Maqriziana IX: Should al-Maqrīzī Be Thrown Out with the Bath Water? The Question of His Plagiarism of al-Awḥadī’s Ḳhiṭṭāt and the Documentary Evidence

INTRODUCTION

One of the most renowned scholars that Islamic civilization has produced, al-Maqrīzī is considered a major historian in his own right and is sometimes compared to the great thinker Ibn Khaldūn, with whom he was associated in the last years of the latter’s life. Al-Maqrīzī’s views on economics, history, and architecture still stimulate modern research in these fields; his ideas inform the way in which we look at certain questions, especially historiographical ones. His books are among the bestsellers of medieval literature, continuously copied in the age of manuscript culture, and then printed, reprinted, translated, and studied. As with every great figure, some criticisms, generated by contemporary envious colleagues or modern viewpoints based on anachronistic criteria, may tarnish the idyllic portrait. In this respect, al-Maqrīzī is no exception to the rule. Some scholars have questioned his integrity in historiographical terms. The case raised by Ayalon as regards al-Maqrīzī’s position towards the Yāṣa, the Mongol book of laws, probably surpasses all others in the modern period.¹ Ayalon’s study did not stir up any controversy among the scholarly community because he based his arguments on irrefutable proofs, even though some remained conjectural.²

In his own time, al-Maqrīzī could not avoid the disparagement of his intellectual probity. The most derogatory remarks concern his alleged plagiarism of the work of his colleague and friend, al-Awḥadī. According to al-Sakhāwī, who vehemently

repeated his accusation on several occasions, al-Maqrızī had supposedly laid hands on his colleague's drafts upon his death (811/1408) and clean-copied the whole lot, adding some data, but publishing it in his own name under the title Kitāb al-Mawāʿiz wa-al-Fībār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār. The treatment al-Maqrızī reportedly applied to al-Awḥadī's text would thus be similar to what we now call “plagiarism.” Such a charge must be taken seriously, even more so in the case of al-Maqrızī given that the resulting book is considered his magnum opus. Though first opened five centuries ago, this case engendered a lively debate that started with the beginning of the last century. Several scholars have endeavored to elucidate the validity of this charge on the basis of the elements they had at their disposal: al-Sakhāwī's accusation and al-Maqrızī's text. Most of the time, these efforts have resulted in a justification of al-Maqrızī, best exemplified by F. Rosenthal's position: “the accusation of plagiarism is much too harsh.” In their scrutiny of this charge, most scholars were influenced by al-Sakhāwī's well-known vindictiveness towards almost everybody in his works, and they rebutted his allegations.

The aim of this article is to reexamine the question in the light of new evidence that has surfaced only recently. In one of the two extant volumes of the first draft of al-Maqrızī's Khiṭaṭ, I noticed that 19 leaves are written in a different handwriting, though most of al-Maqrızī’s extant autograph manuscripts are in fact holograph. Through a close analysis, both external and internal, I seek to


5 In May 2003, I received a copy of the manuscript (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi [Istanbul] MS E. Hazinesi 1405) and noticed the difference in the handwriting. Given that a new edition of the section covered by this manuscript was in preparation by Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid, I had to await its publication to see if he had established the same fact. When vol. 4 appeared at the end of 2003, I realized that he had apparently not noticed the difference in the handwriting. Moreover, several
demonstrate that this section must be identified as the unique remnant of al-Awḥadī’s *Khiṭat* that has survived. As a consequence, this discovery allows me to reopen the case raised by al-Sakhāwī and to see whether or not the charge was justified. However, I do not claim to be an exponent or a proponent in this case: my aim is to try to answer the charge as fairly as possible, and for this, I will have to consider it in view of the perception of plagiarism in the context under study.

This newly-discovered section of al-Awḥadī’s *Khiṭat* needs further investigation: a critical edition together with a biography of al-Awḥadī and a study of the text will be published separately.⁶

**The Charge**

Without the charge brought by al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) against al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), the whole affair would have completely faded into oblivion. Indeed, al-Sakhāwī repeatedly accused al-Maqrīzī of having plagiarized a book written by one of al-Maqrīzī’s colleagues whose name was al-Awḥadī (d. 811/1408). On at least five occasions, he leveled this charge in different terms, but always in a very direct manner. The first of these is to be found in his *Al-Tibr al-Masbūk*, under the year in which al-Maqrīzī died, and in his biographical dictionary entitled *Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ* (al-Maqrīzī’s entry):⁷

---


And he remained in his hometown, devoting his time to occupying himself with history to such an extent that he became renowned and celebrated for this. A number of books in this [field] are attributed to him, such as *Al-Khiṭṭat* of Cairo, which is a useful [book] given that he discovered al-Awhādi’s draft, as already stated in the latter’s biography. He appropriated it and made brief additions to it.

In a few words, al-Maqrīzī’s reputation regarding the book that earned him fame until our time is demolished: it results from an appropriation of somebody else’s work, only improved by adding a few data. The second denunciation is even more defamatory. Al-Sakhāwī wrote it, as he said, in al-Awhādi’s entry:

So, al-Maqrīzī had supposedly gotten hold of al-Awhādi’s draft—some parts of which had already been transcribed by the latter—made a fair copy of the whole thing, and finally written his name on the title page although he had only expanded it with a few additions. Moreover, we are told that al-Awhādi’s work, even though most of it still consisted of a draft, was a comprehensive book to which he devoted a lot of his time. Last but not least, it is clear that this was more than just a few notes scribbled on some quires: it constituted a really important contribution to the history of Cairo’s architectural development. Not content with

---

9 To be understood as the quarter of Cairo and not as referring to Egypt.
these two attacks, al-Sakhāwī reiterated his allegation in another of his books devoted to the defense of history as a science, *Al-ḍlān bi-al-Tawbikh*, where he provided the same details with, however, a reference to his informant in this affair:10

In the same way, al-Maqrīzī compiled [a history] of its topography, and it is a useful [book]. Our master told us that he discovered it in draft form through his neighbor Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Awḥadī who, however, had [already] made a fair copy of some parts. He [al-Maqrīzī] appropriated it after making some additions to what he [al-Awḥadī] had done and then attributed it to himself.

Though the words differ only slightly from the previous quotation, the mention of an informant is a clue to understanding on what grounds al-Sakhāwī presumed to bring forth this charge. The *shaykhunā*, in al-Sakhāwī’s jargon, refers to the only person he ever considered his master and to whom he devoted a lengthy biographical monograph:11 Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449). This is a significant point because al-Sakhāwī was born in 830/1427, which means that he was only 15 years old when al-Maqrīzī died. It is unlikely that al-Sakhāwī would have heard or witnessed anything relating to this case before al-Maqrīzī’s death, given his young age. On the other hand, it is reasonable to think that his master would have told him what he knew about this story when al-Sakhāwī got older, probably after al-Maqrīzī’s death. Given that Ibn Ḥajar died seven years after al-Maqrīzī, his disciple was 22 years old by that time, a more credible age for a divulgence of that kind.12


12 For instance, al-Sakhāwī did not get access to Ibn Ḥajar’s dictionary of his authorities, *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis*, before 850/1447. As we will soon see, this was a major source for al-Sakhāwī’s charge against al-Maqrīzī. His reading note on *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis*, together with two others by renowned scholars (Ibn Fahd and Ṭaḥrī Barmish), found in Ibn Ḥajar’s autograph copy held in al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah, Cairo (MS muṣṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 163a), is edited below.
Al-Sakhāwī confirmed that his informant in this case was Ibn Ḥajar in the biography he dedicated to his master, but he did not refer to an oral transmission, asserting rather that he read Ibn Ḥajar’s allegation in the dictionary of his authorities, Al-Majma’ al-Mu’assis lil-Mu’jam al-Mufahris:¹³

I also read in his [Ibn Ḥajar’s] handwriting, in the biography of the man of belles-lettres, the historian Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṭūghān al-Awḥadī, what follows: “He devoted his time to working on the topography of Cairo but it was in draft form when he died. The shaykh Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī made a fair copy of it.”

Whatever the case may be, the charge is undoubtedly a very serious one, as he claims that al-Maqrīzī’s achievement in this case must be credited to al-Awḥadī. Before investigating if al-Sakhāwī’s assertion was grounded on serious evidence and thus justified, it is necessary to turn to al-Awḥadī’s biography and study his connection to al-Maqrīzī.¹⁴

It can be argued that without the incident discussed here, al-Awḥadī would have remained an obscure scholar. He was indeed largely unnoticed, as the data provided by the sources to recount his life are only found in three sources written by contemporaries who were acquainted with him or by a later historian who relied on these testimonies. In fact, the main sources are the very protagonists of this affair: al-Maqrīzī himself, Ibn Ḥajar, and al-Sakhāwī, the last not having had the opportunity to know al-Awḥadī, as he was born shortly after the latter’s death. Thanks to the data provided by these authors,¹⁵ we know that Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ṭūghān al-Awḥadī was born in

---

¹³ Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Jawāhir wa-al-Durar, 1:394. This is the fifth time al-Sakhāwī exposes al-Maqrīzī’s plagiarism.

¹⁴ A fuller account of al-Awḥadī’s life will be found in “From Draft to Palimpsest.”

Cairo in 761/1360 in a family of eastern origin (probably Iraq or Iran). It was his grandfather who had come to Cairo, where he settled in 710/1310–11. He then entered the service of an influential Mamluk, Baybars al-Awhadi, the governor of the citadel, and the latter’s nisbah was attached to him, as frequently happened in the Mamluk milieu. His grandson, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad, served in the army where he held several positions, after he had received a thorough instruction in the various Quranic readings. As a scholar, he compiled numerous notebooks (majāmīʿ) and composed at least two books: a diwān of his own poetry and a topographical history of Cairo. The latter mostly remained in draft form, though he managed to make a fair copy of some parts of it before his death in his 48th year according to our calendar, in 811/1408. Incidentally, al-Maqrizī, who was born in the sixties of the eighth century (probably in 766/1364–65, which means that al-Awhādī was five years older than him), outlived him by more than 34 years, as he died in 845/1442. Even though al-Awhādī died earlier, the two men were not strangers to one another: they were neighbors, living in the same quarter of Barjawān, in the Fatimid part of the city, close to the street of Bayn al-Qaṣrayn, and they met each other in their respective homes for sessions of transmission (imlāʾ), and this occurred in 810/1407, a year before al-Awhādī’s death:

Our fellow, the expert reader [of the Quran], the historian, the man of letters, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ṭūghān al-Awhādī, the soldier, the Shafiʿite, transmitted to me orally in my home of Cairo on Saturday, 7 [nights] before the end of Rajab in 810 [25 December 1407].

Their bonds can even be appreciated by the fact that al-Maqrizī’s nephew, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī, attended al-Awhādī’s lectures,

---

18 This is the reading in the autograph copy. In both ‘Alī’s and al-Jalīlī’s editions: + ليل + and the following ليلة missing. This shows that al-Jalīlī did not rely on his complete copy of the text, which belongs to his family (see Dāwūd al-Čelebī al-Mawṣili, Kitāb Mukhtārat al-Mawṣili [Baghdad, 1927], 264, no. 5), and the partial autograph, but on ‘Alī’s edition, at least for this part!
19 See Manuel Ocaña Jiménez, Tablas de conversión de datos islámicas a cristianas y viceversa (Madrid, 1946), 42–43.
where he recited to him the Quran and another work he had learned by heart in 810/1407. The relationship between the two scholars must have been friendly, as can be perceived in the biography al-Maqrizi wrote about him, where some pieces of al-Awḥadī’s poetry dedicated to him are provided. In these succinct examples of his mastery of the most appreciated literary genre in the Arab world, sympathy as well as kindness abound. Suffice it to quote the following distich:

شَرْفَتْ قَدْرِي إِذْ أَتَيْتُ لَنْزَليَ ومِلْكِتِي بَالْبَيْرِ وَالْمَعْرُوفِ
يَابِنِ الخَلَافَةَ أَتَتَ عَاصِمُ عَصِرَنَا لاَ بَدْعُ إِنْ أُنْعِمْتُ بِالْتَشْرِيفِ

You honored my rank when you came to my home
and conveyed to me kindness and friendliness.
O scion of the caliphs! You are the support of our times.
It is no heresy if you are vested in the title of sharīf.

Reading the data, it can be inferred that al-Maqrizī and al-Awḥadī struck up a strong relationship based on mutual respect and devoid of academic rivalry, as sometimes happened in other cases.

Let us now come back to the charge brought by al-Sakhāwī against al-Maqrizī, and more particularly to his source, Ibn Ḥajar, as he clearly indicated that he owed his knowledge of the case to him. Given this fact, it seems likely that al-Sakhāwī read something about the plagiarism in Ibn Ḥajar’s writings. In three different places, Ibn Ḥajar devoted space to an account of al-Awḥadī’s work on the khiṭaṭ. The first account appears in his chronicle entitled Inbāʾ al-Ghumr:

---

20 See his biography in al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 9:150. He was born in 801/1399. Al-Sakhāwī cast doubt on his birth in that year, given that he already knew two books by heart at the age of 8. He died in 867/1462.

21 There is an evident play here on the double meaning of tashrīf: to bestow upon somebody the title of sharīf (descendant of the Prophet) or a robe of honor. In the first case, it is a clear reference to al-Maqrize’s alleged Fatimid ancestry. On this, see Paul Walker, “Al-Maqrizi and the Fatimids,” Mamlūk Studies Review 7 (2003): 83–97, particularly 86–87. On tashrīf in the second meaning, see Werner Diem, Ehrendes Kleid und erhendes Wort: Studien zu “tashrīf” in mamlūkischer und vormamlūkischer Zeit (Würzburg, 2002). The first meaning fits better given the beginning of that verse.


This Shihāb al-Dīn was passionately fond of history. He wrote a comprehensive draft on the topography of Miṣr and Cairo, parts of which he made into a fair copy. He did a useful work and in an excellent manner.

As is noticeable, Ibn Ḥajar did not say a word about al-Maqrīzī and the possible use he might have made of al-Awḥadī’s work. On the other hand, it confirms that al-Sakhāwī is quoting from his master’s work when speaking of al-Awhadi’s book, as the words provided here to describe it are found in the entry he devoted to him in his al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ.²⁴ Ibn Ḥajar’s silence on the affair persists in the second source, Dhayl al-Durar al-Kāminah.²⁵

His grandson, Shihāb al-Dīn, who had nice handwriting, compiled a book on the topography of Cairo on which he worked hard and which was in draft form when he died.

Here again, not a shadow of an accusation is to be found in Ibn Ḥajar’s report; but once more, this report can be identified as a source of al-Sakhāwī’s data (in the use of the phrase taʿiba ʿalayhi²⁶). However, Ibn Ḥajar became more explicit in the dictionary of his authorities, Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis, and revealed a bit more information:²⁷

He compiled notebooks in belles-lettres, among them the topography of Cairo. He worked hard on it, but it was in draft form when he died. His friend, the shaykh Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī, made use of it.

