ (C)*. One is the Shafi‘i shaykh Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote that he did not know much about him and only mentioned that this man died that year in Mecca. I cannot find any description of this man in other historical sources. The other is Yūsuf ibn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s half brother, an older brother who died at the age of five in that year. He added that his brother’s mother was released from slavery by his father and, as of the writing of the book, was almost 70 years old living with his own mother. These two people did not appear in his *Nayl*, nor in Ibn Iyās’s *Badā’i’*.

Among the obituaries of the nineteen individuals in al-Rawḍ, only three are mentioned in “Majma‘,” a collection of biographies written by ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ, of which only a part remains.⁵⁷ He chose fourteen obituaries in *Nayl*. Ibn Iyās selected all eleven people out of these nineteen people and wrote short versions of their obituaries for the same year in *Badā’i’*.⁵⁸

The above analyses of the obituary section (biographies) reveal two characteristics of ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s writing. Firstly, he used firsthand information

⁵⁴ *Iqd*, 2:632.

⁵⁵ *Nuzhah*, 4:312–13; *Iqd*, 2:632; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:506.

⁵⁶ *Iqd*, 2:633; *Al-Nujūm*, 15:506–8.

⁵⁷ ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ, “Majma‘ al-Mufannan bi-al-Mu‘jam al-Mu‘anwan,” Maktabat Baladīyat al-Iskandarīyah MS 4448/800b musalsal 5 tāriḥ. As for the three individuals mentioned in “Majma‘,” see Appendix.

⁵⁸ *Nayl (T)*, 5:184–200; *Bada’i’*, 2:241–47.

from acquaintances of his subjects in vividly depicting people and the era in a narrative form. Secondly, he included aspects of his own personal history, which can be considered inextricably related to the method of using firsthand information. He also explained the meaning of Turkish names, which can be considered a distinct characteristic of his writing. The information on ulamarelationships between teacher and student is more detailed in al-Sakhāwī's *Al-Tibr* than al-Rawḍ. One could say that al-Sakhāwī merely showed greater interest in this issue, but I believe that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ used a version of *Al-Tibr* that did not have as much detailed information as the one we know today. Al-Sakhāwī wrote that out of forty people, obituaries of six of them, which are not included in al-Rawḍ, were based on the descriptions of Ibn Fahd, who was well versed in information about Mecca.⁵⁹ This reveals that al-Sakhāwī's history which 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ used to compose al-Rawḍ did not contain information from Ibn Fahd.

CONCLUSION

One of the manuscripts of Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbā'*, which is preserved in the Topkapı Library (Inbā'[T]), was the manuscript that 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ used. He made notes in the margins of this manuscript based on other sources and on his own research. In this article I have analyzed these notes and examined how the author used the information in *Inbā'* when writing al-Rawḍ. First, the notes written in the margins by 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ or others were made based on information from Ibn Taghrībirdī, primarily his *Al-Nujūm*. Second, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ added information from *Iqd* and his own research. It was concluded, through studying the descriptions in al-Rawḍ, that these notes were used as the bases for the accounts and their dates in al-Rawḍ. In the descriptions of the year in question, some events were misdated or miswritten. These same mistakes also appear in Ibn Iyās's book.

In the margin of the obituary section of Inbā'(T), there are several biographies of people who are not listed in the main text, some of which seem to be clearly based on information from *Al-Nujūm*. In these descriptions, 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ added new information and included biographies of sons or grandsons of the people mentioned in the book, who would have been alive at the time. All these biographies in the main text and in notes in the margins of Inbā'(T) are included in al-Rawḍ and their descriptive details tell us that Inbā'(T) was also used as a basis for the creation of this part of al-Rawḍ. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ added information by al-Sakhāwī in composing this part of al-Rawḍ. He also selected some accounts of his personal and family histories from the notes in the margins of both the chronicle and obituary sections of Inbā'(T) and incorporated them into al-Rawḍ.

