Al-Maqrizi as a Historian of the Reign of Barquq

When reading the Kitāb al-Sulūk of al-Maqrizi one cannot help but notice the consistently negative assessment the historian made of Barquq and his rule in the reports on his rise from simple mamlik to amīr kabīr (roughly from 768–79/1366–78), and then from amīr kabīr (779–84/1378–82) to sultan (784–91, 792–801/1382–89, 1390–9). The criticisms he voiced are simply too pervasive and too peculiar to his work—they are absent from most of his contemporaries’ chronicles—for them to be ignored or to be explained away as mere coincidence. The aim of this article is twofold: first, it will present the arguments marshalled by al-Maqrizi in his attacks on Barquq, and then verify whether or not they are present in the works of contemporary and later historians, namely Ibn al-Furat’s (735–807/1335–1405) Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk, Ibn Ḥajr al-‘Asqalānī’s (773–852/1372–1449) Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Abnā’ al-‘Umr, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah’s (779–851/1377–1448) Al-Dhayl fī Tārīkh al-Islām, Ibn Ṭaghrībirdī’s (812–74/1409–78) Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah, al-Jawharī al-Ṣayrafī’s (819–900/1416–94) Nuzhat al-Nūfūs wa-al-Abda’n fī Tawārīkh al-Zaman, and Muḥammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyās’s (852–930/1448–1524) Badā’i’ al-Zuhūr fī Waqā’ī’ al-Duhūr; second, it will examine the historiographical
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The criticisms voiced by al-Maqrīzī towards Barquq are part of a complex of negative opinions that indicate not only that he, alone among the historians of this period, seriously disliked the sultan, but also felt that he was witnessing the end of an era and the dawn of another fraught with a breakdown in the traditional order, social turmoil, danger at the borders, an increasingly predatory regime, etc. The criticisms levied by al-Maqrīzī do not pervade every page of his works. They do however appear consistently in those parts of the Kitāb al-Sulūk that cover the rise of Barquq until the end of his first reign, whenever he described or recounted events that were symptomatic, in his eyes, of the ills of Egypt and Syria and more specifically of the fin d’époque he felt he was witnessing.

The most eloquent criticism of Barquq and his regime is to be found in an often-quoted passage of the Kitāb al-Sulūk that is intended as an assessment of Barquq’s first reign, which ended in 791/1389. After noting the taxes that he abolished, the structures he ordered built, his deference, unique amongst the “Turkish kings,” towards men of religion, al-Maqrīzī said the following:

Izzeddin (Beirut, 1936–38); Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’ al-Ghumr bi-Abnā’ al-‘Umr, vols. 1–4 (Beirut, 1986); Ibn Qaḍī Shuhbah, Al-Dhayl fī Tārīkh al-Islām, vols. 1, 3, 4, ed. ‘Adnān Darwish (Damascus, 1977–97); Ibn Taghrībīdī, Al-Nujūm al-Zāhīrah fī Ṭulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhīrah, vols. 11–13, ed. Muhammad Ḥusayn Shams al-Dīn (Beirut, 1992); and idem, History of Egypt 1382–1467, trans. William Popper, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, vols. 13, 17, 18 (Berkeley, 1954–); al-Jawharī al-Sayrafī, NīCHAT al-Nujūs wa-al-Abdān fī Tawārīkh al-Zamān, vol. 1, ed. Hasan Habashi (Cairo, 1970); Muḥammad ibn Ahmad Ibn Iyās, Badāʾiʾ al-Zahīr fī Waqāʾiʾ al-Duḥūr, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1974–75). Al-‘Aynī’s ‘Iqd al-Jumān is the only one of the major chronicles of the period I was unable to consult. As will become apparent below, of all the above-mentioned historians, Ibn Iyās (852–930/1427–97) is the only one to systematically denigrate Barquq. Interestingly, the overwhelming majority of his criticisms are either taken directly from al-Maqrīzī or are paraphrases of his accounts.

Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:2:618–19. The translation is William Popper’s in Ibn Taghrībīdī, History of Egypt, 13:42–43. Ibn Taghrībīdī made up for the dearth of non-political facts in his chronicle by adding to his work the type of information which makes his chronicle extremely useful: the accounts he reports from people who lived through this period, namely his father’s associates and acquaintances, and the first-hand knowledge he had of the sultan and his family, to whom he was related. In the case of the quotation at hand, Ibn Taghrībīdī clearly identifies the passage as al-Maqrīzī’s (something he rarely does in his narrative unless, for example, he wants to challenge his teacher) in order to criticize him. I have added in italics a few sentences that are present in the Nujūm al-Zāhīrah. On the other hand, I have removed passages that are not to be found in the Kitāb al-Sulūk but are present in the Nujūm al-Zāhīrah.
But he was avaricious, and in his days has introduced the practice of the open offering of bribes; indeed he hardly ever appointed anyone to an office or administrative position except for money, *so the lowlifes acceded to prestigious positions and to high stations*, and on this account political corruption was common; he also had an inordinate predilection for advancing men of the lowest classes and debasing those of noble family so that *he changed the social order amongst people*, and *he antagonized the grandees amongst the Turcomans and Arabs in Syria, Egypt, and the Hijaz*. In his days three disgraceful practices became notorious: pederasty, *to such an extent that prostitutes, for their lack of business, had to imitate the ghulmān in order to boost the demand for their debauchery*, because of the favor which he openly showed to handsome mamluks and the accusation levied against him and his amirs that *he had intercourse with them*; the frank acceptance of bribes, *in which he was imitated by district governors, until such behavior ceased to be reprehensible*; and the decline in the business of the market and the paucity of gain, because of his niggardliness and the rarity with which he made gifts to anyone. So his faults were many times more numerous than his virtues.

The charges levelled here by al-Maqrīzī against Barquq, namely the accusations of pederasty, the taking of briberies and niggardliness, his overturning of the social order, his antagonizing of internal and outside forces, etc., even though forcefully put, do not cover the whole range of criticisms that are to be found in other parts of the *Kitāb al-Sulāk*.

For one thing, the criticisms elaborated by al-Maqrīzī concerning the character of Barquq touch upon much more than the shortcomings noted in the quotation above. In those instances where al-Maqrīzī commented on the very persona of

---

5 This is my understanding of “wa-ghayyara mā kāna lil-nās min-al-tartīb,” whereas Popper reads it as “he brought about a change in the orderly conduct of people,” Ibn Taghrībirdī, *History of Egypt*, trans. Popper, 13:43.

6 Following this passage, Ibn Taghrībirdī systematically rebuked his former teacher by noting in the case of pederasty and the taking of bribes that they were old practices, the former going as far back as the Khurasānīs’ entry into Iraq during the Abbasid revolution (ibid.). Ibn Taghrībirdī stated that the accusation of niggardliness might hold if he is compared to his predecessors, “but he was generous in comparison to those who came after him” (ibid., 44). The refutation of al-Maqrīzī’s discourse is accompanied by harsh criticisms as for example, “Shaikh Taqī al-Dīn (God have mercy on him) was guilty of well-known inconsistencies. . . .” (ibid.).

7 One of them, that of pederasty, was found nowhere else in the chronicle.
Barquq, the latter is depicted as a conniving individual who maneuvered through the meanders of politics to secure his power. For example, as early as 23 Rabî‘ al-Thânî 779/ 28 August 1377, following the removal of Yalbughâ al-Nâshîrî by Barquq and Barakah, al-Maqrîzî noted that the civil wars, the mamluk revolts, and the changes in government that had previously taken place were all but a springboard for Barquq’s taking over of the country. Barquq, continued al-Maqrîzî, quickly settled into office and governed on his own until he was taken to the grave, ”[an] honored, invincible, revered, and lofty [man].” 8 The Machiavellian nature of Barquq was again emphasized by al-Maqrîzî on a number of other instances. For example, when Barquq used the services of the qadis and the ulama on 19 Ṣafar 782/ 25 May 1380 to ease the tension between himself and his former ally Barakah, al-Maqrîzî saw nothing in the motivation of the amîr kabîr but “ruse and cunning.” 9 In 793/1391, one year after his return to the throne, the arrest of an amir by Barquq is yet another opportunity for al-Maqrîzî to dwell upon the sultan’s calculating ways; commenting on the arrest of Aqbughâ al-Mârdînî, he said: “This is the habit of the sultan: he is patient with his enemies in that he does not take revenge on them until he has the opportunity to discipline them for a punishable crime so that he does not appear to be seeking revenge, thanks to his self-command and retenue. Follow this and you will realize that it is as I said to you.” 10

