Maqriziana I: Discovery of an Autograph Manuscript of al-Maqrizi: 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 Abū ‘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. The second part
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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 Maqrizi?” It was read once more, with major modifications, during a seminar on al-Maqrizi organized by the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale in Cairo in May 2000, under the title: “Le carnet de notes d’al-Maqrizi 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-Maqrizi: 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-Mīnḥāj fī 'Ilm al-Kharaį." 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. 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 majmuʿāt 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 majmuʿah, 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.

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

---


2The 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).

3The 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 *Mukhtasar Kitāb al-Kāmil fī al-Duʿāfāʿ* of Ibn ʿAdī. 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 Molla 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-muʿarrikhīn* 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. 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*. 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-Mawaʿīz wa-al-ʾIʿtibār fī Dhikr al-Khitāt wa-al-Āthār*, 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.

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 resumés, epitomes, extracts, excerpts, notes, cards, etc., the subjects of which vary as much as their number (history, numismatics, metrology,

---


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


8 Edited by Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid (London, 1995).

9 On 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, 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 century 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. 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’līqāt) 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-Muqaffā'\(^{13}\) full biographies have been added by another, anonymous, hand on folios left blank by al-Maqrīzī, this hand being attributed to Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī.\(^{14}\) 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-Muqaffā. 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 ʿHajar’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 1177

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

\(^{13}\)Leiden MSS or. 1366a, 1366b, 3075, 14533, and Paris MS arabe 2144.


\(^{15}\)See ibid., 96.
‘Abd al-Razzāq Murtadāḍ al-Ḥusaynī al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790), the famous author of the Tāj al-ʿArūs, 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. The notebook was surely not the only autograph manuscript of al-Maqrīzī in his library, since, in a reference to the Ṭabarānī family of Mecca in his Tāj al-ʿArūs (Benghazi, n. d., 3:355), he cited al-Maqrīzī as follows: ‘kadhā dhakarahu al-Maqrīzī fi baʾd muʿallaṣfīthī.’ But the data supplied by al-Zabīdī about this important family of the Holy City 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 الفقيه إلى الله محمد بن عبد الكريم الفکون غفر له

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

---

16 On him see Carl Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur (Leiden, 1949), S2:620 and 696 (Brockelmann mistakenly mentioned him under two entries); ‘Umar Ridā Kahlālah, Muʿjam al-Muʿallīfīn (Beirut, n. d.), 12:12 (where the same confusion is evident).
17 Here are some of the manuscripts where a possession notation in al-Zabīdī’s handwriting can be found: al-Fāsī, ‘Dhayl al-Taqyīd (Cairo, Dār al-Kutub MS 198 muṣṭalāḥ al-ḥadīth); Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb” (Dār al-Kutub MS 533 tārīkh); Ibn Abī Shaybah, “Al-Muṣannaf fī al-Hadīth” (Tunis, Dār al-Kutub al-Waṭaniyyah 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.
19 On 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-Zirīklī\(^{20}\) 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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 Taqtadī Ithbāt Nasab al-Sayyid Abī Muḥammad ‘ Abd al-Karīm al-Faggūn’ (MS 5439, fols. 43v–55r).

\(^{20}\)Khayr al-Dīn al-Zirīklī, \textit{Al-A’lām} (Beirut, 1989), 4:56.

\(^{21}\)See Touati, \textit{Entre Dieu}, 72.

\(^{22}\)The manuscript of Ibn Abī Shaybah’s \textit{Al-Muṣannaf fī al-Hadīth} already mentioned (see above). See Ibrāhīm Shabbūḥ, \textit{Al-Makhtūt} (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-Maqrizī 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 Hajar on fol. 155r has lost part of its text. This is confirmed by the fact that the autograph volumes of *Al-Muqaffā* were described by a reader during the last year of al-Maqrīzī’s life (844/1440) as a ream (*rizmah*). 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

---

24See the preliminary report on this aspect of my research on the notebook entitled “The Recovery of Mamluk 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, 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, 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 Epitomes

I. (quires I–III, fols. 4r–31v)


[مختار/لنقاو من] كتاب عيون الأنباء في طبقات الأطباء، جمع أحمد بن أبي القاسم بن خليفة


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.
Incipit (fol. 4r, lines 1–3):

الحمد لله وحده وحده وسلامه على بنينا محمد وآله وأصحابه

هذا شيء، اختبرته وكالفائقة في كتاب عيون الأنبياء في طبقات الأطباء، جمع أحمد بن أبي القاسم

من خليفة الخزرجي المتوفي رحمه الله.

وجوه صناعة الطب قسمين، فقوم يقولون بقدمه وقوم بهدته (ع..) [عبون 1، ص 6، سطر 16]

Fol. 6v

أسقلبيس (عبون 1، ص 15)

Fol. 8v

أفلطون (عبون 1، ص 23)

Fol. 9r

أبولات (عبون 1، ص 24)

Fol. 12v

دياسوريس (عبون 1، ص 35)

Fol. 13r

بندقليس (عبون 1، ص 39)

Fol. 16r

سقراط (عبون 1، ص 43)

Fol. 20r

أفلطون (عبون 1، ص 49)

Fol. 22v

أرسطو طاليس (عبون 1، ص 54)

Fol. 26v

جيلينوس (عبون 1، ص 71)

Fol. 29r

محمد بن زكريا أبو بكر الدوري (عبون 1، ص 109)

Fol. 30r

أبو سليم محمد بن طاهر بن بهرام السجستاني المتوفي (عبون 1، ص 321)

محمد بن عمر بن الحسن فخر الدين الروسي (عبون 2، ص 23)

Explicit (fol. 31v, line 12):

انتهي الغرض المطلوب من تأريخ الأطباء والله الوافق

Commentary:
The source is Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Khalīfah ibn Yūnus al-Saʿdī al-Khazrajī Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿah (d. 668/1270), Kitāb ʿUyūn al-Anbāʾ fi Ṭabaqāt al-ʿAṭibbāʾ. We refer to the edition prepared by August Müller (Königsberg, 1884; reprint Farnborough, 1972). The work is quoted once in the Khiṭāṭ (1:229),29 where it appears to be a citation regarding Pythagoras, which

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 *Khiṭat*, but this remains to be
investigated.

