

Ibn Ḥijjī. Analogically, the subchapter dealing with “Later historians” includes a section on “Egyptian historians,” and the list includes Ibn Taghrībirdī, al-Ṣayrafī, al-Malaṭī, Ibn Iyās, and an anonymous author of a chronicle entitled *Jawāhir al-Sulūk fī al-Khulafāʾ wa-al-Mulūk*. In the section devoted to later Syrian historians, Massoud examines the accounts written by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah. As in the case of two previous chapters, chapter three ends with brief comments on “minor historians.”

These three analytical chapters are followed by three appendices, one appendix supplementing each of the chapters. Generally speaking, these appendices include the English rendering of the individual reports which were subjected to analysis in the preceding chapters; each of the three appendices consists of entries referencing reports mentioned in the analysis. Each entry is numbered and organized according to four categories (political/military/administrative affairs, religious life, social history/ miscellany, and foreign affairs) and then identified by the abbreviation of its author’s name. As a result, the reader can easily check the text of the reports referred to in the study, as well as find their location in the sources.

Due to its very particular nature, a study based on a word-by-word analysis of sources by means of textual collation can hardly be summarized. However, the intrinsic value of this kind of work consists not in its storyline, but in the details which fill it and which take the form of dozens of conclusions and hypotheses drawn by the author in the course of the Benedictine effort made in comparing the records. Therefore, to appreciate a study such as Massoud’s *Chronicles and Annalistic Sources*, one has to savor its details (including the collated fragments of transcribed Arabic records inserted into the text) and recognize their value. Taking this into consideration, it seems that the most appropriate way to demonstrate the quality and significance of the discussed work is to indicate some of the most characteristic conclusions and hypotheses formulated by its author.

Generally speaking, the opinions and judgments expressed by Massoud can be divided into those that refer to micro-scale historiography and those that apply to a more universal context. The former are the direct result of Massoud’s efforts to achieve one of the main objectives of his research, that is “to examine inside the confines of a single annal, the disposition of *akhbār* and their interrelation within sources” (p. 10). Meticulous, precise, and insightful, these opinions not only define a given historian’s contribution to our knowledge about the events of a given year, they also constitute essential material without which formulating more universal comments would not be possible. Thus one can learn, for example, that Ibn al-ʿIrāqī’s chronicle “is of little value for anyone interested in investigating the social and political scene in Egypt in 778” (p. 48); that “for the year 778 . . . [al-ʿAynī’s] *ʿIqd al-Jumān* has absolutely nothing original to offer” (p. 40); or that “as regards the annal of the year 778, the primary significance of al-Maqrīzī



[i.e., his *Kitāb al-Sulūk*] is that he replicates the contents of Ibn al-Furāt's *Tārīkh al-Duwal*" (p. 49). One can also learn details such as the fact that Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *Inbāʾ al-Ghumr* "offers a rather poor account of the events of the year 778," that "it is a condensed summary of other people's work" (p. 59), and that it "does not add anything dramatically original to our knowledge of the year 793" (p. 118). A researcher can also read that "the annal of the year 778 in *Jawāhir al-Sulūk* does not reflect Ashtor's assertion that it contains original data not found in contemporary sources" (p. 77), and that generally "*Jawāhir al-Sulūk* is not a very useful source for the events of the year 778" (p. 81). As for Ibn Iyās, we can learn that "perhaps the most striking characteristic of the annal of the year 793 in *Badāʾiʿ al-Zuhūr* is the extent to which it diverges in many parts of its narrative from the general consensus sketched by the other chronicles" (p. 137).

Naturally enough, a great many of Massoud's micro-scale conclusions result from his investigation of textual borrowings. Al-Sakhāwī, for example, relied mostly on Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-Ghumr*, but also on Ibn al-ʿIrāqī's *Dhayl*, at least for the year 778. As for Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-Ghumr*, "the highly condensed and disorganized nature of the narrative, coupled with his [Ibn Ḥajar's] propensity to rewrite other authors' *akhbār*" (p. 55), made it arduous to identify the sources from which Ibn Ḥajar borrowed. However, as far as his elaboration of the annal of 778 is concerned, it can be established with some degree of certainty that he relied on Ibn al-Furāt, Ibn Duqmāq, and Ibn Ḥijjī. Sometimes, as in the case of Ibn Khaldūn's *Kitāb al-ʿIbar*, the clues are so confusing that it is impossible to give a clear answer regarding borrowings. At other times, as in the case of certain data included in the annal of 793/1390–91 in the anonymous *Jawāhir al-Sulūk*, Massoud leaves it for others to determine "whether the author derived this information from an unknown source . . ." or "had recourse to artistic licence by simply inventing this account" (p. 142).

As for Massoud's more general assumptions, comments, and hypotheses, they refer to many different aspects of the works discussed. Most often, they concern a given historian, his style, his reliability, and the value of his work for modern historians. A typical example of such comments are the remarks referring to Ibn Duqmāq's *Nuzhat al-Anām*: the analysis of this chronicle brings Massoud to the fundamental conclusion that it is "the most original of sources in that it was copied extensively by other authors, such as Ibn al-Furāt and al-ʿAynī, and yet does not appear to contain major borrowings from any other works" (p. 34). From the section on Ibn al-Furāt one can learn that *Al-Muntaqá* (i.e., Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah's selections from *Tārīkh Ibn al-Furāt*) is "superior to all other chronicles in terms of wealth of information," and that "it contains a substantial number of in-depth additional data that appear to be original" (p. 36). Moreover, *Al-Muntaqá* "contains more accounts of political events than any other contemporary source,



and it also outdoes these with regard to social and religious affairs” (p. 38). As for the anonymous *Jawāhir al-Sulūk*, Massoud warns researchers that reading this chronicle “leaves one with the impression that its author was more interested in the form that his narrative would take than in the historical content it might provide. Moreover, he took some liberty in rewriting history” (p. 80).

Perhaps the most illustrative of Massoud’s shrewd and expert style are the sections devoted to Ibn Iyās. Thus, all those who use, or intend to use, Ibn Iyās’s *Badāʾiʿ al-Zuhūr* can learn that one of the many narrative techniques used by Ibn Iyās was combining story elements from different sources. However, beyond the data he borrowed from others, the chronicle contains a “substantial amount of information found in no other source” (p. 72). Such a feature would generally be considered a positive quality. However, Massoud leaves no doubt as to the value of at least some of such pieces of information, which he describes as “likely to have been nothing but dramatic embroiderings” (p. 73). Massoud further devalues the quality of Ibn Iyās’s accounts by stressing that the chronicler used to take “considerable liberty in rearranging the story line and plots of certain events” or, in other words, to romanticize certain events whenever these lent themselves to such a treatment, and to alter the storyline for dramatic purposes (p. 75). In practical terms, this means that “the fundamental narrative elements of some series of *akhbār* in *Badāʾiʿ al-Zuhūr* are generally common to Ibn Iyās and to most other historians, but their order of appearance, chronological anchoring, circumstantial dimensions, and, more importantly, the dramatic results of the events they depict,” (p. 138) frequently place “his narrative at odds with the accounts of most other historians” (p. 73). However, one should remember that “despite the profound changes to which Ibn Iyās subjected a number of his reports, the information he used to construct his narrative was made up of historical facts” (p. 75).