Ibn Ḥajar has hit the nail on the head: “he made use of it” (*intifaʿa a bi-hi*). Interestingly, it must be noted that al-Maqrīzī probably knew what Ibn Ḥajar said about this in the dictionary of his authorities, given that he had read his own biography in it. This is proven by the corrections he added in the margins of the autograph manuscript of *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis*.²⁸ It is not known whether Ibn Ḥajar asked al-Maqrīzī to read his own entry and make corrections, if necessary, or let him borrow his book upon its completion,³⁰ but al-Maqrīzī undeniably leafed through the pages.³⁰ It is likely that he would have failed to notice al-Awḥadī’s entry that lies just a leaf before (fol. 129b). If this is the case, he agreed with the fact that he “made use of it [al-Awḥadī’s draft of the *Khiṭaṭ*]” (*intifaʿa a bi-hi*), as he apparently did not modify Ibn Ḥajar’s text. Still, nowhere did Ibn Ḥajar say that al-Maqrīzī made a fair copy of it and then appropriated it, making some additions to it, as did al-Sakhāwī (*bayyadhā wa-nasabahā li-nafsihi maʿa ziyādāt*!)? Should we conclude that this charge is just the result of al-Sakhāwī’s intellectual envy towards someone who, even after his death, was still in the limelight? Truly, al-Sakhāwī managed to build his own reputation as a mudslinger, as he often dipped

---

²⁸ Cairo, al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah MS musṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 131a. This fact had not been noticed by the editor, al-Marʿashlī, who integrated these corrections in the text as if they were written by Ibn Ḥajar. The handwriting, though, is quite different. A critical edition of al-Maqrīzī’s and al-Awḥadī’s entries will be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this article. Al-Maqrīzī’s additions are identified in the picture by a frame and an arrow. It must be added that Ibn Ḥajar also added, at a later date, at the end of al-Maqrīzī’s marginal addition, some interesting data regarding his alleged Fatimid ancestry. These data had not been edited by al-Marʿashlī and were ignored by those who wrote on this subject.

²⁹ The actual copy was finished in Cairo on Thursday 16 Jumādá II 829/25 April 1426 (fol. 161a). Later on, Ibn Ḥajar added “save for what has been added after that” (*siwá mā ultuḥiqa fīhi baʿda dhālika*), which refers to the numerous marginal additions. It can thus be ascertained that al-Maqrīzī read his entry after 829/1426.

³⁰ His marginal notes are found on the following leaves: 11a (يوم) 12a (passage), 50a (الاثناء الثاني صح), 111b (عبد الله بن) 127a (الأربعاء, عدد الله بن) 137a (أخره النثأة, أخبزني الله عليه مما نسبه من ذكره) 128b (عيسى). One will conclude that al-Maqrīzī corrected mistakes and added data unknown to Ibn Ḥajar. Al-Sakhāwī noticed al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting, as he says in the biography he gave of al-Maqrīzī in his *Al-Tibr al-Masbūk* (1: 77): “wa-qad dhakarahu shaykhunā fī al-qism al-akhir min muʿjamī al-saleh waqaṣa saḥib al-tarjamah ‘alayhi.”

³¹ One will notice on the leaf (see Appendix 1), to the left of this information, an additional note consisting of a few words, which was later cancelled with circles that render the decipherment impossible nowadays (the note is identified in the picture by a frame). It is hard to say if this is even Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting. It could have been related to the question of plagiarism. I will come back to this note below.
his qalam in vinegar when depicting others. It can be said that he was not very fond of al-Maqrizī, as the following extract demonstrates:

He had a good memory for history, but his knowledge of the Ancients was tiny. This is why he often made mistakes in their names [phonetic distortions and slips of letters], and sometimes he misplaced the diacritical marks in the texts (matn). . . . As for the events of Islam, the knowledge of the transmitters and their names, the declaration of [their] dishonesty and integrity, [their] ranks, [their] lives, and all sorts of things which are part of the mysteries and beauties of history, he was incompetent. He had a limited knowledge of fiqh, hadith, and grammar.

This is a pretty harsh depiction, and it partly misled modern scholars who dealt with the charge of plagiarism he brought against al-Maqrizī because they considered that it was additional proof of al-Sakhāwī’s envy toward al-Maqrizī.

Given that al-Maqrizī is the accused in this affair, it would be interesting to know what he said about al-Awḥadī—his friend (rafīquhu), according to Ibn Ḥajar—and his work. In fact, he drew his portrait in two of his books. In his biographical dictionary devoted to Egypt, Al-Muqaffā, the only useful data is the following:

He compiled notebooks and copied [a lot] in his own hand. He was skillful in the Quranic readings, belles-lettres, and history.

---

33 Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 2:23.
In the dictionary of his contemporaries, *Durar al-Uqūd al-Faridah*, he is more loquacious on the issue:\(^{35}\)

He memorized a lot about history, particularly the history of Egypt, to such an extent that he hardly missed anything of the history of its rulers, caliphs, and amirs, of the events of its wars, the topography of its houses, and the biography of its notables... I have jotted down from him heaps of historical data, and I benefited from him a lot in the field of history. God assisted me in providing me with drafts in his own handwriting about the topography of Cairo that I incorporated in my comprehensive book entitled *Kitāb al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*. He also offered me the collection of his poems, which is a nice volume in his own hand.

Should we conclude, as some modern scholars have done, that al-Sakhāwī was liable to spin a yarn to bring such a scurrilous accusation? Here is how Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid appraised it:36

This confession . . . refutes the accusation brought by al-Sakhāwī and that many researchers have doubted. It confirms the malicious intent of al-Sakhāwī, who, in consulting al-Awhadi’s biography in al-Maqrizī’s Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīda, was only interested in the quotation and garbled al-Maqrizī’s words to give more weight to the accusation he brought against him.

Maḥmūd al-Jalīlī, who also dealt with the charge of plagiarism at about the same time as Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid, interpreted the data in a similar way:37

Furthermore, al-Sakhāwī had read the draft of al-Maqrīzī’s Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, given that he wrote on it: “Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī also consulted it and took advantage of it in 855,” as it appears on the published photograph and as [it is confirmed] by the fact that he borrowed from Durar al-ʿUqūd for several biographies in his book. This establishes a malicious intent of alteration and omission towards al-Maqrīzī, because there is a big difference between copying from the sources and making a fair copy of a complete book and then appropriating it.

Both authors, writing at the same time, considered al-Sakhāwī’s accusation to be a mere result of his “malicious intent” (sūʾ al-nīyah/al-qaṣd) given that, according to them, al-Sakhāwī made up the charge on the basis of al-Maqrīzī’s confession in his biographical dictionary. Al-Jalīlī stressed that a proof of this maliciousness can be seen in the note of consultation al-Sakhāwī wrote on the title page of the autograph of Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, as is visible here:

Courtesy Forschungsbibliothek (Gotha), MS or. 1771, fol. 1a

محمد المدعو عمر بن محمد بن فهد

| داعيا لمؤلفه بالبقاء ودوم الارتقاء العبد

| لله

الحمد لله || طالعه من أوله إلى آخره مستفيدا منه || داعيا لمؤلفه بالبقاء ودوام الارتقاء العبد
|| محمد المدعو عمر بن محمد بن فهد

الهاشمي المكي بها سنة ٩٣٨ [١٤٣٢-٣٢].

وقدما طالعه واستفاد منه || محمد بن عبد الرحمن السخاوي سنة ٨٥٥ [١٤٥١-٥٢].
To this, two rebuttals can be made. First, al-Sakhāwī also read what Ibn Ḥajar had written in his *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis* regarding the fact that al-Maqrīzī made use of al-Awḥadī’s draft on the *khiṭaṭ*, and this five years earlier, as is shown here: 38

He was thus fully aware of the story thanks to these two sources. Second, it must be emphasized that al-Sakhāwī implicitly acknowledged his awareness of al-Maqrīzī’s confession in the *Durar al-ʻUqūd al-Farīdah*, a point apparently disregarded by Sayyid and al-Jalīlī: 39

38 These reading notes were not published by the editor of this text, al-Mar’ashlī. The first reader, Taghrī Barmish, was the nāʾib al-qalʿah and Ibn Ḥajar’s student. Taghrī Barmish narrated a dream he had involving Ibn Ḥajar, on the same leaf, just above his reading note. This account, unpublished too, can be read in the biography of Ibn Ḥajar that al-Sakhāwī wrote, where he said he read it in one of his master’s works (i.e., *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis*). See al-Sakhāwī, *Al-Jawāhir wa-al-Durar*, 1:309–10. Al-Sakhāwī reveals in the same work that he managed to consult the manuscript of *Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis*, which was brought back by somebody else from Ibn Ḥajar’s house, and that he took note of the biographies mentioned there in a very short time (maybe four days), before returning it to his master. See ibid., 3:1019 (‘āda wa-al-muʾjam maʿahu fa-surirtu bihi kathiran wa-raja’tu min fawri fa-fakaktuhu min al-jīld wa-tajarradtu fa-katabtu minhu al-tarājim duʿāna al-asānīd ikṣīfa’īn bi-al-ṭāhir maʿa tambihī fi kull tarjamah ‘alā asmāʾ mā dhakara fīhā min al-marwīyāt wa-tamma fi ayyām yasīrah azūnumārīh arbaʿa wa-jītuhi bi-hi fa-qādā al-ʾajab min dhālikā wa-saʾalutu bi fīhrīst al-kitāb bi-khaṭṭīhi fa-faʿala).

And there are interesting details in his [al-Awḥādī’s] biography in al-Maqrīzī’s ʿUqūd [= Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah], [where] he [al-Maqrīzī] admitted that he took advantage of his drafts on the topography.

Furthermore, al-Sakhāwī never claimed that Ibn Ḥajar had reported the offense committed by al-Maqrīzī in his own writings. The only thing we are sure of is that he said that Ibn Ḥajar told him (qāla lanā shaykhunā). From this, it may be inferred that this was a testimony by word of mouth, transmitted by a master to his pupil. No doubt, al-Sakhāwī’s conviction was strengthened by what he read in al-Maqrīzī’s own handwriting in 855/1451–52, ten years after the latter’s death, though al-Maqrīzī did not confess he had plagiarized his colleague’s draft, but only that he had incorporated it into his own work. Consequently, Ibn Ḥajar’s oral disclosure was critical, as we will see. Now, the time has come to leave the world of conjecture and to bring forth evidence.

**The Evidence**

No autograph copies of the final version of al-Maqrīzī’s Khīṭat have been reported thus far. However, two volumes, probably out of four, of the first draft have been preserved. It must be stressed that it is quite rare that a draft of a first version would be preserved when a fair copy of a fuller version had been prepared and the book published; when a fair copy of a work had been made, there remained no reason for the draft (musawwadah) to survive. Once published, the draft usually disappeared on the author’s death, or even earlier if he destroyed it himself.

In this particular case, we can explain this idiosyncrasy by the fame gained by al-Maqrīzī during his own lifetime, which gave some value to his autograph manuscripts, even if they were drafts of works already published. After his

---

40 They are now held in the library of the Topkapı palace in Istanbul under the shelfmarks E. Hazinesi 1405 and Hazinesi 1472. The latter was published by A. F. Sayyid under the title *Musawwadat Kitāb al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-Ītibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭat wa-al-Āthār* (London, 1995).

41 This kind of auto-da-fé is documented for Shujāʿ ibn Fāris ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Dhuhlī al-Suhrawardī al-Ḥarīmī (d. 507/1113). A renowned copyist, he had written a supplement to al-Khāṭīb al-Baghdādī’s *Tārīkh Baghdad*, but he “washed” (ghasala) the manuscript when he knew that he would die (fī maraḍ mawtihi). By washing, it must be understood that the leaves were washed with water or that the book was immersed in water. In both cases, it caused the ink to fade and rendered the text illegible. In this case, no fair copy had been made. See al-Dhahabi, *Tārīkh al-Īslām*, ed. ‘Umar ‘Ābd al-Salām Tadmuri (Beirut, 1990–2000), 35:161.

42 Twenty-one holograph volumes representing twelve different works have been located so far.

death, they became collectibles.⁴³

Logically, as we are speaking of drafts, both volumes are holograph manuscripts from the first to the last leaf—with one exception. In the second volume (Topkapı Sarayi Kütüphanesi, MS E. Hazinesi 1405), nineteen leaves (82a–100b), corresponding to two quires⁴⁴ and dealing with the chapter devoted to the madrasahs, seem to bear both al-Maqrizi’s handwriting and a different one. The question is: does it correspond to the handwriting of a copyist hired by al-Maqrizi to produce a fair copy of this section? We know indeed that al-Maqrizi used a copyist for such a purpose at least once. At the end of his life, four years before passing away (841/1438), he hired a professional copyist⁴⁵ who was responsible for producing a fair copy of several small treatises, some of which al-Maqrizi had finalized during his last stay in Mecca in 839/1435–36.⁴⁶ He was less than satisfied with the work accomplished, as he revealed in the comment he added to some colophons.⁴⁷ In any case, the handwriting of that copyist does not match with the one found in the section under study in the draft of the Khiṭṭat. Furthermore, neither of the volumes representing the draft was in any way a definitive version, as is shown by the numerous additions in al-Maqrizi’s hand found on slips of paper, in the margins, or in the body of the text itself.

⁴³ There is no other way to explain why two of his notebooks would have survived. On autograph manuscripts as collectibles, see Houari Touati, L’Armoire à sagesse: bibliothèques et collections en Islam (Paris, 2003), 70–71.
⁴⁴ One leaf is obviously missing.
⁴⁵ The handwriting is clearly that of a clerk who worked at the chancellery. Some features are common with those found in documents produced at the same period. See, for instance, the closing formulas in the colophon on fol. 43a (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS or. 560).
⁴⁶ The MS is now in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS or. 560. It was accurately described for the first time by Reinart P. A. Dozy, “Notice sur le manuscrit 560 de la Bibliothèque de Leyde, contenant les Opuscules d’al-Makrizi,” in Notices sur quelques manuscrits arabes, ed. idem (Leyde, 1847), 17–28.
⁴⁷ For instance, fol. 61b: انتهى تصحيحه جيد الطلاقة مع كثرة سلم النسخة جامعه ومؤلفه أحمد بن علي المقريزي في شهر رمضان سنة إحدى وأربعين وثمانمائه

Al-Maqrizi would hardly have asked somebody to recopy these nineteen leaves if they were only a draft, as the rest of the manuscript is. In the following pages,

48 It must be remembered that none of the twenty-one autograph volumes mentioned earlier contains any handwriting other than al-Maqrizi’s—they are holograph manuscripts. The volume
I argue that this is al-Awḥadī’s handwriting and that these two quires must be regarded as the unique surviving part of the book he devoted to the topography of Cairo, a fact that will have consequences for the question of al-Maqrizī’s alleged plagiarism. In support of my allegations, I will produce several external and internal elements.

Thanks to Ibn Ḥajar, whose role was of the utmost importance in this affair, as we will see, we know that al-Awḥadī’s handwriting was a nice one (kāna hasan al-khaṭṭ). By this, we must understand that he probably had an almost calligraphic script, as opposed to the more common scholar’s naskh. Ibn Ḥajar wrote in a scholar’s naskh, as did al-Maqrizī, which means that the script was not so attractive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (İstanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fol. 97a: al-Maqrizī’s scholar’s naskh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other handwriting featured on these nineteen leaves may indeed be described as beautiful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (İstanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fol. 83a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One notices especially the final shape of the kāf (line 3: wa-dhālika) with its oblique stroke maintained and the curvy wāw. Some ligatures are also visible,

---


most notably in words ending in a tāʾ marbūṭah or hāʾ (line 1: al-madrasah, line 2: wazīruhu, line 3: al-shāfiʿiyah, al-mālikiyah, line 4: qāʾah, tilmīdhuhu). But establishing that this is a pretty script and that it therefore corresponds to Ibn Ḥajar’s description of al-Awḥadī’s handwriting does not suffice to establish the truth. Ideally, it should be compared with a sample of al-Awḥadī’s handwriting. Unfortunately, none of his autograph manuscripts are known to exist anymore,50 but five very brief specimens of his script are still found on title pages of manuscripts he owned or consulted.51 To these ownership and reading notes, he always appended the date, a practice also followed by his colleague, al-Maqrīzī.52 They are all reproduced here:

50 His holograph dīwān, given to al-Maqrīzī (see al-Maqrīzī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 1:186 [wa huwa fi mujaladah latifah bi-khattihi]), has not been discovered so far. Moreover, the resumé of the “Kitāb al-Ḥadāyā wa-al-Tuḥaf” (Afyon Karahisar, Gedik Ahmet Paşa Küttüphane Memurluğu, MS 17596), which is said to have been prepared by al-Awḥadī and later copied by Ibn Duqmāq, must in fact be attributed to Ibn Duqmāq. Al-Awḥadī only added a note to the original, complete manuscript of the “Kitāb al-Ḥadāyā wa-al-Tuḥaf,” and Ibn Duqmāq took note of it at the end of his resumé. The attribution to al-Awḥadī is due to a misunderstanding of the note in question and is imputable to the editor of the text, Muhammad Ḥamīd Allāh (who also wrongly attributed the book to al-Rashid ibn al-Zubayr): Kitāb al-Dhakhāʾir wa-al-Tuḥaf (Kuwait, 1959). The same mistake was repeated by the translator: Ghādah al-Ḥijjāwī al-Qaddūmī, Books of Gifts and Rarities (Kitāb al-Ḥadāyā wa-al-Tuḥaf): Selections Compiled in the Fifteenth Century from an Eleventh-Century Manuscript on Gifts and Treasures (Cambridge, Mass., 1996). For more detail about this, see my “From Draft to Palimpsest.”