8 Kita‘b al-Sulûk, 3:1:316. Ibn Taghrîbirdî noted, for the same event, that the removal of Yalbughâ took place a few days after Barquq and Barakah had dismissed a number of amirs from office, Nujûm al-Zâhirah, 11:130. Ibn Qâdî Shubbah made no negative comments and simply mentioned Yalbughâ’s removal, Al-Dhayl, 3:548. Ibn Hajar simply commented that Barquq held absolute power, Inbā‘ al-Ghumr, 1:234. Ibn Iyās was the only one of the chroniclers to echo al-Maqrîzî: he repeated his account almost word for word and then added “and he established the Circassian regime,” Badā‘i’ al-Zuhûr, 1:2:212.

9 Kita‘b al-Sulûk, 3:1:379. Al-Maqrîzî was more discerning in the analysis he later made of the causes behind the conflict between the two former “brothers.” He mentioned the negative effects of the 781 rebellion led by Ênal al-Yûsufi, the then silâhdâr, with the alleged collusion of Aytamish al-Bijâsî, Barquq’s close ally, whose purpose was to get rid of Barakah, and then he noted the following: because of the jealousy that appears frequently between associates, it was in the nature of things for the two amirs to try to monopolize power and to seek glory for their own person (ibid., 3:1:380–81). See Levanoni, “Al-Maqrîzî’s Account of the Transition,” 96–100, for an analysis of the Ênal rebellion and al-Maqrîzî’s alleged parti pris in its reporting. All four chroniclers who reported this event— Ibn Hajar, Inbā‘ al-Ghumr, 2:2; Ibn Taghrîbirdî, Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah, 11:141ff; Ibn Qâdî Shubbah, Al-Dhayl, 1:22; and Ibn Iyâs, Badā‘i’ al-Zuhûr, 1:2:254–55—refrained from making any negative comment about Barquq.

Thinly veiled references to Barquq’s alleged cowardice and calculating personality can also be construed from the remark al-Maqrizi made in his report on the aftermath of the conflict between Barakah and Barquq in 782: “It is incredible that during this serious incident, Amir Barquq did not ride into battle for even an hour of the day, but remained put while the battle between his supporters—chief among them Amir Aytamish—and those of Barakah [was taking place], until God gave him victory effortlessly (min ghayr ta’ab).” On top of Barquq’s cunning, al-Maqrizi associated with him character flaws that are of a non-political nature such as indulgence in drinking and pederasty.

Beyond the alleged immorality of Barquq the man, al-Maqrizi also often sought to indict the regime that gave rise to him and that he later headed, its genesis and political personnel. And he does this from a particular angle, that of a member of the khasásah who was witnessing the rise of “men of the lowest classes” and the debasing of those of “noble family.” The sentiment of dismay al-Maqrizi felt towards this situation can be seen expressed in various parts of the Kitāb al-Sulūk, whether about the upstart and greedy julbān or members of the āmmah. On 8 Dhū al-Qa’dah 779/8 March 1378, upon the nomination of a new roster of amirs, many of whom had been simple soldiers (māfāridah) prior to their rebellion, al-Maqrizi exclaimed: “The elevation of the lowlifes became the matter of proverbs as the mamluk recruits who yesterday had been unknown quantities, by means of murder, banishment, and various forms of torture, had become kings to whom the bounties of all things are brought and who ruled the kingdoms of the world according to their wants. From then on, the situation of the land changed with the

11Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:385. Ibn Qādī Shubhah, Al-Dhayl, 1:26, was the only chronicler to actually narrate this story that is almost identical to al-Maqrizi’s.
12Of the two instances recorded in the Kitāb al-Sulūk concerning the drinking habits of Barquq, the first is reported as a matter of fact without any criticisms (3:2:590). As for the other, in which al-Maqrizi described a big party held by the sultan at the hippodrome, it is replete with negative comments (3:2:902): he stated that the sultan drank with the mamluks and was warned about doing so, and that later, at the end of the party, the populace was allowed to loot both food and beverages; this, al-Maqrizi added, was an ugly day during which sacrilegious things occurred, so that it dawned upon ahl-al-ma’rifah that this was the end of it all. For the first event, the accounts of both Ibn Taghrībirdī, Al-Nujum al-Zāhirah, 11:210, and al-Jawharī al-Šayrafī, Nužhat al-Nafūs, 1:51, were either modeled upon that of al-Maqrizi or simply directly quoted from the Kitāb al-Sulūk. The second incident elicited more negative reactions. For example, Ibn Taghrībirdī, Al-Nujum al-Zāhirah, 12:66–67, Ibn Qādī Shubhah, Al-Dhayl, 1:662, and Ibn Iyās, Bada’i’ al-Zuhār, 1:2:500–1, actually quoted al-Maqrizi’s account, whereas Ibn Ḥajar stated the facts and then added that a faqīr who decried what was going on was beaten and humiliated, Inba’ al-Ghumr, 3:383–85.
13See note 7, above.
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change of its rulers.14

The imbalance in the traditional social order was not only the work of the julbān but also that of the ‘āmmah. Al-Maqrīzī might have been more prone than, say, an Ibn Taghrībīrī to report the way events such as famine impinged on the lives of the populace,15 but his comments on the ‘āmmah, particularly when it was involved in “political action” on the side of Barquq, reveal a high degree of antagonism. Al-Maqrīzī noted on a number of occasions that the common people liked Barquq and that he did his utmost to protect them so that they sympathized with and felt strongly for him.16 Of note are his thoroughly negative characterization of the ‘āmmah, which he alone did among contemporary historians: during his description of the events surrounding Ināl al-Yūsufī’s rebellion in Rajab 781/November 1379, al-Maqrīzī noted Barquq’s appeal to the ‘awa‘mm and then immediately observed that he was “very cunning and deceitful. They [the plebeians] rose at once and shouted together: ‘Walk ahead of us!’ So he went, surrounded by them as if they were a swarm of locusts.”17

14Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:289. Only Ibn Iyās narrated this story by copying al-Maqrīzī almost word for word, Badā‘i‘ al-Zuhūr, 1:2:191–92. Even though Barquq had not yet emerged from obscurity and is not mentioned by al-Maqrīzī in reference to this event, namely the aftermath of the murder of al-Ashraf Sha‘bān, as a Yalbughāwī mamlik, he was very much involved in the coup; see Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:155 for a brief summary of Barquq’s travels and activities following the murder of Yalbughā al-Umarī in 768/1366. See also Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:277, 287–88, in which much is made about the lowly status and arriviste nature of the new military elite. On the political activities of the julbān and those Levanoni calls rank-and-file mamluks during the period at hand, see her “Rank-and-file Mamluks versus Amirs: New Norms in the Mamluk Military Institution,” in The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society, ed. Thomas Philipp and Ulrich Haarmann (Cambridge, 1998), 25–28.
15For a discussion of the way the ‘āmmah were treated by historians during the Circassian period, see Irmeli Perho, “Al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Taghrībīrī as Historians of Contemporary Events,” in The Historiography of Islamic Egypt, 93–105.
16Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:352–53. Here again, Ibn Iyās was the only one amongst the chroniclers to echo the relationship between Barquq and the ‘āmmah, Badā‘i‘ al-Zuhūr, 1:2:240.
17Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:365–66. See also 3:1:382, 386. Only Ibn Iyās, Badā‘i‘ al-Zuhūr, 1:2:257, used the term jarād al-muntashir (swarm of locusts). Interestingly, even the description of a rather mundane event such as a new fashion trend amongst women in Cairo provided al-Maqrīzī with the opportunity to criticize the uppiness of the lower classes: “In this [the wearing of large dresses] the females of the populace overindulged until they imitated in their dress the women of the rulers and the elite [al-mulūk wa-al-a‘ya‘n],” Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:2:750. The a‘yān ‘awāmm dichotomy can also be seen in al-Maqrīzī’s account about a mazālim court held by Barquq on 28 Ramadān 789/ Saturday 12 October 1387: great fear, said al-Maqrīzī, overtook members of the elite “as the lowlifes became daring in dealing with the grandees,” ibid., 3:2:566. Concerning this last event, Ibn Hajar said “and whoever amongst the villains wished to disrespect the grandees, did so,” Inbā‘ al-Ghumr, 2:249, while al-Jawhari al-Sayrafī simply paraphrased al-Maqrīzī, Nuzhat
But nothing appears to hurt the class sensibility of al-Maqrīzī more than the perceived decline in standing and power of the civilian elite in general and the ulama class in particular, and the concomitant social ascension of arbāb al-sayf and their taking over of domains previously the exclusive preserve of the arbāb al-qalam. The importance al-Maqrīzī attached to the social class he belonged to is clearly discernible in his writings.\(^{18}\) In Kitāb al-Sulūk, al-Maqrīzī reported on an event dated 9 Jumādā al-Thānī 781/21 September 1379 which witnessed the removal of a Hanafi judge who had harbored a man who, because he was sought by the hājjīb, had placed himself under the protection of the shar'. After stating that the hājjīb had complained to Barquq who had then acquiesced to his wishes, namely the removal of the qadi, al-Maqrīzī then declared that “this was also one of the events which were unheard of before whereby the station of the quḍāḥ was diminished and the reach of the hujjāb’s rulings extended according to their fancy; and their evil flourished without it being checked by either knowledge or faith.”\(^{19}\)

Also of great concern to al-Maqrīzī, and a symptom in his eyes of the overall worsening of the state of the kingdom, was the very denigration and lowering of the standing of the ulama in the eyes of the holders of temporal power. Nowhere is this more obvious, and again peculiar to our historian, than in an incident that took place in 783/1381 during which Barquq spoke ill of the ulama by declaring that they were not Muslims. “It was one of those ugly novelties,” noted al-Maqrīzī, that the amīr kabīr and his entourage started to show ill respect to the quḍāḥ and the fiqāḥā’, and that the amirs and mamluks started


\(^{19}\)Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:361. Ibn Hājar, Inbā’ al-Ghumr, 1:303–4, devotes two short paragraphs to this story but makes no comment à la al-Maqrīzī. In his Badā’i’ al-Zuhūr, 1:244–45, Ibn Iyās presented an account similar to but shorter than al-Maqrīzī’s. Al-Maqrīzī made similar comments concerning the office of the ustaḍār whose holders acted as if they were quḍāḥ, al-Khitāṭ, 1:222.