Ibn Iyās was a student of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ and he included descriptions of 'Abd

⁵⁹*Al-Tibr*, 105–6, 108, 110, 113.

al-Bāsiṭ in his book while he was still alive.⁶⁰ When Ibn Iyās referred to Khalīl ibn Shāhīn, he wrote, “He is the father of the author of a book titled *Al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim*.” Ibn Iyās also described him as “his father.”⁶¹ All the accounts with ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s name, with only one exception, are quoted from his poems.⁶² This may be the reason why the influence ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ had on Ibn Iyās has not been studied. This article has focused on the accounts of only one year, but the analyses of this year’s descriptions makes it clear that al-Rawḍ had a great influence on Ibn Iyās’s descriptions of events and biographies, as well as his basic chronological framework. Al-Sakhāwī also wrote about his student ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ. He mentioned ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ’s journey to study, his other teachers, and his journey to the Maghrib. He wrote, “He excelled in many fields. He wrote, composed poetry, and showed an interest in history.” He continued, “Therefore, he visited me very often.”⁶³ As an additional piece of information related to al-Sakhāwī, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ seems to have used a simple version of al-Sakhāwī’s history that had less information than the version of al-Sakhāwī’s book we know today. Al-Sakhāwī’s book was presumably revised after ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ wrote al-Rawḍ. This, I believe, also helps us understand al-Sakhāwī’s own writing process.

⁶⁰*Badā’i*, 4:373–74.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 2:153, 169, 172, 174, 176, 177, 205, 215, 254, 375, 448; 3:25.

⁶²*Ibid.*, 3:263, 318, 424–25, 455–56; 4:83–84.

⁶³*Al-Ḍaw’*, 4:27.

**APPENDIX: LIST OF NAMES OF PEOPLE WHO DIED OR WERE SUPPOSED TO HAVE DIED
IN THE YEAR 848**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd al-Dimashqī					(T) 105 (D) 11:170			
2. Abū Bakr Yūsuf (Ishāq), al-Shaykh Bākīr	[Year 847] (C) 240	[Year 847] (N) 501 (H) 100	[Year 847] 847 613–15	[Year 847] (N) 175 (M) 44r–45r	[Year 847] (T) 78 (D) 11:26–27 (W) 591 (DH) 643		[Year 847] 847 238	
3. Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad					(F)(T) 105–6 (D) 2:12–13			
4. Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad					(T) 106 (D) 2:33			
5. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, al-Ḥannāwī	(H) 228–29 (C) 240 (T) 193v			(R) 26r–v (N) 189 (M) 112r	(T) 106–7 (D) 2:69–70 (W) 598 (DH) 649			1
6. Tajār ibnat Muḥammad					(T) 107 (D) 12:16			
7. Timrāz al-Mu’ayyadi				(R) 26v (N) 187–88 (M) 243r	(T) 107–8 (D) 3:38		242	1

Continued on next page

Appendix—Continued

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Jamāl (Jamāz) ibn Miḥfāḥ					(F(T) 108 (D) 3:78			
9. Ḥasan ibn Qirād					(F(T) 108 (D) 3:121 (T) 108 [Year 849] (D) 3:161			
10. Ḥusayn al-Kāzirūnī					(T) 108 [Year 849] (D) 3:161			
11. Ḥamzah ibn ‘Uthmān Qarāyalik	(H) 229 (C) 231 (T) 193v	(N) 508 (H) 115	644	(R) 26v–27r (N) 192–93	(T) 108 (D) 3:165 (W) 599 (DH) 651	313		2
12. Sa‘īd al-Balīnī					(T) 108 (D) 3:256			
13. Sunqur				(R) 27r (N) 195	(T) 108 (D) 3:273			1
14. Sūdūn al-Nawrūzī	(T) 193v	[year 847] (D) 1:335 (M) 6:172–73		(R) 27r–v (N) 188	[Year 847] (D) 3:287			2
15. (Ṭūkh al-Abūbakrī)	(H) 229 (C) 231 [Year 849] (T) 193v	(N) 508 (H) 116 (M) 7:14 [Year 849] (D) 1:371		[Year 849] (R) 27v (N) 201	[Year 848 or 849] (D) 10:10 [Year 849] (T) 129 (W) 606 (DH) 656		[Year 849] 242	2