51 These are: (1) Muḥammad ibn Hilāl al-Ṣābiʾ, “Al-Hafawāt al-Nādirah,” Topkapi Sarayi Küttüphanesi (İstanbul), MS Ahmet III 2631, fol. 137a (the text is known to me thanks to F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, 479, n. 4, where he states that the reading note is dated to 784/1382): طلبه أحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن الأوحدي بالقاهرة سنة ٤٨٧ (Wāḥi); (2) Ibn Ḥamdīs, “Dīwān,” Biblioteca apostolica vaticana (Vatican City), MS ar. 447, fol. 1a (طلبه أحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن الأوحدي بالقاهرة في جمادى الأولى سنة إحدى وثمان مائة); (3) Ibn Saʿīd, “Al-Mughrib fī Hulā al-Maghrib,” Dār al-Kutub al-Misrijyah (Cairo), MS tārikh 103 mim, fol. 1a (طلبه أحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن الأوحدي بالقاهرة في شهر رمضان المعظم من سنة خمس وثمان مائة); (4) al-Musabbiḥī, “Akhbār Miṣr,” Biblioteca de El Escorial (El Escorial) MS 534, fol. 132a (طلبه أحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن الأوحدي بالقاهرة سنة ٣٠٨); (5) al-Kindī, “Kitāb al-Wulāh wa-al-Qudāh,” British Library (London), MS add. 23.324, fol. 134a (الحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن) (الآحادي بالقاهرة في شهر رمضان المعظم من سنة خمس وثمان مائة). See also Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid, “Muqaddimat al-Muḥaqqiq” in al-Maqrīzī, Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār, 1:61–62.

52 To such an extent that al-Maqrīzī’s reading notes are found on the title pages of two manuscripts consulted earlier by al-Awḥadī. On al-Maqrīzī’s notes of consultation, see F. Bauden, “Maqriziana II,” 117–18, where a list is provided.
The following sample must also be considered to be in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting. It appears on the title-page of the copy of Ibn Ḥamdīs’ Diwān that al-Awḥadī owned (see ownership note above).

Courtesy Biblioteca apostolica vaticana (Vatican City), MS ar. 447, fol. 1a.
A comparison between these brief specimens and the handwriting appearing in the draft allows us to notice a great similarity. The word bi-al-Qāhirah being present twice in these reading notes, it can be compared with the same word in the section of the draft bearing a different handwriting, for which two occurrences are also found:

Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fols. 82a and 93a.

Once again, the resemblance is striking. However, any specialist in Arabic paleography knows perfectly well how difficult and dubious it is to authenticate somebody’s handwriting, even more so if the specimens compared are brief, as is the case here. To this prima facie evidence, it is thus necessary to bring forward other, internal, elements in order to corroborate the identification of this script as al-Awḥadī’s. For this purpose, we must now turn to a textual analysis.

While reading this section, one notices cross references to other parts of the work. The author obviously planned to write a section dealing with houses (al-ādur), and from the text it is understood that this section was to come after the one devoted to madrasahs. But in the final version of al-Maqrīzī’s Khiṭaṭ, the section on houses precedes the one on madrasahs. Though one could argue that, in the draft, al-Maqrīzī had yet to write down the section on houses and that he later modified the order, how can it be explained that, in the second reference, the author of this section refers to his forthcoming study of the house of Ibn Wakīl al-Wazīr al-Maʾmūn al-Baṭāʾiḥī and that this house is not even dealt with by al-Maqrīzī in his final version? If this is al-Awḥadī’s script, it means that either he did not finish the section on houses or that, more probably, al-Maqrīzī ignored his data, as will become clear later regarding some of the madrasahs. Another cross reference, on fol. 99b, mentions the construction of al-Azhar mosque, and in this case, the author indicates that he had already dealt with this subject and the question of courses taught in that place. Here again, the section is found neither

53 Fol. 87a: wa-sayaʾti dhikr dhālika in shāʾa Allāh taʿālá fī dhikr al-ādur; fol. 99a: wa-sayaʾti dhikr dhālika fī al-ādur.

in the draft nor in the final version. In this case too, al-Maqrizī did not bother with this cross reference made by al-Awḥadī, as he knew that he would produce a fair copy and that he could modify these references at that time.

Furthermore, several personal testimonies are found in this specific section, where the author confirms that he visited the monuments whose history he is detailing, in order to verify the historical facts reported in other books he used. For this, we can provide three enlightening examples.

On fol. 82b, one reads the following text:

It is striking that the first words of this paragraph, until alladhī, have clearly been rubbed out by al-Maqrizī, who replaced them with the convenient qāla al-muʿallif, an impersonal way to refer to himself, thus attributing to himself the following words. The author of these lines explains that he had the opportunity to see the document of the waqf of the said madrasah (al-Suyūfiyah) and that he read it, then giving details that corroborated what he declared at the beginning of the paragraph. Let us compare this text with the one appearing in al-Maqrizī’s final version of the Khiṭaṭ:

---

55 The draft just has a section entitled dhikr al-jawāmiʿ allatī tuqām bi-hā al-jumʿah (fol. 127a ff). That section has been reorganized in the final version.
The most conspicuous difference concerns his disregard of the name of the person who is supposed to have shown him the waqf document mentioned in the draft. We may wonder why al-Maqrīzī would have deleted such important data that would have confirmed his seriousness and scrupulousness, when he in fact resorted to this practice in other cases. The only possible interpretation is that al-Maqrīzī was reluctant to lie so explicitly about where he got his information (though the temptation to do so must have been strong); when he introduced al-Awḥadī’s account with the vaguer and less authoritative “qāla al-muʾallif,” he felt no qualms about appropriating it as his own work. The same is true for the following passage, even more disturbing:

I am referring here to the Būlāq edition, given that A. F. Sayyid replaced the text of the final version with the one found in the draft in his own edition of the Khīṭāt (London, 2002–4), 4:461.

Read فرحشاه.

A. F. Sayyid, Khīṭāt, renders the text in his edition in this way: الحمد لله وله توفيقي. One understands that he combined what he found in the draft with the reading given by the Būlāq edition, thus creating a new motto for Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn!
As can be seen, this passage is totally devoid of al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting. The author of these lines attests that he saw a copy of the Quran attributed to ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān in the madrasah al-Fāḍilīyah. If we compare this text with the one appearing in al-Maqrīzī’s Khitaṭ, it appears that, in this case too, al-Maqrīzī neglected to mention these personal data:

If this section of the draft was composed by al-Maqrīzī, why would he withdraw such personal testimonies (indicated here with an underline) in the final version? One final example will demonstrate that he did so because he was not at ease with material he had not written himself.

59 A. F. Sayyid partially replaced the text of the final version with the one found in the draft in his own edition of the Khitaṭ, 4:462.

Here is one more personal testimony attributable to the author of these lines where he states that he saw the document of the waqf of the madrasah al-Ṭaybarsiyah. Again, the comparison between the two texts is illuminating.

Once more, the personal data have disappeared in al-Maqrīzī’s version. This is upsetting because it betrays his determination never to refer to al-Awḥadī, as he could have simply introduced those words by qāla al-Awḥadī. Last but not least, a decisive element in my opinion lies in the names of persons with whom the author of these lines cultivated a disciple-master relationship, calling them shaykhunā. Considering the nineteen leaves, four names are characterized in this way: Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī (fols. 90a, 98b), Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī (fol. 90b), Fakhr al-Dīn al-Bilbaysī (fols. 90b, 98b), and Taqī al-Dīn al-Baghdādī (fol. 100a). If we consider those who were common masters of both al-Awḥadī and al-Maqrīzī, we find only two of them (al-Bulqīnī and al-ʿIrāqī). Moreover, the remaining two (al-Baghdādī and al-Bilbaysī) are explicitly listed as having played a major role in al-Awḥadī’s education, particularly in the field of Quranic readings, in which he excelled, but they do not appear in al-Maqrīzī’s curriculum.

---

60 A. F. Sayyid partially replaced the text of the final version in his own edition of the Khiṭat on the basis of what is found in the draft (4:536).


62 The four are mentioned by him in his dictionary of his contemporaries, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 2:421–42 (al-Bilbaysī, no. 726), 254–55 (al-Baghdādī, no. 584), 234–37 (al-ʿIrāqī, no. 563), 431–36 (al-Bulqīnī, no. 740). It is noteworthy that he devoted less space to the
He [al-Awḥādī] recited [the Quran] according to the seven, and
even the fourteen [readings] under the supervision of Taqī al-Dīn al-
Baghdādī. Likewise, for twelve years, he was inseparable from Fakhr al-Dīn
al-Bilbaysī, who was a master in this [field].

How, then, should we interpret the following passage, where two names are
provided?

Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fol. 90b.

The first one, Ibn al-Mulaqqin, is simply designated as al-shaykh, while the
second, Fakhr al-Dīn [i.e., al-Bilbaysī], as shaykhunā, although the latter does
not appear among al-Maqrīzī’s masters.63 However, about the first, al-Maqrīzī
declares:64

first two men, who were not his masters, than the last two who were. About al-Bulqīnī, he says
that he was “the most venerable man with whom I studied” (ajall man akhadhtu ‘anhu al-ʿilm).
Ibid., 2:434. It is also worth mentioning that al-Maqrīzī wrote down al-Bulqīnī’s death date on
the first leaf of the first preserved volume of his draft of the Khīṭāt (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi
(Istanbul), MS Hazinesi 1472, fol. 1a). See also the list of his masters established by al-Jalīlī on
the basis of the information provided by al-Maqrīzī in his biographical dictionary: al-Jalīlī, “Al-
Muqaddimah,” in al-Maqrīzī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 1:21–27 (neither al-Baghdādī
nor al-Bilbaysī appears in this list).

63 The fact that the author of these lines referred to his master only by his laqab is rather
illuminating, in that the author did not feel the need to clarify who his master was because this
was evident in his eyes.
64 Al-Maqrīzī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 2:431.

I was closely associated with him for several years and I studied with him numerous works he was authorized to transmit and several of his own books.

In this case, should he not have called Ibn al-Mulaqqin shaykhunā in his draft, rather than applying this title to a person with whom he never studied? Of course, there was no need for him to change these personal data particular to al-Awḥadī in the draft, as they would be modified in the final version.

Thanks to all these elements, we can establish that the fragment covering nineteen leaves preserved in al-Maqrīzī’s autograph draft is part of al-Awḥadī’s own draft of his book on the topography of Cairo. Yet, we still have to address the accusation of plagiarism brought by al-Sakhāwī (“he made a fair copy of it and attributed it to himself”). For this, it is necessary to consider how plagiarism, a rather modern concept, was understood in the historical context under consideration.

**Plagiarism: A Nebulous Concept or a Clearly Apprehended Notion?**

Though it is almost as old as literature, plagiarism remains a complicated issue. Conceptualized mainly during the modern period with the impulse of the Romantic movement, which promoted the vision of the inspired writer whose originality was interpreted in aesthetic words, the concept has seen its definition evolving through the ages. When used nowadays, it is understood with moral and aesthetic implications that were not necessarily valid in earlier times and different cultures. Plagiarism, in its modern meaning, may be defined as the act of appropriating, rather faithfully, a textual element written by another author, and doing this without acknowledgement. Moreover, the intent to deceive people into thinking that the borrowed text is the result of one’s own work is essential. Plagiarism nonetheless remains a hazy concept in literary terms. Nowadays, plagiarism in literature is better defined as intertextuality, meaning by this that

65 The Latin word “plagiarius,” designating a person who stole a slave or sold a free man as a slave, was used metonymically for the first time by the poet Martial (died in 104) for a person who had appropriated some of his verses. For Antiquity, see Anthony Grafton, “Plagiarism,” in Brill’s *New Pauly* (Leiden and Boston, 2007), 315. From the very beginning, the ideas of alienation and swindling were thus present. See Ch. Vandendorpe, “Introduction,” in *Le Plagiat: Actes du colloque tenu à l’Université d’Ottawa du 26 au 28 septembre 1991*, ed. Ch. Vandendorpe ([Ottawa], 1992), 7. The following book was not available to me before the publication of this article: *Remploi, citation, plagiat: Conduites et pratiques médiévales (Xe–XIIe siècle)*, ed. Pierre Toubert and Pierre Moret (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2009).

an author cannot help but find himself at the point where all his previous readings intersect, with each of them nurturing his ideas in their turn. In other fields, the term is perfectly well understood, and many universities around the world advise their students with regard to plagiarism and its negative effects. It is thus important to keep in mind the difference that exists between the concept with its literary meaning and its use in the other fields such as the scientific, philosophical, or historical ones.

Looking at the past with this modern definition in mind may lead some scholars to identify striking similarities, either in words or in ideas, in works composed by contemporary (or non-contemporary) authors and, on that basis, to charge one of them—usually the one who wrote later—with plagiarism. When he read the *Disputa de l’Ase* of Anselm Turmeda (ca. 1352–ca. 1424), Miguel Asín Palacios, who knew the *Rasā’il Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ*, immediately saw the resemblance between the story developed by Turmeda and the structure of the 28th epistle of the Brethren of Purity (“The Case of the Animals versus Man before the King of the Jinn”). He concluded that Turmeda had plagiarized the epistle and that, consequently, his work was not original. Recent research has shown that Turmeda had undoubtedly read the said epistle, but that “he took what he found useful in their work, adapted it to his own message and his intended audience.” In other words, this is a perfect case of intertextuality.

Such accusations expressed by modern critics towards medieval scholars exist for other fields too, such as history and the sciences. Regarding history, and particularly early Muslim history where the facts are reported on the basis of pieces of information (*khabar*) and traditions (*haddīth*) that by definition should not be considered as belonging to a given author, the case raised by J. Horovitz is indicative of this modern trend to identify such practices as plagiarism. Horovitz, following his predecessor, Wellhausen, noticed that al-Wāqidī and Ibn Isḥāq’s works shared identical reports both in content and shape, and he concluded that, given that al-Wāqidī never quoted Ibn Isḥāq in his book and that the latter wrote at an earlier date, al-Wāqidī consequently was guilty of plagiarism.

Speaking of my own experience, I have already identified some cases of plagiarism in M.A. theses I was asked to supervise. Furthermore, the University of Liège has recently made software available to professors that is supposed to detect plagiarism in the written material submitted by students.


reevaluated this assumption and concluded that if both versions were similar, this was the result of the kind of material available at their time. In other words, the story was transmitted by the *quṣṣāṣ*, and both authors shared a common corpus from which they selected the material they found interesting. Though they might slightly modify the form of the material (words, structure of the sentence), they usually did not alter the overall structure or content. Jones could establish, for instance, that al-Wāqīdī’s version was closer to the story as it was told by the *quṣṣāṣ* because it still contains the characteristics of the literary processes used by these storytellers, which have been reduced by Ibn Isḥāq in his own version. In any case, the charge of plagiarism was out of context, once again.

