

FRÉDÉRIC BAUDEN
UNIVERSITÉ DE LIÈGE/BELGIUM

Maqriziana I: Discovery of an Autograph Manuscript of al-Maqrīzī: Towards a Better Understanding of His Working Method Description: Section 1

INTRODUCTION

This article aims at presenting an important manuscript discovered recently in the holdings of the library at the University of Liège, in Belgium. It has been authenticated as a holograph manuscript of Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Maqrīzī, and identified as a specimen of his notebooks. As I will try to demonstrate, the notebook was conceived by al-Maqrīzī as a working tool to which he returned, utilizing the greatest part of it in his later writings. Its study, together with al-Maqrīzī’s other preserved autograph manuscripts and drafts, clearly provides answers to numerous questions about the working methods of medieval Muslim scholars, making possible reflection on an archaeology of scholarship. The preliminary results are revealed here for the first time, and are based on the current stage of my research. It is possible some weakness of these arguments may emerge later, although I hope that future research will corroborate most of them.

In this study, to be published in two sections, I decided first to scrutinize the manuscript itself, in codicological terms, i.e., to describe it and reconstruct its history, and finally to give a detailed overview of its contents.¹ The second part

©Middle East Documentation Center. The University of Chicago.

This article is a revised version of a paper presented on the 13th of May 1998 at the 7th Colloquium on Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), under the title: “À propos du MS 2232 de l’Université de Liège: découverte d’un nouvel autographe de Maqrīzī?” It was read once more, with major modifications, during a seminar on al-Maqrīzī organized by the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale in Cairo in May 2000, under the title: “Le carnet de notes d’al-Maqrīzī et son importance pour l’historiographie musulmane.” That version will appear in two sections for reasons of space. Another text was read at the Notre Dame colloquium; that will be published as the second part of this article in a forthcoming issue of this journal, under the title: “Maqriziana II: Discovery of an Autograph Manuscript of al-Maqrīzī: Towards a Better Understanding of his Working Method: Analysis.” I have decided to publish this first part prior to the second as the demonstrations elaborated in the latter are too complex to follow without a clear exposition of the nature and contents of the manuscript.

¹A full critical edition of the notebook is in preparation. It will be published by the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale in Cairo, in two volumes together with a facsimile of the entire manuscript on CD-ROM.

will be devoted to an analysis of al-Maqrīzī's working method.

HISTORY OF THE DISCOVERY

In an article published in 1962, Claude Cahen wondered rhetorically whether unearthing a fundamental text was cheering or discouraging, as his discovery diverted him from his other scholarly commitments. He was speaking of a manuscript which has revealed, since its discovery, new data on the economic history of Egypt in the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods, i.e., al-Makhzūmī's treatise "Al-Minhāj fī 'Ilm al-Kharāj."² Reading his words, I asked myself if he really thought that this was ill-fortune, but I soon realized, when I myself came across an important manuscript, what he meant. Indeed, I also had to leave aside all my current research to dedicate my entire attention to the text I had found, almost accidentally. But this did not happen all at once. In 1989, I was asked by the University of Liège to catalog the Islamic manuscripts held there. It had received in 1986 a gift of about 450 Arabic manuscripts and wished to know exactly what it contained. I carried out this task, beginning with these manuscripts most recently bequeathed. The other Islamic manuscripts already among the holdings of the library had previously been described in a handlist, so I put them aside until I finished my catalogue.³ After having perused hundreds of manuscripts, I decided to look at the older collection. When my eyes fell on MS 2232, I had seen so many *majmū'āt* from the Maghrib that I at first imagined that this was nothing more than another example of this particular kind of manuscript, although eastern in origin as indicated by the script. It appeared that it was not a composite *majmū'ah*, composed of various texts by several hands at different dates, collected at a specific moment and bound together, but rather a uniform text in which entries were written by the same hand. No author was named anywhere in the manuscript, although the greatest part consisted of epitomes of books. To me, it appeared to be nothing more than an ordinary manuscript. At the time I was able to date it to the fifteenth century, thanks to its codicological characteristics, a fact which was confirmed afterwards.⁴

The manuscript was then returned to a dusty shelf for several years until one day in 1997, when I received a copy of a recent edition of one of al-Maqrīzī's

²See Claude Cahen, "Un traité financier inédit d'époque fatimide-ayyubide," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 5 (1962): 140; reprinted in his *Makhzūmiyyāt: Études sur l'histoire économique et financière de l'Égypte médiévale* (Leiden, 1977), 1.

³The first volume of the catalogue is finished and will appear under the title *Inventaire des manuscrits arabes, persans et turcs des bibliothèques publiques de Belgique* (Liège, forthcoming).

⁴The manuscript had already been described in 1970 as "manuscrit arabe, XVIIIe siècle?" See J. Hoyoux, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège: Manuscrits acquis de 1886 à 1960*, vol. 1 (Liège, 1970), no. 1070.

minor works, the *Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍu‘afā’* of Ibn ‘Adī.⁵ This book consists of a resumé made by al-Maqrīzī of a work dealing with “weak” transmitters of tradition. It has been preserved in a unicum which is, moreover, an autograph copy (Istanbul, MS Murād Mollā 569), dated 795/1393. The editor had the excellent idea of including some plates of the manuscript. At first glance, the script looked familiar, and I soon remembered MS 2232. I was able to compare it with the facsimile and was overjoyed to discover that the *codex leodiensis* was an autograph copy in the hand of one of the most important historians of the Islamic world, known as the *shaykh al-mu’arrikhīn* of Egypt.

I proceeded further in my investigation and found that numerous autograph manuscripts of al-Maqrīzī are still extant in various libraries all over the world.⁶ I soon discovered that the attention of scholars had already been drawn to this matter as early as 1847–51, when the Dutch Orientalist R. P. A. Dozy published a notice of his identification of three volumes of al-Maqrīzī’s *Al-Muqaffā’*.⁷ Facing page 28, a plate containing a facsimile of al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting was printed so as to facilitate the identification of other autograph manuscripts, of which, Dozy believed, there must have been other specimens in European and Arab libraries. Indeed, al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting is distinctive, not easily forgotten, and this has been my experience. Later, I learned of an additional publication including another autograph manuscript of the historian: a draft of a volume of *Al-Mawā‘iẓ wa-al-I’tibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*,⁸ which made me realize that both manuscripts were written on the same kind of paper, a discovery which indicated to me another possibility for the study of al-Maqrīzī’s autograph manuscripts.⁹

At this point, there remained no doubt that the Liège codex was to be identified as an unpublished holograph in al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting, but I still had to establish what kind of work this was. I turned back to my description of it, made some years earlier, and improved it by adding every useful detail contained in the manuscript. I carried out a thorough scrutiny of the contents and soon realized that it was a notebook, and that these sheets of paper had been used by al-Maqrīzī to record historical details, facts, and events that he was interested in for the composition of his works. It is full of resúmes, epitomes, extracts, excerpts, notes, cards, etc., the subjects of which vary as much as their number (history, numismatics, metrology,

⁵*Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa-‘Ilal al-Ḥadīth li-Ibn ‘Adī*, ed. Ayman ibn ‘Ārif al-Dimashqī (Cairo, 1415/1994).

⁶See my “Maqriziana II,” where a complete list will be given.

⁷See R. P. A. Dozy, “Découverte de trois volumes du Mokaffā d’Al-Makrīzī,” in idem, *Notices sur quelques manuscrits arabes* (Leiden, 1847–51), 8–16.

⁸Edited by Ayman Fu‘ād Sayyid (London, 1995).

⁹On this point, see below, under the description of the manuscript.

genealogy, medicine, exegesis, etc.). As far as I know, this is the first time that such a notebook has been discovered,¹⁰ a unique document that opens myriad research prospects in many fields. Of course, the most salient aspect is the working method of al-Maqrīzī, since we can now study precisely how he conceived his works, not only by looking at the various drafts he left us, but more precisely by examining the way he summarized the works of his predecessors and how he inserted the data later in his own writings. But it should also be considered a manuscript of incomparable importance because it contains resumés of works which were previously considered lost. The resumés prove that al-Maqrīzī had access to such works as Ismaili texts, and in some cases the parts preserved in the notebook are the sole remaining evidence of their existence. Moreover, comparison of the material in al-Maqrīzī's published writings, where passages have been borrowed, with those in the notebook, will permit us to improve the readings in the editions where they are found, even in the most recent ones. The present study is thus only the first of a series in which the various aspects of the notebook will be scrutinized.

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Prior to his death in 1913, Victor Chauvin, one of the leading Orientalists of the nineteenth century¹¹ and holder of the chair of Arabic studies at the University of Liège, had decided to bequeath his entire library to his alma mater. This collection contained several thousands of books dealing with Islamic studies in general, with a particular interest in literature, printed between the seventeenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, together with some Arabic manuscripts. The whole library was received shortly after his death and it took years before the cataloging was completed. As for the manuscripts, they were only inventoried in 1928, and it was not until 1968 that they were brought to the knowledge of scholars.¹² The manuscript under discussion (2232) was catalogued at that time as "Arabic MS" and dated approximately to the eighteenth century. This laconic description was in fact based on the information provided by a small piece of paper which had been glued by Chauvin himself on fol. A, where one can read: "450 Manuscrit arabe

¹⁰Manuscripts containing notes (*ta'liqāt*) have, of course, been discovered, but they are not comparable to this kind of book.

¹¹His masterwork remains the famous, but now unfortunately not often used, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1888*, 12 vols. (Liège, 1892–1919).

¹²They were published in the general catalogue, mixed with the Occidental manuscripts. See J. Hoyoux, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège. Manuscrits acquis de 1886 à 1960*, 3 vols. (Liège, 1968–70).

(ancien) du XVIIIe siècle, cart. (curieux), 5–,” which means “450 Arabic manuscript (old) from the eighteenth century, hardbound (odd), 5–.” Undoubtedly this is the kind of description often found in sale catalogues, where here 450 represents the serial number and 5 the proposed price, the currency being probably the franc. Upon receipt of his acquisition, Chauvin wrote on the same folio the following note: “Victor Chauvin le 13 9bre 1904, 5ff 45;” in other words, the book was bought on the 13th of November 1904 for the price of 5.45 francs (the sale price plus the taxes, which amounted to 9%). Apparently, Chauvin did not attach any importance to the manuscript.

It is not possible to trace back the whole history of the manuscript from the death of al-Maqrīzī up to its acquisition by Chauvin. Nevertheless, some clues permit us to imagine broadly how it travelled and through what hands. It has been recently established that in the preserved autograph manuscripts of *al-Muqaffá*¹³ full biographies have been added by another, anonymous, hand on folios left blank by al-Maqrīzī, this hand being attributed to Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī.¹⁴ Ibn Ḥajar is one of the few historians whose holograph manuscripts have been preserved, and thus a comparison with them can easily be made, which confirms the attribution. On the other hand, the greatest part of one of the Leiden copies (MS or. 14533) served as the original for a copy made in the seventeenth century which is found in Istanbul (Süleymaniye MS Pertev 496), but the copyist was not deceived and identified Ibn Ḥajar’s hand, indicating in his copy that this particular biography was Ibn Ḥajar’s work.¹⁵ Coming back to the *codex leodiensis*, I observed a note on fol. 155r in a hand difficult to read, which shows great similarity to that found in the manuscripts of *al-Muqaffá*. Since it has been corroborated that these had been in Ibn Ḥajar’s possession, it would not therefore be surprising that most of al-Maqrīzī’s books, his *tarikah*, passed to his contemporary after his death. I may accordingly conclude that until 852/1449, the date of Ibn Ḥajar’s death, the manuscript was still in Egypt. There is then a huge gap during which we do not know who owned the manuscript.

On fol. 4r, in the upper margin, two notations of ownership are visible. The first reads as follows:

ملك الفقير إلى الله تعالى محمد مرتضى الحسيني غفر عنه في سنة ١١٧٧

This owner can be identified as Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn

¹³Leiden MSS or. 1366a, 1366b, 3075, 14533, and Paris MS arabe 2144.

¹⁴See. J. J. Witkam, “Les autographes d’al-Maqrīzī,” in *Le manuscrit arabe et la codicologie*, ed. Ahmed-Chouqui Binebine (Rabat, 1994), 95.

¹⁵ See *ibid.*, 96.

‘Abd al-Razzāq Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790), the famous author of the *Tāj al-‘Arūs*,¹⁶ which means that at that date (1177/1763–64) the manuscript was still in Egypt. I had already noticed, when I was consulting catalogues for my own cataloguing work, that his name appeared several times as an owner, a fact indicating that he was a collector of rare books in his time.¹⁷ The notebook was surely not the only autograph manuscript of al-Maqrīzī in his library, since, in a reference to the Ṭabarī family of Mecca in his *Tāj al-‘Arūs* (Benghazi, n. d., 3:355), he cited al-Maqrīzī as follows: “kadhā dhakarahu al-Maqrīzī fī ba‘ḍ mu’allafātihi.” But the data supplied by al-Zabīdī about this important family of the Holy City¹⁸ do not appear in any of al-Maqrīzī’s extant works. This raises a problem: where did al-Zabīdī find these details? Two answers may be given: either in an unknown work of al-Maqrīzī, a fact highly improbable as we are well informed, by himself and by his biographers, of all the books he composed, or maybe in another of his notebooks? Whatever the case, al-Zabīdī owned, or at least had access to, this manuscript.

Al-Zabīdī died in 1790 and the second notation of ownership provides us with a possible subsequent owner, either after his death or during his lifetime, which would mean that al-Zabīdī must have sold or donated the manuscript. This uncertainty is increased by the fact that no date has been appended to the name of the new owner. The inscription, almost illegible today, reads:

الحمد لله صار هذا الكتاب في نوبة الفقير إلى الله محمد بن عبد الكريم الفكون غفر له

The *nisbah* of this person (al-Fakkūn, read al-Faggūn) is mentioned in biographical dictionaries as belonging to an important family of *a’yān* from Constantine, currently situated in Algeria: the Banū Lafgūn.¹⁹ One of its most important representatives

¹⁶On him see Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (Leiden, 1949), S2:620 and 696 (Brockelmann mistakenly mentioned him under two entries); ‘Umar Riḍā Kaḥḥālāh, *Mu‘jam al-Mu’allifīn* (Beirut, n. d.), 12:12 (where the same confusion is evident).

¹⁷Here are some of the manuscripts where a possession notation in al-Zabīdī’s handwriting can be found: al-Fāsī, “Dhayl al-Taḳyīd (Cairo, Dār al-Kutub MS 198 *muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth*); Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, “Taḳrīb al-Taḥdhīb” (Dār al-Kutub MS 533 *tārīkh*); Ibn Abī Shaybah, “Al-Muṣannaf fī al-Ḥadīth” (Tunis, Dār al-Kutub al-Waṭanīyah MS 3483, vols. 1, 3–7). There is no doubt that other manuscripts that had been part of al-Zabīdī’s library are to be found in other libraries.