II. (quires IV–VIII, fols. 37v–81v\(^30\))
Title on fol. 37v, lines 7–8: *Talkhīṣ Kitāb Futuḥ Mīr wa-Akhbārihā*’/ Abd al-Rahmān

Incipit (fol. 37v, lines 1–11):

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

List of the chapters *(dhikr)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37v</td>
<td>ذكر وصية رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالقطع (فتوح، ص 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40r</td>
<td>ذكر سبب نزول القرآن في مصر وسكناه بها (فتوح، ص 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v</td>
<td>ذكر استنباط الفيوم (فتوح، ص 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47bis v</td>
<td>عمل البراء (فتوح، ص 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r</td>
<td>ذكر دخول بخت نصر (فتوح، ص 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r</td>
<td>ذكر بناء الإسكندرية (فتوح، ص 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r</td>
<td>ذكر كتاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى المفقوس (فتوح، ص 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59r</td>
<td>ذكر سبب دخول عصرو بن العاصر مصر (فتوح، ص 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60v</td>
<td>ذكر فتح مصر (فتوح، ص 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71v</td>
<td>ذكر من قال إن مصر فتحت يبلغ (فتوح، ص 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73r</td>
<td>ذكر من قال فتحت مصر عنوة (فتوح، ص 88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{30}\) On 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.
Commentary:

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

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 Futuḥ Miṣr of Ibn ʿAbd 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 Khīṭāt, 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 Khīṭāt 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 Futuḥ Miṣr at this point, perhaps because the last

\(^{31}\)See Guest, “A List of Writers,” 111; Harīdī, Fihrist Khīṭāt Miṣr, 2:82, 92.

\(^{32}\)A detailed study of this epitome with the quotations found in the Khīṭāt is in preparation and will be published under the title “Maqriziana V: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and al-Maqrīzī.”

\(^{33}\)See nos. XXXV–XXXVII, XXXIX–XL.
story had already been quoted previously, though the source differs. Nevertheless, one fact contradicts this impression: the whole story of the sacrifice of the virgin is to be read in the Khitaṭ (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 1) فصل: كان مروان بن الحكم يكتب لعثمان بن عفان [...] (قوانين، ص 46)
Fol. 121r 2) فصل الذي كان يؤخذ بعض من الجوالي (قوانين، ص 318)
Fol. 121r 3) فصل الذي جرت عادة بشارته للمنجر السلطاني (قوانين، ص 327)
Fol. 121r 4) فصل الشبل (قوانين، ص 328)
Fols. 121r–121v 5) فصل النظرن (قوانين، ص 329)
Fol. 121v 6) فصل دار الضرب بالقاهرة والاسكندرية (قوانين، ص 331)
Fol. 121v 7) فصل دار العبار (قوانين، ص 332)
Fol. 97r 8) فصل: كان يحصر الجنس الجموشي بالبرين الشرقي والغربي [...] (قوانين، ص 336)
Fol. 97r 9) فصل الأسطول (قوانين، ص 339)
Fol. 97v 10) فصل مقرر الجسور (قوانين، ص 342)
Fol. 97v 11) فصل موظف اللبان بالديبار المصرية (قوانين، ص 344)
Fols. 97v–98r 12) فصل الحاج بالوجه القبلي من الديبار المصرية (قوانين، ص 344)
Fol. 98r 13) فصل الفرس (قوانين، ص 347)
Fol. 98r 14) فصل: كانت قطيعة خراج الفدان القمح [...] (قوانين، ص 358)

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

34See no. XXVI.
35I still must establish whether or not there are quotations of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam’s Futūḥ Misr in the Khitaṭ 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 Muhadhdhab al-Khaḍīr Ibn Mammātī (d. 606/1209), *Qawānin al-Dawāwīn*. References are made to the edition of ‘Azīz Suryāl ‘Aṭīyah (Cairo, 1943). This work is cited twice in the *Khīṭat*, but only for other passages. These *fasl*s, 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 *Khīṭat* indicates that al-Maqrīzī was at a preliminary stage of writing.

IV. (quire X, fols. 98v–100r)

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

List of the *fasl*s and incipit:

Fol. 98v

1) 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

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

Fol. 99r

3) فصل: مدينة منف ذات العجائب بها الأبنية والآثار والدفاتر وكنوزها لا تختص [...]

Fol. 99r

4) فصل: الفرما هي أكثر عجائب وأقدم آثاراً كانت منها طريق إلى جزيرة قبرص في البر فغلب عليه البحر [...]

Fols. 99r–100r

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

Fols. 100r–100v

6) فصل النيل: اتبعه من جبل القمر وراء خط الاستواء من عين تجري منها عشرة أنهار [...]

Fol. 100v

7) فصل: رجع الله مصر حاجزا ببهر الروم وبحر الصين والحجاز بينهما مسيرة ليلة واحدة [...]