In other words, Ibn Iyās’s *Badāʾiʿ al-Zuhūr* is a mixture of history and fiction. The main problem with Ibn Iyās, however, is that he was the foremost chronicler to witness the decline of the Mamluk state and Egypt’s transition from Mamluk to Ottoman rule. Consequently, modern historians dealing with this period are forced to rely on him as far as the source material is concerned; for this reason, Massoud’s remarks should always be kept in mind. In fact, Massoud’s *Chronicles and Annalistic Sources* is an extremely useful and indispensable guide to all Burji historiography. The textual collation applied by Massoud has resulted in the production of what Mamlukologists need most of all (and what D. P. Little sought to establish): “an analytical survey of the sources of the period that aims at classifying them in terms of their value to modern historians” (quoted on p. 7). Sami Massoud did his work perfectly. The few typing errors, such as misspelling Jo Van



Steenbergen's name as "Joe" (p. 42), are probably the only examples of imprecision or oversight in this book. The term "*muswadda*" as used by Massoud on p. 22 and defined as "foundation" (of a book) could be also spelled "*musawwadah*," as it was in Ayman Fu'ād Sayyid's 1995 edition of al-Maqrīzī's *Musawwadat Kitāb al-Mawā'iz wa-al-Itibār fī Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*. The form "*musawwadah*" is not the only correct form, but it is perhaps less Egyptian—and therefore more classical—in flavor. In general, due to its informativeness and uniqueness, the value of the book cannot be overestimated.

BERNADETTE MARTEL-THOUMIAN, *Catalogue des manuscrits historiques de la Bibliothèque nationale de Damas: Période mamlouke* (Damascus: Institut français du Proche-Orient, 2003). Pp. 336.

REVIEWED BY RENÉ-VINCENT DU GRANDLAUNAY, Institut dominicain d'Études orientales

The manuscript collection in the Damascus National Library has numbered over 40,000 titles ever since collections from various Syrian cities were assembled there in the 1980s. Catalogues previous to this date are perforce obsolete. Such is not the case for the catalogue reviewed here: though published in 2003, the author has personally told me that it was completed ten years earlier, in 1993. In this work, Bernadette Martel-Thoumian has compiled the catalogue of manuscripts concerning the Mamluk period (648–922/1250–1517) found in this sizeable and outstanding collection. She grounds her undertaking on previous works, in which she occasionally shows undue trust. We wish to mention specifically the two-volume *Fihris Makḥṭūṭāt Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhirīyah: al-Tārīkh wa-Mulḥaqātuḥu*, published by the Majma' al-'Ilmī al-'Arabī bi-Dimashq, the first volume of which was edited by Yusuf Eche in 1947, and the second by Khālīd al-Rayyān in 1973.

Note that manuscripts dating to the Mamluk period, but containing pre-Mamluk texts, have justifiably been omitted from this description. Likewise, from works on general history, only the manuscript sections related to the Mamluk period have been retained. Hence, manuscripts of *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) are not comprehensively described [26–27]:¹ only volume 10, covering the period from 617/1220 to 702/1303, has been included in this work. Similarly, from the anonymous manuscript of the *Tārīkh al-Islām* [38], only the specifically Mamluk sections 7, 8, and 9 have been described.

¹ The description number in Martel-Thoumian's catalogue is enclosed in square brackets.



This work begins with an introduction primarily concerned with the codicological content of the catalogue. It provides such information about the manuscripts as the type of ink utilized by the writer, the written symbols and ornaments, the catchwords and vowelings, the paper, the types of annotation, and the quires and binding. Following the introduction, the main body of the work includes 237 manuscript descriptions, arranged by alphabetical order of title. Fifteen illustrations of specimens are then displayed, followed by a selected bibliography and indexes.

The 237 descriptions cover fewer than 160 titles. All in all, this is quite a small sample for a historical period spanning nearly 300 years and for such a large collection as this. Each description follows a uniform pattern:

1. The header: sheet number (we prefer the French term “notice” to Martel-Thoumian’s “fiche”), manuscript number in the new collection (the previous call numbers of manuscript excerpts from the *Ẓāhirīyah* are mentioned), Arabic title of the work transliterated into Roman letters, name of the author transliterated into Roman letters, title of the work in Arabic, name of the author in Arabic.

2. Description: the nature of the work, the *incipit* followed by the *explicit*, a description of the manuscript, a codicological description, the place of origin of the manuscript, marks indicating the ownership or previous reading of the manuscript.

3. Reference to text editions

The indexes provided are numerous, but inconsistent in their presentation: they appear in Arabic script and in Roman transliteration. Thus, seven indexes are rendered in French: (1) Manuscripts (which might have been more accurately termed “Titles”), (2) Authors, (3) Copyists, (4) *Waqf* founders, (5) Owners, (6) Sellers and buyers, (7) Readers. Two indexes appear in Arabic: (1) *al-makḥṭūṭāt* (understand *al-ʿanāwīn*) and (2) *al-mūʾallifūn*.

THE CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

Martel-Thoumian’s work, while inspired by her predecessors’, is novel in that it takes into account the newly expanded collection of Damascus manuscripts. Most importantly, it undertakes a systematic codicological description, which has been heretofore lacking. In addition to being far superior to the descriptions included even in the best editions, it is above all more comprehensive than those included in similar catalogues. The precision which characterizes this work was made possible by the author’s regular immersion in manuscript texts. Our gratitude must be extended to the directors of the Damascus National Library for authorizing the creation of such a catalogue.



ADDITIONAL REMARKS

The following remarks are meant both as an encouragement of and a contribution to a much-needed Arabic edition of this exquisite catalogue.

A. ROMANIZATION

It is regrettable that the Roman transliteration of the modern names cited in this catalogue is somewhat imprecise. As a rule, using abbreviations in Arabic is a perilous undertaking. Only specialists will recognize that, for instance, the designations A. M. Hilw [129] and F. M. Ḥilū [135] refer to the same individual, ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥilū. Likewise, A. Bigawi, the Egyptian editor of *Tabṣīr al-Muntabih fī Tahrīr al-Mushtabih* by Ibn Ḥajar, becomes A. M al-Bagawi [189]. Another Egyptian editor, ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar, is called A. M. Umarau [145]. With regard to Arabic spelling, the *alif* in *ibn* is too often accompanied by a *hamzah* [71], [82], [138], [215].

B. THE TEXT EDITIONS

After listing the items which are to receive descriptions, Martel-Thoumian states in her introduction that she “might provide the text edition.” We wish to elaborate on this point, which will hopefully be handled more carefully in future manuscript catalogues. This holds especially true when dealing with the Arabic-Islamic heritage, which is presently experiencing a proliferation of editing, not always of the highest quality.² An effort to mention text editions would have been expected within the framework of this catalogue; however, only forty descriptions provide satisfactory information in this regard. Obviously, to indicate every single edition of a given text is out of the question, for this is not the main purpose of a catalogue of manuscripts. Nonetheless, if a text has only one edition, however mediocre, it must be mentioned and qualified as such. Indeed, familiarity with poor editions provides incentive for the production of more thorough works. As stated at the beginning of this review, the catalogue was completed in 1993. Hence, its list of text editions appears somewhat outdated to readers in 2003. In 2007, the year of the present review, its datedness is more glaring still. Here, we

² Though these texts don’t always deserve to be edited (i.e., descriptions 107, 183), we list hereunder those in the catalogue which have not been edited, at the date of the present review: [3], [4], [5, 6, 7], [12], [25], [30, 31], [32, 33], [34], [38–39], [41], [42], [53, 54], [55], [56], [57], [58], [59], [60], [61], [62], [63], [68], [69], [70], [71], [75], [80], [81], [82], [83], [84], [85], [91, 92], [96], [101, 102, 103], [105], [107], [108], [112], [119], [128], [137], [138], [143], [148] [148], [149], [150], [151], [152], [153], [155], [156], [157, 158], [179], [181], [182], [183], [187], [188], [190], [191], [192], [193], [194], [197], [198], [199], [200, 201], [202, 203], [207], [215], [216], [219], [235], [236], [237].



provide a list of editions with which Martel-Thoumian might have acquainted herself, in addition to those published after 1993.