For another incident of this type, see Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:2:636–37, Ibn Hājar, Inbā’ al-Ghumr, 2:329, and Ibn al-Furat, Tārikh al-Dawāl, 9:1:110–12, who give similar accounts of the same event. In the same vein, see Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:330, on the indignation expressed by al-Maqrīzī when reporting that people of high rank destined for mulcting were delivered to the wālī of Cairo instead of to the muqaddam al-dawlah or the muqaddam al-dawlah, both of whom usually acted upon edicts issued by the vizier: “... the rulings of the wālī never extended beyond the populace and the criminals [ahl al-jara’im] amongst them. As for the soldierly, the secretaries, and the elite of the merchants, they were beyond the reach of his ruling, as they were the responsibility of nā’ib al-sulṭān, and if not his then that of the hājjīb al-hujjāb, because each individual has a station peculiar to him he does not exceed. Now barriers collapsed and each person started to exceed his station and to ignore his lot.” Ibn Hājar, Inbā’ al-Ghumr, 1:264, and Ibn Iyās, Badā’i’ al-Zuhūr, 1:224, both mentioned this event without making any value judgment.
to debase their immunity. All that after they (the qudāh and the fuqahā’) had witnessed the lengths the sultan and the grandees from amongst the amirs used to go to dignify them, and after the realization that it was through them that they had known the religion of Islam, and that it was in the shadow of their sanctity that they lived. The grandest of them considered it a blessing to kiss the hand of the learned. Things changed dramatically [inqalaba al-amr] and the opposite situation started to prevail, so the instances of amirs and mamluks demeaning them increased because of what they had learned from the āmīr kābīr. Things then came to a head, and from the end of the Zāhirī Barquq regime, through that of al-Nāṣir Faraj and beyond, the rulers continued to demean the station of the qudāh and the fuqahā’: the lowest of the slave boys and the vilest of peddlers spoke ill of them. . . .

Curiously, the outrage felt by al-Maqrīzī with regard to the fate of the class he belonged to did not prevent him from reporting stories about its corrupt practices, notably employment through money payments or the intercession of a powerful patron. Whether he decried his peers in order to uphold his attachment to “the long-held Islamic societal ideal of intellectual success—[that of a] scholar untainted by the corrupting hand of government,” or to settle scores with them, al-Maqrīzī was critical of those among his peers who bought their charges, and of the state for encouraging such a practice.

20 Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:2:448. Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā’ al-Ghumr, 2:47–48, and Ibn Qādī Shuhbah, Al-Dhayl, 1:61, reported this incident without any comment while Ibn Iyās, Badā’i’ al-Zuhūr, 1: 291, quoted al-Maqrīzī by name but made changes to his report.


22 One of the most devastating attacks on his peers is to be found in the annal of the year 820 in which he blasted the military personnel of the state as well as its civilian functionaries, especially the muḥtasībs and the qudāh, Kitāb al-Sulāk, 4:1:388, 389.

23 Government service need not taint an office-holder. For example, at the very beginning of his 785 annal, we see al-Maqrīzī give a glowing and very long description of the character and person of Shams al-Dīn Kāṭib Arlān, the newly appointed vizier who, in his eyes, constituted the quintessential example of the perfect civil servant, Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:2:486–87.

24 For example Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:1:293, 333–34, 3:2:454, 746, 810, 872. As usual, he is alone most of the time among Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Ibn Ṭaghribirdī, Ibn Qādī Shuhbah, and al-Jawhari al-Šayrafl in making value judgments about, and mentioning the influence of money on, nominations. Only Ibn Iyās usually copied or paraphrased him directly and thus mentioned the negatives without fail.
The role of the state in fostering bribery\textsuperscript{25} has already been pointed out in the lengthy citation from the \textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk} quoted above, but bribery is only one of what appears to be a panoply of means, other than the accepted ones, used by the regime to sustain and enrich itself. Certainly, most of the methods used by Barquq and his collaborators were not new.\textsuperscript{26} The sources dealing with the period preceding that of Barquq all the way to the early Mamluk Sultanate and beyond abound with stories that illustrate various types of money extraction, whether “shake-downs” and the arbitrary seizing of property of both civilian and military personnel, looting, or the occasional forced sale or purchase of goods, etc. However, a cursory and admittedly unscientific survey of mostly secondary sources seems to show that the incidence of such stories as well as of reports about new means of money extraction, such as the confiscation of \textit{awqāf}, is more pervasive in Barquq’s period and later than in the preceding Bahri era.