Commentary:

All these faṣls, except no. 3, appear extensively in Khīṭat as follows: 1 and 2 in Khīṭat 1:26, in this order; 4 in Khīṭat 1:211, in this order too; 5 in Khīṭat 1:98; 6 in Khīṭat 1:53; 7 in Khīṭat 1:212; and finally 8 in Khīṭat 1:75. For no. 3, cf. Khīṭat 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 Khīṭat, 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 Taʿlīq al-Mutajaddidāt, also titled as such with some variations by al-Maqrīzī.39 But in the Khīṭat, the work is attributed to al-Ḥasan ibn Ṭalḥa ibn Qudāmah ibn Jaʿfar’s Kitāb al-Kharāji,41 but it is not to be found there word for word. A careful examination of the text appearing in the


38Indeed, we find texts 3 and 4, with the same wording, in Yaʿqūt, Muʾjam al-Buldān (Beirut, 1968), 4:256 (s.v. al-Faramā) and vol. 5:214 (s.v. Manf). Yaʿqūt could not be al-Maqrīzī’s source for these passages, because al-Maqrīzī is more complete in his quotations than Yaʿqūt. It thus seems that Yaʿqūt took these data from Ibn al-Kindī’s text as well. After having consulted recently a newer edition of the Fadāʾīl Miṣr (ed. Ḣādīṣ Ahmad al-ʿAdawī and ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar, 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).


40This source is mentioned neither by Guest, “A List of Writers,” nor by Harīdī, Fihrist Khīṭat Miṣr.

Khitāt demonstrates that it comes from an indirect source that is probably al-Nuwayrī’s (d. 733/1333) Nihāyat al-Arab,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 Khitāt. 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 Khitāt, and the order of the fasāls has changed in the final version.

V. (quires XI–XIII, IX, fols. 101v–120v, 205, 2, 196r–204v, 87r–96v44)

قوائد (منقطة) من كتاب الواقي بالوفيات، تأليف العلامة صلاح الدين خليل بن أبيك الصوفي

Incipit (fol. 101v, lines 1–5):

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، ربي زدني علمًا. الحمد لله على ما أولى من الإحسان وآتنعم وصلى الله على تيبين محمد وآله وسلم.

وبعد هذه قوائد المنقطة من كتاب الواقي بالوفيات تأليف العلامة صلاح الدين خليل بن أبيك الصوفي صرف الله وجهه عن النار وحشره مع الصفوة الأبار ( [...] )

List of the fasāls and the biographies:
Fols. 101v–102v

فصل: تقول العرب أرخت وورخت وبوذرون بالليلالي دون الأيام لأن النهال إذا برى لبلا (الوافي 1 ص 16)

---

42Cairo, 1923.

43The same passage found in al-Nuwayrī and the Khitāt appears in al-Suyūṭī’s Husn al-Muhādarah, ed. Muhammad Abū al-Fadl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1968), 2:347–49, 355–56, where al-Suyūṭī declares that the passages were taken from the Mabāhīj al-Fikar by Jamāl al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Yahyā al-Watwāt al-Kutubī (d. 718/1318). See the facsimile of MS Fātih 4116 published by F. Sezgin under the title Encyclopædia of Four Natural Sciences, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 1990). It is highly probable that the Mabāhīj 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 orginal 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 iltaqatṭuhā.
فردريك باودن، مقرزيانا، المجموعة الأولى

فصول 102v–103r
فصل تقول للفترة وما دونها خلون وما فوق الفترة خلت ومضت ومن بعد العشرين لسع أن يقين
بلفظ الشك (الوافي 1، ص. 20).

فصول 103r–104r
1 محمد بن محمد بن علي بن محمد بن سليم المصري الصاحب تاج الدين أبو عبد الله بن الصاحب
فحار الدين بن الوزير بهاء الدين بن حنا (ت ٣٦٧٧، الوافي ١٤٦٦/١ و ص ٢١٧).

فصول 104r–104v
2 محمد بن محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن يوسف التونسي ركن الدين أبو عبد الله الجعفي التونسي
المعروف بابن القويع (ت ٣٣٨، الوافي ١٥٩١، ص. ٢٣٨).

فصول 104v–105v
3 محمد بن محمد بن أحمد بن سيد الناس فتح الدين أبو الفتح الحمصي الريعي (ت
٤٤١، الوافي ١٩٨٨، ص. ٢٨٩).

فصول 105v–106v
4 محمد بن محمد بن محمد بن أبي الحسن بن صالح بن علي بن يحيى بن طاهر بن
محمد بن الخضيب أبي يحيى عبد الرحمن بن نباتة النافري الأصل المصري المولد الخزافي الشافعي
جمال الدين أبو بكر الأديب الناظم (ت ٣١٢، الوافي ١٩٩١، ص. ٣١١).

فصول 106v–107r
5 محمد بن إبراهيم بن سعد الله بن جماعة بن علي بن جماعة بن حازم بن صخر بدر الدين أبو عبد
الله الكتاني الحمصي (ت ٣٣٨، الوافي ٢٦٨٨، ص. ١٨).

فصول 107r–107v
6 محمد بن إبراهيم بن ساعد شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الأنصاري المعروف بابن الأكفائي السنجار
المولد والأصل المصري النادر (ت ٣٤٩، الوافي ٢٧٥٤، ص. ٢٥).

فصول 107v–108v
7 محمد بن أحمد بن عثمان بن قايان شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الذهبي (ت ٥٤٨، الوافي ٢٠٣٦، ص. ١٦٣).

فصول 108v–109r
8 محمد بن الحسن بن رزان بن موسي بن عيسى بن موسي بن نصر الله تقي الدين أبو عبد الله
الحموي العامري (ت ٣٨٠، الوافي ٢٧٩٨، ص. ١٨).