[1] *Āthār al-Bilād wa-Akhbār al-ʿIbād* by al-Qazwīnī (d. 682/1283). This text was first edited by F. Wüstenfeld in *Zakariya ben Muhammed ben Mahmud el-Cazwini's Kosmographie* (Göttingen: Verlag der Dietrichschen Buchhandlung, 1848–49). It has been reprinted twice: (1) Wiesbaden: M. Sändig, 1967; and (2) Frankfurt: Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science, 1994.

[2] *Kitāb Ikhbār al-Kirām bi-Akhbār al-Masjid al-Ḥarām* by al-Asadī (d. 1066/1656). A mediocre edition of this text has been produced by al-Ḥāfiẓ Ghulām Muṣṭafā (Cairo: Dār al-Ṣaḥwah, 1985.)

[3] *Irshād al-Sālik ilā Manāqib al-Mālik* by Ibn Mibrad (d. 909/1503). To be more precise, the author's *nasab* (the string of ancestors mentioned in a name) is Yūsuf ibn Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥādī. Reference number 6 to Brockelmann is mistaken: instead of II, pp. 130–31, read GII, 107–8, and SII, 130–31.

[8] *Asmāʾ Muʾallafāt al-Imām Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taymīyah* by Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīyah (d. 751/1350). Surprisingly, the author failed to connect this text with the manuscript later described in description [213], though they both share the same *incipit*.

[13] [14] [15] *Kitāb al-ʿIḥām bi-ʿĀlām Bayt Allāh al-Ḥarām* by al-Nahrawālī (d. 990/1582). It is regrettable that ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar fails to annotate the text in his edition (Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Diniyah, 2004).

[16] *Al-ʿIḥām fī Wafayāt al-ʿĀlām* by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347). The first edition was published in Beirut in 1991 by ʿAbd al-Jabbār Zakkār and Riyyād ʿAbd al-Majīd Murād.

[26][27] *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-Nihāyah (al-juzʾ al-ʿāshir)* by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373). One should now depend on ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī's edition (Cairo: Dār Hajar, 1999), which includes annotations and indexes.

[35][36][37] *Tāj al-Tarājim* by Ibn Quṭlūbughā (d. 879/1474). We can now rely on the edition by Muḥammad Khayr Ramaḍān Yūsuf (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1992), which includes annotations and indexes.

[45][46][47][48][49] *Tuḥfat al-Anām fī Faḍāʾil al-Shām* by Ibn al-Imām (d. 1015/1606). A good edition, including annotations and indexes, has been made by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Fayyād Ḥarfūsh (Damascus: Dār al-Bashāʾir, 1998).

[51][52] *Tuḥfat al-Ẓurafāʾ bi-Asmāʾ al-Khulafāʾ* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). Al-Suyūṭī inserted this poem, which he composed in a traditional form, as a conclusion to his *Tārīkh al-Khulafāʾ*. This poem is contained in the two manuscripts described here. It is located at the end of the extremely mediocre editions of the *Tārīkh al-Khulafāʾ*. However, Maḥmūd Naṣṣār's edition of al-Suyūṭī's *Kitāb al-Tabarrī min*



Ma'arrat al-Ma'arrī (Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1989) also contains an edition of the *Tuḥfat al-Zurafā'*.

[60] *Tarjamat al-Badawī* by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1448). This proves the existence of a second manuscript of this *Tarjamah* of Aḥmad al-Badawī written by Ibn Ḥajar. In her superb work, *Al-Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badawī, un grand saint de l'islam égyptien* (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale [IFAO], 1994), Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen presumed that there was only one extant manuscript (p. 16). Apparently, this text has not yet been edited.

[76][77][78] *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih* by Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Qaysī (d. 842/1438). The manuscript in this collection does not display the title or author's name. On page 196 of his *Fihrist Makḥṭūtāt Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriyah: al-Tārīkh wa-Mulḥaqātuḥu*, published in Damascus, Yusuf Eche ascribes this text to Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, thus confusing it with another work by Ibn Ḥajar, *Tabṣīr al-Muntabih fī Tahṛīr al-Mushtabih*. However, in 1964, ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī edited this *Tabṣīr al-Muntabih* (Cairo: Muʿassasah al-Miṣriyah al-ʿĀmmah lil-Taʿlīf wa-al-Anbāʾ wa-al-Nashr). A simple comparison between both *incipits* dispels all ambiguity: the *Tabṣīr al-Muntabih* must be distinguished from the *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih*. Moreover, in 1986, Muḥammad Naʿīm al-ʿIrqūsī edited the latter text (Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risālah), which he attributed to its true author, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Qaysī al-Dimashqī (d. 842), better known by his *shuhrah* Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn. Hence, Martel-Thoumian's erroneous attribution is surprising inasmuch as she is familiar with the edition of the *Tabṣīr al-Muntabih* and probably with the *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih*, re-edited in 1993.

[79] *Thabt al-Bulqīnī* by Ibn al-Bulqīnī (d. 868/1464). Note that this work is comprised of a list of the shaykhs of Sirāj al-Dīn Abū Ṣāliḥ ʿUmar ibn Raslān al-Bulqīnī (d. 805/1403), compiled by his son Ṣāliḥ (cf. Yūsuf ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashlī, *Muʿjam al-Maʿājim wa-al-Mashyākhāt* [Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2002], 1:493).

[86][87][88] *Husn al-Muḥādarah fī Akhbār Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). Note ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar's very recent edition of *Husn al-Muḥādarah* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī, 2007), with notes and indexes.

[89] *Tārīkh al-Khamīs fī Aḥwāl Anfas Naḥīs* by al-Diyārbakrī (d. 966/1559). The Beirut edition referred to in this catalogue is most likely the 1984 reprint by the Muʿassasat Shaʿbān lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzīʿ.

[101][102][103] *Dhayl Lawāqih al-Anwār fī Ṭabaqāt al-Sādah al-Akhyār* by al-Shaʿrānī (d. 973/1565). This is likely *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣuḥrā'*, the most recent edition of which, by Saʿīd Hārūn ʿĀshūr (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ādāb), completely ignores the three Damascus manuscripts.

[104] *Sukkardān al-Sulṭān* by Ibn Abī Ḥajalah (d. 776/1375). This has been edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī, 2001).



[111] *Al-Sham‘ah al-Muḍī‘ah fī Akhbār al-Qal‘ah al-Dimashqīyah* by Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 953/1546). The information provided about the text edition is somewhat succinct. At the very least, we may add that this text was printed without notes on the basis of the Damascus manuscript by the Maktabat al-Qudsī wa-al-Budayr, Damascus, 1929. Dār Zāhid al-Qudsī, Cairo, recently reprinted this edition without dating it. However, we believe it was produced at the beginning of the 1990s.

[123][124][125][126][127] *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanaḥīyah* by al-Ḥinā‘ī (d. 979/1571). Although unable to consult this text, we know of its existence; it has been edited in three volumes by Muḥyī al-Dīn Hilāl al-Sarḥān (Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-Waqf al-Sunnī, 2004).

[129] *Al-Jawāhir al-Muḍī‘ah fī Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanaḥīyah* by Ibn Abī al-Wafā‘ (d. 775/1373). The Cairo edition by ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥilū, with notes and indexes, is preferable (Giza: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1993).

