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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-shuyukh, ṭhabāt). 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-Thamin fī Tārikh al-Balad al-Āmin,4 and a history of the Holy City, the title of which is Shīfā’ al-Ghārām bi- Akhbār 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 (Shīfā’ 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 Tārikh Baghdādī by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi, the Tārikh Dimashq by Ibn ‘Asākir, and the Tārikh Misr by al-Quṭb al-Ḫalabī (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 Shīfā’ is not a conventional


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 at 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 Tārikh Makkah by al-Fākihi, a work which he did not get access to before, and from his own book Al-‘Iqd al-Thamin. Thus the actual version of the Shīfā’ 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 wāqi‘ ‘alā ḥādhā al-mukhtaṣar wa-葲ṣliḥah”; 1:356: “kamā dhakartuḥu fī aṣl ḥādhā al-kitāb wa-iqṭasartuḥu hunā min dhālika ‘alā mā dhakartuḥu”; 1:380: “wa-nadḥkuruhum kamā dhukira fī aṣl ḥādhā 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, ribāḥs, etc.) and 37 to 39 (lists of governors, and political, meteorological, and finally economic events). 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 Tārikh of al-Musabbihī as he had access to a resumé (mukhtasar) made by Rashīd al-Dīn al-Mundhirī (1:203), a fact that has been overlooked by historians of this period.

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.

2) It was only in 1956 that the full text was made available to scholars in an edition based on an undated manuscript belonging to the Dār al-Kutub al-Misrīyah (shelf-mark: Tārikh 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 Tadmūrī. It has been criticized by al-Hilah 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-Madinah,” where no. 1 was in fact the Tārikh 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.

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


Al-Tārikh wa-al-Mu‘arrīkhān 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 *Shifāʾ*, this is far from being the case.

The introduction (pp. 13–33) contains a short biography of al-Fāsi 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-Miṣrīyyah manuscript already mentioned for edition no. 2. This was not chosen as the basic text; rather another manuscript preserved in the same institution under the shelf-mark Tārikh Ṭalʿat 2067 was selected. Because it is dated 864, only 32 years after al-Fāsi’s death, it was preferred. Recognizing that in some places both manuscripts have blanks clearly indicated as such (*kadhāfi 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-Hilah’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 *insād* with eleven transmitters, only four are clearly identified. Elsewhere (1:458), Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Māwārdī is identified as his famous namesake who died in 450/1058, even though he appears in an *insād* just after Sufyān ibn ‘Umaynah (d. 196/811), and is followed by three other transmitters, the last one being al-Dāraquṭnī (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

---

12 Here its shelf number is given as Tārikh 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.

13 The editors also refer to a third manuscript in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyyah (Tārikh 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.

14 According to al-Hilah, *Al-Tārikh wa-al-Muʿarrabūn bi-Makkah*, 121, there is a manuscript in the Royal Library in Rabat (al-Khizānah al-Malikīyyah, no. 1911) which is the oldest copy (848 A.H.) and the most reliable one (*aṣālīh*).

15 Al-Māwārdī in this passage must be read al-Jārūdī, a correct reading appearing in the edition no. 2 although their manuscript gave al-Māwārdī. In this case, the editors could modify the reading by comparison with the source quoted by al-Fāsi.
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, Mūsulīm, 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 تنخس/شطابا must be read متقوس/عصة as al-Fāsī is speaking of the hijr (an enclosure with a wall in the shape of a bow); 1:459, where (two occurrences) the المخاطت العرافي is in fact as is confirmed by a quotation two lines below where the name is correctly given; 2:999 (عقيف الدين المطري), leg. مشاشخنا، leg. مشاشخنا (2:1029); 2:1026 (عقيف الدين المطري), leg. مشاشخنا, leg. مشاشخنا, leg. مشاشخنا (2:1029). 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-Shīfā' still awaits a serious critical edition with full annotation and proper indexes.

Al-Fāsī prepared a resumé of the Shīfā that he entitled Al-Zuhūr al-Muqtaṣafah min Tārikh 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 Shīfā. Besides the Zuhūr, he produced, as he declares in his introduction, three other books on the same subject which must also be considered resumés of the Shīfā: Tuhfah al-Kirān bi-Akhbār al-Balad al-Hāram, Tahṣil al-Marām min Tārikh al-Balad al-Hāram, and Hādī Dhawi al-Aṣfām ilā Tārikh al-Balad al-Hāram.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


17Ali ‘Umar speaks in disparaging terms (‘tabah kathirat al-tahrīf wa-al-asaqā”) of an edition published in Mecca-Riyadh (Maktabat Nizār Muṣṭafā al-Bāz) in 1997 and prepared by Muṣṭafā Muhammad 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 Ahmad ibn 'Ali al-Shuwā’ītī al-Yamānī18 and was in the library of the Kuwaiti scholar 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Khalaf al-Dāhiyyān, 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:

أوّلًا هذا الكتاب من طريق شيخنا المحقق برهان الدين الناجي عن المؤلف تقي الدين الفاسي
وعن شيخنا السخاوي إجازة عن شيخنا ابن حجر رواية عن المؤلف
وعن شيخنا الشيخ مهاب الدين ابن الملاح المرزوقي الرماليني يدمشق رواية عن المؤلف
أوّلًا هذا الكتاب من طريق شيخنا الفاضي سراج الدين ابن الصبيري رواية عن المؤلف

Given its importance, a facsimile edition of the whole text was published by Muhannā Hamad al-Muhannā20 together with an introduction, notes, and indexes. ‘Umar, however, made occasional use of an additional manuscript preserved in Baghdad (al-Matḥaf al-‘Irāqi, 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.21 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 Fadh, 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.
20Unidentified.
21Unidentified.
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 Shīfā’. The presence of numerous, reasonably reliable indexes, is another positive aspect.\(^\text{24}\) 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.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Ghazzāwī & ‘Umar \\
\hline
p. 30 & الغرب \textbf{p. 19} \\
ibid. & lacuna \textbf{ibid.} \\
ibid. & هجر \textbf{ibid.} \\
p. 31 & خامس عشر من شوال \textbf{ibid.} \\
ibid. & منها \textbf{ibid.} \\
p. 32 & بأبي قيس \textbf{ibid.} \\
ibid. &سمي برجل من إباد وذكر الوراق أنه \textbf{ibid.} \\
p. 35 & حمامات \textbf{ibid.} \\
ibid. & وهو الهدة وعدون من أعمالها \textbf{ibid.} \\
p. 80 & بن أبي الصغير \textbf{p. 87} \\
p. 91 & شير \textbf{p. 108} \\
ibid. & ضيات \textbf{ibid.} \\
ibid. & فتنخشن \textbf{ibid.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\(^{24}\)Although in my copy pp. 367–84 are missing and pp. 385–404 are duplicated at the end of the book.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Arabic Title</th>
<th>English Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>منقوش</td>
<td>p. 124 متقوس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>ابن الجباب</td>
<td>p. 142 ابن الجباب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>ذو الفرس</td>
<td>p. 145 ذوالقرنين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>في حجرته</td>
<td>p. 153 مسند مكة ومتتبعها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>شرح الثنية</td>
<td>p. 167 شرح التنبيه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>علي السعداني</td>
<td>p. 195 علي البعداني</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>