Even though stories about mulcting are as prevalent in other chronicles as they are in his, in this respect al-Maqrizī again differed from his contemporaries in going it alone with regard to emphasizing the evil inherent in the corruption of the state, and describing its mechanisms.\textsuperscript{27} In his report about 13 Dhu al-Hijjah 779/12 April 1378, less than seven months after Barquq and Barakah had monopolized power following the removal of Yalbughā al-Nāṣīrī, al-Maqrizī depicted the way this duumvirate functioned and presented the earliest evidence of systemic corruption in the state: the two then friends divided all matters between them and while decisions pertaining to nominations to and removals from office were taken in the house of Barakah, the countersigning of all was in the hands of Barquq in the royal stables.\textsuperscript{28} No position, continued al-Maqrizī, could be obtained by anyone

\textsuperscript{25}In his \textit{Ighāthah} (trans. Allouche, 52–53), al-Maqrizī indicted bribery as one of the three causes behind the crises of the years 807/1404–5 and 796/1393–94. See also the \textit{Khīṭat}, 1:111, where al-Maqrizī dated back the practice of bribery to the Ayyubids while noting that Barquq over-indulged in it.

\textsuperscript{26}For a general work on this issue, see Hasanayn Muhammad Rābī‘, \textit{The Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564–741/A.D. 1169–1341} (London, 1972).


\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk}, 3:1:324.
without payment of money so that "society’s lowlifes and wretches acceded to what their minds fancied in terms of prestigious positions and high situations, and a great disaster befell people and led necessarily to the destruction of Egypt and Syria..." 29 Elsewhere, as part of the events of 23 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 781/31 March 1380, al-Maqrīzī described in detail the predatory fiscal policies of governors who enriched themselves at the expense of the local population, only to see themselves replaced while they were still in office by people who had paid a larger amount, and also mulcted and deprived of all that they had accumulated in terms of movable and immovable property; and the province of Egypt, concluded al-Maqrīzī, became corrupt because of this practice. 30

The leitmotiv, encountered above, peculiar to al-Maqrīzī, that Egypt and Syria had declined and were no longer the same as before was used by him while highlighting the shortcomings of the state at yet another level: its antagonizing of both internal and external forces, namely the Arabs in both Egypt and Syria, and the Turcomans in the Anatolian marches, something which caused both political instability and economic hardship to the kingdom. For example, al-Maqrīzī related news that reached Cairo on 25 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 780/13 April 1379 about a Mamluk defeat in Anatolia: after having attacked and looted the encampments of Turcomans who had come to them bearing gifts and asking for peace, the Mamluk forces of Syria fell into a trap set by remaining Turcomans forces and were wiped out, their military equipment, their money, horses and camels, etc., taken away. "This," commented al-Maqrīzī,

caused a weakness in the state: the Turcomans were the equivalent of fortifications protecting the country, and every year tens of thousands of sheep would be garnered from them along with alms payment in kind called the ‘idād. From them, the people of Aleppo reaped uncountable benefits, and if the sultan delegated them to fight a war they acquiesced to his order and they went ahead in obeisance and prostration. The ill treatment and the oppression they were subjected to transformed them into the enemies of the state who kill its soldiers, loot its moneys, and take over its dependencies... 31

29Ibid. Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā’ al-Ghumr, 1:326–27, Ibn Ṭaghhrībīdī, Al-Nujūm al-Zahirah, 11:133, Ibn Qādī Shuhbah, Al-Dhayl, 3:555, noted the changes in the top echelons of the state, but offered no information on the mechanisms of corruption described by al-Maqrīzī. Ibn ʿIyās, Badāʾīʾ al-Zuhūr, 1:220, offered almost the same account as al-Maqrīzī whom he appeared to have paraphrased.
30Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:371–2. Ibn ʿIyās, Badāʾīʾ al-Zuhūr, 1:251, is the only chronicler to give an account of this mechanism of money extraction. His report is almost exactly the same as al-Maqrīzī’s.
31Kitāb al-Sulūk, 3:1:347–48. Neither of the other chroniclers who reported this event, Ibn Ḥajar...
Al-Maqrīzī used the same alarmist tone in his analysis of the relations between the state and the Arabs. For instance, on two occasions he decried the harshness of Mamluk governors in dealing with the nomads of Egypt and Syria, and on both occasions his reports ended with laments about the fact that such behavior was pivotal in the destruction of both regions. 32