[134] *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyah* by Abū Bakr al-Muṣannif (d. 1014/1605). This was first edited by Nu‘mān al-A‘zamī al-Kutubī (Baghdad: al-Maktabah al-‘Arabīyah, 1937), and then by ‘Ādil Nuwayhid (Beirut: Dār al-Afāq al-Jadīdah, 1971).

[139][140] *Ṭabaqāt al-Lughawīyīn wa-al-Nuḥāh* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). The second Cairo edition by Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (‘Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī) was made in 1964, not in 1973 as Martel-Thoumian claims. A third Cairo edition was published in 2005. The editor, ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar, provides few annotations and, as usual, neglects both of these Damascus manuscripts.

[141] *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn* by al-Dāwūdī (d. 945/1539). ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar has produced an edition (Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah, 1972), with few notes, but some indexes.

[159][160] *Al-Kawākib al-Durriyah fī Tarājim al-Sādah al-Ṣūfiyah* by al-Munāwī (d. 1031/1621). The most recent edition is likely that of Muḥammad Adīb al-Jādir (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1999). This edition mainly relies on the manuscript described in [159], and it includes notes and indexes.

[162] *Kawkab al-Rawḍah* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). This text was edited by Muḥammad al-Shishtāwī in 2001 (Cairo: Dār al-Afāq al-‘Arabīyah) and is yet another example of an Egyptian editor’s ignoring all manuscripts located outside of Egypt.

[163][164] *Lubb al-Lubāb fī Tahrīr al-Ansāb* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). We may also mention, with the utmost reservation, the edition by Muḥammad and Ashraf Aḥmad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz available at the Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīyah (Beirut, 1991).

[166]–[175] *Lawāqih al-Anwār fī Ṭabaqāt al-Sādah al-Akhyār* by al-Sha‘rānī (d. 973/1565). ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥasan Maḥmūd prepared the latest edition (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ādāb, 1993 [vol. 1], 2001 [vol. 2]). However, a critical edition is still needed.



[176][177] *Al-Majma‘ al-Mu‘assas lil-Mu‘jam al-Mufahras* by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852/1448). Yūsuf ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar‘ashlī has indeed edited this text in 4 volumes (Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1992). This edition takes into account the two manuscripts described in this work. The editor mentions another manuscript which should have been included in this catalogue since it belongs to Al-Maktabah al-‘Uthmānīyah of Aleppo, no. 241 (395 fols.), and dates back to the year 895. Neither the editor nor Martel-Thoumian were able to consult the manuscript—it seems to have disappeared.

[184] *Mudhakkirāt Yawmīyah* by Aḥmad ibn Ṭawq (d. 915/1509). Ja‘far al-Muhājir completed the edition of this text between 2000 and 2004 at the Institut Français du Proche-Orient (IFPO) in Damascus (formerly the Institut Français d’Etudes Arabes de Damas [IFEAD]). The title in French is *Journal d’Aḥmad Ibn Ṭawq, 834–915/1430–1509 : La vie quotidienne à Damas à la fin de l’époque mamelouke*. It includes notes and indexes.

[186] [*Dhayl*] *Mir‘āt al-Zamān* by al-Yunīnī (d. 726/1326). Note that the title of al-Yunīnī’s work is *Dhayl Mir‘āt al-Zamān*, which continues Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī’s (d. 1256/654) *Mir‘āt al-Zamān*.

[195] *Al-Ma‘azzah fīmā qīla fī al-Mazzah* by Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 953/1546). Note the Egyptian re-edition in 2002 (Cairo: Dār Zāhid al-Qudsī) of the 1929 edition.

[196] *Al-Muqtanā fī al-Kunā* by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347). This manuscript provided the basis for Ayman Ṣāliḥ Sha‘bān’s edition (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīyah, 1997).

[204][205][206] *Manāqīb Ibn Qawwām* (not Qawām), i.e., Abū Bakr ibn Qawwām (d. 659/1261), written by his grandson Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qawwām (d. 718/1318). We have grouped the descriptions 204, 205, and 206 in the same paragraph, since we believe them to be three manuscripts of a single text, authored by the same person. The manner of their presentation in this catalogue is misleading. A comparison with a similar manuscript belonging to the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo might explain their different *explicit*s. Manuscript DK 2597 *Tārikh*, which Aḥmad Farīd al-Mazīdī “transcribed” in a recent commercial edition, resembles the manuscript portrayed in description 206. This manuscript comprises two distinct texts: (1) *Manāqīb Ibn Qawwām*, then (2) *Manāqīb Sayyidī Abī al-‘Abbās al-Sabtī*. One might easily overlook the second text, the title of which adjoins the end of the *Manāqīb Ibn Qawwām*. For this reason, the *explicit* of the *Manāqīb Sayyidī Abī al-‘Abbās al-Sabtī* is often taken to belong to the *Manāqīb Ibn Qawwām*. We believe this to hold true in the present case, since the *explicit* provided in description 206 is identical to the one at the end of the *Manāqīb Sayyidī Abī al-‘Abbās al-Sabtī*. The *Manāqīb Ibn Qawwām* has therefore been “edited,” though very poorly, by Aḥmad Farīd al-Mazīdī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmīyah, 2005).



[208] *Al-Minhāj al-Sawī fī Tarjamat al-Nawawī* by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). Note the existence of an edition one year older than the one indicated in this catalogue, by Aḥmad Shafiq Damj (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1998), with notes.

[209][212] *Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-ʿtibār bi-Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār* by al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442). Ayman Fuʿād Sayyid’s edition must now be added (London: Al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation, 2002–4), with notes and indexes.

[213] *Muʿallafāt Ibn Taymīyah* by “Ibrāhīm, the author’s student” (!): probably the same text as the one presented in [8]. The late copyist limited his undertaking to Quran-related works, for which he listed approximately twenty titles.

[217][218] *Nuzhat al-Anām fī Maḥāsin al-Shām* by Ibn al-Badrī (d. 894/1489). An edition based on manuscript 9210, portrayed in description [218], has since been made by Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ (Damascus: Dār al-Bashāʿir, 2006), with notes and indexes.

This fine research tool provided by Martel-Thoumian compels us to dream of a time when conscientious editors may gain easy access to such sources as these. If, for instance, the number of manuscripts consulted in some Egyptian editions is limited, it is probably simply because the task of collating all known manuscripts often proves discouraging. Yet, this is no justification—intellectual endeavors must be judged by their own standards. Admittedly, research conditions in Arab countries are not yet conducive to progress. The complicated process involved in accessing the Damascus manuscripts is a most significant example of this.

Let us conclude by saying that the usefulness of this work will only be felt when similar endeavors are initiated and related to one another. Indeed, the study of a manuscript in isolation contributes nothing, in and of itself, to its intelligibility. It must rather be understood within the wider context of manuscript production, in which texts can be categorized according to manufacturing techniques or places of production. Other similar works would create a corpus of codicological studies, making a worthwhile investigation of manuscript production possible.

Finally, we express the hope that an Arabic edition of this catalogue might be published, thus offering encouragement to the numerous Arab editors and historians of the Mamluk period. The French text will remain inaccessible to the majority of these scholars, whose thirst for progress we do not question



YOSSEF RAPOPORT, *Marriage, Money and Divorce in Medieval Islamic Society* (Cambridge University Press, 2005). Pp. 137 + xii.