Similarly anachronistic statements have also been made regarding scientific texts. In the field of medicine, the case recently publicized by Khader Musa is interesting. A comparison between two texts—the *Kitāb Khalq al-Janīn wa-Tadbīr al-Ḥabālah wa-al-Mawlūdīn* of ‘Arīb ibn Sa’īd al-Qurṭubī (d. 370/980) and the *Siyāsat al-Ṣibyān wa-Tadbiruhum* of Ibn al-Jazzār (d. 369/979 or 360/970)—led him to conclude that 90% of the contents of the latter could be identified in the former, and this without quoting Ibn al-Jazzār at any time. On the basis of the similarity he found in the contents and the fact that he tracked down one identical passage from the *Siyāsat al-Ṣibyān* in the *Kitāb Khalq al-Janīn*, Musa reckoned that al-Qurṭubī had plagiarized his contemporary’s work, a charge that nobody had dared to put forward during the author’s lifetime, or any time thereafter.

As in every case, the key elements that drive modern scholars to charge medieval authors with plagiarism are: similarity in either expression or content, the absence of reference to the “plagiarized” source (which points to intellectual dishonesty of the “plagiarist”), and the desire to deceive the reader by pretending that the “plagiarist” is the real author of the book. This is the typically biased view that results from a comparison between two books produced in a given period of the past, judged by a definition of a concept that cannot but be anachronistic when applied to the period in which the said “plagiarism” is detected. Undoubtedly,

---


72 Ibid., 51: “A more acceptable theory would be that the greater part of the *sirah* was already formalized by the second century A.H. and that later writers shared a common corpus of *qāṣṣ* and traditional material, which they arranged according to their own concepts and to which they added their own researches.”


74 Ibid., 127.

75 As regards literature, see M. Peled, “On the Concept of Literary Influence in Classical Arabic
when dealing with books written in these times, an accusation of plagiarism remains controversial. In order to apprehend the phenomenon of plagiarism correctly, it is thus essential to try to understand how it was perceived in the context we are dealing with, i.e., the pre-modern Muslim culture. We have seen that there may be a difference in the way it was apprehended in literature and the non-literary fields, and we will therefore evaluate both situations independently.

As theorized by Muslim authors of the pre-modern period, plagiarism in literary criticism was a concept expressed through the word *sariqah*. In this sense, it was mainly used for poetry and, to a lesser extent, epistolography. Though many works have been devoted to this theme from an early period onwards, a clear theory of what *sariqah* meant was never really developed. Several works tried to categorize the different genres and the broader limits of plagiarism in poetry, but they resulted in a quite complicated and wide-ranging taxonomy of various kinds of “borrowings,” from crude plagiarism to creative borrowing. Even if crude...

---

Litany Criticism,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 11 (1991): 37: “A discussion of the concept of literary influence in classical Arabic literature has to contend with several obvious difficulties. First, the very notion as conceived by present-day criticism was unknown to the Arab critics, just as it was unknown to their Greek predecessors, whose ideas on intertextual relations are often discernible in Arabic critical thinking. Consequently the phenomenon of literary influence is never explicitly discussed in Arabic works dealing with problems of poetics. If, in spite of this difficulty, we can attempt to reconstruct their attitude toward it, it is because the results of such influence are nevertheless apparent in Arabic poetry. This was recognized by the medieval critics within another conceptual framework, namely, that of plagiarism (*al-sariqah al-adabīyah*).”

For a very broad presentation of plagiarism in poetry and a good bibliography, see W. Heinrichs, “Sariqa,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, Supplement*, fascicles 9–10, 707–10.

W. Heinrichs, “An Evaluation of Sariqa,” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 5–6 (1987): 357: “One of the favorite pastimes of the medieval critic of arabic literature was to hunt for *sariqāt* (“thefts,” “plagiarisms”) in the works of the poets and, to a lesser extent, the epistolographers.”


See W. Heinrichs, “An Evaluation of Sariqa,” 367: “By now it will have become abundantly clear that the *sariqāt* literature is less important to us for what, on the surface, it purports to be, namely collections of plagiarisms.”

With several technical words being applied to each of these kinds of “borrowings.” For this, see specially the work of S. A. Bonebakker on al-Ḥātimi (d. 998): “Sariqa and Formula: Three Chapters from Ḥātimi’s *Hilyat al-Muhāḍara*,” *Annali dell’Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli* 46 (1986): 367–89; “Four Chapters from the *Hilyat al-muhāḍara*—Arabic Texts,” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 17 (1999): 29–52. See also his “Ancient Arabic Poetry and Plagiarism: a Terminological Labyrinth,” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 15 (1997): 65–92; and A. Sanni, “From Value Judgment to Theoretical Formalism: The Development of Arabic Theory on Sariqa (Plagiarism),” *Proceedings of the 1989 International Conference on Europe and the Middle East held at the University of Durham,*
plagiarism existed (quotation word for word of the verse[s] of another poet), most of the forms it took encompassed a broad range of literary devices, from borrowing to quotation through evocation, to cite just a few. The idea of blameworthiness conveyed by the word *sariqah* (“theft”) was however not instinctive in the mind of those who used that term. Some kinds of *sariqah* were laudable, others reprehensible. Hence the development of the concept of *akhdh*, more neutral, and also divided into two ethical categories: laudable and blameworthy.\(^\text{81}\) Arab critics who devoted their time to identifying and classifying the borrowings in poetry relied on a binary system: that of the *lafz* (expression) and *maʿná* (poetical idea). If the poetical ideas were considered to be common property, the way they were expressed by a poet was regarded as personal and thus not permissible to be copied and reused in the same context.\(^\text{82}\) Furthermore, *sariqah* was never considered from the legal point of view, as Islamic law does not recognize any legal value for the “theft” of intellectual property.\(^\text{83}\) Nonetheless, it remains true that “the idea of intellectual property seems to have been well developed.”\(^\text{84}\) To conclude with this part, *sariqah* in literary criticism, as conceptualized by Arab critics of classical literature, does not fully equate with the word “plagiarism.” Most of the cases registered by the treatises on *sariqah* have to do with what is now called intertextuality, though this was not expressed in those terms by Arab critics. However, they knew that a poet or a littérateur is inspired by his previous readings and cannot avoid the repetition of a theme or a metaphor.\(^\text{85}\)


\(^\text{83}\) It must be remembered here that in Western law, intellectual property was not recognized as such before the end of the eighteenth century (France, arrêts du Conseil du Roi, 30 August 1777), and was not protected by copyright before the end of the nineteenth century (the Bern convention of 1886). Even in this case, jurists prefer to speak of counterfeit rather than plagiarism. See A. Lucas, “Plagiat et droit d’auteur,” in *Le Plagiat*, 199–200.

\(^\text{84}\) W. Heinrichs, “Sarika,” 707. The idea of the consciousness of intellectual property in Islam was expressed for the first time, as far as I know, by G. Schoeller, “Die Anwendung der oral poetry-Theorie auf die arabische Literatur,” *Der Islam* 58 (1981): 222. For al-Ḥātimi’s point of view, see also Sanni, “The Arabic Theory,” 42–43: “He [al-Ḥātimi] dismisses the argument that all poetical ideas are common property and are therefore not subject to copyright. If this were so, he argues, al-Aʿshā (d. 7/629) would not have been imprisoned for his alleged appropriation of a work by another poet.”

\(^\text{85}\) Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d. 395/1005) underwent such a situation: “This is something I have experienced myself and about which I have no doubt. Namely, I had composed something to
as we use the term nowadays, should rather be reserved for crude or slavish copying.\textsuperscript{86}

If seldom established in literary works, especially poetry, this baser form of plagiarism is more likely to be recurrently used in the other fields of non-literary texts (hadith, history, sciences, etc.). And this is more pertinent for our purposes because the concept of intertextuality can hardly be invoked as a justification in these cases. Historical facts, for instance, would never be considered an author’s intellectual property, but the words he chose to recount these facts could. We will see whether, in these cases, an author who slavishly copies from another without quoting his source is regarded as a plagiarist. It has repeatedly been said that authors in Islam very often quoted sources without paying their dues, i.e., citing the author or the title from which they were borrowing, but whether this behavior was evaluated, and if so in what manner (positively, neutrally, or negatively) has not really been approached from the point of view of the authors of these periods. For this, we will have to consider the evaluations and examples collected in several books dating to the period under consideration (eighth–ninth/fourteenth–fifteenth c.) and belonging to different genres, mainly hadith works, history and sciences.

The field of traditions (hadith) might appear to have eluded such practices, but the sources give a different picture. Here is what a renowned specialist of the field, al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348), had to say about \textit{sariqah} with regard to hadith works:\textsuperscript{87}

describe women and said: ‘\textit{safarna budūran wa-intaqabna ahlatā.’} I came to believe that nobody had already combined these two metaphors until I exactly found them [under the pen] of an author of Baghdad. I was really surprised and decided that I would never at all charge any modern poet of plagiarism regarding one of his predecessors” (“\textit{wa-hādhā amr qad ‘araftuhu min nafṣī fa-lā amtari fihi wa-dhālika anni kuntu ‘amiltu shay’an fi ẓifat al-nisā’i fa-qultu ‘safarna budūran wa-intaqabna ahlatā’ wa-zanantu anni lam usbaq ilā jam′ hādhayn al-tashbīhayn ḥattā wajadtu dhālika bi-‘aynihi li-ba’d al-baghdādiyyin fa-kathura ta‘ajjubī wa-tazamtu ‘alā allā ʾakhkum ‘alā al-muta’akkhir bi-al-sariqah min al-mutaqaddim ḥukman ḥatman’”). See al-Qalqashandi, \textit{Ṣubḥ al-Aʿshá fi Ṣināʿat al-Inshā’} (Cairo, 1913–20, reprint 1963), 2:303.


\textsuperscript{87} Al-Dhahabi, \textit{Tārīkh al-Islām}, 17:140.
Ibn Maʿīn said: “This [transmitter, i.e., al-Ḥusayn ibn Faraj], we know that he plagiarized traditions. I [al-Dhahabī] say: ‘The plagiarism of traditions is less considerable than forging or inventing them. It consists in that a traditionist is the only one to transmit a given tradition, then the plagiarist comes and pretends that he heard it too from the same master. This is not similar to the plagiarism of the ajzāʾ [small compendia of hadith] and the books: this is far more disastrous than the plagiarism of the transmission, which is less wicked than the forgery of tradition because of his saying: “To tell a lie on my behalf does not equal a lie told on behalf of someone else.”’”

This very interesting passage posits several perceptions of the word sariqah not necessarily encountered so far in the context of literary texts. Thanks to it, we learn that traditionists identified people who attributed to themselves traditions that were known to be transmitted by only one person. This is similar to the appropriation of someone else’s intellectual property. However, it was regarded as less egregious (ahwan) than the forgery of traditions, which is more blameworthy because it implies that a lie is forged and put in the mouth of the Prophet. Obviously, to “steal” a tradition from someone who is its only transmitter is more easily forgiven. For the sake of understanding, al-Dhahabī wanted to make intelligible that there existed another kind of appropriation of someone else’s words that was more harmful than the “theft” of a tradition: the plagiarism (sariqah) of works. Even speaking of ajzāʾ—the compendia of traditions (often on a certain theme) collected by a transmitter, which necessarily consisted only of hadiths and thus greatly obscured the transmitter’s authorial voice—al-Dhahabī considered that to copy it and appropriate it was tantamount to an act of plagiarism. Authorship is nevertheless clearly discernible in these compendia because the transmitter selected those traditions, put them in a given order, and sometimes

appended a commentary for a difficult word found in a given tradition. Moreover, the personal approach is conspicuous in the isnād, which is very individualized. Of course, he added that books (kutub) could be the subject of the same treatment, but this is far more to be expected. In al-Dhahabī’s perception of the phenomenon, one understands that, on an ethical scale, crude plagiarism (of compendia or books) is situated beneath the forgery of traditions (the worst) and above the appropriation of someone else’s traditions (the least of all).

This perception concerning crude plagiarism emerges when reading the biography of a renowned ‘ālim who was mainly a traditionist: Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d. 804/1401). Here is what a Syrian historian, himself a traditionist, had to say about him:

After that, he wrote numerous books, but the Egyptians accuse him of plagiarism in his works. Indeed, he did not attend anything, he did not study thoroughly, and he composed many works in the sense that he copied the books of others.

What several authors reproached Ibn al-Mulaqqin for was the fact that his numerous works, amounting to more than three hundred, could only be produced in such quantities because he composed them by stealing what others had already written. We understand that Ibn al-Mulaqqin’s books were not necessarily completely borrowed from others, but that the material he put in them mainly stemmed from others’ production. One of Ibn Ḥajar’s comments enlightens us in this matter. It is reported by al-Sakhāwī in the biography he devoted to his

---


90 Cf the words he used: anḥas (calamitous) and ithm (sin).

master, in a section entitled “Those who appropriated someone else’s work and attributed it to themselves, adding or cutting out insignificant material, but the majority being mentioned in the words of the original.” This section contains several cases of “plagiarism” or “borrowing” that Ibn Ḥajar could track down. Al-Sakhāwī gives the data regarding Ibn al-Mulaqqin on the basis of a note in Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting found on a supplement (dhayl) Ibn al-Mulaqqin wrote to his Tabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyah:^

I saw in his handwriting found on a Supplement of his master Ibn al-Mulaqqin... what follows:

“I examined this book from its beginning to its end and compared all the biographies it contains with Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Wusṭā of the judge Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī. I found that almost everything is copied, word for word, from it. Likely, the small amount of additional material does not exceed ten biographies.”

As is noticeable, Ibn Ḥajar’s comment, written directly on a copy of this book, does not characterize Ibn al-Mulaqqin’s borrowing as plagiarism (sariqah). But for someone who reads between the lines, that is precisely what he is saying. Hence al-Sakhāwī’s remark.:

---

^92 Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Jawāhir wa-al-Durar, 1:391.

^93 Al-Sakhāwī explains, a few lines later (ibid., 392), that he managed to lay hands on a copy of Ibn al-Mulaqqin’s Tabaqāt in the handwriting of someone who was acquainted with Ibn Ḥajar. The first volume consisted of the Tabaqāt while the second contained, among other things, the Dhayl Ibn Ḥajar examined. Al-Sakhāwī found Ibn Ḥajar’s comment on that copy.

^94 Ibid., 392.
I remained astonished at my master’s purpose in this matter. It would not have harmed him if he had said in his comment: “He gleaned it from the work of one of his predecessors.” Did he think that Tāj al-Dīn’s Ṭabaqāt would be buried with its author in his grave and would not be published? And that he would not have yet authorized another copy to be made? That is really strange!

Even though al-Sakhāwī never speaks of plagiarism (sariqah) because the work contained some additional—albeit limited—original material, he considered that his master’s judgment was too neutral and that he should have been more explicit in order to reveal Ibn al-Mulaqqin’s bad behavior. Interestingly, his comment also demonstrates that a deceit such as this one would have been unmasked sooner or later, as copies usually survived their author and were always likely to be compared with someone else’s work.

In the given section of Ibn Ḥajar’s biography, al-Sakhāwī lists further cases of appropriation noticed by his master, most of the latter’s comments having been found written on the incriminated books. In none of these comments does Ibn Ḥajar refer to the appropriation with the word “sariqah,” and his tone always remains almost neutral, with no hint of a moral judgment. He simply exposed what was wrong in the way they acted: the books they produced were just a collection of passages borrowed from others without quoting them; the material they added or omitted was insignificant in comparison with the amount of data they took from others; they copied almost word for word; and, finally, they deceived others by saying that this was their original work. Only once did he pour out his feelings about such behavior. Describing what al-Birmāwī (d. 816/1413) had done in a particular case, he declared: “This does not advance knowledge!”

