

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

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

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

REVIEWED BY FRÉDÉRIC BAUDEN, University of Liège

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given its importance, a facsimile edition of the whole text was published by Muhannā Ḥamad al-Muhannā²² together with an introduction, notes, and indexes. ‘Umar, however, made occasional use of an additional manuscript preserved in Baghdad (al-Maṭḥaf al-‘Irāqī, no. 1385), which was previously the property of Father Anastase Marie de Saint-Élie, who bought it in 1918. It is unfortunately undated, but seems to be from the seventeenth century.²³ While al-Ghazzāwī’s edition is provided with an introduction written by the supervisor al-Arna’ūt (pp. 5–20), in which he discusses the author and his work and provides a cursory description of the manuscript, ‘Umar is more laconic (pp. 5–8) and speaks especially of the previous Meccan edition and of the manuscripts. Both editions are provided with footnotes, but not of the same value. Al-Ghazzāwī has tried to return to the original sources from which al-Fāsī quoted, though failing to locate the references made by the author to his other works. He also added, but rather meagerly, identifications of persons and places and explanations of lexical terms. On the other hand, ‘Umar has considered it important to faithfully indicate where he

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

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

²⁰Unidentified.

²¹Unidentified.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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