16. (Ṭūghān)					[Year 849] (R) 27v	[Year 849] (T) 129			(2)
17. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr						(T) 108 (D) 5:15–16			
18. ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī						(F)(T) 108 (D) 5:35			
19. ‘Abd Allāh al-Zura‘ī					(R) 27v (N) 200	(T) 108 (D) 5:76	245	1	
20. ‘Abd al- Raḥīm ibn Abī Bakr (cf. no. 35)	(H) 229 (C) 231 (T) 194r	(N) 506 (H) 113	632		(R) 27v–28r (N) 197	(T) 108–9 (D) 4:170 (W) 598 (DH) 650	246	2	
21. ‘Abd al- Ghannī ibn ‘Abd Allāh						(T) 109 (D) 4:251			
22. ‘Abd al- Karīm Ibrāhīm						(T) 109 (D) 4:306			
23. ‘Abd al- Muḥsin al- Baghdādī					(R) 28r (N) 185	(T) 109 (D) 5:79		1	
24. ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr						(T) 109 (D) 5:127			
25. ‘Ulba ibn Muḥammad						(T) 109–10			
26. ‘Alī ibn Yūsuf						(F)(T) 110 (D) 6:52			

Continued on next page

Appendix—Continued

27. Fayruz al-Ṭawāshī	(H) 229 (C) 231 (T) 193r	(N) 506–8 (H) 114–15 (D) 2:523 (M) 4:348	633	(R) 28r–v (N) 194	(T) 110 (D) 6:176 (W) 599 (DH) 651 (T) 110	313	244	2
28. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Baṭīkh								
29. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar, Ibn al-Kumayl	(H) 230 (C) 232–33 (T) 194v	(D) 2:592 (M) 9:275–79		(R) 28v–29r (N) 193–94	(T) 110–12 (D) 7:28–30 (W) 598 (DH) 648 (T) 112		244	2
30. Muḥammad ibn Abī Sa‘d								
31. Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh				(R) 29r–v	(T) 112 (D) 8:159 (T) 112			1
32. Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān	(C) 232 (T) 194v			(R) 29v				1
33. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Bakr ibn ‘Alī				(R) 29v				3
34. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Bakr, al-Khawājā Ibn al-Muzalliq	(C) 232 (T) 194v			(R) 29v–30r (N) 191	(T) 112–13 (D) 8:173 (W) 599 (DH) 650		243	1

35. Muḥammad (ibn ‘Alī al- Ḥamawī) (cf. no. 20)	(C) 231 (T) 194v	(N) 506 (H) 113				312– 13		
36. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr					(T) 113 (D) 9:67			
37. Muḥammad ibn Yahyá ibn Aḥmad, Abū Zuhrah	(T) 194v		(R) 30r–31r (N) 188–89		(T) 113–14 (D) 10:71 (W) 596 (DH) 648 (T) 114 (D) 10:71		242	1
38. Muḥammad ibn Yahyá ibn Aḥmad Abū ‘Abd Allāh								
39. Yūsuf ibn Khalīl ibn Shāhīn			(R) 31r					3
40. Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad, al- Kawmī			(R) 31r (N) 192		(T) 114 (D) 10:328 (W) 598 (DH) 649		243	1

ABBREVIATIONS IN APPENDIX COLUMNS FROM LEFT TO RIGHT

1. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī
(C): *Inbā’ (C)*, vol. 4
(H): *Inbā’ (H)*, vol. 9
(T): *Inbā’ (T)*, 193v–194v
2. Ibn Taghrībirdī
(N): *Al-Nujūm*, vol. 15
(H): *Ḥawādith*, vol. 1
(D): *Al-Dalīl*, 2 vols.
(M): *Al-Manhal*, vols .1–9
3. al-‘Aynī
‘Iqd, vol. 2
4. ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ
(R): *Al-Rawḍ*, Vatican Arabo 728, 26r–31r
(N): *Nayl (T)*, vol. 5
(M): *Majma’*
5. al-Sakhāwī
(T): *Al-Tibr*
(D): *Al-Ḍaw’*, 12 vols.
(W): *Wajīz*, vol. 2
(DH): *Al-Dhayl*, vol. 1
(F): Information from Ibn Fahd
6. al-Ṣayrafī, Ibn Dāwūd
Nuzhah, vol. 4
7. Ibn Iyās
Badā’i’, vol. 2
8. a supposed group