If Ibn Ḥajar was reluctant to use the word “sariqah” (plagiarism) in such cases, his remarks nevertheless imply that he did not at all appreciate the way these authors acted. His assessment of one of his colleague’s books further corroborates that he felt this way even for verbatim quotations of passages without referring to the source, a practice generally observed in those days. This assessment, which

---

95 Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Jawāhir wa-al-Durar, 1:394 (“wa-laysa dhālik min shukr al-ʿilm”).
brings us to the historical field,\(^{96}\) refers to al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451) and his *ʿIqd al-Jumān*, and Ibn Ḥajar placed it at the beginning of his chronicle entitled *Inbāʾ al-Ghumr*:\(^{97}\)

I have consulted for it the *History* of the judge Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-ʿAynī, who mentioned that he based himself on the *History* of Ibn Kathīr, and that is indeed the case. However, when Ibn Kathīr[’s *History*] ends, he relied mainly on the *History* of Ibn Duqmāq, to such an extent that he uninterruptedly copied almost a full page from it, sometimes following him blindly in his mistakes, even his grammatical mistakes like “*akhlaʿa ʿalá fulān.*” Even stranger, Ibn Duqmāq mentions that he witnessed an event, and al-Badr [al-ʿAynī] blindly reproduces his words although this event happened in Cairo while he [al-ʿAynī] was far away from it, in ʿAyntāb. I have not busied myself with following his slips. Rather, I copied from him things I believe he was aware of, things I did not witness myself but he did, and that were not at my disposal [elsewhere].

Even if this criticism must be gauged in the light of an academic rivalry between both scholars, as A. Broadbridge stressed,\(^{98}\) this passage is remarkable because it can be placed in a broader context, i.e., all the other cases Ibn Ḥajar tried to track down: as such, it definitely confirms his own apprehension, in negative terms, of the phenomenon.


Al-Maqrīzī himself did not refrain from revealing the bad behavior of colleagues, and his reaction is just as significant.\(^9\)

He [Ibn Duqmāq] limited himself to copying what he found to such an extent that those who know the truth have accused him of negligence. Among this is that he borrowed my notebooks. When he died, I found the history of Timur Lang the tyrant in his handwriting and there, he had copied a section related to the seizure of Aleppo by Timur that I had written, where I said: “An unsuspicious person informed me that he witnessed” and he had written what he saw “An unsuspicious person informed,” making the reader believe that he was the person who was telling this section though, by God, he did not find this section but in my handwriting.

In al-Maqrīzī’s words, the appropriation of one of his texts, quoted word for word, without even modifying passages considered to be personal, was tantamount to negligence (ghaflah).\(^10\) If he was disturbed by the discovery of his own words attributed to someone else, he was more upset by seeing that a fact that was transmitted to him by a trustworthy informant, some sort of a scoop, was “stolen” from him because Ibn Duqmāq used the same words to introduce the informant. In this way, Ibn Duqmāq was becoming another possible source for this matter. Moreover, a comparison of both works would have raised the question of plagiarism and the conclusion reached by a reader would have been disadvantageous to al-Maqrīzī because he was younger than Ibn Duqmāq and

---


\(^10\) The same word is used to define the way Ibn al-Furāt acted with the same section on Timur Lang: “thumma baʿ da dhālik shāḥadtu fi al-ghaflah aʾ jāb mīn dhālik wa-huwa anna . . . Ibn al-Furāt kataba tārīkh kabīr . . . wa-yanqul uʾ anhu fi tārikhihi kathīran. Fa-lammā māta waqafa tārīkhī baʿ da dhālik bi-khāṭṭī bi-minhu hādhā al-mawdī biʾ aynīhi wa-qad katabahu innā min khaṭṭ Ibn Duqmāq qaw waqafa “alā khaṭṭī ʾinda huwa aydān: akhrar man lā attahīm.” Fa-ṣāra al-mawdī biʾ khaṭṭ Ibn al-Furāt yahsabu annahu huwa rāwī al-juzʾ aydān wa-mā dhāka illā ghaflah.” Ibid.
more likely to have borrowed it from his predecessor.

From all this, we may conclude that authors of non-literary texts were acquainted with the concept of plagiarism in the sense that a text appropriated by someone else is sometimes slightly modified but, nevertheless, remains identifiable for a vigilant mind. It became a pastime for several authors of the Mamluk period to recognize such hoaxes. Sometimes, they were themselves the victims and did not appreciate that the result of several years of thorough study could be stolen by a dilettante. In such cases, their reaction could be measured, as with Ibn Ḥajar, or vehement, as with al-Sakhāwī or al-Maqrīzī. An author like al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) went further and did not refrain from publicly denouncing another author he accused of having plagiarized several of his works. The title and several passages of his book clearly refer to the theft and the thief as sariqah and sāriq respectively, demonstrating that he understood that the appropriation of his personal work, slightly modified or not, was plagiarism and the author of this act was a plagiarist.

At this point, we probably need to make a distinction between two different situations. The first is the quotation of passages in the body of a work considered as original without referring to the source. Though not appreciated, it appears that this was a rather common practice at all times. But, in this matter, there was undoubtedly a difference between a book written several decades or centuries before and another one published by a contemporary. Old books were considered a common heritage and as such could be plundered without paying one’s debts towards their authors. Older sources sometimes circulated for several centuries and were consequently widespread and known to the general readership. Anyone

102 In the field of the sciences, which was no exception in this matter, a similar example may be quoted. This is the Faʿalta fa-Lā Talum (You have done it, so do not condemn) of Qūṭ al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d. 710/1311), who wrote this treatise partly to denounce the fact that his contemporary, Muḥammad ibn ʿAli al-Himādhi, had substantially plagiarized his Al-Tuhfah al-Shāhiyyah. See J. Ragep, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī’s Memoir on Astronomy (al-Tadhkira fi ʿilm al-hay’a) (New York, 1993), 1:60. I wish to express my thanks to the author for pointing me to this example.
103 Cf. Charles Nodier’s words: “Le plagiat commis sur les auteurs modernes, de quelque pays qu’ils soient, a déjà un degré d’innocence de moins que le plagiat commis sur les anciens.” Ch. Nodier, Questions de littérature légale (Paris, 1828), 4 (quoted by Ch. Vandendorpe, “Introduction”, in idem, Le Plagiat, 8). Cf. the attitude of some websites where electronic copies of copyrighted works and manuscripts are put at the disposal of everybody because they are considered to be part of a cultural heritage and as such waqf lillāh. An instance of this attitude as regards ancient material can be given for al-Maqrīzī, who extensively exploited al-Kindī’s works, as well as Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam’s Kitāb Futūḥ Mīṣr and Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-Abṣār, without quoting the source in most cases. For al-Kindī, see in particular G. Wiet, “Kindī et Maqrīzī,” Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale 12 (1916): 61–73.
sharing a common cultural heritage could identify the sources without problem, and in this sense, the phenomenon was in no way comparable to plagiarism: the idea of deceit was generally absent. On the other hand, contemporary works took time to be circulated and become well-known. They could be defended by their own authors or their disciples and were regarded as a personal work normally to be quoted with full attribution. The second situation is the slavish copying and appropriation of somebody else’s work by a later author, whether or not he made additions to it, a practice most of the authors condemned. The terms they chose to express their discontent with the phenomenon varied greatly, from the explicit *sariqah* or neutral *akhdh* to a more ambiguous *ghaflah*. Nevertheless, they always referred to the same practice, to be identified as plagiarism.

As Ibn Ḥajar is the central witness in the case at the core of this article, what would he have thought of al-Maqrīzī’s plagiarism of al-Awḥādi, given that we can now speak of plagiarism in the light of the aforesaid elements? What Ibn Ḥajar saw in this part of the draft is: that al-Maqrīzī took al-Awḥādi’s draft and erased some parts of the text that he then replaced with his own words, to establish that he was the author of these words, as is discernible in the introductory part of the section on the madrasahs; that he modified the personal references made by al-Awḥādi, as is conspicuously evident on fol. 82b where he erased some words and replaced them with *qāla al-muʾallif*; that in most cases he copied al-Awḥādi’s words almost verbatim, without citing him in his final version; finally, a close analysis of the layout of this section, I mean the order in which the madrasahs are enumerated, shows conclusively that al-Maqrīzī followed it almost exactly: only eight madrasahs appear to have been moved to another place in al-Maqrīzī’s plan, which means that he stuck to al-Awḥādi’s general organization of the section on buildings. This is another upsetting element.

Undoubtedly, it must have been worrisome for a colleague like Ibn Ḥajar to notice that the text composed by al-Awḥādi had been appropriated by his colleague al-Maqrīzī. However, in these conditions, it is better understood why al-Maqrīzī never referred to al-Awḥādi as an author in his *Khiṭat*, not even in the list of

104 See Appendix 3.

105 These are nos. 6, 9, 10, 11, 15, 25, 27, 67 according to their order of appearance in al-Awḥādi’s draft and nos. 24, 25, 31, 30, 26, 41, 62, 71 according to their order of appearance in the final version of the *Khiṭat*. Three additional madrasahs appearing in the draft have also been moved to another place in the final version, but these were added to al-Awḥādi’s draft by al-Maqrīzī and must not be considered here, given that al-Maqrīzī placed them where he found blank spaces in the draft.

106 Al-Maqrīzī mentioned al-Awḥādi only once for a *khabar* he transmitted to him on the authority of Ibn al-Furāt regarding the teaching sessions that took place in the mosque of ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ in Fustāṭ before 749/1348. Al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār*, Būlāq ed., 2:256 (see the Sayyid edition, 4:36, l. 22). The same *khabar* is given by al-Maqrīzī in al-Awḥādi’s entry in his
authors who preceded him in this field, a list that he placed in his introduction to the book. Sayyid recognized the unforgivable nature of this deliberate omission and noted that al-Maqrīzī should have mentioned al-Awḥadī’s contribution, as he did in al-Awḥadī’s biography in his biographical dictionary, *Durar al-Uqūd al-Farīdah*. Yet Sayyid justified al-Maqrīzī’s behavior by claiming that al-Awḥadī’s drafts at his death partly covered the material collected in al-Maqrīzī’s own drafts: in other words, when al-Maqrīzī took possession of these drafts, he would have noticed that they were nothing more than a miscellany of unorganized extracts (*amshāj min al-nuqūl ulṣiqat janbana ilā janbdina mā ayy tamḥīṣ*). Nonetheless, these extracts would have been indispensible for his own work, but rather than adding them to his own drafts, Sayyid argues that al-Maqrīzī would have gone back to the sources used by al-Awḥadī. Doing so, he was excused from quoting his name in the body of his work.

Sayyid’s argument belittles al-Awḥadī’s work: nowhere is it said that his book was just a collection of notes, cards, slips, and extracts. On the contrary, we know for sure that he had already made a fair copy of part of it and that, according to al-Maqrīzī himself, there were several volumes of drafts. Sayyid probably interprets the word *musawwadah* as designating a chaotic draft, but this was not the case. It already reflected the author’s intentions toward his book. Consequently, the rough draft was more than a bunch of notes. Proof of this is that such drafts were sometimes prized by later authors. Several examples corroborate that drafts surviving their authors could be deemed useful enough to be sold and later on exploited. The rough draft was often considered as a personal work and worth

---

107 See al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār*, Būlāq ed., 1:4–5. The same is true of Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407), another colleague with whom al-Maqrīzī was acquainted, and the author of an unfinished book dealing with the topography of Egypt entitled *Al-Intiṣār li-Wāsiṭat ʿIqd al-Amsār*. Vols. 4 and 5 of the autograph were discovered and published by K. Vollers in 1893 (Būlāq).


being quoted,\textsuperscript{111} even when a fair copy of the work existed.\textsuperscript{112} More relevant for our purposes, the rough draft could, in some cases, be fair-copied by someone else, a disciple or a colleague; this is what happened with al-Jawhari’s famous dictionary, \textit{Al-Ṣaḥāḥ}, which was still a draft when its author became convinced that he could fly like a bird and died as a result. A fair copy of the unrevised rough draft was prepared by his disciple, who was apparently less knowledgeable and introduced many mistakes.\textsuperscript{113}

Rough drafts were thus considered personal works in their own right, even though they were not published. They were valued as sources and quoted by others who did not hesitate to refer to them. Thus al-Maqrizi had several options at his disposal. He could have prepared a fair copy of al-Awhadi’s drafts, even cutting off some parts and adding others, but published it in the name of his colleague, as others did in such cases. This option was disregarded by al-Maqrizi, who rather decided to start his work on the \textit{khiṭaṭ} thanks to the material collected and already prepared by al-Awhadi, as I will demonstrate in the following pages. In this case, he could have quoted al-Awhadi’s draft, a solution adopted by several of his predecessors, but he chose not to do so. On the contrary, he completely obliterated al-Awhadi’s contribution to the field, except in the biography he devoted to him in his \textit{Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah}. However, his decision indicates his intent to deceive the readers of his \textit{khiṭaṭ}. Consequently, Sayyid’s justification hardly stands up, particularly in light of the section identified as being in al-Awhadi’s handwriting. Indeed, it shows that we are not dealing with disorganized cards bearing unverified data, in fact not even a mere draft.

\textbf{AL-AWHADI’S KHIṬAṬ: JUST A DISORGANIZED DRAFT?}

A close analysis of the section on the madrasahs allows us to establish several facts, thanks to the external and internal elements it contains.

First of all, it may be argued that al-Awhadi’s work on the madrasahs was at a fairly advanced stage at the time of his death. The section begins with a preamble in which the author explains how and when the madrasah was instituted for the first time and who introduced this institution in Egypt.\textsuperscript{114} Then, he proceeds...
with the list of the buildings arranged chronologically according to the year of foundation, starting with the Ayyubid period and proceeding further into the Mamluk period until the end of the eighth/fourteenth century.\footnote{115} For almost every building, data about the location, the name of the founder, the year of construction, the furnishings, the \textit{waqfs} dedicated by the founder, and the law schools to which it was devoted are provided. The section ends with an appendix dealing with the lessons that were also organized in the various mosques in Cairo, which demonstrates that, in al-Awḥadi’s mind, the section on madrasahs dealt essentially with teaching.

Additionally, this section clearly indicates that al-Awḥadi’s work was more than just miscellanies on the topic. In truth, it probably represents the partial fair copy referred to by Ibn Ḥajar and al-Sakhāwī, a fact confirmed by the following passage:

\begin{quote}
Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fol. 90b.

مقدم المماليك السلطانية الأشرفية ووقفها على الإخريجية الشافعية

In this passage, the first occurrence of the word \textit{al-ashrafīyah} was right, but it was repeated a few words further on instead of \textit{al-shāfiʿiyah}, a mistake he noticed immediately given that he had not even had the time to add all the diacritical dots. He drew a line through the word and wrote at its end the correct reading. This phenomenon (\textit{homoioiteleuton}), typical of the copying process, shows that al-Awḥadi was clean-copying his text.

Thus, al-Awḥadi’s work was far from being a draft or a collection of disorganized quotations. The author organized the material according to the date of foundation, as already stressed above, numbered the buildings accordingly,\footnote{116} and used red illustrated on p. 176.

\footnote{115} This chronological order is somewhat disrupted at the end with two madrasahs going back to the Ayyubid period that Ibn ‘Abd al-Zahir did not mention in his work, \textit{Al-Rawdah al-Bahiyyah}, though he should have, according to al-Awḥadi (fols. 98b–99b: al-Madrasah al-Nabulusiyah (\textit{lam yadhkurhā Ibn ‘Abd al-Zahir}); al-Madrasah al-Kuhāriyah (\textit{wa-lam yadhkurhā Ibn ‘Abd al-Zahir fi kitābihī wa-hīya mīn sharīthī}).