¹⁸About them, see F. Bauden, “Les Ṭabariyya: histoire d’une importante famille de la Mecque (fin XIIIe–fin XVe siècle),” in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras: Proceedings of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd International Colloquium Organized at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in May 1992, 1993 and 1994*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 73, ed. U. Vermeulen and D. De Smet (Leuven, 1995), 253–66 + 5 pl.

¹⁹On them, see H. Touati, *Entre Dieu et les hommes: Lettrés, saints et sorciers au Maghreb (17e*

was ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn (d. 1073/1663), who had been appointed to the coveted post of chief of the caravan of Maliki pilgrims to Mecca, a position which would be transmitted within the family for some time. Al-Ziriklī²⁰ speaks about him and specifies that he had a son named Muḥammad. At first, it is tempting to identify him with the Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm who put his owner’s mark in the notebook, but according to the sources he died in 1114/1702.²¹ This would mean that he owned the manuscript prior to al-Zabīdī, and that the notebook made a journey between Cairo, Constantine, and then Cairo again, which is highly improbable, even if we consider that manuscripts have always travelled widely in the Muslim world. I prefer to believe that this person is another member of the family who died after al-Zabīdī. My hypothesis is supported by the fact that one of the manuscripts owned by al-Zabīdī, besides the Liège manuscript, also bears the ownership mark of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn.²² This clue is insufficient in itself to prove my conviction unconditionally. What seems to me an unassailable argument lies in the Paris MS arabe 1535, a copy of Ibn Khaldūn’s *Al-‘Ibar* (vol. 7). This copy was completed by ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Badr al-Dīn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn on 3 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1179/13 May 1766 (fol. 160r). The name of the copyist is not important, except that he was from the same family, but the fact that on fol. 1r there is an ownership notation of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn is decisive. Fortunately, the date of the copy (1766) allows us to fix a *terminus post quem* for this owner’s mark and to establish that this person lived after that date, thus confirming that the manuscript was first in the possession of al-Zabīdī before it went to Constantine. The circumstances in which it passed from al-Zabīdī to this member of the Banū Lafgūn are not clear, although we have seen that the Banū Lafgūn were in charge of the pilgrimage caravan to Mecca each year. During his stay in Egypt, al-Faggūn could have bought al-Maqrīzī’s notebook, as well as the Tunis manuscript, directly from al-Zabīdī, or from an heir after his death, unless he received them as a gift. In any event, the manuscript was in Algeria at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Constantine was conquered by the French in 1837, and the Paris manuscript of *al-‘Ibar* entered the collection of the then Bibliothèque Royale in 1838, through J. J. Caussin de Perceval. Did the

siècle) (Paris, 1994), chapter 3, 71–110. I wish to express my gratitude to the author for providing me with this reference during one of our many stimulating conversations during a stay in Cairo in April 2000. The Library of the University of Liège holds a manuscript entitled “Rasm Taqtaḍī Ithbāt Nasab al-Sayyid Abī Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn” (MS 5439, fols. 43v–55r).

²⁰Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *Al-A‘lām* (Beirut, 1989), 4:56.

²¹See Touati, *Entre Dieu*, 72.

²²The manuscript of Ibn Abī Shaybah’s “Al-Muṣannaf fī al-Ḥadīth” already mentioned (see above). See Ibrāhīm Shabbūh, *Al-Makḥūṭ* (Tunis, 1989), 14–15.

Liège codex follow the same path? In 1904, Chauvin bought it from a sale catalogue written in French. I will refrain from jumping to conclusions about this last part of the history of the manuscript, but this element is disturbing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The manuscript is composed of 209 folios, plus one fol. A at the beginning and one fol. B at the end. It was foliated at the time it was catalogued, but 4 folios were overlooked and have been numbered by me, with the number of the preceding folio accompanied by the word *bis* (47bis, 82bis, 124bis, 195bis). When I discovered the manuscript, it was in a terrible mess, as several folios, which were now loose leaves, and even a quire, had gotten out of order over time. Careful study allowed me to reorder the notebook completely, which gives the following rearrangement: fols. 4–86, 122, 121, 97–120, 205, 2, 196–204, 123, 87–96, 124–126, 3, 127–195bis, 1. The average size of a folio is 137 by 185 mm. Al-Maqrīzī used two colors of ink: black for the text and red for some titles and words within the texts. For some resumés, he also took the time to write the catchword in the lesser margin of the verso of the folios, and one notices particularly the marginal headlines that appear in one of the resumés. The manuscript has been trimmed, probably after al-Maqrīzī's death: the note inscribed by Ibn Ḥajar on fol. 155r has lost part of its text. This is confirmed by the fact that the autograph volumes of *Al-Muqaffá* were described by a reader during the last year of al-Maqrīzī's life (844/1440) as a ream (*rizmah*).²³ There is no reason to believe that the notebook was worth a binding if one of his personal works was not. The binding which was provided for the notebook was produced in the east, but is of the kind called Occidental, which means without the traditional flap. The boards are decorated with marbled paper, while the spine is covered with brown leather.

The paper is of two different kinds. The first one is a good quality paper, of the Oriental type, glossy and creamy. The other is thicker and darker, and its surface is slightly rough. The most interesting feature is that the paper (of both types) had already been used: this can be deduced from inscriptions written in larger characters throughout the pages. I was able to identify them as being Mamluk chancery documents which had been cut into pieces by paper merchants, who sold them in the form of quires. These quires were in fact composed of scrap paper. I managed to reconstruct from the Liège manuscript five of these chancery documents and could date them precisely and link them to a particular event.²⁴

²³See Witkam, "Les autographes d'al-Maqrīzī," 93–94.

²⁴See the preliminary report on this aspect of my research on the notebook entitled "The Recovery of Mamlūk Chancery Documents in an Unsuspected Place," in *The Mamluks in Egyptian and Syrian Politics and Society*, ed. A. Levanoni and M. Winter (Leiden, in press). This is the prelude

Other samples had already been mentioned in the other autograph manuscripts of al-Maqrīzī,²⁵ but they had always been described merely as pieces of reused paper and were never paid close attention.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTENT

The following description is divided into two sections: the first, which appears here, studies the epitomes, while the second, which will appear in a subsequent issue of this journal, will present the scattered notes. As I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere,²⁶ the notebook was composed progressively, year by year. At first, al-Maqrīzī wrote resumés for which he sometimes used several quires, sometimes not even one. The quires were put together at a time which cannot be fixed precisely, and the spaces that al-Maqrīzī had left blank were filled with notes. This did not necessarily take place after the quires were gathered, but probably both before and after. For this reason, the manuscript gives an impression of chaos at first glance, but this is not the case. In order to make the arrangement understandable, I have decided to follow the aforementioned division. In both sections, I have followed the physical order in which the resumés and the notes respectively appear. A serial number has been attributed to each item, running from I to XXII for the epitomes, and from XXIII to LXXI for the notes.

A. THE EPITOMES²⁷

I. (quires I–III, fols. 4r–31v²⁸)

Title on fol. 4r, line 2: [*Mukhtār/Intiqā' min*] *Kitāb 'Uyūn al-Anbā' fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭibbā'*/Aḥmad ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn Khalīfah al-Khazrajī al-Mutaṭabbib.

[مختار\انتقاء من] كتاب عيون الأنباء في طبقات الأطباء، جمع أحمد بن أبي القاسم بن خليفة الخزرجي المتطبب.

to my forthcoming study which will be entitled *Maqriziana III: Scraps of Paper to the Rescue of History: The Reconstruction of Mamlūk Chancery Documents from the Reign of Sultan 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl (743/1342–746/1345)*.

²⁵See the list of the manuscripts in Bauden, "The Recovery."

²⁶See my "Maqriziana IV: Le carnet de notes d'al-Maqrīzī: l'apport de la codicologie à une meilleure compréhension de sa constitution," to appear in the proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Palaeography and Codicology of Islamic Manuscripts, which was held in Bologna in October 2000 (St. Petersburg, in press).

²⁷I follow the form of the title and the name of the author given by al-Maqrīzī in the first part of each number. Proper identification is provided in the commentary. For reasons of space, bibliographical references for the identification of the authors have been restricted to the minimum. Full references will be found in the critical edition of the text, which is in preparation.

²⁸On fol. 28, a narrow strip of paper has been cut vertically prior to the scribbling.

الحمد لله وحده وصلوة وسلامه على نبينا محمد والديه واجتماع
هذا في اختراجه وكل انتقنه من كتاب عيون الانبياء طبع
الطبايع احمد بن ابي القيس بن خليفة الخزرجي المتطبب رحمه الله
وحب ود صناعة الطب فسيبين يقوم يقولون بقدمه وقوم حجة
وذلك بين على القول بتقديم الاجسام المبتدلة للطب اوجدونها
فانما يكون حجة في قسبان منهم من يقول انه خلق مع خلق آدم
ومنهم من يقول بلا استخراج بعد وهم الجمهور وهو الاصح من قول
هو الهام من الله للناس وهم ابقراط وجميع اصحاب القياس وغير
اليونانيين ومنهم يقول ان الناس استخراجهم اخترف
هو افعال بعضهم استخراجهم اهل مصر وقال اخوانهم من
استخرج سائر الصناعات والفلسفة والطب وقال اخرون ان اهل
فولوس استخراجهم من بلاد وبيد الى القنبا القابلة لامرأة الملك وكان
ياسر وهاو وكل قوم ان اهل سوريا واورشليم استخراجهم
وان هو اول من استخراج الزمرد وكانوا يشقون ملكة الياض
والايقاعات ايام النفس وشيخ ايام النفس ما شق به البدن
وقيل ان المستخرج لها الحكم من اهل قوق في الجزيرة التي كان بها
ايقراط واباه وذكر كثير من لغز ان الطب ظهرت في بلاد
جزائرية وسط اهلهم الرابع ويروى وقيل في بلاد
وقيل استخراجها العنبرانيين وقيل سحرة البروميل سحر ابل او
سحرة فارس وقيل الهند وقيل الصقالية وقيل اهل افريقية

Folio 4r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.

Incipit (fol. 4r, lines 1–3):

الحمد لله وحده وصلوته وسلامه على نبينا محمد وآله وأصحابه
هذا شيء اخترته وكلام انتقيته من كتاب عيون الأنباء في طبقات الأطباء جمع أحمد بن أبي القاسم
بن خليفة الخزرجي المتطبب رحمه الله.

	وجود صناعة الطب قسمين فقوم يقولون بقدمه وقوم بحدته [...] (عيون ١، ص ٤، سطر ١٦)
Fol. 6v	أسقلنبوس (عيون ١، ص ١٥)
Fol. 8v	أفلاطن (عيون ١، ص ٢٣)
Fol. 9r	أبقراط (عيون ١، ص ٢٤)
Fol. 12v	دياسقوريدس (عيون ١، ص ٣٥)
	بندقليس (عيون ١، ص ٣٦)
Fol. 13r	فيثغورس (عيون ١، ص ٣٧)
Fol. 16r	سقراط (عيون ١، ص ٤٣)
Fol. 20r	أفلاطون (عيون ١، ص ٤٩)
Fol. 22v	أرسطوطاليس (عيون ١، ص ٥٤)
Fol. 26v	جالينوس (عيون ١، ص ٧١)
Fol. 29r	محمد بن زكرياء أبو بكر الرازي (عيون ١، ص ٣٠٩)
Fol. 30r	أبو سليمان محمد بن طاهر بن بهرام السجستاني المنطقي (عيون ١، ص ٣٢١)
	محمد بن عمر بن الحسين فخر الدين الرازي (عيون ٢، ص ٢٣)

Explicit (fol. 31v, line 12):

انتهى الغرض المطلوب من تأريخ الأطباء والله الموفق

Commentary:

The source is Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Khalīfah ibn Yūnus al-Sa‘dī al-Khazrajī **Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah** (d. 668/1270), *Kitāb ‘Uyūn al-Anbā’ fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭibbā’*. We refer to the edition prepared by August Müller (Königsberg, 1884; reprint Farnborough, 1972). The work is quoted once in the *Khiṭaṭ* (1:229),²⁹ where it appears to be a citation regarding Pythagoras, which

²⁹References are to the Būlāq edition. It is not mentioned in A. R. Guest, "A List of Writers, Books, and other Authorities mentioned by El Maqrīzi in his *Khiṭaṭ*," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (1902): 103–25, but it is in A. ‘Abd al-Majīd Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr* (Cairo, 1983), 2:91.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ رَبِّ زِدْنِي عِلْمًا وَاعْطِنِي
 بِرَحْمَتِكَ مَعَارِفَهُمَا وَارْزُقْنِي النَّهْرَ عَنْكَ وَاللَّيْلَ عِنْدَكَ وَوَقِّفْنِي
 لِيَوْمِ الْحِسَابِ طَاعَتِكَ وَالْإِقْبَالَ عَلَيْكَ حَتَّى لَا تَتَّخِذَنِي فِي سُوَيْدِ أَرَادَتِكَ
 وَلَا مَحَبَّتِي فِي غَيْرِ عِبَادَتِكَ اللَّهُمَّ صَلِّ عَلَى عَبْدِكَ وَنَبِيِّكَ وَأَمِينِ حَيْكَلِكَ
 وَرَسُولِكَ مُحَمَّدٍ الْيَقِينِ خَلِّصْنَا مِنَ الْإِنْبِيَاءِ وَالرَّسُولِينَ وَفَضَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ
 أَعْمَى وَوَعِيَّا لَهُ وَأَصْحَابِهِ وَالسَّالِعِينَ صَلِّ عَلَى مُحَمَّدٍ الْيَقِينِ وَفَضَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ
 وَبَعْدَ ذَلِكَ فَاصْدُ لِي خَيْرَ كِتَابٍ فَتَوْحِ مِصْرًا وَخَيْرَ هَامِ مِنْ أَيْفِ
 عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْحَكَمِ رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ مَعَ الْأَجْتِهَادِ فِي سِرِّهِ
 جَوَاهِرَ مِنَ الْأَخْبَارِ الَّتِي تَدْعُو الْحَاجَةَ إِلَيْهَا وَتُرْكِبُهَا لِجِنَاحِ الْيَلْبُوتِ
 مِنْ ذَلِكَ كَمَا يُذَكَّرُ الدُّورُ وَالْمِجَادُ الَّتِي دَبَّرَتْ وَكَذَكَرَ الْأَسَانِيدُ
 فِي الْأَخْبَارِ غَيْرِ الْبُيُوتِ وَشَبَّهَ هَذَا وَأَسْلَمَ تَسْبِيْرًا ذَكَرَهُ وَكَرَّمَهُ
 عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو الْعَاصِمِ قَالَ خَلَقْتَ الدُّنْيَا عَلَى صُورَةِ الطَّيْرِ
 بِرَأْسِهِ وَصَدْرِهِ وَجِنَاحِيهِ وَذَيْبِهِ فَالرَّاسُ مِثْلُكَ وَالْمَدِينَةُ وَالْيَمِينُ
 وَالصُّدْرُ وَالسَّنَامُ وَمِصْرُ وَالْجِنَاحُ الْأَيْمَنُ لِعِرَاقٍ وَخَلْفُ الْعِرَاقِ
 أُمَّةٌ يُقَالُ لَهَا وَاقٌ وَخَلْفُ وَاقٍ أُمَّةٌ يُقَالُ لَهَا وَاقٌ وَوَاقٌ وَخَلْفُ
 ذَلِكَ مِنَ الْأَسْمَاءِ مَا لَا يَعْلَمُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالْجِنَاحُ الْأَيْسَرُ السُّنْدُ وَالْهِنْدُ
 وَخَلْفُ الْهِنْدِ أُمَّةٌ يُقَالُ لَهَا بَاسِكٌ وَخَلْفُ بَاسِكٍ أُمَّةٌ يُقَالُ لَهَا مَسْكٌ
 وَخَلْفُ ذَلِكَ مِنَ الْأَسْمَاءِ مَا لَا يَعْلَمُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالذَّيْبُ مِنْ ذَاتِ الْحِمَامِ
 إِلَى مَغْرِبِ الشَّمْسِ وَشَرْمِهَا فِي الطَّيْرِ الذَّيْبُ (وَذَكَرَ وَصِيَّةَ رَسُولِ
 اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بِالْقَبْطِ بِمَا أَشْبَهَ بِنِ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ وَعَبْدِ
 الْمَلِكِ بْنِ مَسْلَمَةَ مَا لَكَ عَنْ ابْنِ شَهَابٍ عَنْ ابْنِ كَعْبٍ بَرَزَ لَكَ أَنْ

لي

جواهر

موقع السناد
من الارض

عبد العزيز

سور

means that it is part of the epitome under discussion. It is highly probable that more passages have been used by al-Maqrīzī in the *Khiṭaṭ*, but this remains to be investigated.