فول. 109r
9 محمد بن دانيال بن يوسف الخزاعي الموصلي شمس الدين (ت ١٠٠٣، الوافي ٩٥١، ص. ٥١).
10. محمد بن سعيد بن حماد بن محسن بن عبد الله بن حنيتي بن صنهاج بن ملال الصنهاجي شرف الدين أبو عبد الله (ت 697، الوافي 1451/1، ص 165).

Fol. 109v

11. محمد بن عبد البر بن يحيى بن علي بن ثميم، بهاء الدين أبو البقى بن القاضي سيد الدين السبكي الأنصاري الشافعي (ت 629/1193، الوافي 1196/3، ص 210).

Fols. 110r–110v

12. محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر جلال الدين أبو عبد الله الفزوي (ت 739، الوافي 1258/3، ص 242).

Fol. 110v

13. محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر الباجيقي الخزرجي (ت 744، الوافي 1276/9، ص 249).

Fol. 111r

14. محمد بن عبد الله بن الحسن بن علي أبو المكارم شرف الدين الصقراوي الإسكندري المصري الشافعي المعروف بابن عين الدولة (ت 639، الوافي 1437/3، ص 352).

Fols. 111r–111v

15. محمد بن عبد الله بن عبد الظاهر بن نشوان بن عبد الظاهر فتح الدين ابن محبي الدين الجذامي المصري (ت 691، الوافي 1433/3، ص 366).

Fols. 111v–112r

16. محمد بن عبد الله بن إبراهيم الشهير بالمرشدي (ت 737، الوافي 1449/3، الوافي 737، الوافي 1449/3، ص 372).

Fols. 112r–113r

17. محمد بن عثمان بن أبي الرجاء شمس الدين التنوخي ابن السلموس (ت 693، الوافي 1555/4، ص 86).

Fol. 113r

18. محمد بن عثمان بن أبي الحسن شمس الدين بن صفى الدين الأنصاري الجنفي ابن الحربي الدمشقي (ت 638، الوافي 1559/4، ص 90).

Fols. 113r–114r

19. محمد بن علي بن محمد بن أحمد بن عبد الله محبب الدين الطائي الحافي الأندلسي ابن العربي (ت 638، الوافي 1559/4، ص 173).

Fols. 114r–115v

20. محمد بن علي بن وهب بن مطبع تقى الدين أبو الفتح بن دقيق العبد الفحري المفلوطي المصري (ت 702، الوافي 1461/4، ص 193).
Fols. 115v–116v
21 محمد بن عمر بن مكي بن عبد الصمد صدر الدين ابن المرحل ويعرف في الشام بابن وكيل بيت المال المصري الأصل العثماني الشافعي (ت 716، الواقفي 1482، ص 426)

Fol. 116v
22 محمد بن عيسى بن حسن بن كر من ولد مروان الحمار شمس الدين أبو عبد الله الخيتي (ت 763، الواقفي 1486/1، ص 305)

Fols. 116v–117v
23 محمد بن فضل الله القاضي فخر الدين (ت 732، الواقفي 1490/4، ص 335)

Fols. 117v–120، 205، 2، 196v
24 محمد بن قلاون ناصر الدين أبو الفتح بن المنصور الملك الناصر (ت 741، الواقفي 1917/4، ص 353)

Fols. 196v–197r
25 محمد بن مكرم بن علي بن أحمد الأنصاري الرويفي الإفريقي المصري جمال الدين أبو الفضل (ت 711، الواقفي 1444/5، ص 54)

Fol. 197r
26 محمد بن ناماور بن عبد الملك أفضل الدين الخوغيرجي (ت 646، الواقفي 211/5، الواقفي 208، ص 101)

Fols. 197v–198v
27 محمد بن يوسف بن علي بن يوسف بن حيان أثير الدين أبو حيان الغزنتي (ت 745، الواقفي 2345/5، ص 277)

Fol. 198v
28 محمد بن يوسف بن علي بن يوسف بنден محب الدين أبو عبد الله بن نجم الدين التيمي (ت 2348/5، ص 290)

Fol. 199r
29 محمد جمال الدين الساويجي (ت بعد 630، الواقفي 2351/6، ص 292)

Fols. 199r–200v
30 إبراهيم بن أحمد جمال الدين أبو إسحق بن المغربي (ت 756، الواقفي 2388/5، ص 314)

Fol. 200v
31 إبراهيم بن عبد الله بن هبة الله بن مرزوق صفي الدين العقلياتي (ت 659، الواقفي 2473/6، ص 39)

Fol. 201r
32 إبراهيم بن عرفات بن صالح زين الدين بن أبي المتنى القباني (ت 744، الواقفي 1495/6، ص 55)
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي بشكل طبيعي. يظهر النص على صفحات مخطوطة مع بعض الأخطاء الرسمية والخطاطية.

Folio 87r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège, ms. 2232.
33) إبرهيم بن لقمان بن أحمد بن محمد بن فضل الله إسحاق فخر الدين الشبياني الإسعودة (ت 696، الوافي 1276، ص 97) 

Fol. 201v
34) إبرهيم بن معيض بن شداد برهان الدين الجعبري (ت 876، الوافي 1476، ص 147)

Fol. 201v
35) إبرهيم بن لاجين بن عبد الله برهان الدين الرشدي (ت 749، الوافي 1326، ص 164)

Fols. 201v–202r
36) إبرهيم الخانق ويفة الحجار والمعمار علم النوري المصري (ت 2، الوافي 1236، ص 173)

Fols. 202v–202v
37) إبرهيم جمال الدين جمال الكفاة وابن خان السمرش (ت 745، الوافي 1336، ص 180)

Fol. 202v
38) أحمد بن إبراهيم شهاب الدين الصناعي القرافي (ت 822، الوافي 1486، ص 270، 287)