\footnote{116} In its current state, the manuscript bears only a few figures placed in front of the names of the madrasahs, starting with no. 3 up to no. 10, then no. 13, where it stops. The fact that the first numbers and those between 10 and 13 are missing may be explained by the fact that they were
ink to write their names. His sources are quoted in the body of the text, while no marginal note in his handwriting nor any addition on a slip of paper is found in the section. Nevertheless, in some cases, he left blank spaces at the end of a building for future additions. In summary, the text is the result of a preliminary version, but it obviously shows that the author intended to revise it in the future. Cross references also confirm that the author had already written more than this section by the time he clean-copied it. He indicates that the section on mosques had already been dealt with¹¹⁷ and that the one on houses was still to come or to follow, meaning by this that he had already written it in draft form.¹¹⁸

Finally, this preserved section proves that al-Awḥadī used several kinds of sources: works by predecessors, oral witnesses, documents, and visits to the monuments described. With all these he was very critical, in that he always tried to corroborate second-hand data with primary information such as documents or inscriptions.

Furthermore, an analysis of the text in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting reveals that his book must have been particularly detailed. Through the comparison of this section with the equivalent in the final version of al-Maqrīzī’s Khiṭaṭ, we notice that the latter decided, quite strangely, not to take advantage of all the material he had at his disposal: 72 madrasahs were recorded by al-Awḥadī¹¹⁹ against 72 by al-Maqrīzī.¹²⁰ Yet, 23 madrasahs present in al-Awḥadī’s census were omitted by al-Maqrīzī, which means that he replaced them with new ones: in fact, those built mainly after al-Awḥadī’s death (811/1408).¹²¹ If the entirety of al-Awḥadī’s Khiṭaṭ was as detailed as this surviving part is, then we can only imagine how many buildings al-Awḥadī recorded in the remaining parts of his book and that presumably rubbed out by al-Maqrīzī. The lack of figures after no. 13 is either due to al-Awḥadī himself, who decided not to use this system until the end of the section, or must be attributed to al-Maqrīzī, who erased them in the same way he likely did at the beginning. Only a material analysis of the manuscript could reveal this.


¹¹⁸ On one occasion, he referred to this section in the past (fol. 86a): “kamā qaddamnā sharḥahu fī dhikr al-ādur.” In the other cases, he always mentioned it in the future (fol. 87a): “wa-sayaʾti dhikr dhālik in shāʾa Allāh taʿālá fī dhikr al-ādur” (the whole sentence has been cancelled with a stroke in red ink by al-Awḥadī himself); (fol. 99a) “wa-sayaʾti dhikr dhālik fī al-ādur.”

¹¹⁹ This figure does not include the eleven buildings added by al-Maqrīzī to al-Awḥadī’s manuscript.

¹²⁰ Actually, al-Maqrīzī listed 73 buildings, but his list includes a duplication (nos. 20 and 58: al-Madrasah al-Muhadhthhabiyah; see Appendix 3).

¹²¹ It must also be said that al-Maqrīzī overlooked six of the eleven madrasahs he added to al-Awḥadī’s work!
al-Maqrizī decided to omit in his own work\textsuperscript{122}

In light of what has been substantiated and of other elements to be considered shortly, another question arises, one which might have an answer as disturbing as the fact just established: when did al-Maqrizī start working on the topography of Cairo? Or, more perniciously, did he hit upon the idea of writing a book on this topic before al-Awḥadī’s death, as is generally believed, or afterwards, upon acquiring his deceased neighbor’s draft?

**Dating the Draft of al-Maqrizī’s *Khīṭaṭ***

In order to try to answer this question, a chronologically arranged list of his writings would be necessary. Unfortunately, such a list does not exist, although proposals could be made on the basis of the autograph manuscripts and other elements.\textsuperscript{123} Meanwhile, we must rely on the facts at our disposal, and these are al-Maqrizī’s biographical data, dated references in *Al-Khīṭaṭ*, dated notes in the autograph draft of the first version, and the order of the data on some leaves therein.

The earliest date referred to in the final version of the *Khīṭaṭ* is 818/1415, seven years after al-Awḥadī’s death, and the last one is 843/1439; it is generally assumed that al-Maqrizī composed this work between 1415 and 1424.\textsuperscript{124} But before composing it, he had to collect most of the data he needed, and this is more problematic. Sayyid is convinced that al-Maqrizī started to record and organize the material just after the year 806/1404, the year al-Maqrizī identified as corresponding to the beginning of Cairo’s collapse from an architectural point of view.\textsuperscript{125} This hardly stands up with al-Maqrizī’s agenda. As a matter of fact, a few pieces of information on his early life as a scholar gathered from various sources

\textsuperscript{122} That he meant not to include them in the final version of the *Khīṭaṭ* is clearly visible in the manuscript. The names of the neglected buildings are not accompanied by the sign indicating that the data were copied (nuqila), while those found in the *Khīṭaṭ* are. On this sign, see Frédéric Bauden, “Maqriziana II,” 109–12.

\textsuperscript{123} The present writer will tentatively provide a chronology of al-Maqrizī’s works in his forthcoming study of al-Maqrizī’s working method.


contradict this statement. First of all, the first work of history (more precisely, economic history) he wrote was published in 808/1405. Secondly, we know for sure that, from 810 to 815, he was far away from Cairo (he lived in Damascus, sometimes travelling between the Syrian capital and his hometown). Under these circumstances, he would hardly have had the time to produce a manuscript of the Khıṭat in almost finished form, as represented by the two preserved volumes of the draft, before 811. It may be added that al-Maqrızī knew perfectly well that Ibn Duqmāq and al-Awḥadī were working on that subject, as both of them were his colleagues. Eventually, Ibn Duqmāq died in 809/1407, leaving an unfinished draft, and al-Awḥadī followed him in 811/1408 with his work in the same stage. If al-Maqrızī had ventured to write a book on the topography of Cairo shortly after 806/1404, the result would have been a third book on the topic, and at that time he obviously could not have known that the other two authors would die prematurely.

Yet, the two volumes of the draft can be accurately dated between 811 and 816, striking evidence that he had at his disposal most of his material at a very early date. For Sayyid, neither manuscript of al-Maqrızī’s draft help in this matter. However, several autograph notes found at the beginning of the first volume, on the first leaves, provide a terminus ante quem. These notes refer to events that all took place in 816, although they are scattered on various leaves and were written at different moments as is shown by the color of the ink. If we assume


127 His stay in Damascus was generally thought to have lasted ten years, more or less between 810 and 820. It can now be fixed precisely thanks to the publication of his Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, where he states that he stayed in Damascus from 810 to 815. See al-Maqrızī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 1:154 (wa-lammā waradtu Dimashq min sanat ʿashr wa-thamāni miʿah wa-ilā sanat khammah ʿasharah) and 34–35.

128 Even 814 if we consider that he prepared a resumé of the Tārīkh of Ibn Muyassar during that year and that this source is quoted in the body of the text of the first volume of the draft.


130 Topkapı Sarayi Kitüphanesi (Istanbul), MS Hazinesi 1472, fol. 1a (title-page providing the title in al-Maqrızī’s handwriting: Al-Juz’ al-Thānī min Kitāb al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-ʿĪbār fi Dhikr al-Khiṭat wa-al-Āthār): note recording the death of Ṣadr al-Din ʿAmīn ibn al-Âdām in 816; fol. 1b (containing a list of contents): note recording the death of Ṣāḥibunā Fakhir al-Din ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪbrāhīm ibn Aḥmad al-Bîrmāwī 11 nights from the end of Shaʿbān 816; fol. 4a (containing a list of contents for the kharāj): note regarding the insurgence of Ṭūḡān al-Dawādār on 16 Jumādā I 816.

that al-Maqrizi wrote down these events shortly after they happened, these notes allow us to establish that, at that date, the first volume of this draft was already finished. On the other hand, one will notice that these leaves contain several parts of the table of contents:131 from this, it can be deduced that the plan was complete as early as 816, and given that this table refers to contents included not only in this first volume, but also in the second, and probably a third (now lost), we may infer that those parts were also finished by that date.

Proceeding now to the second volume of the draft and, more particularly, to the section now identified as al-Awḥadī’s draft, we can draw the same conclusion and even determine that it was completed before 811, which further corroborates the identification of this part with al-Awḥadī’s work, as he died during that year. This is proven by the following examples selected from the section in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting:

131 These tables of contents were not published by A. F. Sayyid in his edition of this volume of the draft (al-Maqrizi, Musawwadat Kitāb al-Mawā’īz wa-al-Fitbār). A critical edition of these tables will be found in Appendix 2.
On leaf 97a, a few lines in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting dealing with Madrasat Umm Ānūk (founded by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn’s wife at the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century) can be read. The space left blank, above and below, was used by al-Maqrīzī to add two madrasahs: one in the quarter of the Suwayqat Mun‘im for which a date is provided (817) and another one, the Madrasat al-Ṣuwwah, founded by the sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh, who reigned from 815/1412 to 824/1421. From this, it may be inferred that both additions were made after these dates. But the dating of this section can be better narrowed with leaf 95b:

Here, al-Maqrīzī added a note at the end of al-Awḥadī’s text, which ends in the middle of the third line: one is dated to 811 and the following one, added immediately after it, to 814! We can hardly say if the information regarding the year 814 was added at a later stage, but that referring to the year 811 provides us with a very useful terminus ante quem: the preceding data was definitely written before that date.\textsuperscript{134} Be that as it may, we can now establish that this section was written before 811.

All this implies that, at a very early date, al-Maqrīzī already had in hand a comprehensive version of his book. On this basis, my conviction is that he did not start working on the \textit{Khiṭṭat} before al-Awḥadī’s death. In this case, he would have made a fair copy of his colleague’s draft, surely improving and developing it\textsuperscript{135} his whole life long;\textsuperscript{136} but he largely based himself on what had already been

\textsuperscript{134} Another case will strengthen this argument. Regarding the Madrasat Ibn al-Maghribī (fol. 89b), for which all the data is in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting, al-Maqrīzī stated at the end that the madrasah was demolished and that its building material was sold in 814.

\textsuperscript{135} The improvements are already visible in that section on the madrasahs.

\textsuperscript{136} Though his efforts to expand his survey sensibly diminished roughly after 1420. See André
accomplished by another author, as was maintained by al-Sakhāwī. 137 There is insufficient evidence to prove this view, although the following striking features could help to bolster it.

One of the sources used by al-Awḥadī consisted of what he calls “the ancient books of estates” (kutub al-amläk al-qadīmah), likely some archival material. 138 On at least one occasion, he refers to these to confirm the existence of a madrasah that must have been replaced by another building later on. 139 A striking feature regarding this archival material appears elsewhere in the same volume of the draft (this time in al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting). On fol. 1a of the same volume, for the Darb al-Ṣufayrah, reference is made to this very source in the first person: “wa-raʾaytu fi kutub al-amläk al-qadīmah.” In the final version of the Khiṭaṭ, 140 this became: “hākadhā yūjad fī al-kutub al-qadīmah.” The same applies to the other example, a little bit further down (fol. 8b): speaking about the Bāb al-Khūkhah, the author writes this time “wajadtu fi kutub al-amläk al-fāṭimīyah,” which disappeared in the final version. 141 On fol. 39b, one reads: “wa-raʾaytu fī kutub al-amläk al-qadīmah allatī bi-ḥārat Barjawan mā yadullu ʿalā dhālika . . . wa-hādhā muwāfiq li-qawl Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir,” a personal testimony that was completely omitted in the final version! 142


137 It must be remembered here that al-Maqrizi acknowledged (Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalili, 1:186) that he became the owner of several musawwadāt of al-Awḥadī’s Khiṭaṭ, meaning by this several volumes.

138 This source was also available to Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir. See al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār (Būlāq ed.), 1:438, 445; 2:14. On one occasion, al-Maqrizi referred to this source as kutub ibtiyāʿāt al-amläk al-qadīmah (ibid., 1: 438) from which it may be concluded that these books recorded the sales of properties, probably dating back to the Fatimid period.

139 Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS E. Hazinesi 1405, fol. 91b (wajadtu dhikrahā fī kutub al-amläk al-qadīmah).

140 Al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār (Būlāq ed.), 2:41.

141 Ibid., 2:45. This precious piece of information has been added by A. F. Sayyid to al-Maqrizi’s text in his recent edition, once again against al-Maqrizi’s intention! See al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār, ed. Sayyid, 3:140.

142 Al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār (Būlāq ed.), 2:101. The whole passage was introduced by A. F. Sayyid into al-Maqrizi’s Khiṭaṭ though the author had decided not to insert it in his final version! See al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār, ed. Sayyid, 3: 334.

Another passage may be added to this list. It appears on fol. 53a: “gāla wa-raʾaytu fi baʿd kutub al-amläk al-qadīmah.” It is missing in the final version. See Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār (Būlāq ed.), 2:115. Once again, it was included by A. F. Sayyid in the final version. See al-Maqrizi, Al-Mawāʾiẓ wa-al-Fītbār, ed. Sayyid, 3:381 (who erroneously attributed the passage to Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir).

Another striking feature lies in the fact that on fol. 111b, a section completely in al-Maqrizi’s handwriting, one reads: “shaykhunā Fakhr al-Dīn al-Bilbaysī,” though he was not al-Maqrizi’s
Now, the question is: why would al-Maqrīzī modify this information, written in the first person in the draft, into an impersonal one in the final version of his book? Apparently, al-Maqrīzī was not able to see these books, given that in such cases he always replaced the personal reference in the draft with an anonymous one in the final version, or he simply omitted it altogether. Undoubtedly, he did not feel at ease with a source to which he had no access. Still, in the sections of the draft in his own handwriting, he appropriated the fact that “he saw himself.” What induced him to act this way? Personally, I think that these sentences come from al-Awḥadī’s draft and that al-Maqrīzī felt uncomfortable, in the end, with these personal testimonies that belonged to someone else. He thus rendered them with more anonymous references in the final version of his Khiṭaṭ. Consequently, we may surmise that large parts of the data found in the two preserved volumes of the drafts are likely to be identified as al-Awḥadī’s Khiṭaṭ.

In order to demonstrate that this view is credible, we need to provide further evidence, still on the basis of the second volume of the draft. We know that before his death in 811/1408, al-Awḥadī had already composed several parts of his book on the topography of Cairo, having already clean-copied part of it. It may thus be inferred that he started working on this topic at a much earlier date. This is confirmed by his reading notes, found on the title page of five manuscripts already mentioned that are dated from 801 to 805.\(^{143}\) It is reasonable to think that he collected data even during the last decade of the eighth/fourteenth century and that he started to write his work several years before his untimely death.\(^{144}\) On the other hand, al-Maqrīzī is generally believed to have started collecting data on that topic after the year 806. Turning back to the second volume of the draft, the following quotation in al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting is quite disturbing (fol. 127a): “wa-ammā al-ṭilasm alladhī bi-hi fa-innahu ṣaḥīḥ wa-huwa bāqin mustamirr al-ʿaml ilā waqtinā ḥadhā wa-huwa sanat thamānin wa-tisʿīn wa-sabʿimiʾah!” It is found at the beginning of the section dealing with the mosques where the Friday master. On the contrary, he was al-Awḥadī’s master, as stated earlier. If this material was also written by al-Awḥadī, this means that al-Maqrīzī copied it blindly, without taking pains to modify this word relevant only to al-Awḥadī.

\(^{143}\) See note 51.