REVIEWED BY LI GUO, University of Notre Dame

The book under review is, to my knowledge, the first monograph in a western language that “sets out to explain the economic, legal and social causes of Muslim divorce in the Middle Eastern cities of Cairo, Damascus and Jerusalem in the Mamluk period (1250-1517)” (p. 4). In doing so, the author has utilized an impressive array of primary sources and recent scholarship, all woven into a narrative that is graced with clarity, precision, and erudition. The result is a splendid blend of social history and Islamic Studies (Islamic law in particular), of macroscopic breadth and microscopic minutiae, of solid quantitative analysis and fine storytelling.

In his introduction to the subject, scope, and sources, the author is quick to warn us that this is not “a grand narrative about patriarchy and Islam” (p. 7), nor does it touch upon *all* the issues related to marriage and family, among these the choice of spouses, polygamy and concubinage, love and sexuality (p. 11). In other words, this is not just another book on marriage and divorce, or gender and women, in Islam in general. Five chapters—the first three on economic issues and the last two on legal discourse—constitute the main narrative, followed by a short conclusion. In a sense, each chapter can be read separately as an independent essay on the given topic. (As a matter of fact, earlier versions of chapters 4 and 5 have been published elsewhere as independent papers.) But they all relate to one another within a grand framework: while the first three chapters focus on “money,” namely, money brought into marriage, money earned outside of marriage, and money managed within a marriage, the last two “legal” chapters examine divorce in practical procedures and divorce/repudiation in practice and theory, respectively.

Chapter 1, “Marriage, divorce and the gender division of property,” deals with the nuts and bolts of the economics in a Muslim marriage and divorce. Various forms of financial and monetary deals that were brought into a marriage are on display, under the rubrics of “the dowry,” “dowry and inheritance,” and “land, cash and credit.” Here we witness the exquisite method at work, a remarkable feature of the book. The chapter starts off with an intriguing divorce case, which leads to a thorough pondering of the sources and some in-depth discussion, winding down with succinct summation and conclusion. The presentation of the individual cases does not stop at what the sources have to offer, but extends to an interpretation, with a modern sensibility, of legal opinions from various schools of Muslim legal



Book reviews ©2009 by review authors.

DOI: [10.6082/M16D5R4M](https://doi.org/10.6082/M16D5R4M). (<https://doi.org/10.6082/M16D5R4M>)

DOI of Vol. XIII, no. 1: [10.6082/M1WQ01W6](https://doi.org/10.6082/M1WQ01W6). See <https://doi.org/10.6082/DRTM-CA24> to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See <http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html> for more information about copyright and open access.

tradition (for example, pp. 17, 21, 23–24, etc.). The author posits the interesting argument that the exclusion of Mamluk elite women from receiving landed revenue as trousseaux, a practice that had been common in the Ayyubid time, pushed them towards the credit market to gain economic independence (pp. 22–25). However, the gender (or gendered) division of property was sometimes challenged, not by legal thinking, but rather by natural disaster, such as the Black Death. In such cases, large fortunes were temporarily moved to elite daughters out of anxiety, resulting in elite women, married or single, becoming major patrons of religious buildings (pp. 26–29). The phenomenon of Mamluk elite women becoming major patrons of religious endowments has long been noted by historians—Stephen Humphreys, Carl Petry, Jonathan Berkey, among others—and now, thanks to the present book, we have a better idea as to how and why this happened.

It may initially come as a surprise that the ensuing Chapter 2, “Working women, single women and the rise of the female *ribāt*,” seems to step away from the topic of marriage and divorce, and instead explores some of the unknown, or least investigated, aspects of salaried women in and out of wedlock. The rationale for such a “side tour” is explained by the author, in his Introduction, as follows: for the majority of working women, dowries were of less value, and therefore an investigation of women’s employment and wages is “crucial for an understanding of the balance of power that existed between husbands and wives, as well as for a comprehension of the phenomenon of frequent divorce” (p. 6). This chapter is for me the most unexpected, ground-breaking, and thought provoking segment of the book, not least because the medieval sources are notoriously silent on women living on the margins of society, but also because the subject of “working women” has yet to be adequately addressed in modern scholarship. Once again, the author is in total control of his sources and has done an admirable job in combing through historical narratives as well as literary texts, such as poetry, for fragmentary piecemeal materials. He has also successfully avoided the easy pitfall of sensationalizing the gender-sensitive subject (the phrase “working women” alone would surely bring about a dubious wince from some corners) by focusing on three socio-economic arenas where single women either shone or made their presence keenly felt: the textile industry, the women’s shelter (*ribāt*), and women immigrants in Jerusalem. The three segments deal with these arenas from different angles: professional, institutional, and demographic. While the discussion of women in the textile industry (spinning and embroidery were “the female professions par excellence” in the Islamic Near East, as we are told [p. 34]) dwells heavily on the well-known sources, such as the Cairo Geniza and S. Goitein’s monumental synthesis of it, it has also incorporated recent scholarship, such as Bethany Walker’s discussion of Mamluk textiles (pp. 37–38). With regard to elite single women’s shelter/lodging, Remie Constable’s book on the *funduq*



appeared too late for the author to consult. It would be very interesting to see if some comparison between the two would yield a new understanding of this fascinating issue. The picture of the immigrant women in Jerusalem depicted in this chapter is an intriguing one: some of them were probably, judging from the descriptions in the sources, “part-time spinners, part-time beggars and part-time pilgrims” (p. 49). Again, the survey relies on well-known sources, such as the Ḥaram documents and Huda Lutfi’s examination of them, but Rapoport has also utilized some new and/or little used sources—namely three literary works—that shed light on working women in Mamluk Syria (p. 49). Although he does not treat these sources extensively, one can hope that more investigation and study are to come from the author.

Chapter 3, “The monetization of marriage,” takes us once again back to Muslim marriage per se, or the monetary arrangements within a marriage, to be more precise. Various forms of domestic monetary and financial arrangements are discussed, among them the marriage gift (*ṣadāq*), marital support, and a cash allowance—ranging from food money (*idam*), clothing (*kiswah*), to “bed-fee” (*ḥaqq al-firāsh*; one ought to read the book to find out what is at stake here; pp. 60–61). The thematic discussion is followed, and illustrated, by a case study of the saga of Zumurrud, a slave-girl in Mamluk Jerusalem whose revolving-door marriages drive home the many points elucidated herein (pp. 64–68). This is the most fun chapter to read. What makes it even more enjoyable is the fact that all the colorful anecdotal accounts (from sources no less than Ibn Ṭawq, whose Damascene diary offers an endless supply of such material, among others) are accompanied by the author’s careful number crunching, based on the documents (contracts, legal opinions, etc.).

As the book takes the commonly high divorce rate in the Islamic Near East as its starting point, chapter 4, “Divorce, repudiation and settlement,” and chapter 5, “Repudiation and public power,” dive into the thick of Islamic legal discourse regarding the institutional aspects of divorce and repudiation procedures, as well as their impact on society as a whole. Chapter 4 begins with a general outline of the issues and questions at stake, and proceeds to deal with several carefully chosen topics. The topics in this chapter include the various steps in a divorce case, stemming from the initial repudiation and leading to the final showdown in court, in both the Islamic courts (pp. 74–78) and the military courts (pp. 79–82). The chapter winds up with a synthesis of divorce in fifteenth-century Cairo (pp. 82–88). Chapter 5 tackles the rift between the state and the religious scholars over the use of repudiation, and more specifically the Sunni law regarding the use of divorce oaths. The discussion proceeds in two directions: one historical (pp. 91–96), in a survey and narration of the societal, cultural, and even linguistic, functions of divorce oaths in Mamluk society, and one legal (pp. 96–105), through a retelling