II. (quires IV–VIII, fols. 37v–81v³⁰)

Title on fol. 37v, lines 7–8: *Talkhīṣ Kitāb Futūḥ Miṣr wa-Akḥbārihā* / Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam.

تلخيص كتاب فتوح مصر وأخبارها من تأليف عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن عبد الحكم.

Incipit (fol. 37v, lines 1–11):

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم رب زدني علما وأعطني برحمتك معارف وفهما وارزقني الفهم عنك والاصغاء اليك [...] وبعد فياني قاصد تلخيص كتاب فتوح مصر وأخبارها من تأليف عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن عبد الحكم رحمه الله مع الاجتهاد في سرد ما حواه من الأخبار التي تدعو الحاجة إليها وترك ما لا يحتاج إليه الآن من ذلك كنعو ذكر الدور والمساجد التي دثرت وكذكر الأسانيد في الأخبار غير النبوية وشبهه هذا والله أسأل تيسير ذلك بمنه وكرمه.

First quotation (fol. 37v, lines 12–13):

عن عبد الله بن عمر بن العاص قال خلقت الدنيا على خمس صور على صورة الطير برأسه [...] (فتوح، ص ١)

List of the chapters (*dhikr*):

Fol. 37v	ذكر وصية رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالقبط (فتوح، ص ٢)
Fol. 40r	ذكر سبب نزول القبط بمصر وسكنائها بها (فتوح، ص ٧)
Fol. 42v	ذكر استنباط الفيوم (فتوح، ص ١٤)
Fol. 47bis v	عمل البرابي (فتوح، ص ٢٧)
Fol. 49r	ذكر دخول بخت نصر (فتوح، ص ٣١)
Fol. 52r	ذكر بناء الإسكندرية (فتوح، ص ٣٧)
Fol. 57r	ذكر كتاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى المقوقس (فتوح، ص ٤٥)
Fol. 59r	ذكر سبب دخول عمرو بن العاص مصر (فتوح، ص ٥٣)
Fol. 60v	ذكر فتح مصر (فتوح، ص ٥٥)
Fol. 71v	ذكر من قال إن مصر فتحت بصلح (فتوح، ص ٨٤)
Fol. 73r	ذكر من قال فتحت مصر عنوة (فتوح، ص ٨٨)

³⁰On fol. 55r, al-Maqrīzī wrote only 3 lines of text, leaving the rest and the verso blank. He repeated this on fol. 56, where he wrote only 9 lines on the recto and the verso was left blank. Later on, he used these spaces to write down notes quoted from other sources. For their description, see numbers XXXI–XXXIV.

Fol. 74r	ذكر فتح الفيوم (فتوح ص ١٦٩)
Fol. 74v	كتاب الخطط (فتوح، ص ٩١)
Fol. 78r	ذكر المقطم (فتوح، ص ١٥٦)
Fol. 79v	ذكر أمر عمرو الناس بالخروج إلى الريف (فتوح، ص ١٣٩)
Fol. 81r	ذكر النيل (فتوح، ص ١٤٩)
Explicit (fol. 81v, line 21):	
	[...] فلما قدم الكتاب على عمرو فتح البطاقة فإذا فيها من عبد الله (فتوح، ص ١٥٠، سطر
	[ends abruptly] (١٨)

Commentary:

The source is Abū al-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh **Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam** (d. 257/871), *Kitāb Futūḥ Miṣr wa-Akḥbārihā*.

We rely on the edition published by Charles C. Torrey under the title *The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain known as the Futūḥ Miṣr of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, Edited from the Manuscripts in London, Paris and Leyden* (New Haven, 1922; Leiden, 1920). It was already well known that this source was used extensively by al-Maqrīzī for the *Khiṭaṭ*, where the name of the author as well as the title of the book is mentioned several times.³¹ Indeed, the major part of this epitome is found in the *Khiṭaṭ* verbatim, without modifications in the wording. Comparison with the original source shows, however, some discrepancies, sometimes indicated by Torrey in his *apparatus criticus*, sometimes not.³² The resumé ends, as it seems, abruptly within the story of the virgin who was sacrificed by the Copts in the Nile to induce its flood. This impression is strengthened by the fact that another hand added at a later date the word *kharm* (lacuna) in the lower margin. Another feature supports this idea: a clear examination of the resumé indicates that al-Maqrīzī wrote the catchword in the lesser margin of the verso of each folio, a custom which is generally observed in Islamic codicology, but this is not the case with the last folio of the resumé. Moreover, the last part of the resumé has been written on the fourth bi-folio of the quire, which means that, in this case, three folios remained blank at the end of the quire. These blank folios were filled with various notes at a later stage.³³ All this leads us to believe that al-Maqrīzī really ended his epitome of the *Futūḥ Miṣr* at this point, perhaps because the last

³¹See Guest, "A List of Writers," 111; Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:82, 92.

³²A detailed study of this epitome with the quotations found in the *Khiṭaṭ* is in preparation and will be published under the title "Maqriziana V: Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam and al-Maqrīzī."

³³See nos. XXXV–XXXVII, XXXIX–XL.

story had already been quoted previously,³⁴ though the source differs.³⁵ Nevertheless, one fact contradicts this impression : the whole story of the sacrifice of the virgin is to be read in the *Khīṭaṭ* (1:58)! At this point, several hypotheses may be conjectured: (a) the manuscript of the *Futūḥ* used by al-Maqrīzī ended abruptly at the point where he ended the resumé; (b) like (a), but he found a more complete copy later; (c) al-Maqrīzī decided to terminate the resumé at this point because nothing more interested him in the last parts of the book. The present state of my research makes me think that a complete version of the epitome did not exist, thus favoring the third hypothesis.

III. (quire X, fols. 121r–121v, 97r–98v)

No title. Fourteen *faṣls* dealing with various subjects of the Egyptian economy.

List of the *faṣls*:

- Fol. 121r (١) فصل: كان مروان بن الحكم يكتب لعثمان بن عفان [...] (قوانين، ص ٦٤)
- Fol. 121r (٢) فصل الذي كان يؤخذ بمصر من الجوالي (قوانين، ص ٣١٨)
- Fol. 121r (٣) فصل الذي جرت العادة بشرائه للمتجر السلطاني (قوانين، ص ٣٢٧)
- Fol. 121r (٤) فصل الشب (قوانين، ص ٣٢٨)
- Fols. 121r–121v (٥) فصل النطرون (قوانين، ص ٣٣٤)
- Fol. 121v (٦) فصل دار الضرب بالقاهرة والاسكندرية (قوانين، ص ٣٣١)
- Fol. 121v (٧) فصل دار العيار (قوانين، ص ٣٣٣)
- Fol. 97r (٨) فصل: كان بمصر الحبس الجيوشي بالبرين الشرقي والغربي [...] (قوانين، ص ٣٣٦)
- Fol. 97r (٩) فصل الأسطول (قوانين، ص ٣٣٩)
- Fol. 97v (١٠) فصل مقرر الجسور (قوانين، ص ٣٤٢)
- Fol. 97v (١١) فصل موظف الأتبان بالديار المصرية (قوانين، ص ٣٤٤)
- Fols. 97v–98r (١٢) فصل الخراج بالوجه القبلي من الديار المصرية (قوانين، ص ٣٤٤)
- Fol. 98r (١٣) فصل القرظ (قوانين، ص ٣٤٧)
- Fol. 98r (١٤) فصل: كانت قطيعة خراج الفدان القمح [...] (قوانين، ص ٢٥٨)

Commentary:

Most of this resumé was used by al-Maqrīzī in one place (*Khīṭaṭ* 1:109–11)

³⁴See no. XXVI.

³⁵I still must establish whether or not there are quotations of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s *Futūḥ Miṣr* in the *Khīṭaṭ* that correspond to the last parts of the book which are missing in al-Maqrīzī’s resumé. This matter will be dealt with in “Maqriziana V.”

without indicating the source. I was able to identify the source as Abū al-Makārim al-As‘ad ibn Muhadhhab al-Khaṭīr **Ibn Mammātī** (d. 606/1209), *Qawānīn al-Dawāwīn*. References are made to the edition of ‘Azīz Suryāl ‘Aṭīyah (Cairo, 1943). This work is cited twice in the *Khiṭaṭ*, but only for other passages.³⁶ These *faṣls*, like the entire notebook, were transcribed on the spot, while al-Maqrīzī read the source, and the fact that most of them appear at almost the same place in the *Khiṭaṭ* indicates that al-Maqrīzī was at a preliminary stage of writing.

IV. (quire X, fols. 98v–100r)

No title. Eight *faṣls* concerning the geographical location of Egypt and its wonders, the marvels of the cities of Manf [Memphis] and al-Faramā [Pelusium], the *kharāj* and the Nile.

List of the *faṣls* and incipit:

Fol. 98v

(١) فصل: مصر جعلها الله متوسطة الدنيا وهي في الإقليم الثالث والرابع سلمت من حر الإقليم الأول والثاني ومن برد الإقليم السادس والسابع [...]

Fols. 98v–99r

(٢) فصل: مصر ثمانون كورة ليس فيها كورة إلا وفيها طرائف وعجائب من أنواع البر والأبنية والطعام والشراب والفاكهة [...]

Fol. 99r

(٣) فصل: مدينة منف ذات العجائب بها الأبنية والآثار والدفائن وكنوزها لا تحصى [...]

Fol. 99r

(٤) فصل: الفرما هي أكثر عجائب وأقدم آثارا كان منها طريق إلى جزيرة قبرص في البر فغلب عليه البحر [...]

Fols. 99r–100r

(٥) فصل في خراج مصر: جباها عمرو بن العاص عشرة آلاف ألف دينار فكتب اليه عمر بن الخطاب [...]

Fols. 100r–100v

(٦) فصل النيل: انبعثه من جبل القمر وراء خط الاستواء من عين تجري منها عشرة أنهار [...]

Fol. 100v

(٧) فصل: وجعل الله مصر حاجزا بين بحر الروم وبحر الصين والحاجز بينهما مسيرة ليلة واحدة [...]

³⁶Not mentioned in Guest, "A List of Writers," but mentioned in Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:93.

Fols. 100v–101r

(٨) فصل: نقل من خط القاضي الفاضل ما صورته وجد في كتاب قبطي باللغة الصعيدية مما نقل إلى اللغة العربية أن مبلغ ما كان يستخرج لفرعون مصر [...]

Commentary:

All these *faṣls*, except no. 3, appear extensively in *Khiṭaṭ* as follows: 1 and 2 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:26, in this order; 4 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:211, in this order too; 5 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:98; 6 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:53; 7 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:212; and finally 8 in *Khiṭaṭ* 1:75. For no. 3, cf. *Khiṭaṭ* 1:134 sqq. In the notebook, it is possible to imagine that he wrote them at one sitting, as if they came from the same source. However, sometimes in the *Khiṭaṭ*, he identified, carelessly as usual, the original sources. It turns out that numbers 4 and 7 were taken from a work by Ibn al-Kindī,³⁷ and it may be presumed that number 3 came from the same source.³⁸ Although six *faṣls* have the same origin, it would be untenable to attribute the two remaining to the same source and would constitute an anachronism, as number 8 is quoted from a work by al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (d. 596/1200, on him see number XXVIII), the *Ta'liq al-Mutajaddidāt*, also titled as such with some variations by al-Maqrīzī.³⁹ But in the *Khiṭaṭ*, the work is attributed to al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Asadī!⁴⁰ Finally, for number 6, al-Maqrīzī indicates that it is to be found in Qudāmah ibn Ja'far's *Kitāb al-Kharāj*,⁴¹ but it is not to be found there word for word. A careful examination of the text appearing in the

³⁷Umar ibn Abī 'Umar Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Ibn al-Kindī (date of death unknown), the son of al-Kindī (d. after 350/961). He is the author of a *Faḍā'il Miṣr*, published by Oestrup under the title *Beskrivelse af Ägypten* (Copenhagen, 1896). G. Wiet, in his edition of the *Khiṭaṭ* (4:29–30), quoted the book and insisted that he found what corresponds to our *faṣl* 4 in the notebook in Oestrup's edition (on pp. 232–33). The *Faḍā'il Miṣr* is cited on several occasions by al-Maqrīzī. See Guest, "A List of Writers," 114; Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:92.

³⁸Indeed, we find texts 3 and 4, with the same wording, in Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-Buldān* (Beirut, 1968), 4:256 (s.v. al-Faramā) and vol. 5:214 (s.v. Manf). Yāqūt could not be al-Maqrīzī's source for these passages, because al-Maqrīzī is more complete in his quotations than Yāqūt. It thus seems that Yāqūt took these data from Ibn al-Kindī's text as well. After having consulted recently a newer edition of the *Faḍā'il Miṣr* (ed. Ibrāhīm Aḥmad al-'Adawī and 'Alī Muḥammad 'Umar, Cairo-Beirut, 1971), I have been able to identify clearly numbers 1–5 and 7 as coming directly from this source (respectively on pp. 45, 47, 51, 52, 54, 67 and in this same order).