Fol. 203r
39) أحمد بن أبي بكر بن عزالديناء الدين الأسويي المحترف الإسكندراني المولد (ت 720، الوافي 1376)

Fols. 203r–204v
40) أحمد بن الحسن الامام الحاكم بأمر الله أمير المؤمنين أبو العباس بن الأمير أبي علي الحسن الغبي بن أبي بكر بن علي بن المسترشد بن المستشرق العباسي (ت 288196، الوافي 1417، ص 317)

Fol. 204v
41) أحمد بن سعيد بن محمد تاج الدين بن شرف الدين بن شمس الدين بن الأثير الكيلبي (ت 771، الوافي 1426، ص 92)

Fol. 87r
42) إسماعيل بن عبد الجبار بن يوسف بن عبد الجبار بن شبيل أبو الظاهر علم الدين الأكرم أبي الخاجاج الجذامي الصوسي المصري (ت 610، الوافي 1419، ص 41)

Fols. 87r–87v
43) إسماعيل بن علي الملك المؤيد عمار الدين أبو الفداء بن الأفضل بن المظفر بن المنصور تعالى الدين عمر بن شاهنشاه بن أبو بني شادي (ت 732، الوافي 1480، ص 173)

Fol. 88r
44) إسماعيل بن محمد بن قلاون السلطان الملك الصالح بن الناصر بن المنصور عماد الدين أبو الفداء (ت 746، الوافي 1346، ص 219)
Fols. 88r–88v
5) إسماعيل بن محمد بن باقت بابوان مجد الدين السلاطي (ت 743، الوافي 419، ص 22).

Fol. 88v
6) أصلم الأمير بها الدين (ت 746، الوافي 211، 4285، ص 285).

Fols. 88v–89r
7) أغولو الأمير شجاع الدين (ت 748، الوافي 225، 4294، ص 294).

Fols. 89r–89v
8) أسفنقر الغارقي (ت 776، الوافي 245، 430، ص 31).

Fol. 89v
9) أسفنقر السلاطي (ت 745، الوافي 424، ص 313).

Fols. 89v–90v
10) أقوش الأمير جمال الدين (ت بعد 720، الوافي 2265، 426، ص 326).

Fols. 91r–91v
11) أقوش الأمير جمال الدين (ت 736، الوافي 4277، 436 ص 336).

Fols. 91v–92r
12) أكرم كرم الدين الصغير (ت 726، الوافي 4267، 445، ص 345).

Fols. 92r–92v
13) الخزاز الناصري (ت 738، الوافي 4276، 454، ص 358).

Fol. 92v
14) أطينيفا المارداني السلاطي الناصري (ت 744، الوافي 4292، 464، ص 365).

Fol. 92v
15) أطينيفا الجرايلي (ت 744، الوافي 4293، 464 ص 366).

Fol. 93r
16) ألماس (ت 4-733، الوافي 4296، 470 ص 37).

Fols. 93r–93v
17) أملك الأمير سيف الدين (ت 746، الوافي 4297، 472، ص 372).

Fols. 93v–94r
18) آنوك بن الناصر محمد بن قلاوون (ت 740، الوافي 4265، 481، ص 431).

Fols. 94r–96v
19) أبوبك بن عبد الله الصالحي الملك المزع عز الدين التركمانى (ت 755، الوافي 4430، 469، ص 489).

Fol. 96v
20) أبدر الخطيبي (ت 738، الوافي 4461، 49، ص 17).
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, with mention of the date of death (preceded by tā’ī), the volume and the number of the biography in it, and finally the page on which the biography begins.

Al-Safadī is quoted only thrice in the Khīṭat, 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 Khīṭat. I have noticed that al-Maqrīzī also used this kind of biography in Al-Muqaffā. Further study will be required in order to verify whether this material also appears in Itti‘āz al-Hūnafī 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: Khīṭat, 2:35 contains a biography of Bashṭāk, 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 faṣāls 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 faṣāls and incipit:
Fols. 124r–124v
فصل في ميراث البناء: لا خلاف أن من مات وترك ثلاث بنات فأكثر من غير ابن ذكر إن لحين تلما
ما ترك [...]

Fols. 124v–125v
فصل في تلاف الرحمن من غير فعل الراهن ولا المرتهن: هذه مسألة اختلاف أهل العلم فيها على خمسة
أقوال [...]

---

48 See Guest, “A List of Writers,” 118; Harīdī, Fihrist Khīṭat Miṣr, 2:69 (A‘yān al-‘Aṣr), 75, and 96. Note that Harīdī gives two titles on pp. 75 and 96: Tārikh and Kitāb, but neither of them appears in the Khīṭat. In fact, both of them are passages coming from the Kitāb al-Wāfī (number 1 of the resumé appears in Khīṭat, 2:429).
Commentary:
So far I have not been able to identify the source of these *fāṣls*, 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 *Khiṭṭat*, 1:111, which demonstrates that he was interested in this matter.

VII. (quires XV–XVI, fols. 131r–142r)
Title on fol. 131r, line 1: *Fāṣlī Manāfiʿ al-Ḥayawān.*

Incipit (fol. 131r, lines 1–2):

الفَرْس

[...]