and contextualization of the failed “reform” championed by Ibn Taymiyah, which eventually got him into serious trouble. On the widely practiced use of divorce oaths in daily life situations, the author weaves a tapestry of individual scenes where divorce oaths were used in such a “baffling variety of social contexts” (p. 92)—such as in connection with financial obligations, in the marketplace, during quarrels, and associated with gift giving in popular literature (by the way, the *Arabian Nights*, which is essentially a Mamluk text, is also full of such expressions uttered by the characters in all the above-mentioned situations)—that they lost their true meaning and judicial function. The discussion of the legal hair-splitting regarding the fine line between real divorce oaths and subterfuges designed to circumvent them is based on a thorough reading of the sources and a careful re-construction of how the jurists and Everymen handled the challenge (pp. 93–96). The discussion of Ibn Taymiyah’s attempted reform of the divorce oath is enhanced by a clear and nuanced analysis of his writings on the subject and their theological background and doctrinal ramifications. In the final analysis, as the author has strongly argued, the Sunni doctrine on divorce oaths “withstood Ibn Taymiyya’s attack” (p. 105), in part due to the efforts of the state authorities to suppress the Hanbali’s extremist dogma, and, more importantly, due to the fact that it never gained currency among jurists, let alone the common people, who continued using non-committal “divorce” oaths in their daily life as they pleased. “Ibn Taymiyya’s attempt to reform the Sunni law on divorce oaths,” as the author puts it, “highlights the inextricable link between the patriarchal order of the domestic sphere and the patriarchal values at the heart of the political and social order. Perhaps more than any individual story of failed marriage, the reaction of the Mamluk state to the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya demonstrates the crucial role of the institution of divorce within medieval Islamic society” (pp. 109–10). Hence the significance of the subject, which has received a superb and well-deserved treatment in this magnificent book.

There are many reasons to admire this book. For a serious scholarly work that tackles such an important topic on such a large scale, it is pleasantly readable: exquisitely compact and clear, free of dreadful jargon, and oftentimes amusing and fun. Not a single page is dull, insofar as theoretical discourse is always illustrated by a slew of case studies full of dicey dilemma, colorful personality, and dramatic punch. And it is typo-free; no small feat for a work with extensive quotes from Arabic material. What a treat!



CATERINA BORI, *Ibn Taymiyya: una vita esemplare: Analisi delle fonti classiche della sua biografia* (Pisa and Rome: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 2003) (Supplemento n. 1 alla Rivista degli studi orientali volume LXXVI). Pp. 234.

REVIEWED BY ARAM SHAHIN, University of Chicago

This monograph, originally presented as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Rome, grew out of the author's research into Ibn Taymiyah's *fatāwā* against the Mongols. The aim of the study is to analyze the representation or the image of Ibn Taymiyah as propounded by the various biographers of his life. The author does not offer a study of Ibn Taymiyah's doctrines or his thought, nor does she aim for a historical reconstruction of his biography. The critical analysis of the biographical material focuses on the texts composed during the eighth/fourteenth century (p. 19). The premise is that this biographical material must be read as a reflection of the conflicts that arose around Ibn Taymiyah and his authority. The biography is thus seen as a polemical and political instrument. It becomes a battleground in which the focus is not simply the authority of Ibn Taymiyah himself, but rather that of the individual or group whom he represents and which legitimizes or perpetuates its own social status by taking advantage of the image of Ibn Taymiyah (p. 20).

The author lays out the required steps for the study of Ibn Taymiyah as follows: (1) a comparison of all available versions of a notice or report; (2) the contextualization of each report, taking into account the formation of the writer, his *madhhab*, the group that he represents, and his relation to Ibn Taymiyah or to his adversaries; and (3) the identification of the doctrinal and moral model which Ibn Taymiyah needed to fit in order to recognize the more personal and individual characteristics of his image. The author also points out the importance of identifying the individual(s) for whom the biography was intended (p. 24). Following this approach, the study of the biographical tradition of an individual ought to reveal important information concerning the biographers themselves and of the social, political, and cultural context in which the portrayal of the individual is created (p. 24).

The division of the various chapters of the book does not follow a chronological pattern, but rather proceeds according to themes. The monograph itself is divided into two parts. Part one (pp. 27–59) is a description of the sources utilized in the study. Part two (pp. 61–170), comprising the bulk of the work, is dedicated to the study of various aspects of the biographical tradition concerning Ibn Taymiyah.

The author divides the sources that she utilized for her study into three categories: (1) biographical monographs and biographical notices in biographical dictionaries and chronicles; (2) chronicles; and (3) polemical texts composed



against Ibn Taymiyah or against the ideas of which he was a proponent. In chapter one, which comprises the entirety of part one, the author gives a brief description of the sources that she deems most important and that she utilized most frequently. This is not simply a description of the contents of each work accompanied by a short biographical notice of its author, but also a description of the sources utilized by the author of the work. The reader is thus introduced to the interconnectedness of all of these sources, as many depend on others and derive from them while sometimes presenting the information from a different perspective and with different aims.

The second chapter (pp. 63–110) is an evaluation of how the biographical tradition developed the material for the biography of Ibn Taymiyah with the focus being placed on four aspects: (1) the intellectual formation of Ibn Taymiyah; (2) the moral ideal attributed to him; (3) his polemical image; and (4) the formation of his myth.

With regard to the intellectual formation of Ibn Taymiyah (pp. 63–77), Bori points out a number of aspects that do not conform to the list of conventional *topoi* that one finds given in biographies of Muslim scholars in Islamic literary sources. One of these is the lack of mobility of Ibn Taymiyah during this formative period. Unlike what is usually described of other scholars, once the family of Ibn Taymiyah moved to Damascus, Ibn Taymiyah himself never traveled in search of teachers and knowledge. He, therefore, did not embark on the *riḥlah fi ṭalab al-‘ilm*, which seems to have been an essential part of the career of a religious scholar (pp. 66–67). Despite this, Ibn Taymiyah wrote a number of treatises on hadith. Thus, he was, as Bori remarks, “a *muḥaddith* without *riḥlah*” (p. 68). As such, Ibn Taymiyah cannot be considered a true *muḥaddith*, but rather an expert in the use and citation of Prophetic hadith as proofs in argumentation (*ibid.*). This would put in doubt the true value of some of the titles that are ascribed to him by some biographers. It is possible that such titulature was given to him to impress rivals and strengthen his credibility (pp. 68–70).

The absence of the *riḥlah* in the formative period of Ibn Taymiyah lends weight to the hypothesis that he obtained his education entirely in Damascus. The majority of his teachers who are mentioned in his biographies were Hanbalis and Damascenes. Those who were not originally from Damascus had moved there or passed by there, imparting their knowledge to Damascene students, thereby creating an inversion of the *riḥlah* model (pp. 69–70).

One aspect of the intellectual creativity of Ibn Taymiyah was his poetical compositions. Apparently, he was a mediocre poet who did not compose much poetry. Some critical biographers, like al-Dhahabī, point this out, whereas more adoring students, like Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī, omit any mention of it. Whether the poetic inadequacy of Ibn Taymiyah was due to his austere nature and the revulsion that he



might have had towards poetry or to some other factor, remains an open question (pp. 70–72). However, if we wanted to suppose that he, following the admonition of some sayings attributed to the Prophet, shunned poetry for religious reasons, we would need to wonder why he bothered to compose any poetry at all.

There are two tendencies in the biographical sources in depicting Ibn Taymīyah: one makes him follow the model of Ibn Ḥanbal, while the other depicts him as an independent scholar who did not follow any particular juristic *madhhab* (p. 73). In the latter case, hagiographers tend to present the independence of Ibn Taymīyah as a positive aspect of his juristic thought. However, others, like al-Dhahabī, saw this in a negative light and condemned his teacher's break with the four legal *madhhabs* (pp. 75–77).