³⁹*Al-Mutajaddidāt, Mutajaddidāt al-Ḥawādith, al-Muḃawamāt*. See Guest, "A List of Writers," 110; Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:121.

⁴⁰This source is mentioned neither by Guest, "A List of Writers," nor by Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*.

⁴¹Abū al-Faraj Qudāmah ibn Ja'far ibn Qudāmah al-Baghdādī (d. 320/932), *Kitāb al-Kharāj wa-Ṣinā'at al-Kitābah*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Zabīdī (Baghdad, 1981), 151. This source is quoted twice by al-Maqrīzī in the *Khiṭaṭ*. See Guest, "A List of Writers," 117; Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:82.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ رَبِّ زِدْنِي عِلْمًا
 الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ عَالِمًا أُولَىٰ مِنْ لَا حِسَابَ وَالنَّعْمُ وَجِبَالُهُمْ جِبَالُنَا
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَعَجَدُ فِيهَا نَوَائِدَ السُّفْطَانِ مِنْ كِتَابِ
 الْوَاوِيَةِ بِالْوَفِيَّاتِ بِالْبَيْتِ الْعَطِيَّةِ مَطْحِ الدَّرَجِ جَلِيلِ أَيْدِي
 الصَّفِيِّ مَرْفَعِهِ وَجَهْدِهِ عَنِ النَّارِ وَجِئْتُ مَعَ الصَّفْوَةِ الْأَبْرَارِ
 فَصَلِّ بِقَوْلِ الْعَرَبِ أَرْحَمْتَ وَوَرَحْتَ وَتَوَرَّخُونَ
 بِاللَّيَالِي دُونَ الْأَيَّامِ لِأَنَّ الْهَلَالَ إِنَّمَا يَبْرُدُ لَيْلًا وَيُوتُونَ
 الْمَكْرُوبِينَ وَرَوَى الْمَوْتِ بِمَا عَادَ الْعِدَّةُ
 الْعِدَّةُ نَسَقُومُ فِي اللَّيَالِي مَا
 سَبْعَ لَمَّاتٍ إِلَى الْعَشْرِ لَمَّتْ
 لَيْالٍ وَلرَبْعَ لَيْالٍ وَنَقُولُ فِي
وَذَلِكَ نَفْسُهُ
 الْأَيَّامُ ثَلَاثَةٌ أَيَّامٌ وَأَرْبَعَةٌ أَيَّامٌ وَكُلُّهَا إِلَى الْعَشْرِ أَيَّامٌ وَتَقُولُ يَوْمٌ
 وَاحِدٌ وَيَوْمَانِ وَثَلَاثَةٌ أَيَّامٌ وَمَا بَعْدَ إِلَى الْعَشْرِ فَلَمْ يَضِيفُوا
 وَاحِدًا وَكُلُّهَا ثَمَانِيَةٌ لِي مِمَّا لَا يَخْتَصِرُ الشَّعْرُ كَقَوْلِهِ
 كَانَ خَصِيصَةً مِنْ لَدُنِّكَ فَطَرَفٌ مَجْزُوبٌ فِيهِ تَتَأَخَّرُ نَسَقُومُ
 وَأَضَافُوا الْعِدَّةَ مِنَ الثَّلَاثَةِ إِلَى الْعَشْرِ إِلَى جَمْعِ الْقَلْبِ مَا
 ثَلَاثَةٌ أَيَّامٌ وَأَرْبَعَةٌ أَجْمَالٌ وَلَا يَضَافُ عِدَّةُ أَقْلٍ مِنْ سِتَّةٍ إِلَى
 مُمَيَّزِينَ ذِكْرًا وَنَسَقُومُ لِأَنَّ كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْ أَلْفٍ مَزْجُومٌ مَعَ وَ
 الْجَمْعُ ثَلَاثَةٌ وَالْوَاوِيَةُ الْعِدَّةُ الرَّكْبَةُ مِنْ بَعْدِ الْعَشْرِ إِلَى
 الْعَشْرِ أَحَدِي عَشْرَ لَيْلَةٍ وَأَسْبَاعُهُ وَثَلَاثَةٌ وَأَبْعَدُ إِلَى
 الْعَشْرِ مَا بَقِيَ السَّابِعُ فِي الْجَمْعِ مِنْ أَحَدِي عَشْرَ وَأَسْبَاعُهُ

Khiṭaṭ demonstrates that it comes from an indirect source that is probably al-Nuwayrī's (d. 733/1333) *Nihāyat al-Arab*,⁴² 1:262–64. However, the text present in the resumé, although containing the same data and almost the same phrasing, contains some discrepancies from the final version found in the *Khiṭaṭ*. This could mean that the source was not al-Nuwayrī, even if ultimately it is from this source that al-Maqrīzī made the citation.⁴³ I cannot help but think that this section was written at a preliminary stage in the redaction of the *Khiṭaṭ*, and the order of the *faṣls* has changed in the final version.

V. (quires XI–XIII, IX, fols. 101v–120v, 205, 2,⁴⁴ 196r–204v, 87r–96v⁴⁵)

Title on fol. 101v, lines 3–5: *Fawā'id [Multaqāṭah⁴⁶] min Kitāb al-Wāfī bi-al-Wafayāt/Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī.*

فوائد [ملتقطه] من كتاب الوافي بالوفيات، تأليف العلامة صلاح الدين خليل بن أبيك الصفدي
Incipit (fol. 101v, lines 1–5):

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، رب زدني علما. الحمد لله على ما أولى من الإحسان وأنعم وصلى الله على
نبينا محمد وآله وسلم.

وبعد فهذه فوائد التقطتها من كتاب الوافي بالوفيات تأليف العلامة صلاح الدين خليل بن أبيك
الصفدي صرف الله وجهه عن النار وحشره مع الصفوة الأبرار [...]]

List of the *faṣls* and the biographies:

Fols. 101v–102v

فصل: تقول العرب أرخت وورخت ويؤرخون بالليالي دون الأيام لأن الهلال إنما يرى ليلا (الوافي ١،
ص ١٦)

⁴²Cairo, 1923.

⁴³The same passage found in al-Nuwayrī and the *Khiṭaṭ* appears in al-Suyūṭī's *Huṣn al-Muḥāḍarah*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1968), 2:347–49, 355–56, where al-Suyūṭī declares that the passages were taken from the *Mabāhij al-Fikar* by Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Waṭwāṭ al-Kutubī (d. 718/1318). See the facsimile of MS Fātiḥ 4116 published by F. Sezgin under the title *Encyclopædia of Four Natural Sciences*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 1990). It is highly probable that the *Mabāhij al-Fikar* was indeed the source used by al-Maqrīzī for the resumé (see no. LXX).

⁴⁴A large vertical strip of paper was removed from fol. 2, prior to al-Maqrīzī's scribbling.

⁴⁵This quire was placed between quires VIII and X; it was bound there and cannot be moved physically, until the manuscript has been restored. It is clear, however, that its original position was after quire XIII, which ends with biographies of those whose *ism* is Aḥmad. This quire begins with biographies of those whose *ism* is Ismā'īl.

⁴⁶Al-Maqrīzī speaks in the first person: *fawā'id iltaqāṭuhā*.

Fols. 102v–103r

فصل تقول للعشرة وما دونها خلون ولما فوق العشرة خلت ومضت ومن بعد العشرين لتسع أن بقين بلفظ الشك (الوافي ١ ، ص ٢٠)

Fols. 103r–104r

١) محمد بن محمد بن علي بن محمد بن سليم المصري صاحب تاج الدين أبو عبد الله بن صاحب فخر الدين بن الوزير بهاء الدين بن حنا (ت ٧٠٧ ، الوافي ١٤٦١\١ و ص ٢١٧)

Fols. 104r–104v

٢) محمد بن محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن يوسف التونسي ركن الدين أبو عبد الله الجعفري التونسي المعروف بان القويح (ت ٧٣٨ ، الوافي ١٥٩١\١ ، ص ٢٣٨)

Fols. 104v–105v

٣) محمد بن محمد بن محمد بن أحمد بن سيد الناس فتح الدين أبو الفتح اليعمري الربعي (ت ٧٣٤ ، الوافي ١٩٨٢\٢ ، ص ٢٨٩)

Fols. 105v–106v

٤) محمد بن محمد بن محمد بن الحسن بن أبي الحسن بن صالح بن علي بن يحيى بن طاهر بن محمد بن الخطيب أبي يحيى عبد الرحيم بن نباتة الفارقي الأصل المصري المولد الحذاقي الشافعي جمال الدين أبو بكر الأديب الناظم (ت ٧٦٨ ، الوافي ١٩٩١\١ ، ص ٣١١)

Fols. 106v–107r

٥) محمد بن إبراهيم بن سعد الله بن جماعة بن علي بن جماعة بن حازم بن صخر بدر الدين أبو عبد الله الكناني الحموي (ت ٧٣٣ ، الوافي ٢٦٨٢\٢ ، ص ١٨)

Fols. 107r–107v

٦) محمد بن إبراهيم بن ساعد شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الأنصاري المعروف بابن الأكفاني السنجاري المولد والأصل المصري الدار (ت ٧٤٩ ، الوافي ٢٧٥٢\٢ ، ص ٢٥)

Fols. 107v–108v

٧) محمد بن أحمد بن عثمان بن قايماز شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الذهبي (ت ٧٤٨ ، الوافي ٥٢٣\٢ ، ص ١٦٣)

Fols. 108v–109r

٨) محمد بن الحسين بن رزين بن موسى بن عيسى بن موسى بن نصر الله تقي الدين أبو عبد الله الحموي العامري (ت ٦٨٠ ، الوافي ٨٧٩\٣ ، ص ١٨)

Fol. 109r

٩) محمد بن دانيال بن يوسف الخزاعي الموصلبي شمس الدين (ت ٧١٠ ، الوافي ٩٥١\٣ ، ص ٥١)

Fols. 109r-109v

(١٠) محمد بن سعيد بن حماد بن محسن بن عبد الله بن حياني بن صنهاج بن ملال الصنهاجي شرف الدين أبو عبد الله (ت ٦٩٦-٦٩٧، الوافي ٣\١٠٤٥، ص ١٠٥)

Fol. 109v

(١١) محمد بن عبد البر بن يحيى بن علي بن تمام بهاء الدين أبو البقاء بن القاضي سديد الدين السبكي الأنصاري الشافعي (ت ؟، الوافي ٣\١١٩٩، ص ٢١٠)

Fols. 110r-110v

(١٢) محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر جلال الدين أبو عبد الله القزويني (ت ٧٣٩، الوافي ٣\١٢٥٥، ص ٢٤٢)

Fol. 110v

(١٣) محمد بن عبد الرحيم بن عمر الباجري الخزرجي (ت ٧٢٤، الوافي ٣\١٢٦٩، ص ٢٤٩)

Fol. 111r

(١٤) محمد بن عيد الله بن الحسن بن علي أبو المكارم شرف الدين الصفراوي الإسكندري المصري الشافعي المعروف بابن عين الدولة (ت ٦٣٩، الوافي ٣\١٤٣٣، ص ٣٥٢)

Fols. 111r-111v

(١٥) محمد بن عبد الله بن عبد الظاهر بن نشوان بن عبد الظاهر فتح الدين ابن محيي الدين الجذامي المصري (ت ٦٩١، الوافي ٣\١٤٤٣، ص ٣٦٦)

Fols. 111v-112r

(١٦) محمد بن عبد الله بن إبراهيم الشهير بالمرشدي (ت ٧٣٧، الوافي ٣\١٤٤٩، ص ٣٧٢)

Fols. 112r-113r

(١٧) محمد بن عثمان بن أبي الرجاء شمس الدين التنوخي ابن السلعوس (ت ٦٩٣، الوافي ٣\١٥٥٥، ص ٨٦)

Fol. 113r

(١٨) محمد بن عثمان بن أبي الحسن شمس الدين بن صفى الدين الأنصاري الحنفي ابن الحريري الدمشقي (ت ٧٢٨، الوافي ٤\١٥٥٩، ص ٩٠)

Fols. 113r-114r

(١٩) محمد بن علي بن محمد بن أحمد بن عبد الله محيي الدين الطائي الحاتمي الأندلسي ابن العربي (ت ٦٣٨، الوافي ٤\١٧١٣، ص ١٧٣)

Fols. 114r-115v

(٢٠) محمد بن علي بن وهب بن مطيع تقي الدين أبو الفتح بن دقيق العيد القشيري المنفلوطي المصري (ت ٧٠٢، الوافي ٤\١٧٤١، ص ١٩٣)

Fols. 115v–116v

(٢١) محمد بن عمر بن مكّي بن عبد الصمد صدر الدين ابن المرّحل ويعرف في الشام بابن وكيل بيت المال المصري الأصل العثماني الشافعي (ت ٧١٦، الوافي ١٨٠٢\٤، ص ٢٦٤)

Fol. 116v

(٢٢) محمد بن عيسى بن حسن بن كر من ولد مروان الحمار شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الحنبلي (ت ٧٦٣، الوافي ١٨٤٦\٤، ص ٣٠٥)

Fols. 116v–117v

(٢٣) محمد بن فضل الله القاضي فخر الدين (ت ٧٣٢، الوافي ١٨٩٠\٤، ص ٣٣٥)

Fols. 117v–120, 205, 2, 196v

(٢٤) محمد بن قلاوون ناصر الدين أبو الفتح بن المنصور الملك الناصر (ت ٧٤١، الوافي ١٩١٧\٤، ص ٣٥٣)

Fols. 196v–197r

(٢٥) محمد بن مكرم بن علي بن أحمد الأنصاري الرويفعي الإفريقي المصري جمال الدين أبو الفضل (ت ٧١١، الوافي ٢٠٤٤\٥، ص ٥٤)

Fol. 197r

(٢٦) محمد بن نامور بن عبد الملك أفضل الدين الخونجي (ت ٦٤٦، الوافي ٢١٢١\٥، ص ١٠٨)

Fols. 197v–198v

(٢٧) محمد بن يوسف بن علي بن يوسف بن حيان أثير الدين أبو حيان الغرناطي (ت ٧٤٥، الوافي ٢٣٤٥\٥، ص ٢٦٧)

Fol. 198v

(٢٨) محمد بن يوسف بن أحمد بن عبد الدائم محب الدين أبو عبد الله بن نجم الدين التيمي (ت ؟، الوافي ٢٣٤٨\٥، ص ٢٩٠)

Fol. 199r

(٢٩) محمد جمال الدين الساوجي (ت بعد ٦٣٠، الوافي ٢٣٥١\٥، ص ٢٩٢)