List of the animals:
Fol. 131r
الشَّيْلا

Fols. 131r–131v
الشَّرْف

Fol. 131v
البَكْر

Fols. 131v–132r
البَجَيْل

Fol. 132r
الجَـامِعَة

Fols. 132r–132v
الضّـانَـة

Fol. 132v
المـعـز

Fols. 132v–133r
الأَـيْـل

Fol. 133r
أَـيْـبَـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأـيْـأ~
الفهد
القرد
الكلب
النمر
السناز
شاره وار
الفيل
الكركدن
ابن عرس
فصل في منائع الطير
الإوز
البلبل
البوم
الخيارى
الحلج
الخودة
الحمام
الخطاف
الوطاط
الدجاج
الرمح
الزاغ
الطافوس
العصفر
العقاب
العنقاء
الغراب
الفهد
القرد
الكلب
النمر
السناز
شاره وار
الفيل
الكركدن
ابن عرس
فصل في منائع الطير
الإوز
البلبل
البوم
الخيارى
الحلج
الخودة
الحمام
الخطاف
الوطاط
الدجاج
الرمح
الزاغ
الطافوس
العصفر
العقاب
العنقاء
الغراب
Fol. 137v

Fols. 137v–138r

Fol. 138r

Fols. 138r–138v

Fol. 138v

Fols. 138v–139r

Fol. 139r

Fols. 139r–139v

Fol. 139v

Fols. 139v–140r

Fol. 140r

Fols. 140r–140v

الفاخنة
القلب
القلب
مالك الحزين
النسر
النعام
النهد
الوطأط
البراعة
البسام
البازي
النونوت
الدرب
القرطس
الكركي
البغا
فصل في الحشرات والهوام
الأرضة
الأفعى
البرغوث
النعان
الخروس
الخيبة
الخراطين
الحنفاء
دود الغز
الذباب
السالمندرا
Commentary:
This fasl 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-Maqrizi did not indicate in each case the precise species. 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-Maqrizi 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-Maqrizi for any of his writings, but this impression is misleading. I was able to trace at least two quotations from this resumé in the Khitaṭ. Both of them deal with animals of the last classification: the crocodile (Khitaṭ, 1:67) and the ra’ādah (the electric ray) (Khitaṭ, 1:65). In the first of these, two lines before the beginning of the passage, al-Maqrizi cites the name of Ibn Zuhr, which is preceded a few lines before by the name of Ibn

---

49 It 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).

50 This is Abū al-‘Ala’ 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-Baytār. 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-Baytār (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 *Khitaṭ* comes directly from Ibn al-Baytār, but it is impossible to identify the resumé as being an epitome of Ibn al-Baytār’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‘īb 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’ādaḥ* do not appear in his book, and data found in the resumé are lacking in the ‘Ajā‘īb. 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

51Cairo-Būlāq, 1291/1874, 4 vols.
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 *Mabāḥij al-Fikar* of al-Wāṭwāṭ, 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.
 Folio 149r. Courtesy Bibliothèque de l’Université de Liège, ms. 2232.
In summary, Ibn Zuhr’s *Khawāṣṣ al-Hayān* 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

1. في القبلة: قال أبقراط الجماع بغير مؤانسة جفاء (...)
2. آداب المحادثة ثلاثة وعشرون (...)

Fol. 146v

3. آداب الضعافة: 14 آدبا (...)

Fol. 147r

4. سبب العشق: التجانس وقوته وضعفه على قدر التشاقة (...)

Fol. 148r

5. الكلام له أربع مراتب

Fol. 148v

6. سبب اللياقة: تخلل 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)**


مقتل الفقيه عمراء على ما ذكر ابن المتوج في كتاب الخطاب

Incipit (fol. 149r, lines 4–5):

قال لما سيمع حدود واستمرت أمر صلاح الدين وقصد المتوجه إلى البلاد الشامية (...
Explicit (fol. 149v, lines 9–10):

[... وعجل لك الاجتماع بإحبابك فقال إنا قلتمي إحسانكم وإساهمكم.

Commentary:

The source of this epitome is clearly indicated by al-Maqrizi as being the Kitab al-Khitat written by Ibn al-Mutawwaj. He is to be identified with Taj al-Din Muhammed ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab Ibn al-Mutawwaj (d. 730/1329), who is the author of a book dealing with khitat entitled Igaz al-Mutaghaffil wa-Itti‘az al-Muta‘ammil, which is considered lost. This work is one of the few that al-Maqrizi cites in his introduction to the Khiyat (1:5) among the sources he relied upon. It has previously been stated that all the references to this work in the Khiyat 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.

X. (quire XVII, fols. 149v–150r)

Title on fol. 149v, line 10:

الإهاب

Incipit (fol. 149v, lines 10–11):

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

Explicit (fol. 150r, lines 6–7):

[... وعند مدينة فرعون موسى أعظم ما قبلها وهرم ميودم آخراً.]

Commentary:

Some passages of this resumé on the pyramids can be identified in the Khiyat (1:116, 119). For the first occurrence, al-Maqrizi identifies the source as Kitab Tuhfat al-Albah of Abü ‘Abd Allâh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Rahim al-Qaysî [al-Gharnâти] (d. 565/1170). The data are almost identical and a date (501) which is mentioned in the resumé appears again in the Khiyat, on the same page. Moreover, the quotation in the Khiyat can be traced in the published version of the Tuhfat al-Alba;[56] which prompts me to regard this work as definitely the source of the resumé.


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

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*, 1:447.

XII. (quire XVII, fols. 150r–150v)

Commentary:
The stated source of this resumé is the *Akhbār Bānī Ayyūb* by Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Naẓīf (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-Ta’rīkh al-Mansūrī, Talkhīs al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān fī Hawādīth al-Zamān*. As its title indicates, the book is a shorter version of a universal history (*Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān fī Ḥawādīth al-Zamān*). The *Al-Ta’rīkh al-Mansūrī* ends with the year 624 and is considered to be the most important source for the Ayyubid period. A close examination of the text reveals that

---

57 Ed. M. Muștafa Ziyyādah (Cairo, 1967).
58 See 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. Griaznevich (Moscow, 1960).
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-Maqrizi 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-Maqrizi entitles Akhbar Bani Ayyub is equivalent to Al-Tarih al-Manṣūri, and it has been reutilized for the Khitaṭ 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: Mukhtar min Tarih Ibn Nazif al-Kabir/Ibn Nazif.