The exemplary model on which the biography of Ibn Taymīyah is based is that of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, while the moral ideal attributed to Ibn Taymīyah is based on two intertwined aspects: (1) the idea of *zuhd*, understood as total dedication to knowledge, extreme religious devotion, and detachment from worldly material attractions; and (2) activism and polemic in the struggle for a rigid and literal interpretation of the Quran and the Sunnah, which is expressed in the participation in public life with the conviction that this action is in the best interests of the community (p. 77). The *zuhd* of Ibn Taymīyah was expressed and described mainly through three aspects of his lifestyle: (1) his parsimony in nourishing himself; (2) his abhorrence of expensive clothing that might make him stand out from common people; and (3) his disinterest in money (pp. 78–82).

One interesting aspect of Ibn Taymīyah's life is his celibacy. As the author points out, despite the existence of a number of precedents for this, it is quite unusual for a Muslim religious scholar not to marry, as marriage is considered a *sunnah* of the Prophet and the foundation block of Islamic society. Bori suggests that Ibn Taymīyah might have been of the opinion, shared by a few other scholars, that marriage and family were an impediment from the proper pursuit of knowledge. However, the biographers of the Damascene celibate inserted the information concerning his celibacy within a discussion of his asceticism, probably in an attempt to disguise an aspect of his life that did not conform well to the Islamic model of a Muslim scholar (pp. 82–86).

Some of the more endearing qualities of Ibn Taymīyah's character were his confrontational and aggressive attitude. Some of his students applauded his relentlessness in standing up for his beliefs, but others lamented his uncouth manners and his attachment to polemics. There might have been an attempt by later Hanbali scholars to distance themselves from this aspect of Ibn Taymīyah's opinions and scholarship (pp. 86–91).

Bori selects two episodes from the biographical narratives of Ibn Taymīyah to show the creation of the mythos surrounding his character. The first episode is his



funeral, whereas the second one is his meeting with the Ilkhanid ruler Ghāzān.

The reports about the funeral of Ibn Taymīyah emphasize the attendance of large numbers of people, both men and women. Ironically, the reports also give details of popular commotion, excessive manifestations of grief, and acts of veneration and mass hysteria that accompanied the funeral—the kinds of behavior that Ibn Taymīyah had fought against during his own lifetime. The model on which the narrative of the funeral is based is that of Ibn Ḥanbal himself. The absence of three individuals who were associated with the governor of Damascus and were responsible in some way or another for the imprisonment and eventual death of Ibn Taymīyah is mentioned in the reports. This seems to be done in order to contrast the overwhelming popular presence at the funeral with the absence of an official representation, establishing a dichotomy between the people and the administration (pp. 92–99).

The second episode which Bori studies in detail is the meeting between Ibn Taymīyah and the Ilkhanid sovereign Ghāzān. Here, the author contrasts the information presented in chronicles with that given in biographies of Ibn Taymīyah. As is to be expected, the latter are more detailed, more dramatic, and accentuate more the role and character of Ibn Taymīyah (pp. 99–108). Bori seems to give more credence to the chronicles than to the biographies and describes how al-ʿUmarī “constructs” an episode and an anecdote (pp. 106–7). That biographies of Ibn Taymīyah would tend to eulogize and aggrandize him and to exaggerate certain points in his favor is to be expected. However, I do not see why chronicles should be considered more impartial and objective or why chroniclers should be considered more trustworthy than biographers. In some instances, the chronicler and the biographer were the same individual.

The third chapter of the book discusses the activism of Ibn Taymīyah. Bori begins by giving us glimpses of the activism, both military and religious, of a number of individuals who lived in the thirteenth century in Damascus. This is done for the purpose of contextualizing the activism of Ibn Taymīyah himself and to show the existence of tensions between religious groups, in particular between Hanbalis and Shafiʿis (pp. 112–17). The activism of Ibn Taymīyah himself is divided into:

(1) military activism, including: exhortation of governors and sultans to defend the Muslims from the Mongols; negotiating with the Mongols to secure the release of prisoners or the sparing of bloodshed; and participation in campaigns against the Mongols and against the Shiʿites in Lebanon (pp. 118–23). Bori notes that the most significant of Ibn Taymīyah’s initiatives in this regard occurred during the years 698–705/1298–1305 (p. 118). She also sees a difference in the perspective of Syrian and Egyptian historiography with regard to Ibn Taymīyah’s role in military events. Syrian historiography, especially that based in Damascus, portrays



Ibn Taymīyah as a local hero. On the other hand, Egyptian historiography often neglects to mention his interventions and participation in these events (p. 123).

(2) civil activism, including: the smashing of wine containers; the destruction of stones and idols that attracted people; and the disruption of chess games (pp. 123–30). Bori points out that none of Ibn Taymīyah's activism was directed against the authorities themselves, rather, contrary to the practice of Ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Taymīyah cooperated with them and in his writings urged obedience to rulers.

Some sources imply that the reason behind Ibn Taymīyah's activism was his political ambitions, and some accusations were leveled against him of plotting sedition against the governorate of Damascus. Some of Ibn Taymīyah's supporters, like Ibn Kathīr, attributed these accusations to envy (pp. 131–33). Bori argues that the accusations and tribulations that Ibn Taymīyah suffered have to be seen within the larger framework of the conflict and competition between the different *madhhabs* and religious factions (pp. 136–39).

A contradictory image of Ibn Taymīyah thus arises in the biographical sources. There is an oscillation between the image of the wise ascetic who abstains from any contact with the political world following the model of Ibn Ḥanbal, and the image of an activist who willfully cooperates with those in power, especially in cases of military emergencies. However, this contradiction is balanced by the coherence of Ibn Taymīyah's actions and his political thought that envisaged a position of intermediary power for the ulama in Islamic society. Although this is a break with the original Hanbali position, it is echoed in the local Damascene Hanbali activism of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (p. 139).

The fourth and last chapter of the book provides a biographical study of some contemporaneous adversaries of Ibn Taymīyah and authors of polemics against him. The objectives of this study are three: (1) to identify the dynamics of social competition in Damascus at the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth century in which to place some of the tensions that were focused around Ibn Taymīyah; (2) to point out the themes over which he was mostly attacked; and (3) to give a portrait of Ibn Taymīyah as depicted by his adversaries (p. 141). It would seem that the role, social position, and doctrinal position of the polemicists are often more revealing than the contents of their writings themselves, which were a vehicle and symbol of the conflict, not its true essence (*ibid.*).

Bori begins by arguing for the correctness of the attribution of *Al-Naṣīḥah al-Dhahabīyah*, a critical letter addressed to Ibn Taymīyah, to his disciple al-Dhahabī (pp. 142–48). The letter strongly criticizes Ibn Taymīyah's excessively polemical attitude. It also shows Ibn Taymīyah's involvement in the struggle among the ulama to acquire prestige and authority through the control of the religious institutions of Damascus (pp. 147–48).

Bori then presents brief biographical sketches of five of the adversaries of Ibn



Taymiyah: four Syrian residents in Damascus and one Egyptian, three of whom were Shafi'is, one Hanafi, and one Maliki (pp. 148–54). The author argues that the intellectual polemic against Ibn Taymiyah and the traditionalist group led by him cannot be separated from the battles for the control of teaching positions at religious institutions (p. 154).

Most of the writings of the five individuals presented in the previous section have not survived. On the other hand, the numerous writings of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355–56) against Ibn Taymiyah have survived, and this allows for a more in-depth study of the polemics aimed at Ibn Taymiyah. The rest of the chapter is dedicated exclusively to the polemics of al-Subkī (pp. 155–69).