Fols. 199r–200v

(٣٠) إبراهيم بن أحمد جمال الدين أبو إسحق بن المغربي (ت ٧٥٦، الوافي ٢٣٨٨\٥، ص ٣١٤)

Fol. 200v

(٣١) إبراهيم بن عبد الله بن هبة الله بن مرزوق صفي الدين العسقلاني (ت ٦٥٩، الوافي ٢٤٧٣\٦، ص ٣٩)

Fol. 201r

(٣٢) إبراهيم بن عرفات بن صالح زين الدين بن أبي المنى القبابي (ت ٧٤٤، الوافي ٢٤٩٥\٦، ص ٥٥)

اسم عيلى بن عبد الجبار بن يوسف بن عبد الجبار بن شهاب بن الطاهر
 علم الدين بن لاظم الى اجماع الجذامى الصويلى القديس المرحوم
 احمد بن بن برية وسبع من السلف وولي يوانا لجنير للسلطان
 صلاح الدين بن ابي العزيم والافضل والقاعد الى الرضوخ منه
 وكان شاعرا متمرسا وعاشر هو وابوه عمرا واحدا طرا واحدا
 منها احدي وستين سنة واما في في القعدة وولي كل منها دوا
 الجيش عشرين سنة وهذا اتفاق غرب وكانت وفاته سنة
 عشر ومائة
 اسم عيلى بن عيا اللطاف ابو يعقوب الدين بن الفدا بن لا فضل بن
 الظفر بن منصور بن الدين بن عمر بن اصف شاه بن يوسف بن شاد بن
 مات كهنلا سنة ثمان مائة وبعثه الملك لعله الافضل محمد وكان اول
 امير ايدوشق فلما كان لنا صر محمد ولا في الكرك باع في خدمته
 فلما عاد الى مكة اعطاه مدينة جاهه من بلاد من سند من المانطة التي
 جلب بعد موت محمد بن محمد سلطانا بقلها ما احتسار
 من اقطاع وغيره ليس للنايب بصر ولا العزيم بعد فيها جكر الامان
 كردد عكر من حمل والشام فجزوه من جاهه وركب في الناهن
 بن عمار الملك وابنته السلطنة ومشي الامراء والناس في خدمته حتى
 الامير اعور الناب وقام له كبر الذي يظن ان اجماع اليه في ذلك اللهم
 من اشارة في الامعان في اوجوه الدولة وغيره ولقبه
 الملك الصالح ثم بعد قليل لقبه الملك ابو يد وكان في كل سنة بعد
 لامصر بانواع الخيل والرقص والحواهر وغيرها ما يهدى بطول

Fols. 201r–201v

(٣٣) إبراهيم بن لقمان بن أحمد بن محمد بن فضلان أبو إسحق فخر الدين الشيباني الإسعدي (ت ٦٩٣، الوافي ٦\٢٥٢٧، ص ٩٧)

Fol. 201v

(٣٤) إبراهيم بن معضاد بن شداد برهان الدين الجعبري (ت ٦٨٧، الوافي ٦\٢٥٩٢، ص ١٤٧)

Fol. 201v

(٣٥) إبراهيم بن لاجين بن عبد الله برهان الدين الرشيد (ت ٧٤٩، الوافي ٦\٢٦١٤، ص ١٦٤)

Fols. 201v–202r

(٣٦) إبراهيم الحائك ويقال الحجار والمعمار غلام النوري المصري (ت ؟، الوافي ٦\٢٦٣٣، ص ١٧٣)

Fols. 202r–202v

(٣٧) إبراهيم جمال الدين جمال الكفاة وابن خالة النشو (ت ٧٤٥، الوافي ٦\٢٦٣٦، ص ١٨٠)

Fol. 202v

(٣٨) أحمد بن إدريس شهاب الدين الصنهاجي القرافي (ت ٦٨٢، الوافي ٦\٢٧٠٨، ص ٢٣٣)

Fol. 203r

(٣٩) أحمد بن أبي بكر بن عزام بهاء الدين الأسواني المحتد الإسكندراني المولد (ت ٧٢٠، الوافي ٦\٢٧٦٥، ص ٢٧٠)

Fols. 203r–204v

(٤٠) أحمد بن الحسن الامام الحاكم بأمر الله أمير المؤمنين أبو العباس بن الأمير أبي علي الحسن القبي بن أبي بكر بن علي بن المسترشد بن المستظهر العباسي (ت ؟، الوافي ٦\٢٨١٩، ص ٣١٧)

Fol. 204v

(٤١) أحمد بن سعيد بن محمد تاج الدين بن شرف الدين بن شمس الدين بن الأثير الحلبي (ت ٦٧١، الوافي ٦\٢٩٠٦، ص ٣٩٢)

Fol. 87r

(٤٢) إسماعيل بن عبد الجبار بن يوسف بن عبد الجبار بن شبل أبو الطاهر علم الدين الأكرم أبي الحجاج الجذامي الصويسي المقدسي المصري (ت ٦١٠، الوافي ٩\٤٠٤٣، ص ١٤١)

Fols. 87r–87v

(٤٣) إسماعيل بن علي الملك المؤيد عماد الدين أبو الفداء بن الأفضل بن مظفر بن المنصور تقي الدين عمر بن شاهنشاه بن أيوب بن شادي (ت ٧٣٢، الوافي ٩\٤٠٨٥، ص ١٧٣)

Fol. 88r

(٤٤) إسماعيل بن محمد بن قلاوون السلطان الملك الصالح بن الناصر بن المنصور عماد الدين أبو الفداء (ت ٧٤٦، الوافي ٩\٤١٢٣، ص ٢١٩)

Fols. 88r-88v

(٤٥) إسماعيل بن محمد بن ياقوت الخوجا مجد الدين السلامي (ت ٧٤٣، الوافي ٩\١٢٤، ص ٢٢٠)

Fol. 88v

(٤٦) أصلم الأمير بهاء الدين (ت ٧٤٦، الوافي ٩\٢١١، ص ٢٨٥)

Fols. 88v-89r

(٤٧) أغرلو الأمير شجاع الدين (ت ٧٤٨، الوافي ٩\٢٢٥، ص ٢٩٤)

Fols. 89r-89v

(٤٨) أقسنقر الفارقاني (ت ٦٧٦، الوافي ٩\٢٤٥، ص ٣١٠)

Fol. 89v

(٤٩) أقسنقر السلاري (ت ٧٤٥، الوافي ٩\٢٤٧، ص ٣١٣)

Fols. 89v-90v

(٥٠) آقوش الأفرم جمال الدين (ت بعد ٧٢٠، الوافي ٩\٢٦٥، ص ٣٢٦)

Fols. 91r-91v

(٥١) آقوش الأشرفي الأمير جمال الدين (ت ٧٣٦، الوافي ٩\٢٦٧، ص ٣٣٦)

Fols. 91v-92r

(٥٢) أكرم كريم الدين الصغير (ت ٧٢٦، الوافي ٩\٢٧٥، ص ٣٤٥)

Fols. 92r-92v

(٥٣) الأكوز الناصري (ت ٧٣٨، الوافي ٩\٢٧٦، ص ٣٤٨)

Fol. 92v

(٥٤) أطنبغا المارداني الساقي الناصري (ت ٧٤٤، الوافي ٩\٢٩٢، ص ٣٦٥٤)

Fol. 92v

(٥٥) أطنبغا الجاولي (ت ٧٤٤، الوافي ٩\٢٩٣، ص ٣٦٦)

Fol. 93r

(٥٦) ألماس (ت ٧٣٣-٤، الوافي ٩\٢٩٦، ص ٣٧٠)

Fols. 93r-93v

(٥٧) أملك الأمير سيف الدين (ت ٧٤٦، الوافي ٩\٢٩٧، ص ٣٧٢)

Fols. 93v-94r

(٥٨) آنوك بن الناصر محمد بن قلاوون (ت ٧٤٠، الوافي ٩\٣٦٥، ص ٤٣١)

Fols. 94r-96v

(٥٩) أيبك بن عبد الله الصالح المملك المعز عز الدين التركماني (ت ٦٥٥، الوافي ٩\٤٤٣، ص ٤٦٩)

Fol. 96v

(٦٠) أيذمر الخطيري (ت ٧٣٨، الوافي ١٠\٤٤٦، ص ١٧)

Commentary:

The source is Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak **al-Ṣafadī** (d. 764/1363), *Kitāb al-Wāfī bi-al-Wafāyāt*. References are to the edition published beginning in 1949,⁴⁷ with mention of the date of death (preceded by *tā'*), the volume and the number of the biography in it, and finally the page on which the biography begins.

Al-Ṣafadī is quoted only thrice in the *Khīṭaṭ*,⁴⁸ but most of the persons whose biographies are found in this resumé are mentioned in this work. When al-Maqrīzī speaks of a particular building erected by a celebrity, he adds details about his biography. For the Mamlūk period, most of the information can be traced back to this resumé, but it would be too reductive to believe that the resumé was used solely in the *Khīṭaṭ*. I have noticed that al-Maqrīzī also used this kind of biography in *Al-Muqaffá*. Further study will be required in order to verify whether this material also appears in *Itti'āz al-Hunafā'* and *Al-Sulūk*. The epitome resumes with what seems to be the end of the letter *hamzah*, and it is tempting to think that al-Maqrīzī did not go further. This is far from being the case: *Khīṭaṭ*, 2:35 contains a biography of Bashtāk, where al-Maqrīzī reveals that most of it was borrowed from al-Ṣafadī (i.e., *Al-Wāfī*). This citation shows that he made a resumé of *Al-Wāfī* which went far beyond what is found in the notebook.

VI. (quire XIV, fols. 124r–125v)

No title. Two *faṣls* dealing with juridical matters, one regarding the law of inheritance when the deceased leaves three or more daughters and no son, the other the conditions according to the various schools of law in which the security for a debt (*rahn al-dayn*) vanishes.

List of the *faṣls* and incipit:

Fols. 124r–124v

فصل في ميراث البنات: لا خلاف أن من مات وترك ثلاث بنات فأكثر من غير ابن ذكر إن لهن ثلثا ما ترك [...]]

Fols. 124v–125v

فصل في تلاف الرهن من غير فعل الراهن ولا المرتهن: هذه مسألة اختلف أهل العلم فيها على خمسة أقوال [...]]

⁴⁷*Das biographische Lexikon des Ṣalāḥaddīn Ḥalīl ibn Aibak aṣ-Ṣafadī*, Bibliotheca Islamica 6, ed. H. Ritter (vol. 1), S. Dederling (vol. 2–6), I. 'Abbās (vol. 7), M. Y. Najm (vol. 8), J. Van Ess (vol. 9), A. Amara and J. Sublet (vol. 10) (Wiesbaden-Istanbul-Damascus-Beirut, 1949–80).

⁴⁸See Guest, "A List of Writers," 118; Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:69 (*A'yān al-'Aṣr*), 75, and 96. Note that Harīdī gives two titles on pp. 75 and 96: *Tārīkh* and *Kitāb*, but neither of them appears in the *Khīṭaṭ*. In fact, both of them are passages coming from the *Kitāb al-Wāfī* (number 1 of the resumé appears in *Khīṭaṭ*, 2:429).

فصل في منافع الحيوان : الحيوان الذي له قرون له نطفة
 حيوان له جاف لقرون له نطفة لقرون له نطفة لقرون له نطفة لقرون له نطفة
 لغزاله واذا ترك تحت راسه من نطفة في يومه زال عنه ذلك وان
 اخذ من شعرة الفرس وشدت على باب بيت بالعرض له يده
 ناموسا يعوض واذا اغرت المرأة جافه اسقطت الشيمة والحين
 البيت واذا دفن حافر الفرس الشموس في داره بالفار عنها
 وعرق الفرس اذا يطا به عانه في ابلع الحبل وابطله لم ينبت هناك
 شعر وان طليت به البواسير نفعها نفعا سينا وان سقى به نصلها
 ميسوا ينقل من جرح به واذا اغرت الفرس من عسر ولادها سهل
 عليها واذا در على الجرح الذي يسيل منه الدم قطع الدم واذا اسقط
 صاحبها لعنانه يعصاه سيل حينه انقطع دمه واذا اقطر في الا
 زال وجعها بقل ان شربت امرأة من شحم اذنيه لم تحبل وان
 سقى انسان من مخه كملت جميع جوارحه وصار كالبهيمة وان كلفه حبل
 كان لولده ابله خبيثا واذا سحق من جافه خمسة دراهم واصيفها
 دهراس وطيب به راسه لا تقع نبت شعرة وان حرق البنت بجافه شعر
 بدنه وزيد صرب الفار منه واذا تحملت امرأة من عرقه في صوفه لم تحبل
 وان شربت من بوله اسقطت وان كانت ولادتها عجة هارت لطفها
 واذا شد الزبور الذي في دبر البغل الصغير على عضد جامل استسقط
 الجمار اذا سمع الكلب نبيقه تالم وعموعه من شهه الالم واذا ركب
 من لذعته عقرب جمار وجعل وجهه الى ذنبه فان الجمار اذا
 شغبه انتقل الالم الى الجمار واذا شد ذنبا لجمار حجر زنه عشرون

Commentary:

So far I have not been able to identify the source of these *faṣls*, nor to see if something equivalent appears in al-Maqrīzī's extant works. Still I want to point out that he dwells on the problem of inheritance in the Fatimid period in the *Khīṭaṭ*, 1:111, which demonstrates that he was interested in this matter.

VII. (quires XV–XVI, fols. 131r–142r)

Title on fol. 131r, line 1: *Faṣl fī Manāfi' al-Ḥayawān*.

فصل في منافع الحيوان

Incipit (fol. 131r, lines 1–2):

الحيوان الذي له قرن له ظلف، حيوان له حافر لا قرن له [...]