\(^{144}\) Ibn al-Furāt (d. 807/1404) quoted al-Awḥadī in his Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk, where he asserted, on several occasions, that he read the information in his handwriting, meaning that he had access to his notes or books. Among these quotations, some may be identified as stemming from al-Awḥadī’s work on the Khiṭaṭ, which confirms that al-Awḥadī’s book was already in an advanced stage before 807, the year of Ibn al-Furāt’s death. See the list provided by A. F. Sayyid, “Muqaddimat al-Muḥaqiq,” in al-Maqrīzī, al-Mawāʾīṯ wa-al-Ḏibār, 1:64 (read 9/2: 425 instead of 9/2: 417 and 9/2: 450 instead of 451). The following quotations were overlooked by Sayyid: Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk, ed. Qustantin Zurayq and N. ʿIzz al-Dīn (Beirut, 1936–42, vols. 7–9), 4/1: 11, 9/1: 132, 9/2: 341, 354.
prayer was performed, starting with the al-Azhar mosque. In it, the author of these lines wanted to specify that the talisman (ṭilasm) that was found in that mosque to prevent birds from settling and nesting in the building, thus some sort of scarecrow, was still playing its role at the time he was writing those lines, i.e., in 798. How could al-Maqrīzī have written this at that time, as it would mean that he had already been working on the topography of Cairo well before the date of 798, given that this was part of a section dealing with the great mosques (jawāmiʿ)? However, al-Awḥādī could be the author of these lines, given that in the section on the madrasahs, still in his own handwriting, he stated that he had already discussed the great mosques, as we have already seen. Though in his preliminary draft al-Maqrīzī faithfully copied what he was reading, even if they were not his words, he totally disregarded this in his final version.145

This demonstration can be reinforced by a similar quotation found in the section on the madrasahs in al-Awḥādī’s handwriting, a further element that will prove that this is part of his original clean-copied work. Speaking of al-Madrasah al-Suyūfiyah (fol. 82b), al-Awḥādī specified that he had access to the waqf document of this institution, which was shown to him by the scholar who was teaching there (mudarris), Majd al-Dīn Ismāʿīl al-Ḥanafī. This scholar must be identified as Ismāʿīl ibn Ibrāhīm al-Bilbaysī, who died in 802/1399.146 In other words, al-Awḥādī saw this document before that date, proving, if still necessary, that he had been working on this topic well before 802. In the final version of the Khīṭat, these personal details were forgotten, but al-Maqrīzī replaced them with his own personal testimony, as he stated that he had seen the very document; this is true, as he quoted some parts of it, though al-Awḥādī did not in his text. This establishes that al-Maqrīzī went back to the source exploited by his colleague and replaced al-Awḥādī’s personal testimony with his own, but also that al-Maqrīzī worked on the topic of the khīṭat well after 802.

So far we have established that, besides the section on the madrasahs now identified as being al-Awḥādī’s autograph fair copy, some parts of the second volume of the draft in al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting might originate in al-Awḥādī’s work too: in this case, al-Maqrīzī faithfully copied data and left al-Awḥādī’s personal testimonies unchanged until he elaborated the final version and the fair copy of the Khīṭat. However, this same volume also includes material that was obviously drafted by al-Maqrīzī. The emendations added in the margins and on slips of paper must undoubtedly be credited to him. When a date is mentioned in these additions, it provides us with a terminus ante quem for the main text to which it was added. Three cases may be put forward in this respect: two of them

are dated to the year 818 and one to the year 813.\textsuperscript{147} If we consider now the dates provided by al-Maqrizi in the body of the text, these never go further than 815 when they are explicitly given, or 815–18 when they must be surmised.\textsuperscript{148} Thanks to these elements, we are in a good position to date the second volume of the draft as having been copied sometime between 815 and 818. As we saw, the first volume of the draft may be dated at the earliest to the year 816;\textsuperscript{149} this means that al-Maqrizi had already finished most of that first version by 815. In this context, it is better understood why his appropriation of al-Awḥadī’s draft was pivotal: between 811 and 815–18, he expanded his colleague’s draft, copying several parts of it into his own new work.\textsuperscript{150}

In light of this, al-Sakhāwī’s words ("[he] made a fair copy of it [completely] and attributed it to himself [after he had made] additions") are better understood. Of course, it does not mean that everything in the actual version of al-Maqrizi’s Khiṭaṭ comes from al-Awḥadī’s draft, as we have seen. Obviously, he completed the book, expanded its plan, and added data regarding the period between al-Awḥadī’s death in 811 and the date of his own death in 845. Nonetheless, this was not originally his work, and a great part had already been written by someone else.

To conclude this section, we should remember that in al-Sakhāwī’s eyes no excuse of any kind could justify this reprehensible way of acting, though Ibn Ḥajar himself, the key witness in this case, did not seem to mind it. Ibn Ḥajar maintained a high opinion of his colleague, al-Maqrīzī, as confirmed by the


\textsuperscript{149} See p. 206.

\textsuperscript{150} When Ibn Ḥajar completed his work entitled Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʾassis (his dictionary of authorities), he had already included a biography of al-Maqrizi which the latter read and even corrected for some details (see above, n. 28). Though this dictionary was started in 803/1400, it was not finished before 829/1426. However, the only work Ibn Ḥajar deemed worthy of mention regarding al-Maqrizi’s production was Al-Ightibāṭ. Though we do not know when Ibn Ḥajar wrote al-Maqrizi’s biography (sometime between 803 and 829), this means that al-Maqrizi’s project for the Khiṭaṭ was already known to Ibn Ḥajar, as he confirmed that al-Maqrizi benefitted from al-Awḥadī’s draft, but that the book was not yet completed.

following words:\textsuperscript{151}

Our master, the most erudite, the scholar of his time [Ibn Ḥajar], revered him and showed him respect and awe. He used to go to his house and to spend time there with him.

And indeed, in 829/1426, Ibn Ḥajar expressed his feelings towards al-Maqrizi with warm words:\textsuperscript{152}


\textsuperscript{152}Ibn Ḥajar, \textit{Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis}, 3:60.
The friendship that exists between us is beyond words. May God—he is exalted—prolong his benefits.

Yet, Ibn Ḥajar was also acquainted with al-Awḥadī, as they met together during lessons with common masters: 153

I met him on several occasions and he accompanied me to attend the lessons of some of my masters.

Truly, he must have known him quite well. In the end, is it not he who informs us that al-Awḥadī had nice handwriting (kāna ḥasan al-khaṭṭ)?

The question remains: how did Ibn Ḥajar know about the misdemeanor? Once again, sources and manuscripts come to our rescue. Scholars could lend their works, finished or not, to colleagues, if they trusted them. We have a fairly good example concerning al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407). Al-Maqrīzī declared in his biography, in the dictionary of his contemporaries, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah: 154

He borrowed my holograph notebooks.... I was closely associated with him for a while and he was my neighbor for many years. He frequently visited me at home.

In the case of Ibn Ḥajar, it has already been established that he lent the dictionary of his authorities, Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʾassis, to al-Maqrīzī, who did not hesitate to correct therein the data regarding his own biography or to make some marginal additions, which means that he had time to read it through at home. Al-Maqrīzī might have lent Ibn Ḥajar his own works too, but probably not his draft of the first version of the Khiṭaṭ; 155 it is unlikely that this is how Ibn Ḥajar discovered

---

153 Ibn Ḥajar, Dhayl al-Durar al-Kāminah, 195.
154 Al-Maqrīzī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 1:102–3. We have already seen that he was not at all pleased with the use Ibn Duqmāq made of his personal notes.
155 In 829, he confessed that among al-Maqrīzī’s writings he had consulted was Al-Ightibāṭ bi-Aḥwāl al-Fustāṭ, confirming that that book was already completed by that time, but did not say a word about Al-Mawāʾir wa-al-ʾītibār. See Ibn Ḥajar, Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʾassis, 3:60 ("wa-mimmā waqāftu
On a scholar's death, his intellectual legacy could be coveted by his colleagues, particularly if he was a prolific author (the same thing can be said of his library). This is what happened, for instance, to the Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk of Ibn al-Furāt (d. 807/1404), who had not had enough time to make a fair copy of the draft, except for the volumes covering the last three centuries. The draft was sold because his son had no interest in this matter. Al-Maqrīzī made use of it, he said, by which he meant that he summarized it, when he managed to lay hands on it.

As for al-Maqrīzī’s legacy, there is an indirect reference to it in al-Sakhāwī’s Ḍawʾ:

He [al-ʿUryānī] compiled a commentary on the shawāhid of Al-Kāfiyah al-Shāfiyah by Ibn Mālik, as I saw in our master [Ibn Ḥajar]’s handwriting. It is a nice commentary that demonstrates a thorough study in grammar . . ., even though some pretend that a commentary on the same book by al-Ghammārī was found in al-Maqrīzī’s bequest. If he [al-ʿUryānī] laid hands on it, he might have appropriated it and expanded it.

156 In Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis, 3:39 (al-Awḥadī’s entry), he revealed that al-Maqrīzī took advantage of al-Awḥadī’s drafts, which means that he already knew what happened, but he refrained from saying more about this. As already stated, al-Maqrīzī read the manuscript of Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis but he did not correct Ibn Ḥajar’s divulgation. He thus agreed with this view.

157 About 20 volumes, out of 60 according to al-Sakhāwī, or 100 according to al-Maqrīzī. See al-Maqrīzī, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalilli, 3:227; al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 8:51.


159 Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 1:70–71. Al-Maqrīzī’s library, at least some of his holograph volumes, were inherited by his nephew, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Maqrīzī (801–67/1399–1462). (On him see al-Sakhāwī, Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 9:150). His mark of ownership (malakahu Muḥammad al-Maqrīzī) is found in the following holograph manuscripts of his uncle: “Al-Khabar ʿan al-Bashar,” vol. 1, Süleymaniye Küütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS Ayasofya 3362, fol. 4a; ibid., vol. 3, MS Fatih 4338, fol. 1a; ibid., vol. 4, MS Fatih 4339, fol. 1a; ibid., vol. 5, MS Fatih 4340, fol. 1a; ibid., vol. 6, MS Fatih 4341, fol. 1a; “Al-Sulūk li-Maʿrifat Duwal al-Mulūk,” vol. 1, Süleymaniye Küütüphanesi (Istanbul), MS Yeni Cami 887, fol. 3a.
In 845/1442, Ibn Ḥajar, who was to die seven years later, was probably the first to get access to al-Maqrizi’s private library (the drafts and the fair copies). The fact that he had access to the autograph manuscripts of his colleague is established by two elements: a report and material evidence. As for the report, it is provided by al-Sakhāwī:160

Our master [Ibn Ḥajar] also wrote [al-Ḥusbānī’s] biography in his additions to al-Maqrizi’s History of Egypt [al-Muqaffá], though [al-Ḥusbānī] is found in his ʿUqūd.161

Courtesy Universiteit Leiden (Leiden), Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS or. 14533, fol. 120b showing al-Ḥusbānī’s biography in Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting, confirming al-Sakhāwī’s statement.

This information would seem ambiguous if Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting were not found in several of al-Maqrizi’s autograph manuscripts, which definitely proves that he had access to them, most probably after the latter’s death, as we are told that he supplemented (istadraka) his data. In at least three instances, Ibn

160 Al-Sakhāwī, Al-Dawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, 1:239.
161 One must understand that Ibn Ḥajar’s addition to Al-Muqaffá was not pertinent given that al-Maqrizi devoted some space to the biographee in his dictionary of his contemporaries. See al-Maqrizi, Durar al-ʿUqūd al-Farīdah, ed. al-Jalīlī, 1:366 (no. 286).
Ḥajar indeed added notes and data, consisting of additions and corrections, in the margins or in the body of the text: these are several volumes of Al-Muqaffā, Durar al-Uqūd al-Farīdah, and the final version of the Khiṭaṭ. To his great surprise, he found (as did I) in a volume of the draft of the first version, nineteen folios in al-Awḥadī’s handwriting where al-Maqrīzī had lined through, erased, and modified some words or sentences, adding some details in the margins or on slips of paper. Nevertheless, he hesitated to indicate his discovery in his writings, maybe because of his esteem for al-Maqrīzī. One must remark that Ibn Ḥajar revised his historical works almost until he passed away: al-Maqrīzī’s death is recorded in his Inbāʾ al-Ghumr, and in this sense he could have added something about his discovery at that time. Anyway, if he did not modify his appreciation of al-Maqrīzī in his books, he might have dropped a word into the ear of his pupil al-Sakhāwī, who had fewer scruples about writing the news down. Alternatively, al-Sakhāwī might have been content with Ibn Ḥajar’s words found in his Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis, which he interpreted as meaning, in his master’s choice of words, that this was a case of plagiarism. Whatever the case, al-Sakhāwī had

---

162 His handwriting is found in almost every volume preserved, hence al-Sakhāwī’s comment quoted above, which also confirms that al-Sakhāwī managed to consult the autograph volumes of al-Muqaffā. For the list of these volumes, see F. Bauden, “Maqriziana II,” 115–16.

163 His handwriting is found on fol. 152 (a biography added) of al-Maqrīzī’s partially preserved autograph (Forschungsbibliothek [Gotha], or. 1771).

164 The autograph of the final version is considered lost, but the copyist of one of the manuscripts used by A. F. Sayyid identified Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting in these notes and indicated it. See al-Maqrīzī, Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-Iʿtibār, ed. Sayyid, 4:490 (“wujida bi-khaṭṭ mawlānā qāḍī al-quḍāh Ibn Ḥajar al-‘almānī nuskhat al-muṣannif al-manqūl minhā mā naṣṣuhu”). A. F. Sayyid did not indicate in which of the manuscripts he used he found this note.

165 It is interesting to note that some words have been added to the right of the passage where he divulged that al-Maqrīzī benefitted from al-Awḥadī’s drafts on the Khiṭaṭ (Ibn Ḥajar, “Al-Majmaʿ al-Muʿassis,” al-Maktabah al-Azharīyah [Cairo], MS muṣṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 129b. See Appendix 1, al-Awḥadī’s entry). These words were cancelled later on and are now illegible, and, as such, could have been related to this affair.

166 That Ibn Ḥajar’s words were understood in this sense is confirmed by two details. First, there is the fact that al-Sakhāwī included this case of plagiarism in the list of the other cases identified by Ibn Ḥajar himself. See al-Sakhāwī, Al-Jawāhir wa-al-Durar, 1:390–94 (“fasl fīman akhadha taṣnīf ghayrihi fa-iddā’ahu li-nafsihī wa-zāda fīhi qalīlan wa-naqṣa minhu wa-lākinna aktharahu madhkūr bi-la’if al-aṣl”). Secondly, an anonymous reader of Al-Muqaffā, who had previously read al-Sakhāwī’s words in his Al-Flān bi-al-Tawbīkh, added to Al-Muqaffā a short biography of al-Awḥadī, in which he mentioned al-Sakhāwī’s accusation (attributed to Ibn Ḥajar), and he concluded: “hākadhā wajadtuhu maktūban bi-khaṭṭ al-ḥāfiẓ Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī raḥimahu Allāh wa-huwa thiqah fī dhālika li-annahu amīr al-muʾminīn fī ʿilm al-ḥadīth!” See al-Maqrīzī, “Al-Muqaffā,” Universitätsbibliothek (Leiden), MS 14533, fol. 225b. This proves that al-Jalīl’s opinion that “law kāna hunāka adnā shay’ min al-sīḥah fi ittiḥām al-Sakhāwī lil-Maqrīzī fimā yakhtaṣṣu bi-kitāb al-Khiṭaṭ, la kāna ashāra Ibn Ḥajar ilā dhālika” is mistaken. See al-Jalīl, “Al-Mu’arrīkhūn al-Mu’āṣirūn

the merit to tell the truth, although Ibn Ḥajar probably never revealed to him all the details, which is why al-Sakhāwī could not give evidence to sustain his accusation. Whether jealousy (ghayrah) pushed him to reveal this qīl wa-qāl is not important: he did his job as a historian with professional integrity.