Incipt (fol. 150v, lines 15–16):

حدث في سنة 76

Explicit (fol. 151r, line 23):

درة [...] وخمسة ذراعاً

Commentary:
Just below the resumé (mukhtar) of Al-Tarih al-Manṣūri, al-Maqrizi 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: Mukhtar min Tarih Ibn Nazif al-Kabir. We should understand from this title that al-Maqrizi intended to summarize the longest text written by Ibn Nazif, i.e., Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayan fi Ḥawādith al-Zaman, a work which has not been preserved, except in a shorter version (i.e., Al-Tarih al-Manṣūri, see the preceding entry). A comparison of the material found in the resumé and the beginning of Al-Tarih al-Manṣūri shows that the wording of the latter is different and more complete. This proves that what al-Maqrizi included in this resumé was not taken from Al-Tarih al-Manṣūri, assuming that this was a part of the longest work, but from Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayan itself.

XIV. (quire XVII, fols. 151r–151v)
No title. Excerpt regarding the kings of Himyar.
Incipit (fol. 151r, lines 24–25):

جمس ملوك حمير على اختلاف القول فيهم سنتة وعشرون ملكاً وامرأة أعتي بلقبين [...]  

Explicit (fol. 151v, line 8):

قد طال ما أكلوا يوماً 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 Khīṭat,⁶⁰ where the Kitāb al-Tījān fī Mulīk Ḥimyar by Wahb ibn Munabbih, in the transmission of Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd 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)

لخصت ما قبل في الدرهم والدينار من مختار من كتاب الدينار والدرهم. تأليف أبي بكر محمد بن خلف بن حبان المعروف بوكيم.  

Incipit (fol. 151v, lines 13–14):

القول في الدينار والدرهم: قال كعب الأحجار أول من ضرب الدينار والدرهم أدم [...]  

Explicit (fol. 155r, lines 17–18):

[...] وكان علي بيت المال رجل من طيء، بقال له سمير فأمره فأعطى الناس فجعل الناس يقولون دراهيم سمرية فبذل ذلك سمت سمرية.  

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 aqīf ‘alā al-aṣl), but rather a resumé (mukhtār) from which he made an epitome (talkhīṣ). Undoubtedly this resumé 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 Khīṭat Miṣr, 1, s.v. Ḥimyar and Sayf ibn Dhī Yazan.  
⁶¹See ibid., 2:80.
known by his shuhrah as Wakī’. His Akhbār al-Qudḥāh 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-‘Uqūd 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 [بماض]: كل مطلوب مدرك وإن كان شاهقا في السماء ومن رجع عن حاحته فهو غير طالب.

النفوس المحبة 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: اللؤلؤ الأحمر مقاطعة ألف تنبّكة ذهبًا [ ...]

Fol. 156r
خان بالقلم من بلاد الخطا: ملكها اجل ملك توران [ ...]
ومعاملة أهل خوارزم والقفقاج ومعظم مالك إيران بالدينار [ ...]
ومعاملة بغداد دينران أحدهما العوال عنه اثنا عشر درهما [ ...]

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

63 This 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.
The most interesting point here is probably his discussion of China and the currency used there: al-Maqrizi 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-`Uqīd* 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‘iyah*.

**XVIII. (quire XVIII, fols. 157r–160v)**


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

Incipit (fol. 157r, lines 3–4):

في هذه السنة يعني سنة 502 فتح ديوان التحقيق تولاه ابن أبي الليث النصارياني واضيف إليه ديوان المجلس

List of the dates and events dealt with:

Fol. 158r

سنة 512

Fol. 158v

 سنة 513

Fol. 159r

خُبر في الأفضل

Commentary:

The source is clearly indicated as being the *Sīrat al-Ma’mūn al-Batā‘ihi*, a work attributed to Ibn al-Ma’mūn al-Batā‘ihi. His full name was Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Ali Mūsā Ibn al-Ma’mūn Muḥammad ibn Fāṭik ibn Mukhtar al-Batā‘ihi (d. 588/1192), son of the vizier al-Batā‘ihi, and his book, known as *Tārikh Ibn al-Ma’mūn* or *Al-Sīrah al-Ma’mūniyah*, 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 Ḥulā al-Maghrib*), al-Nuwayrī (*Nihāyat al-Arab*), Ibn Duqmāq (*Al-Intiṣār*), and al-Maqrizi (*Al-Khīṭāt, Ittī‘āz al-Ḥunafā‘*, and *Al-Muqaffā‘*). The excerpt preserved in the Liège codex is

---

65 See Ayman Fu‘ād Sayyid, “Lumières nouvelles sur quelques sources de l’histoire fatimide en
thus the first proof that al-Maqrizi 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-Maqrizi where the Fatimid period is dealt with (see above). Another interesting feature of the notebook is that it contains a specimen of al-Maqrizi’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-Maqrizi’s working method.

XIX. (quire XVIII, fols. 161r–163v)
Title on fol. 161r, line 1: Al-Khabar ‘an Jinkiz Khān.

Incipit (fol. 161r, lines 1–2):

قبل إن جنكر خان ينتهي نسبه إلى امرأة تسمى آلان توا كانت تحت رجل أولدهو و الدين [...]