List of the animals:

Fol. 131r	الفرس
	البغل
Fols. 131r–131v	الحمار
Fol. 131v	الجمل
	البقر
Fols. 131v–132r	الجاموس
Fol. 132r	الضأن
	المعز
	الأيل
	ابن آوى
Fols. 132r–132v	الأرنب
Fol. 132v	الأسد
	البيبر
	الثعلب
Fols. 132v–133r	الخنزير
Fol. 133r	الدب
Fols. 133r–133v	الذئب
Fol. 133v	السنور
	الضبيع

Fols. 133v–134r	الفهد
Fol. 134r	القرد
	الكلب
	النمر
Fols. 134r–134v	السناد
Fol. 134v	شاذه وار
	الفيل
Fols. 134v–135r	الكركدن
Fol. 135r	ابن عرس
Fols. 135r–139r	فصل في منافع الطير
Fol. 135r	الإوز
	البلبل
Fols. 135r–135v	اليوم
Fol. 135v	الحبارى
	الحجل
	الهدأة
	الحمام
Fols. 135v–136r	الخطاف
Fol. 136r	الوطواط
	الدجاج
Fols. 136r–136v	الرخم
Fol. 136v	الزاع
	الطاووس
Fols. 136v–137r	العصفور
Fol. 137r	العقاب
	العنقاء
Fols. 137r–137v	الغراب

Fol. 137v	الفاختة
	القبج
	القلق
	مالك الحزين
Fols. 137v–138r	النسر
Fol. 138r	النعام
Fols. 138r–138v	الهدهد
Fol. 138v	الوطواط
	اليراعة
	اليمام
	البازي
	التنوط
	التدرج
Fols. 138v–139r	القوقنس
Fol. 139r	الكركي
	البيغاء
Fols. 139r–141v	فصل في الحشرات والهوام
Fol. 139r	الأرضة
Fols. 139r–139v	الأفعى
Fol. 139v	البرغوث
	الثعبان
	الحرقوص
Fols. 139v–140r	الحية
Fol. 140r	الخراطين
	الخنفساء
	دود القز
	الذباب
Fols. 140r–140v	السالامندرا

Fol. 140v	سام أبرص السلحفاة الضب العقرب
Fols. 140v–141r	العنكبوت
Fol. 141r	الفأر الفراش الفسافس
Fols. 141r–141v	القمل
Fol. 141v	الصناجة
Fols. 141v–142r	فصل في حيوان الماء
Fol. 141v	التمساح سميكة صيدا
Fols. 141v–142r	العلق
Fol. 142r	الرعادة

Commentary:

This *faṣl* deals only with animals, more precisely the medical usefulness of some parts of their bodies. Evidently, the animals are classified according to species, although al-Maqrīzī did not indicate in each case the precise species.⁴⁹ Within each species, the classification adopted is alphabetical, although one can see that some animals have been added at the end of each species, as if al-Maqrīzī was going backwards in the text he was reading. It is hard to conceive that this kind of information could have been of any use to al-Maqrīzī for any of his writings, but this impression is misleading. I was able to trace at least two quotations from this resumé in the *Khiṭaṭ*. Both of them deal with animals of the last classification: the crocodile (*Khiṭaṭ*, 1:67) and the *ra‘ādah* (the electric ray) (*Khiṭaṭ*, 1:65). In the first of these, two lines before the beginning of the passage, al-Maqrīzī cites the name of Ibn Zuhr,⁵⁰ which is preceded a few lines before by the name of Ibn

⁴⁹It is only the case at the beginning of the resumé, where one perceives that we have first the *dawābb* (riding animals), followed by the *na‘am* (grazing livestock), then the *sibā‘* (beasts of prey).

⁵⁰This is Abū al-‘Alā’ Zuhr ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad ibn Marwān ibn Zuhr al-Ishbīlī al-Iyādī (d. 525/1131). See on him *GAL* 1:486, no. 13 and *S1*:889, no. 13. He is the author of a

al-Bayṭār. It would, of course, be tempting to attribute the material to be found in the resumé to Ibn Zuhr, but this would be acting too quickly. The text that appears immediately after the name of Ibn Zuhr is not to be found in the resumé, which proves that the direct source is different. A comparison of the resumé with a manuscript of Ibn Zuhr's *Khawāṣṣ al-Ḥayawān* (Berlin, Ahlwardt 6166) reveals that the data contained in both texts are very similar. However, in Ibn al-Zuhr's text, the material is presented differently: all the animals are considered as a group, organized alphabetically, without taking into account a statement of species. It is highly improbable that al-Maqrīzī would have written the resumé reordering all the data according to the division in species. This is completely incompatible with his working method, as we will establish in "Maqriziana II." The fact that al-Maqrīzī's resumé bears resemblance to Ibn Zuhr's text indicates that he must have used an intermediate source which relied mainly on Ibn Zuhr. This is the case with Ibn al-Bayṭār (d. 646/1248) in his *Al-Jāmi' li-Mufradāt al-Adwiyah wa-al-Aghdhiyah*,⁵¹ where Ibn Zuhr is quoted for the medical benefits of the crocodile. This proves that the material found in the *Khīṭaṭ* comes directly from Ibn al-Bayṭār, but it is impossible to identify the resumé as being an epitome of Ibn al-Bayṭār's book, which is comparable to Ibn Zuhr's work in its arrangement of the data (i.e., no distribution by species). We thus have to look for another author who would have relied on Ibn Zuhr, but would have rearranged the data according to species. This is the case with al-Qazwīnī's *'Ajā'ib al-Makhlūqāt*.⁵² Here again, a comparison of the resumé with the data included in this text reveals that there is an important relationship between the two, and one could believe that this is actually the original source of al-Maqrīzī in the Liège manuscript. Problems remain: al-Qazwīnī did not consider the aquatic animals, meaning that the crocodile and the *ra'ādah* do not appear in his book, and data found in the resumé are lacking in the *'Ajā'ib*. Al-Qazwīnī's book must thus be set aside, leaving the mystery of the source of the resumé in the Liège codex unresolved for the time being.⁵³

book entitled *Khawāṣṣ al-Ḥayawān*, where *khawāṣṣ* is a synonym of *manāfi'*.

⁵¹Cairo-Būlāq, 1291/1874, 4 vols.

⁵²Ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1849) under the title *Zakariya Ben Muhammed Ben Mahmud el-Cazwini's Kosmographie: Erster Theil: Kitāb 'Ajā'ib al-Makhlūqāt*. Al-Qazwīnī died in 682/1283.

⁵³M. Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften* (Leiden/Cologne, 1972), 5–42, speaks of other works related to this kind of literature, where the material was classified according to species and then by alphabetical order of the animals, but I must still investigate this matter. One of these works, the *Mabāhij al-Fikar* of al-Waṭwāt, must be disregarded, as it does not deal with the medical uses of the various parts of animals (*khawāṣṣ*). See R. Kruk, "Some Late Mediæval Zoological Texts and Their Sources," in *Actas del XII Congreso de la U.E.A.I. (Malaga, 1984)* (Madrid, 1986), 424.

صاحبها شديداً سبق رخوا لاله فاذا الهبت الشهوة جراته
 تفحنت بعرضه فأنزل مع انزال من مائة وهذا أشد هولاً
 من اجل اللذين والشهوتين (د) مقتداً لفقير عمارة (د)
 على ما ذكر ابن المتوج في كتاب المخطط قال لما مات العاضد واستقر
 امور صلاح الدين وقصد التوجه الى بلاد الشام استتاب
 عنه في الزيار المصرية ابن اخيه الملك المنصور بن المنصور
 ابن ايوب فبلغه ولوع عمارة بالراية في العاضد والقريض فتيقن
 فامر شقيقه فادرعاه الى العائج القاضد فتمنع فيه فترك ونهاه عن
 العود ثم بلغه عنه انه قال عظيم الامر ومخناه ما بين
 فامر شقيقه ببلغه ذلك ففصل العائج القاضد وقال له
 عبد الرحيم اجتمع صداعي فالراسر عتاه الصداع فتمنع فيه
 وكانت منازل العزيز مصر قد وقبها المنصور عن الذكور وكان من بنا
 المعز القاطم بنا هانظرة لاخته لما قدمت عن العرب ولمكرامها ما يحيا
 عن نظرا ينل ثم تداوها الخلقا للفره الى زين العاضد فلما استقر
 امر صلاح الدين بعد العاضد وحضر اليه ابنه واخوته واولادهم
 انزل المنصور في الدين في هذه المنظر فلما استقر بها اشتراها جميعها
 وحمام الذهب المجامع لها وبيع ايضا من بنا العز والاسطبل المحاور
 الحمام زينت لمار واستر به جرمه مصر العروقه بالروضة وحمل
 منازل العروقه في مال الفقير عمارة
 يا بالديار عتاه البين وقعات الارسوا حلت منهن سادات
 في المنار لي فيها علامات من بعد سكانها اهل العلاماتوا

Folio 149r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.

In summary, Ibn Zuhr's *Khawāṣṣ al-Ḥayawān* is probably the basis of the resumé, but by way of another source which relied on it while reordering the material according to species.

VIII. (quire XVII, fols. 146r–149r)

No title. Text dealing with love and its various aspects.

List of the sections and incipit:

Fol. 146r	(١) في القبلة: قال أبقرط الجماع بغير مؤانسة جفاء [...]
	(٢) آداب المحادثة ثلاثة وعشرون [...]
Fol. 146v	(٣) آداب المضاجعة: ١٤ أدبا [...]
Fol. 147r	(٤) سبب العشق: التجانس وقوته وضعفه على قدر التشاكل [...]
Fol. 148r	(٥) الكلام له أربع مراتب
Fol. 148v	(٦) سبب اللياطة: تفحل الشهوة وغلبتها [...]

Commentary:

The main theme of the section is love. The various sections discuss how to kiss, to converse, to sleep with somebody, the reasons for passion, the different kinds of intercourse, and finally the reasons that could explain a leaning toward sodomy. It is very difficult to identify the original source from which al-Maqrīzī made this resumé and to determine whether he used it for any of his books, preserved or lost. While consulting the *Nihāyat al-Arab* of al-Nuwayrī, I realized that this encyclopedist spoke about human passion, and argues about the reasons for this facet of love. It appears that the material found there (*Nihāyat al-Arab*, 2:135–38) is similar to no. 4 in al-Maqrīzī's resumé. In spite of similarities, al-Nuwayrī cannot be considered to be al-Maqrīzī's direct source, because there are details in the resumé absent from the *Nihāyat al-Arab*. Both of them must have utilized the same source once more.

IX. (quire XVII, fols. 149r–149v)

Title on fol. 149r, lines 3–4: *Maqṭal al-Faqīh 'Umārah* from *Kitāb al-Khiṭaṭ/Ibn al-Mutawwaj*.

مقتل الفقيه عمارة على ما ذكر ابن المتوج في كتاب الخطط

Incipit (fol. 149r, lines 4–5):

قال لما مات العاضد واستقرت أمور صلاح الدين وقصد التوجه إلى البلاد الشامية [...]

Explicit (fol. 149v, lines 9–10):

[...] وعجل لك الاجتماع بإحبابك فقال إنما قتلتني إحسانهم وإساءةكم.

Commentary:

The source of this epitome is clearly indicated by al-Maqrīzī as being the *Kitāb al-Khiṭaṭ* written by Ibn al-Mutawwaj. He is to be identified with Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb **Ibn al-Mutawwaj** (d. 730/1329), who is the author of a book dealing with *khiṭaṭ* entitled *Īqāz al-Mutaghaffil wa-Itti‘āz al-Muta’ammil*, which is considered lost. This work is one of the few that al-Maqrīzī cites in his introduction to the *Khiṭaṭ* (1:5) among the sources he relied upon.⁵⁴ It has previously been stated that all the references to this work in the *Khiṭaṭ* concern old Cairo (prior to the Fatimids) and refer only to archeological matters. The resumé preserved here brings up material which goes against this mistaken idea, and establishes the importance of the historical data presented here.⁵⁵

X. (quire XVII, fols. 149v–150r)

Title on fol. 149v, line 10:

الأهرام

Incipit (fol. 149v, lines 10–11):

عددها ثمانية عشر هرما في مقابلة الفسطاط [...]

Explicit (fol. 150r, lines 6–7):

[...] وعند مدينة فرعون موسى أعظم مما قبلها وهرم ميدوم آخرها.

Commentary:

Some passages of this resumé on the pyramids can be identified in the *Khiṭaṭ* (1:116, 119). For the first occurrence, al-Maqrīzī identifies the source as *Kitāb Tuḥfat al-Albāb* of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-Qaysī [al-Gharnāṭī] (d. 565/1170). The data are almost identical and a date (501) which is mentioned in the resumé appears again in the *Khiṭaṭ*, on the same page. Moreover, the quotation in the *Khiṭaṭ* can be traced in the published version of the *Tuḥfat al-Albāb*,⁵⁶ which prompts me to regard this work as definitely the source of the resumé.

⁵⁴For the quotations noticed in the *Khiṭaṭ*, see Guest, “A List of Writers,” 116 and Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:72, 74, 82, 94. The title given by al-Maqrīzī varies greatly from one reference to another: *Īqāz al-Mutaghaffil*, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, *al-Tārīkh*, *al-Kitāb*.

⁵⁵I have not traced exactly the data preserved here in al-Maqrīzī’s books. But compare with *Al-Muqaffā* (ed. M. al-Ya’lāwī, Beirut, 1991), 8:740 sqq. and *Itti‘āz al-Ḥunafā*’ (ed. Ḥilmī M. Aḥmad, Cairo, 1973), 3:332–34.

⁵⁶See Ayman Fu’ād Sayyid’s edition (London, 2002), 1:313–14.

XI. (quire XVII, fol. 150r)Title on fol. 150r, line 7: *Khabar fīhi Mu‘tabar*.

خبر فيه معتبر

Incipit (lines 7–8):

توفي صاحب الوزير زين الدين يعقوب بن الزبير في ثالث عشر شهر ربيع الآخر سنة ٦٦٨ بالسجن
[...]

Commentary:

The source of this very short excerpt (14 lines) remains to be identified. Part of the data is to be found in *Al-Sulūk*,⁵⁷ 1:447.

XII. (quire XVII, fols. 150r–150v)Title on fol. 150r, lines 20–21: *Mukhtār min Akhbār Banī Ayyūb*/Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Naẓīf al-Ḥamawī al-Kātib.

مختار من أخبار بني أيوب، تأليف محمد بن علي بن عبد العزيز بن نظيف الحموي الكاتب

Incipit (fol. 150r, lines 21–22):

سنة ٥٧٩ فيها ظهر بقربة بوصير من الجيزة بيت هرمس الثاني فتحه القاضي بن الشهرزوري [...]

Explicit (fol. 150v, lines 13–15):

[...] سنة ٦٢٤ في شوال منها أمر الكامل بن العادل الأيوبي بهدم مدينة تينيس وكانت من المدن
الجليلة.

Commentary:

The stated source of this resumé is the *Akhbār Banī Ayyūb* by Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz **Ibn Naẓīf** al-Ḥamawī (d. in the second part of the seventh/thirteenth century). Ibn Naẓīf is the author of three books, of which only one has been preserved: *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī*, *Talkhīṣ al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān fī Ḥawādith al-Zamān*.⁵⁸ As its title indicates, the book is a shorter version of a universal history (*Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān fī Ḥawādith al-Zamān*). The *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī* ends with the year 624 and is considered to be the most important source for the Ayyubid period.⁵⁹ A close examination of the text reveals that

⁵⁷Ed. M. Muṣṭafá Ziyādah (Cairo, 1967).

⁵⁸See the critical edition of this work by Abū al-‘Īd Dūdū (Damascus, 1981). The editor decided to publish only the part beginning with the year 589. Prior to this edition, a facsimile of the *unicum* preserved at St. Petersburg in Russia had been published by P. Giaznevich (Moscow, 1960).