The book concludes with four appendices: (1) a description of biographies of Ibn Taymiyah that were deemed of secondary importance by Bori due to their brevity or derivative content (pp. 177–81); (2) a table listing the teachers of Ibn Taymiyah as given in seven sources (pp. 183–86); (3) a table listing the titles given to Ibn Taymiyah in eight sources (pp. 187–90); and (4) a translation of *Al-Naṣīḥah al-Dhahabīyah* (pp. 191–94).

This is a very interesting study that highlights a number of aspects of Ibn Taymiyah's life and the way that they have been portrayed by various writers who were mostly his contemporaries. For those readers who are approaching Ibn Taymiyah for the first time, it is advisable that they start by reading a standard biography of the scholar before immersing themselves in Bori's work so that they may become familiar with the general outline of the events of Ibn Taymiyah's life. However, for all the Ibn Taymiyah enthusiasts out there, this will be required reading and a necessary reference point for all future research on the Damascene scholar's life as well as the religious and social milieu in which he lived.

Having said that, I must point out that this must be the worst edited book that I have read—either that or it is the first one that I have read with any diligence. In the 177 pages of text, from the preface to the last appendix, I have found at least one error in 116 pages, or in about 66% of the pages of the book. This is quite frustrating for the reader, especially since the majority of these errors are obvious slips or typographical errors that should have been easily corrected. In what follows, I will mention a number of the more salient errors.

- The word Ġumādā [Jumādā] that appears in the names of two lunar Islamic months has two long vowels and not just one, Ġumāda, as given on pp. 46, 51, 53, 68, 82 (note 89), 120, 131 (note 80), 134, and 151.

- The Arabic equivalent of the name David is Dā'ūd or Dāwūd, with two long vowels, not Da'ūd or Dawūd as it appears in the name of Abū Dā'ūd on pp. 92 (note 133), 95 (in text and in note 151), 98, 130 (note 74), 195 (the bibliography), and 215 (the index).



- The name of the city on the Mediterranean coast is ‘Akkā, with a long vowel, not ‘Akka as given on pp. 122 (in the text and in note 41), 123, and 215 (the index).

- The name Ibn Ruššayq al-Mağribī is found on pp. 40 (in text and in note 54), 148 (note 30), and 221 (the index), and as Ibn al-Ruššayq al-Mağribī on pp. 148 (in the text) and 163 (in the text and in note 129). The name of the student of Ibn Taymiyah is actually Ibn Rushayyiq al-Mağhribī (d. 749/1348 or 9), as is clearly voweled by Shams and al-‘Imrān.¹

- The title of the work by Ibn Taghribirdī is *Al-Manhal al-Šāfi*, not *al-Manḥal al-Šāfi* as given on pp. 40 (note 52), 43 (in the text and in note 74), 44 (notes 74, 75, and 76), 149 (note 40), 198 (twice, in the bibliography).

- Marğ al-Rāhiṭ on pp. 100, 104, and 105 (twice) should be corrected to Marğ Rāhiṭ.

- There is some confusion in the name of Ğahm b. Šafwān. The name is given correctly twice on p. 162, note 124, but in the same note and in the text on the same page as well as on p. 164, the name is incorrectly given as Ğahm b. Šufyān.

- Two works that are cited in the book are not listed in the bibliography: Ibn al-Ḥāğğ, *al-Madhal al-šar‘ al-šarif* [sic] on p. 80 (note 80),² and M. Sakhy, “al-Wāsiṭ,” on p. 116 (note 21), that should be corrected to M. Sakly, “Wāsiṭ.”

- On p. 41, note 59, the title of a second article by de Somogyi and its page numbers has been completely omitted, although it is listed in the bibliography on p. 212. In the bibliographic entry, in the title of the article, it is “Adh-Dhahabī’s record” not “Adh-Dhahabī record,” and the article appears in the *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, not the *Goldziher Memorial Volume*, as correctly given in note 59 on p. 41.

- On p. 42, note 67, Ğamāl al-Dīn Āqqūš al-Afram is identified as governor, first of Damascus from 698 to 709 AH (1298–1309/1310 AD), and then of Kark. Within the text on the same page, his death date is given as ca. 720 AH/1320–21 AD. This information is repeated in an article by the author, except that the death date of al-Afram is given for certain as 720 AH.³ Throughout the article, Bori

¹ See *Al-Jāmi‘ li-Sīrat Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyah (661–728) (khilāl Sab‘at Qurūn)*, collected by Muḥammad ‘Uzayr Shams and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-‘Imrān (Mecca: Dār ‘Ālam al-Fawā’id lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī‘, 1420/[1999]), 10–13 and 220. For biographical information on Ibn Rushayyiq, see the references on p. 11, note 3. On pp. 10–13, Shams and al-‘Imrān argue that Ibn Rushayyiq al-Mağhribī is the author of a short work entitled “Asmā’ Mu’allafāt Ibn Taymiyah” that has been attributed to Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyah by some other scholars.

² The name of Ibn al-Ḥāğğ in the index on p. 220 is not placed in the correct alphabetical order, and neither is Ibn Ḥallikān nor Ibn Ḥaldūn.

³ Caterina Bori, “A New Source for the Biography of Ibn Taymiyya,” *Bulletin of the School of*



identifies the second place of his governorate as Kark (on pp. 42, 148, and 222). The correct place name is al-Karak, in central Jordan. Reuven Amitai reads the name of the individual as Aqūsh al-Afram.⁴

There is one major complaint that I have, and that is in the method of citation of modern Arab authors. Bori has taken the approach of citing these authors by using initials for the first and middle names. I cannot recommend this method at all and must insist on seeing the full names of the authors to avoid any possible confusion in their identities. This might work for Western authors (although I would like to see the full name of these fellows as well), but for Arabic authors it can be nightmarish. What exactly is one supposed to do with the author identified simply as M. Y. Mūsā (p. 18, note 30)?⁵ This system also fails to indicate compound names. For example, ‘A. ‘A. al-Marāḡī (ibid.) is supposed to be the abbreviation for ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Marāḡī. But how can the reader know whether the two ‘ayns represent the initials of two separate names or whether they are indeed representing the given compound name? And what exactly happened to the definite article in front of the second ‘ayn?⁶ Bori herself is inconsistent, as she sometimes cites some scholars with their full name, while at other times she only gives the scholar’s last name. As is to be expected, the use of abbreviated names has led her to commit some errors. For example, on p. 18, note 30, Ṣ. ‘A. al-Ḥāmid is supposed to stand for Ṣā’ib ‘Abd al-Ḥāmid. The author of *Tarjamāt Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah* is Muḥammad Kurd ‘Alī, not ‘A. al-Kurdī. On p. 24, note 56, the editor’s name is not ‘A. Ğ. al-Faryawā’ī, but ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Faryawā’ī. I think that it is always best to give the full name of all cited scholars, especially those with Arabic names.

Oriental and African Studies 67, pt. 3 (2004): 344, note 35. This article is an edition, translation, and study of a biography of Ibn Taymīyah by his student Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347 or 48) given the title *Nubdhah min Sirat Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Dīn ibn Taymīyah*.

⁴ Reuven Amitai, “The Remaking of the Military Elite of Mamlūk Egypt by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn,” *Studia Islamica* 72 (1990): 159–60.

⁵ The full name of the scholar is Muḥammad Yūsuf Mūsá.

⁶ The same problem arises with the name of the scholar Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid, whose full name is cited a number of times, but at others is abbreviated as Ṣ. D. al-Munajjid.