Explicit (fol. 163v, line 16):

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

Commentary:
In a series of articles published between 1971 and 1973, David Ayalon studied the problem of al-Maqrizi’s hypothetical source for the data about the yāsas in the Khīṭṭāt (2:219–22). After a close examination of the sources, Ayalon was inclined to identify it as Ibn Fadl Allāh Al-‘Umarī’s Masālik al-Absār fī Mamālik al-Amşār. 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-Absār68 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-Absār preserved, one

---

66 This argument will be treated extensively in “Maqriziana II.”
68 I 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-amşār (Wiesbaden, 1968).
can read an inscription in al-Maqrīzī’s hand, which is “intaqaḥu dā’iyyan li-mu‘īrihi Ahmad ibn ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī sanat 831.” 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. In all these cases, he chose the verb “intaqā” which in this context means “to take notes, to digest.” 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 Khīṭaṭ, given its inclusion in this book. This resumé proves definitely that al-Maqrīzī prepared a notandum of the part regarding Chingiz Khān and the yāsā. But there is more to come: Ayalon stressed that the data found in the Masālik al-Absār had been deliberately distorted by al-Maqrīzī with the aim of discrediting the yāsā among his contemporaries. It will now be possible to compare the original version (Ibn Fāḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī) with the resumé, where some modifications are already visible, and finally with the version in the Khīṭaṭ. Once more, we will come closer to the working technique of this historian.

XX. (quire XIX, fols. 166r–174v)
No title. Six faṣlgs dealing with juridical matters.
List of the faṣlgs and incipit:

| Fol. 166r | فصل في بيان الفرع والكيل والوزن |
| Fol. 169r | فصل في حد المدعي الذي يحتاج إلى البيئة والمدعى عليه الذي لا يحتاج إليها |
| Fol. 169v | فصل في حكم اليهود والنصاري الذين مصير الأن |
| Fol. 172r | فصل في زيارة القبور والنذر لها والعكف عندها والقراءة عليها |
| Fol. 172v | فصل في النذر |
| Fol. 174v | معنى تذيب الميت بالبكا عليه |

Moreover, 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.

For a complete list, see “Maqriziana II.”

I will come back to this particular point in “Maqriziana II.”

At least, it is the part that has been preserved. Scholars had already noticed that al-Maqrīzī took almost complete chapters from the Masālik al-Absār without acknowledgment, which confirms that he made several resumés of this book. See Ayman Fu‘ād Sayyid’s edition of Ibn Fāḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-Aḥsār fī Mamālik al-Amšār (Mamālik Maṣr wa-al-Šām wa-al-Ḥijāz 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.

This matter will be the subject of our “Maqriziana VII.”
Commentary:
All these *fasl* s 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-Maqriti borrowed this material. Considering the first *fasl* only, I noticed that it contains data about numismatics and metrology which can be found in *Shudhur al-‘Uqud*, *Al-Ighathah*, and *Al-Awzan wa-al-Akyal al-Shar’iyah*, 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 *dar al-hisbah*, to which, he says, he had been appointed. This person is to be identified as Najm al-Din Aḥmad ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Ali ibn al-Rif’ah (d. 710/1310).74 The sources consulted say that he was in charge of the *hisbah* in Cairo. Al-Maqriti mentions that he was the author of a commentary on al-Shirazi’s *Al-Tanbih* entitled *Kifayat al-Nabi fi Sharh al-Tanbih* in fifteen volumes, and also of a work on measures and weights (*al-makayil wa-al-mawazin*), which was entitled, according to Ibn Ḥajar, *Ḥukm al-Mikayil wa-al-Mizān*.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 *fasl*. It remains to be determined whether the other *fasl* s come from the same author, and in this case maybe from his *Sharḥ al-Tanbih*. 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 مرضًا ولهم عذاب أليمًا بما كانوا يكتبون المرض في القلب يجوز أن يكون حقيقة ومجازًا [...] [...
Explicit (fol. 184r, line 8):
[... وعن الأوزاعي لا يجوز تبرعها ما لم تلد أو تقم في بيت زوجها سنة.]

---

76 *Al-Idāh wa-al-Tibyan* 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 *fasl* in the notebook with Ibn al-Rif’ah’s *Al-Idāh wa-al-Tibyan*, seems to be corroborated as Muhammad ‘Abd al-Sattār ‘Uthmān, in his edition of al-Maqriti’s *Shudhur al-‘Uqūd fi Dhikr al-Nuqūd* (Cairo, 1990), 52, after having compared the two texts, asserts that *Al-Idāh* served as a basic source for al-Maqriti in writing his *Shudhur al-‘Uqūd*.
77 Fol. 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-Zamakhshārī quoted once on fol. 177r. Comparison with al-Zamakhshārī’s *Al-Kashshāf ‘an Ḥaqā’iq al-Tanzil* reveals that it was the original source of the resumé. Al-Zamakhshārī is cited only once in the *Kitāb*, 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 *Kitāb*, 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):

Yoysf bim Ahmad bim Muhammad bim Ahmad bim Jafr bim Qasim al-Isri Jamal al-din al-Jasisi ( . . .
Explicit (fol. 191v, lines 1–3):

. . .) waAntiymta tArkhkta uNlNf yntNf harf min dNtNf wntNf ( . . .) uNlNf dNtNf

Commentary:
This very long biography is written in al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting, of course, but it differs from the other resumés. 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-Muqaffā*, 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 Tarājm al-A‘yān al-Mufidah*. Unfortunately, this important source has

---

not yet been fully published. It is preserved in an incomplete autograph manuscript in Gotha (A 1771), 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. Fortunately, my eyes fell by mere chance on the Durar al-Fawā‘id al-Munażẓamah fī Akhbār al-Ḥajj wa-Ṭarīq Makkah al-Mu‘azzamah, a book written by ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Mūhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Anṣārī al-Jazīrī (d. after 976/1568), 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