⁵⁹See Claude Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l’époque des croisades et de la principauté franque d’Antioche* (Paris, 1940), 57–58; idem, “Editing Arabic Chronicles: a Few Suggestions,” *Islamic*

material on early Islamic history and successive periods is by far more concise than the parts beginning with the year 580. It is thus not surprising to notice that al-Maqrīzī began his resumé with the year 579 and continued with the following years: 597, 601, 611, 622, 624, taking notes for events related to Egypt. The data correspond exactly to what is found in the original source, consequently confirming that what al-Maqrīzī entitles *Akḥbār Banī Ayyūb* is equivalent to *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī*, and it has been reutilized for the *Khīṭaṭ* and other of his works, although neither the author's name nor the title of the work appears in any of them.

XIII. (quire XVII, fols. 150v–151r)

Title on fol. 150v, in the margin: *Mukhtār min Tārīkh Ibn Naẓīf al-Kabīr*/Ibn Naẓīf.

مختار من تاريخ ابن نظيف الكبير

Incipit (fol. 150v, lines 15–16):

سنة ٧٦ من الهجرة نقش عبد الملك بن مروان على الدنانير والدرهم سكة الإسلام [...]

Explicit (fol. 151r, line 23):

[...] عن الشمس في نصف برج الحوت طول ذؤابته مائة وخمسون ذراعاً.

Commentary:

Just below the resumé (*mukhtār*) of *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī*, al-Maqrīzī added other notes starting with the year 76, then proceeding with the following years: 91, 99, 133, 180, 199, 216, 234, 235, 237, 253, 258, 268, 274, 286, 310, 375, 398, 435, 487, 496, in which all events are more general and do not deal exclusively with Egypt. In the margin, he added a title: *Mukhtār min Tārīkh Ibn Naẓīf al-Kabīr*. We should understand from this title that al-Maqrīzī intended to summarize the longest text written by Ibn Naẓīf, i.e., *Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān fī Ḥawādith al-Zamān*, a work which has not been preserved, except in a shorter version (i.e., *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī*, see the preceding entry). A comparison of the material found in the resumé and the beginning of *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī* shows that the wording of the latter is different and more complete. This proves that what al-Maqrīzī included in this resumé was not taken from *Al-Tārīkh al-Manṣūrī*, assuming that this was a part of the longest work, but from *Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān* itself.

XIV. (quire XVII, fols. 151r–151v)

No title. Excerpt regarding the kings of Ḥimyar.

Incipit (fol. 151r, lines 24–25):

[...] جميع ملوك حمير على اختلاف القول فيهم ستة وعشرون ملكا وامرأة أعني بلقيس [...]

Explicit (fol. 151v, line 8):

[...] قد طال ما أكلوا يوما وما شربوا فأصبحوا بعد ذاك الأكل قد أكلوا.

Commentary:

No source is indicated by al-Maqrīzī for this very short excerpt dealing with the kings of Ḥimyar. The main part consists in the quotation of six verses attributed to Sayf ibn Dhī Yazan. The purpose of this excerpt is quite clear: al-Maqrīzī evokes the kings of Ḥimyar several times in his *Khiṭaṭ*,⁶⁰ where the *Kitāb al-Tījān fī Mulūk Ḥimyar* by Wahb ibn Munabbih, in the transmission of Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Hishām (d. 218/833), is quoted more than once as a source.⁶¹ He even devoted a biography to Ḥimyar in his *Al-Muqaffā* (3:691–97). However, the material found in this excerpt was not used by him in either work. It must be considered a preliminary step for his books or an unused note.

XV. (quire XVII, fols. 151v–155r)

Title on fol. 155r, lines 19–20: [*Talkhīṣ*] *Mukhtār min Kitāb al-Danānīr wa-al-Darāhim*/Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn Ḥayyān al-ma‘rūf bi-Wakī‘.

لخصت ما قيل في الدرهم والدينار من مختار من كتاب الدنانير والدرهم، تأليف أبي بكر محمد بن خلف بن حيان المعروف بوكيع.

Incipit (fol. 151v, lines 13–14):

[...] القول في الدينار والدرهم: قال كعب الأخبار أول من ضرب الدنانير والدرهم آدم [...]

Explicit (fol. 155r, lines 17–18):

[...] وكان على بيت المال رجل من طيء يقال له سمير فأمره فأعطى الناس فجعل الناس يقولون دراهم سميرية فبذلك سميت سميرية.

Commentary:

Fortunately the title of the source is indicated by al-Maqrīzī at the end of the text, where with rare meticulousness he specifies that he had not seen the original work in its complete form (fol. 155r, line 20: *lam aqif ‘alā al-aṣl*), but rather a résumé (*mukhtār*) from which he made an epitome (*talkhīṣ*). Undoubtedly this résumé had been prepared by another scholar and al-Maqrīzī decided to condense it. The original work was produced by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn Ḥayyān,

⁶⁰See Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 1, s.v. Ḥimyar and Sayf ibn Dhī Yazan.

⁶¹See *ibid.*, 2:80.

سنة ٢٣٧٢ وردت من الروم الى دمناف فمبلاو اختلفا كثيرا
 واحرقوا الفوارج واربعة بيكاتا وسبوا ونبوا مئة ثلثة اسام
 سنة ٢٤٣٣ ملكا احمد بن طولون وهو وانفق جميع التذرية
 والبرج والزهر وعطار والقرع بربع السرطان في اليوم العشرين
 من حزيران فبوله كتاب ومطروحات وسيرد اجموع اول
 لموزجة اجتاج اهل العراق وبغداد الى حمار وهذا من اجموع
 ورج سنة ٢٥١٨ تغير كاسل صرغية صار اصغر منه ثم عاد الى
 حاله سنة ٢٥٤٨ فارتبيل مصر ولا عهد له قبل ولا مع
 خبره في طاهر الباسوق طينه وبنوا اولو السمل بالبلاد سنة ٢٧٤٤
 ولدت صرغية هذه الوعارة انا وهلا خلق ولم يعد لها سمل
 هذا سنة ٢٨٧٦ استولى التجار المعروف بالصاويج على ملكه البر
 وبلغت برب العوة فمحل اسد خلاكه سنة ٣١٠٠ بعد مصر
 بالاعداد هدية بها بغل وولدها وعلام بلحق لسار اذيه سنة ٣٧٥
 ات اغل الاعلم صاحب النزع سنة ٣٩٨ خرج بصرد طرما له
 ابوركم فمغزير الحاخم بك لغزير ومار له ما دعاه الى هذا فقال
 علمه حية لوسا عثية الاقنار فقال له اكل فلوسا غوزك الامبارا
 ذالك يصنع والكتب اجعلك في مصر فعمله في قصر لفقوله وقتله
 سنة ٤٣٤٤ وجد تلعه حلب راسر حجة من زكرا با علي بيلر واساس
 التوك اطرش نزع عثرية الحركا وهو لعمري لاسر هتم ل
 سنة ٤٨٧٦ مات ابو يوسف الفزوي في معنزي وهو مصنف
 في غير القرآن في سبابة مجله سنة ٤٩٤ في سابع عشر حبي
 الاخر منها ظهور الغريب كوكيل بصر له دوابة من سرقة لعينه
 عز السوس في نصف برج الحوت طول فعا بقده ايت وخمسو ذراعا
 حسيب بلوك جرم على اختلاف القول فيهم سنة وعشرون
 ملكا وامرأة ابي لميسر ومئة ملكه على تقارب القول في الغيب
 وسنانه وتسع ومانون سنة وقيل القان واية وسننا واربعة
 واوله سينا بن شجيب بن يعرب بن فحطان بن هو واجرهم سيف

اعمال النخل
ولدت

راسر حجة
على سبابة
اشفاق

ابو محمد
تغير

Folio 151r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.

known by his *shuhrah* as **Wakīʿ**. His *Akhbār al-Qudāh* made his fame, but he was also renowned as the author of a book on numismatics. Here it is entitled *Kitāb al-Danānīr wa-al-Darāhim*, although according to the sources it was *Kitāb al-Ṣarf wa-al-Naqd wa-al-Sikkah*.⁶² This text is now known to be one of the most ancient on this subject, thus making it a major discovery. Numerous parts of it were used by al-Maqrīzī for his treatise on numismatics, *Shudhūr al-ʿUqūd fī Dhikr al-Nuqūd*. In this case as in numerous others, neither the name of the author nor the title of his book has been cited.⁶³

XVI. (quire XVII, fol. 155v)

No title. *Faṣl* on philosophical matters regarding the soul.

Incipit (fol. 155v, lines 1–2):

فصل [بياض]: كل مطلوب مدرك وإن كان شاهقا في السماء ومن رجع عن حاجته فهو غير طالب.
النفس الحية هي التي [...]

Commentary:

This passage consists of just a few lines, but al-Maqrīzī deemed it so valuable that he labelled it a *faṣl*. It contains remarks on the soul and aphorisms of philosophical or moral character. At this point, I have not been able to identify the source nor to determine whether al-Maqrīzī used this material.

XVII. (quire XVIII, fols. 155v–156v)

No title. Excerpts on numismatics and metrology.

List of the sections and incipit:

Fol. 155v	نقود الهند التي يتعاملون بها: اللك الأحمر مائة ألف تنكة ذهباً [...]
Fol. 156r	خان بالقي من بلاد الخطا: ملكها اجل ملوك توران [...] ومعاملة أهل خوارزم والقفجاق ومعظم ممالك إيران بالدينار [...] ومعاملة بغداد ديناران أحدهما العوال عنه اثنا عشر درهما [...]

Commentary:

After no. XV, this is another text dealing with numismatics, but not exclusively.

⁶²See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Al-Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel (Leipzig, 1871–72), 114 (*Kitāb al-Taṣarruf . . .*); al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Wāfī*, 3:43–44; GAL S1:225 (*Kitāb al-Taṣarruf . . .*); not mentioned in Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (Leiden, 1967–2000).

⁶³This material, as well as the other parts of the notebook related to numismatics (see below, numbers XVII and XX), will be the subject of my “Maqriziana VI,” which will appear in a forthcoming issue of *MSR*.

الحمد لله مختار من سيرة المأمون ليطاعي باليعمال الملك
 علي بن موسى بن المأمون بن عبد الله محمد بن فائق بن مختار المعروف
 والله بابن البطيحي في سنة () في هذا السنين سنة
 ٤٠٤ في ديوان التحقيق في ولاية ابن عبد الله النخعي واضيف
 اليه ديوان الجلسوا في ما يحدث في نعل السنة الثمينة الى العزة
 وكان قد حصل فيها ما نزل في سنين يخرج الامور الى الشخ الى
 القسم العريه بانشاء سجل به فتم نسخ نسخة دواويل الاموال
 والجيش وخلق بعد ذلك بيتا للملك وكان قد اختارها للبر
 العسكرية والمقطيع من خمسة ارتفاع الاقطاعات وقد تجمل
 وبضا عفا ارتفاعا قطاع الامور وزيادتها عن غيرها وتوفر
 في كل ناحية جمل للديوان صارت تحي بالعرف من تردد الرسل
 من الديوان بسببها فامر الامل من سراج الجيوش بجلد جميع
 الاقطاعات وراكها واقربا كان في النواحي من تلك
 ستان ومعرفة بيد مالكة ولم يربط ذلك الاقطاعات
 واذن لضعف الجند فزيادوا في اقطاعات الاقويان
 زيادتهم وكنت السجلات بانها باقية في ايديهم الى يومنا
 لا نقل عليهم فيها زيادوا في الاقويان في ذكر شكائهم في اقطاعات
 الاحساد فقالوا انك كثر غيرتها وقد تحصلها وخرابها وقد
 الساكنها فامرهم ان يزلوا في كل ناحية ما تجمل بين نظر العزة
 المطول من ايديها في بلغت الى الجند الذين رغب كل منهم في
 فاطعوا به وكنت لهم السجلات في الجمل المتقدم وحصل للديوان

وسال الامور بالامر من
 الاقطاعات التي كانت في

Folio 157r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.

The most interesting point here is probably his discussion of China and the currency used there: al-Maqrīzī describes, of course, the paper currency, stating that it is printed on pieces of mulberry bark. No source is indicated in this excerpt and no trace of it has been identified in his numismatic treatises: *Shudhūr al-'Uqūd* or *Ighāthat al-Ummah bi-Kashf al-Ghummah*. In the last part, however, where the currency of Baghdad is studied, information is also given about weights. This material has been reused for his treatise on this matter, which is entitled *Al-Awzān wa-al-Akyāl al-Shar'īyah*.

XVIII. (quire XVIII, fols. 157r–160v)

Title on fol. 157r, lines 1–3: *Mukhtār min Sīrat al-Ma'mūn al-Baṭā'ihī*/Jamāl al-Mulk Abū 'Alī Mūsá ibn al-Ma'mūn Abī 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Fātik ibn Mukhtār Ibn al-Baṭā'ihī.

مختار من سيرة المأمون البطائحي، تأليف الأمير جمال الملك أبي علي موسى بن المأمون أبي عبد الله محمد بن فاتك بن مختار المعروف والده بابن البطائحي.

Incipit (fol. 157r, lines 3–4):

في هذه السنة يعني سنة ٥٠١ فتح ديوان التحقيق تولاه ابن أبي الليث النصراني واضيف إليه ديوان المجلس

List of the dates and events dealt with:

Fol. 158r	سنة ٥١٢
Fol. 158v	سنة ٥١٣
Fol. 159r	خبر قتل الأفضل

Commentary:

The source is clearly indicated as being the *Sīrat al-Ma'mūn al-Baṭā'ihī*, a work attributed to Ibn al-Ma'mūn al-Baṭā'ihī. His full name was Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī Mūsá **Ibn al-Ma'mūn** Muḥammad ibn Fātik ibn Mukhtār al-Baṭā'ihī (d. 588/1192), son of the vizier al-Baṭā'ihī, and his book, known as *Tārīkh Ibn al-Ma'mūn* or *Al-Sīrah al-Ma'mūniyah*,⁶⁴ is considered one of the best sources for the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt, even though it is lost. Our knowledge of this source and its contents is based only on the passages found, whether attributed or not, in the works of Ibn Muyassar (*Akhbār Miṣr*), Ibn Sa'īd (*Al-Mughrib fī Hulá al-Maghrib*), al-Nuwayrī (*Nihāyat al-Arab*), Ibn Duqmāq (*Al-Intiṣār*), and al-Maqrīzī (*Al-Khiṭaṭ*, *Itti'āz al-Hunafā'*, and *al-Muqaffá*).⁶⁵ The excerpt preserved in the Liège codex is

⁶⁴See Guest, "A List of Writers," 115; and Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:114.