There remains one more worrying question: why did al-Maqrīzī not erase every bit of al-Awḥadī’s handwriting in his draft by copying the only remaining section of al-Awḥadī’s fair copy? And of course, we lay aside the possibility that this also occurs in the lost volumes of al-Maqrīzī’s draft. The two-part answer, although completely conjectural, is quite simple. First of all, as already established, the draft was not meant to survive after al-Maqrīzī’s death, as a fair copy of his work was already circulating in his lifetime. Secondly, al-Awḥadī died in 811, a long time before al-Maqrīzī’s own death. With the passing of time, persons who were closely enough acquainted with al-Awḥadī to be able to identify his handwriting became rare. Even if the draft might have been seen by others, the probability of discovering the secret was almost nil.

Conclusions
The title of this article issues a challenge: should al-Maqrīzī be thrown out with the bath water? Obviously, the answer cannot but be negative. However he behaved, his work on the khiṭat still remains the best source for the study of the history of the Egyptian capital from the very beginning down to his own period. This is partly because he used several sources that are now considered lost, but also because he benefitted from al-Awḥadī’s work on which he built his own magnum opus. However, the modern historian must be conscious that his tremendous activity as a historian is partly explained by his having recourse to some dubious practices. Plagiarism was definitely one of them, and it is particularly noticeable in the khiṭat.

To conclude, I think that I have been able to establish that:

• the nineteen folios carrying a different handwriting in al-Maqrīzī’s draft of the first version of his khiṭat represent one part of al-Awḥadī’s fair copy on the khiṭat;
• al-Maqrīzī utilized this part for his own book, sometimes modifying slightly al-Awḥadī’s text;
• other parts of the khiṭat might have been based on other parts of al-Awḥadī’s drafts;
• al-Maqrīzī did not begin working on the khiṭat prior to al-Awḥadī’s death, and consequently he completed the work initiated by his colleague, without


crediting him;

• the charge of “plagiarism”—as perceived in those times—brought against him by al-Sakhāwī, who relied on his master Ibn Ḥajar, was justified because he made a fair copy of al-Awḥadī’s drafts, later expanding them and deleting some parts, but the result owed a great deal to al-Awḥadī’s work.167

Thus, five centuries later, this case can finally be closed. But I would like to conclude with an ironic twist. In his *Laṭāʾif al-Minan*, al-Shaʿrānī recorded the following information: 168

I also read aloud to him the commentary to the *Alfīyah* of al-ʿIrāqī by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī, the great scholar. It is said that, in fact, it was [written] by Ibn Ḥajar, the great scholar. Al-Sakhāwī discovered the draft in the legacy of Ibn Ḥajar or of someone else, corrected it, made a fair copy of it, and published it.

The general moral of this story could be: people who live in glass houses shouldn’t throw stones. But one may also conclude that even the harshest critics of plagiarism were not always above the practice themselves.169


169 Cf. Ch. Vandendorpe, “Introduction,” in *Le Plagiat*, 10: “Mais, si traquer le plagiat est une façon pour le critique d’affirmer une culture infiniment supérieure à celle du lecteur naïf, cette activité ne laisse pas d’apparaître dérisoire et virtuellement sans fin, car, pour parodier une formule célèbre, un plagiat peut en cacher un autre et l’on risque toujours de découvrir, avec Anatole France, que ‘le volé était lui-même voleur.’”


Al-Awhādi’s entry (fol. 129b)\textsuperscript{170}

![Image of the entry](image-url)

Courtesy al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah (Cairo), muṣṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 129b.

 أحمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن طوغان المقري المعروف بالأوحاوي. ولد في المحرم سنة إحدى وستين وقرأ بالسبع على الواسطي ولزم الشيخ فخر الدين بعدن عشراً سنة وسمع على الطبردار خاتمة أصحاب الدمياطي بالسماع وعلى جويرية ينتبأ الكاري يجمع مجاميع في الأدب منها خطط القاهرة يحب فيه وهو القدر.

إنني إذا ما أتاني أمر نفسي تلذذن وشتد منه جزعي وجهت وجهي للذدي

اجتمعت به مرارا ورافقنا في السماع على بعض شيوخنا وسمعنا من نظمه وقوانه، مات في تاسع عشري جمدي الأولي سنة إحدى عشرة وثمانين.


\textsuperscript{171} In al-Mar‘ashlī’s ed.: ومني. The actual reading is confirmed by the quotation of the same verses by al-Sakhāwī, \textit{Al-Daw‘ al-Lāmi‘}, 1:359, who relied on Ibn Ḥajar’s \textit{Al-Majma‘ al-Mu‘assīs} as evidenced by his reading note on fol. 163a.

\textsuperscript{172} In al-Mar‘ashlī’s ed.: عشر. The actual reading is confirmed by al-Sakhāwī, \textit{Al-Daw‘ al-Lāmi‘}, 3:359.
Added at a later date, in the right margin:

وكتب عنه رفيقنا أبو الصفاء الأقفهسي
وأغعيد زاد ففي نباعده عـد ففسقـمي لأجـل حاـصل
مذ دام لي هاجـرا بـلا سبب مازاـلت حـتى عملـته واصلـ

Added at a later date, at the left of lines 5–6 (see the frame), are a few words on three lines that were later erased and are now illegible.

Al-Maqrizi’s entry (fol. 131a)\(^{173}\)

---

\(^{174}\) The letters ṭāʾ, yāʾ, and zāy rewritten by al-Maqrizi.

---

Courtesy al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah (Cairo), muṣṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 131a.
Courtesy al-Maktabah al-Azhariyah (Cairo), muṣṭalaḥ 1360, fol. 131a.

١٧٥ ٌنسبةٍ مُنسبةً إلى حارةٍ المقارزة بعليك. ١٧٦ ٌنزل بها جديٌّ إبرهيم بن محمد. ١٧٧ ٌCorrected by Ibn Ḥajar in جده.

١٧٨ ٌThis word was added by Ibn Ḥajar later on.

١٧٩ ٌIn al-Marʿashi’s edition, the last four words read: وقد نسبة أنساها! ١٨٠ ٌThis data in the right margin is in al-Maqrizi’s handwriting.

فكتب ١٨٠ {ً} الأنصاري وتميم جد [٣٥] {ً} الأنصاري. كتبه ظانا. عرفت من قوله وأما الشيخ تقي الدين فإنه ذكر أن تميمًا الأعلى في نسبه هو [١٦٢] {١٨٢} باني القاهرة وأول الخلفاء المصريين || العبيديين بالقاهرة]. ولد سنة بضع و١٨١ ستين وقيل محمد بن أحمد بن علي بن جعفر بن محمد حنبلياً وتبعه أبوه ١٨٣ و ההريقة في نسبه وهو صغير فنشأ هو على مذهب جده لأمه العلامة || شمس الدين ابن الصاغ الحنفي ثم لما وقع رجل وبنيه تحوّل شافعية وسمع الحديث وقرأ وتميم جد في شرح بالقاهرة والحد الجنسي بناش毁 في القلب ولما التلمذ الفائق واللبر الرائق || والتصانيف الباهرة خصوصاً في تاريخ القاهرة فإنه أحياء معالمها ورغم || منزله وبنيه ١٨٧ وأوضح محالها وجد مانعة وترجم أعانيها فلم ما وقفت عليه من ذلك كتابه المسمى الاغتباط بأحوال الفسطاط وقد ولي الحسبة ومازمعه|| بالقاهرة مراراً وحسنت سيرته ودخل إلى دمشق مراراً والأخثر هو مؤثر للانجماع || يمارس في حسن الخلق وكرمه العهد وصدقه الود وبيننا من المودة ما لا يسعه || || الورق فتاعة بالنفع به.

وأعلى ١٨٨ من عهده ناصر الدين محمد بن علي بن يوسف بن إدريس النبهاني || الحراوي الطبري دار سمع عليه فضل الخيل وحج سنة ثلاث وثمانين وجاء في سنة ستين وثمانين وسعب بها || من الشاشري وغيره ثم جاور مراراً ١٨٩.

١٨٠ This data up to [١٨٠] {ً} added at a later date, is found in the top margin, in Ibn Ḥajar’s handwriting. It is missing in Marʿashlī’s edition.

١٨١ Two words illegible now due to water stain.

١٨٢ One or two words illegible now, as the ink has faded.

١٨٣ added at a later date by Ibn Ḥajar.

١٨٤ This word cancelled by al-Maqrīzī.

١٨٥ These words, from محمد بن ١٦٢ up to محمد بن أحمد بن علي بن يوسف بن إدريس النبهاني || الحراوي الطبري دار سمع عليه فضل الخيل وحج سنة ثلاث وثمانين وجاء في سنة ستين وثمانين وسعب بها || من الشاشري وغيره ثم جاور مرارا’ ١٨٩.

١٨٦ تمت معه أبوه.

١٨٧ These words cancelled by Ibn Ḥajar during the writing process.

١٨٨ The following words were added by Ibn Ḥajar at a later date.

١٨٩ The last three words are missing in al-Marʿashlī’s edition. The last word seems to be cancelled but this is due to the fact that the ink was not dry and it resulted in a blot as shown by the word that just precedes it.

fol. 1b:

1) ذكر ما كانت عليه القاهرة ايام الخلفاء 
2) ذكر ما صارت اليه القاهرة بعد زوال الدولة الفاطمية 
3) ذكر حدودها وإيراد حدوتها 
4) ذكر اختلاف الناس في انسبايب [الخلفاء الفاطميين] 
5) ذكر ابتداء الدولة الفاطمية 
6) ذكر بناء القاهرة 
7) ذكر الخطط القاهرة 
8) ذكر ما قيل في القاهرة


ذكر محاريب مصر؛ [٦]
ذكر اشتقاق مصر؛ [٧]
ذكر نيل مصر؛ [٨]
ذكر كور مصر وقراها؛ [٩]
ذكر خراج مصر وكيف كان يعمل في جباهه وما استقر عليه الأمر في ذلك عدة عشرة.

الحمد لله وإسالة الإعانة والتوفيق في نشر كتاب المواعظ والاعتبار في ذكر الخطط والآثار يسر الله إتمامه ووفق للصواب فيه.

ذكر طرف من هيأة الأفلاك؛ [١] ذكر طرف من هيئة الآفلاك.
ذكر صورة الأرض وموقع الأقاليم منها؛ [٢] ذكر صورة الأرض ووضع الأقاليم.
ذكر محل مصر من الأرض؛ [٣]
ذكر فضائل مصر؛ [٤]
ذكر حدود مصر؛ [٥]
ذكر خراب مصر على يد بخت نصر؛ ج[٨] ذكر مدينة أسوس.
ذكر الأهرام؛ ب[٢] ذكر الفسطاط.
ذكر الجيزة؛ ط[٩] ذكر مدينة منف.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عمل البرابي.
عامة عشرة.
ذكر مدينة أمسوس؛ ح[١] ذكر فعل البطال.
ذكر الطوفان؛ د[٥] ذكر عمل البرابي.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عمل البرابي.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عمل البرابي.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عمل البرابي.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عمل البرابي.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر مدينة منف؛ ط[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر استبطاق الفيوم؛ ب[٥] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر سجن يوسف. ه[٦] ذكر عملية الفتوح.
ذكر نزول العرب في الأرياف وزراعتهم الأراضي وما كان في ذلك من الأجذاب; بعد ما كثر إسلام القبط ونزلت طوائف العرب بالقرى وما كان يعمل في ذلك إلى أوان الروك الناصري; ذكر الروك الناصري وما استقر عليه الأمر من ذلك إلى أن ابتدأ الخراب; ذكر الحوادث التي أوجبت تلاشي أحوال الإقليم ونقص الخراج وبيان الأسباب التي نشأ عنها ذلك.

菲尔ست الخراج عشرة أبواب
أ=[١] ذكر ما كانت عليه أرض مصر قد.[ما]
ب=[٢] ذكر كور مصر;
ج=[٣] ذكر ما كان يعمل في أراضي مصر من حفر التراص والإقامة الجسور ونحو ذلك.
د=[٤] ذكر سلع خراج مصر في الجاهلية;
ه=[٥] ذكر ما عمله المسلمون في الخراج وكيف كان حكمهم فيه;
و=[٦] ذكر انقضاض القبط ومحاربتهم للمسلمين;
ذكر المنتزهات
ذكر الجبال
ذكر الأكوام
ذكر المقابر
ذكر السجون

يلتحق بكتاب الخطط
ذكر الخلاجان
ذكر القناعط
ذكر البرك
ذكر الجزائر
دار سيف المقدم
دار عباس
دار الحاجب بيرس
دار خوند
دار كريم الدين
دار ابن فرقة
دار فتح الله
دار النوباري
دار بيرس
دار كتبغا
دار ابن فضل الله
دار كهردانش
دار ابن كتيبة
دار البندق
دار السلام
دار أوحد الدين
دار بهادر العزي (كذا لـ "المعزي")
دار السكني
دار الملك
دار قشمر
ذكر الدور
حارة بهاء الدين
دار الأحمدي
دار قاسقى
دار البليني
دار مكنوسر
حارة بروجان
دار المظفر
دار بنت السعدي
دار أفوش
دار [بابس] ابن عبد العزيز
دار البشمار
دار السليماني
عالم
دار [الكافوري]
دار الحاجب بكتمر
دار ابن تنكر
خط باب سر المارستان وغيره
دار نائب الكرك
دار ابن صغير
Appendix 3: A Juxtaposition of the Sequence of the Madrasahs in Al-Awḥadī’s Draft and Al-Maqrīzī’s Final Version of Al-Khitat

المواضع والبتى، طب طوب قبو سراي، م، ص، ١٢٠-١٣٠

195 An asterisk indicates that the name of the madrasah has been modified by al-Maqrīzī in al-Awḥadī’s text, while the square brackets point to the fact that the given madrasah has been added by al-Maqrīzī to al-Awḥadī’s text. In the latter case, the madrasah is not numbered.

196 Each madrasah is numbered according to its place in the final version of the Khitat. Only those mentioned by al-Awḥadī or added by al-Maqrīzī to al-Awḥadī’s draft are taken into consideration here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mamluk School Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>المدرسة الفارقانية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>المدرسة الفرقة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>المدرسة الفططية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن المغربي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>المدرسة البديرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>المدرسة الجاهلية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>المدرسة البدرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن المغربي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>المدرسة البهرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>المدرسة البقريه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>المدرسة القيصرانية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>المدرسة البديرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>المدرسة الملكية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>المدرسة الجاهلية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>المدرسة الجاهلية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>المدرسة القيصرانية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>المدرسة البدرية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>المدرسة الصغرى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>المدرسة الصغرى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>مدرسة محمود بن علي المؤذن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>مدرسة محمود بن علي المؤذن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>المدرسة المهذبية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>مدرسة ابن عرام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>المدرسة المعلمية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>مدرسة الأمير جمال الدين الأستاذدار</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(55) المدرسة الأشرفية المستجدة
(56) مدرسة فماري الحموي
(57) المدرسة الصارمية
(58) المدرسة بميدان الفمح
(59) مدرسة الحاجب بكتمر
[مدرسة قراجا]
(60) مدرسة بن كرائي
[مدرسة الشميساطية]
[مدرسة بخط سويقة منعم]
(61) مدرسة أم أوك
[مدرسة بالصومة]
(62) مدرسة ابن غلامها
(63) مدرسة إبرهيم الزويمل
(64) مدرسة الطنطش
(65) المدرسة الأشرافية
(66) المدرسة الصغر غتمشية
(67) مدرسة إينال
[مدرسة ابن البابا]
(68) مدرسة أبي غالب
(69) المدرسة الباقينية
(70) المدرسة الشريفية
(71) المدرسة النابلسية
(72) المدرسة الكهارية
[مدرسة مقبل الأشتمري]