⁶⁵See Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid, "Lumières nouvelles sur quelques sources de l'histoire fatimide en

thus the first proof that al-Maqrīzī had access to the original source. Furthermore, we now know that he took notes from it to prepare a resumé which would serve him as a memorandum. The material has been identified in the three works of al-Maqrīzī where the Fatimid period is dealt with (see above). Another interesting feature of the notebook is that it contains a specimen of al-Maqrīzī's notecards (see no. LXIV), where part of the data from this resumé was transcribed later. This rare sample gives us an opportunity to better understand al-Maqrīzī's working method.⁶⁶

XIX. (quire XVIII, fols. 161r–163v)

Title on fol. 161r, line 1: *Al-Khabar 'an Jinkiz Khān.*

الخبر عن جنكز خان.

Incipit (fol. 161r, lines 1–2):

قيل إن جنكز خان ينتهي نسبه إلى امرأة تسمى ألان قوا كانت تحت رجل أولدها و الدين [...]]

Explicit (fol. 163v, line 16):

[...] وكان ولده تولى متصلا به فكان موضعه نقطة.

Commentary:

In a series of articles published between 1971 and 1973,⁶⁷ David Ayalon studied the problem of al-Maqrīzī's hypothetical source for the data about the *yāsa* in the *Khīṭaṭ* (2:219–22). After a close examination of the sources, Ayalon was inclined to identify it as Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī's *Masālik al-Abṣār fī Mamālik al-Amṣār*. He identified it as such without reservation, even though the two texts were not quite the same, and without irrefutable proof. The resumé present in the notebook is anonymous in the sense that no source is indicated. Nonetheless, a comparison with what is found in the *Masālik al-Abṣār*⁶⁸ unequivocally demonstrates that it is the original source. Another element strengthens this attribution, an element of which Ayalon was not aware at the time he wrote his study: on the first folio of eight volumes among the twenty-seven of the *Masālik al-Abṣār* preserved, one

Égypte," *Annales Islamologiques* 13 (1977): 20–21. The passages that appear in the works of al-Nuwayrī and al-Maqrīzī have been edited by Sayyid, *Nuṣūṣ min Akhbār Miṣr li-Ibn al-Ma'mūn* = Passages de la Chronique d'Égypte d'Ibn al-Ma'mūn (Cairo, 1983).

⁶⁶This argument will be treated extensively in "Maqriziana II."

⁶⁷David Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khān: A Reexamination," *Studia Islamica* 33–38 (1971–73).

⁶⁸I compared it with the facsimile of MS Ahmet III 2797/2 produced by Fuat Sezgin (Frankfort, 1988), 4:40–55. This part has been edited by K. Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich: Al-'Umarī's Darstellung der mongolischen Reiche in seinem Werk Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār* (Wiesbaden, 1968).

can read an inscription in al-Maqrīzī's hand, which is "intaqāhu dā'īyan li-mu'īrihi Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī sanat 831."⁶⁹ This is not the only example of this kind of note. Other samples can be found in various other manuscripts of sources used by al-Maqrīzī.⁷⁰ In all these cases, he chose the verb "intaqā" which in this context means "to take notes, to digest."⁷¹ Thanks to the date, we now have a *terminus post quem* for this part of the notebook, and this is perhaps more important for the history of the composition of the *Khiṭaṭ*, given its inclusion in this book. This resumé proves definitely that al-Maqrīzī prepared a notandum of the part regarding Chingiz Khān and the *yāsa*.⁷² But there is more to come: Ayalon stressed that the data found in the *Masālik al-Abṣār* had been deliberately distorted by al-Maqrīzī with the aim of discrediting the *yāsa* among his contemporaries. It will now be possible to compare the original version (Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī) with the resumé, where some modifications are already visible, and finally with the version in the *Khiṭaṭ*. Once more, we will come closer to the working technique of this historian.⁷³

XX. (quire XIX, fols. 166r–174v)

No title. Six *faṣls* dealing with juridical matters.

List of the *faṣls* and incipit:

Fol. 166r	فصل في بيان الذرع والكيل والوزن
Fol. 169r	فصل في حد المدعي الذي يحتاج إلى البينة والمدعى عليه الذي لا يحتاج إليها
Fol. 169v	فصل في حكم اليهود والنصارى الذين بمصر الآن
	فصل في ذكر اللعن وما جاء فيه
Fol. 172r	فصل في زيارة القبور والنذر لها والعكوف عندها والقراءة عليها
Fol. 172v	فصل في النذر
Fol. 174v	معنى تعذيب الميت بالبكاء عليه

⁶⁹Moreover, marginal notes in al-Maqrīzī's own handwriting have been identified by the present writer in volumes 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, and 19.

⁷⁰For a complete list, see "Maqriziana II."

⁷¹I will come back to this particular point in "Maqriziana II."

⁷²At least, it is the part that has been preserved. Scholars had already noticed that al-Maqrīzī took almost complete chapters from the *Masālik al-Abṣār* without acknowledgment, which confirms that he made several resúmes of this book. See Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid's edition of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī's *Masālik al-Abṣār fī Mamālik al-Amṣār (Mamālik Miṣr wa-al-Shām wa-al-Hijāz wa-al-Yaman)* (Cairo, 1985), 28 (from the introduction in Arabic). This is confirmed by the note found on the first folio of several volumes of this text.

⁷³This matter will be the subject of our "Maqriziana VII."

Commentary:

All these *faṣls* seem to have been transcribed in sequence, as if they came from the same source. Indeed they all treat subjects that may be defined as juridical. It is difficult to recognize the source/sources from which al-Maqrīzī borrowed this material. Considering the first *faṣl* only, I noticed that it contains data about numismatics and metrology which can be found in *Shudhūr al-‘Uqūd*, *Al-Ighāthah*, and *Al-Awzān wa-al-Akyāl al-Shar‘īyah*, where no source is indicated. However, in the resumé, the name of a certain Ibn al-Rif‘ah appears twice. He is anonymously quoted again, about an event where he speaks in the first person about the *dār al-ḥisbah*, to which, he says, he had been appointed. This person is to be identified as Najm al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Ibn al-Rif‘ah (d. 710/1310).⁷⁴ The sources consulted say that he was in charge of the *ḥisbah* in Cairo. Al-Maqrīzī mentions that he was the author of a commentary on al-Shīrāzī’s *Al-Tanbīh* entitled *Kifāyat al-Nabīh fī Sharḥ al-Tanbīh* in fifteen volumes, and also of a work on measures and weights (*al-makāyīl wa-al-mawāzīn*), which was entitled, according to Ibn Ḥajar, *Ḥukm al-Mikyāl wa-al-Mīzān*.⁷⁵ It is, of course, very tempting and credible to see in this text the source of the resumé found in the notebook, at least for the first *faṣl*. It remains to be determined whether the other *faṣls* come from the same author, and in this case maybe from his *Sharḥ al-Tanbīh*. Unfortunately, only the book on metrology has been preserved.⁷⁶

XXI (quire XX, fols. 176r–184r⁷⁷)

No title. Epitome of a Quranic commentary.

Incipit (fol. 176r, lines 1–2):

قوله تعالى في قلوبهم فزادهم الله مرضا ولهم عذاب أليم بما كانوا يكذبون المرض في القلب يجوز ان يكون حقيقة ومجازا [...]

Explicit (fol. 184r, line 8):

[...] وعن الأوزاعي لا يجوز تبرعها ما لم تلد أو تقم في بيت زوجها سنة.

⁷⁴On him, see *GAL*, S2:164; al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Wāfi*, 7:395 (no. 3392); al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Muqaffá*, 1:623–24; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Al-Durar al-Kāminah* (Hyderabad, 1348/1929–30,) 1:284–87.

⁷⁵Or rather, *Al-Īdāḥ wa-al-Tibyān fī Ma‘rifat al-Mikyāl*, according to al-Ziriklī, *Al-A‘lām*, 1:222.

⁷⁶*Al-Īdāḥ wa-al-Tibyān* has been edited by M. Aḥmad Ismā‘īl al-Khārūf (Mecca, 1980), but I was unable to consult a copy of it. My hypothesis, which consists in identifying the source of the first *faṣl* in the notebook with Ibn al-Rif‘ah’s *Al-Īdāḥ wa-al-Tibyān*, seems to be corroborated as Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Sattār ‘Uthmān, in his edition of al-Maqrīzī’s *Shudhūr al-‘Uqūd fī Dhīkr al-Nuqūd* (Cairo, 1990), 52, after having compared the two texts, asserts that *Al-Īdāḥ* served as a basic source for al-Maqrīzī in writing his *Shudhūr al-‘Uqūd*.

⁷⁷Fol. 177 is in fact a tiny piece of paper, oblong in form, which was pasted in the margin of fol. 178.

Commentary:

A glance at this resumé shows immediately that it consists of an epitome of a Quranic commentary, beginning with Quran 2:10 and ending with Quran 4:4. No source is indicated by al-Maqrīzī, but I found the name of al-Zamakhsharī quoted once on fol. 177r. Comparison with al-Zamakhsharī's *Al-Kashshāf 'an Ḥaqā'iq al-Tanzīl* reveals that it was the original source of the resumé. Al-Zamakhsharī is cited only once in the *Khīṭaṭ*⁷⁸ (1:161), for Quran 89:5–7. This could mean that al-Maqrīzī went on with the resumé, presumably until the end of the commentary. Here, once more, we have only a quire that has been preserved, and it would be too conjectural to conclude that an entire resumé of the book exists for the sole reason that a quotation related to the end of it appears in one of his books. The aim of a Quranic resumé is clear when one looks at the *Khīṭaṭ*, but other quotations must have been used by al-Maqrīzī for his other works, extant or not.

XXII. (quire XXI, fols. 187r–191v)

No title. Long biography of a Mamluk who died in 812.

Incipit (fol. 187r, lines 1–2):

يوسف بن أحمد بن محمد بن أحمد بن جعفر بن قاسم البيري جمال الدين البجاسي [...]

Explicit (fol. 191v, lines 1–3):

[...] واشتملت تركته على سبعمائة ألف دينار من الذهب وثمان [...] على ذكر [...] على ألفي ألف دينار ذهباً

Commentary:

This very long biography is written in al-Maqrīzī's handwriting, of course, but it differs from the other resúmes. Diacritical dots are scarcer and the letters were written quickly. The person dealt with here was an important Mamluk who accumulated an immense fortune during his lifetime. The date of his death clearly indicates that this biography did not find its place in *Al-Muqaffá*, a biographical dictionary of Egyptian residents, from pre-Islamic times to the middle of the eighth/fourteenth century. As this Mamluk was a contemporary of al-Maqrīzī, his biography must have been written for another of his works: *Durar al-'Uqūd al-Farīdah fī Tarājim al-A'yān al-Mufīdah*. Unfortunately, this important source has

⁷⁸See Harīdī, *Fihrist Khīṭaṭ Miṣr*, 2:99.

187
 يوسف ابن احمد بن محمد بن احمد بن جعفر واسم اليه جمال الدين مشير
 المالك الاسلاميه واستناد ادر السلطان الملك الناصر فرج بن قوق
 ولد بالبيته ونشأ به حلب في كنف خاله الوزير
 يتجول لم قدم الى مصر فخدم عبد الامرا حية انصارا لا مير بحاسر
 احد امرا الطاهر مرقوق فترى في خدمته حية اقامه استنادا له
 واشهر بطول ايامه وكثر ثراه وترود اليه الناس فلما مات الظاهر
 تزايد له وكثر جواسيسه وانبطت يده في مباشرة الامرا فاشهر
 استناد ادر البضعة عشر اكارا الامرا وصار مقصد للناس ومنجا
 لا رباب الحاجات رد الى يابه الامرا والوزرا والقضاة كجوانهم
 فيقوم باعبا الامور وتقيح ما ريعث وينفق بالبحر عنه فلما كان
 ثومه الامير شيبك على الناصر فرج بن قوق في جميع سنة مع بلال
 والحاقه بدمشق ومع الامير سعد الدين لم ير غير الامير استناد ادر
 وكان جمال الدين حصيدا اثيرا عنده طلبه السلطنة والزمه بمباشرة
 الغداه فامتنع وفضل اشد الامتناع واما غايه الا ما يقف عليه
 وعوق مدة ايام لم افرج عنه وامر به فاحضر الى مجلس السلطنة
 والسيرت فيها الاستناد ادر به عوضا عن جمال الدين غير ان فاستد
 بمباشرة ملكوته فلما كان في عود الامير شيبك فلما كان في شهر
 رمضان سنة مع وازمه احضر الامير بلغا اليه في شهر يكتف به

Folio 187r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.

not yet been fully published. It is preserved in an incomplete autograph manuscript in Gotha (A 1771),⁷⁹ and there exists a complete copy made from the autograph which is held in a private collection in Mosul, where it remains inaccessible to scholars.⁸⁰ Fortunately, my eyes fell by mere chance on the *Durar al-Fawā'id al-Munazzamah fī Akhbār al-Ḥajj wa-Ṭarīq Makkah al-Mu'azzamah*, a book written by 'Abd al-Qādir ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Qādir al-Anṣārī al-Jazīrī (d. after 976/1568),⁸¹ where I found an interesting passage (92–94) dealing with the same Mamluk. There, the author gives a detailed biography which, he says, he cites from the *Durar al-'Uqūd al-Farīdah* of al-Maqrīzī! In the absence of an edition of the complete manuscript, this information is, of course, vital. In this way, I have been able to compare the biography in the notebook with the one in al-Jazīrī's work, concluding that the texts are very similar, the information given in the notebook being more complete. This leads us to infer that the text found in the notebook is in fact a preliminary stage of redaction for the *Durar al-'Uqūd al-Farīdah*, or it may alternatively be the definitive one, conjecturing in this case that al-Jazīrī changed the wording of al-Maqrīzī, which would not be surprising. The fact that the script is abnormal (impression of rapid writing) reinforces this interpretation.

To be continued

⁷⁹Published by M. Kamāl al-Dīn 'Izz al-Dīn 'Alī (Beirut, 1992). The manuscript on which this edition is based contains biographies beginning with the letter *alif*, part with the letter *bā'* (Abū Bakr), then some with the letter *'ayn* and one with the letter *dāl* (Dā'ūd). As M. al-Ya'lāwī has shown (*Al-Muqaffā*, 8:699–700), the biographies beginning with *'ayn* are related to persons who died prior to the middle of the eighth/fourteenth century. It is thus ruled out that they were part of the *Durar*, and it is more probable that we are dealing with part of *Al-Muqaffā* that was misplaced after the death of al-Maqrīzī.

⁸⁰See Maḥmūd al-Jalīlī, "Durar al-'Uqūd al-Farīdah fī Tarājim al-A'yān al-Mufīdah lil-Maqrīzī," *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Irāqī* 13 (1966): 201–14; idem, "Tarjamat Ibn Khaldūn lil-Maqrīzī," *ibid.*, 215–42.

⁸¹On him, see *GAL*, 2:325 (no. 1); S2:447 (no. 1) and 517 (no. 10c) (Brockelmann confused him twice; the information given in the last reference is an error). The book was published in Cairo in 1384/1964–65.