The last category of criticisms to be dealt with here is al-Maqrīzī’s apparent dislike of the very ethnic stock of the new ruling elite, the Circassians. Politically, it has been shown that he displayed a marked bias against the Circassians in the very way he presented the events that accompanied the struggle between Barquq and Barakah which came to a head in Rabī‘ al-Awwal 782/June 1380.33 Thus, among other things, al-Maqrīzī generalized to all Circassians the accusation of inveterate plotting he had leveled earlier against Barquq. 34 Elsewhere in his Kitāb

32In the case of Egypt, the occasion is the reporting of the nailing of Awlād al-Kanz Arabs on 17 Muḥarram 781/5 May 1379: the severity of the governor’s oppression caused the rebellion of those Arabs and their depredations, to such an extent that “Aswan escaped the control of the state and was then destroyed,” Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:1:352. Of the other chroniclers, only Ibn Ḥajār, Inbā‘ al-Ghumr, 1:273, reported the fact of the ālā‘ī oppression of the Arabs and their defeat at his hands, but made no value judgment. As for Syria, the event in question, in early Rajab 785/late August 1383, at the very beginning of Barquq’s sultanate, was the attack launched by Yalbughā al-Nāsirī on Nu‘ayr ibn ʿAmīr al-ʿarab. Nu‘ayr was defeated, his encampment looted, his womenfolk taken away: “this,” said al-Maqrīzī, “was also one of the greatest reasons for the corruption of the state, and one of the most important reasons behind the destruction of Syria,” Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:2:3496. Ibn Ṭabrībīrī and Ibn Ḥajār did not report the event, while Ibn Qādī Shuhbah, Al-Dhayl, 1:111, presented the bare facts without comment. As for al-Jawhārī al-Šayrāfī, Nuzhat al-Nufūs, 1:72–73, and Ibn Iyās, Badā‘i‘ al-Zuhūr, 1:334, both offered accounts very close to al-Maqrīzī’s that incorporated his negative characterization of the event: in al-Jawhārī al-Šayrāfī’s story, al-Maqrīzī’s name actually appeared directly before the quote describing the evils that befell Syria.

33See note 9, above.

34And the Turkish government came to an end completely. They [the Turkish amirs] were pursued, executed, banished, and imprisoned. And the Circassians had already . . . spoken among themselves, saying that there would be a great civil war that would be put down, and after it another one would break out between them and the Turks in which they would vanquish the Turks after a fight, and [then] they would be under their command. And when there was the rebellion led by Ināl, they spoke of it aloud and so unashamedly and made it public to the degree that the most senior and the most junior of them spoke of it. And thus it indeed happened;” Levanoni’s translation, quoted in her “Al-Maqrīzī’s Account of the Transition,” 95; see also Kitāb al-Sulāk, 3:1:385. Ibn Qādī Shuhbah, Al-Dhayl, 1:26, and Ibn Iyās, Badā‘i‘ al-Zuhūr, 1:262, both quoted al-Maqrīzī
al-Sulûk, al-Maqrîzî appeared to be shocked at the fate of the mamluks of Uljây al-Yûsufi (d. 775/1373), a former grandee of al-Nâṣîr Ḥasan, who on 23 Rabî‘ al-Thânî 779/28 August 1377 were accused of plotting against Barquq and were imprisoned in the Shamâyil treasury, the prison of the common criminals. “It was unheard of before this incident,” noted al-Maqrîzî, “for the Turks, the foundation of the state (rijâl al-dawlah), to be humiliated in this fashion.”

* * * *

The discourse of al-Maqrîzî on Barquq’s reign is remarkable on many accounts. Firstly, even though, as will be shown below, his tone did change in his accounts of the sultan’s second reign, the antipathy he felt towards Barquq is clearly evident. As a matter of fact, no other sultan of the Circassian period attracted the ire of al-Maqrîzî more consistently than Barquq did. This is not to say that al-Maqrîzî did not have anything negative to say about post-Barquq Circassian sultans or their regimes. As a matter of fact, in his Kitâb al-Sulûk, al-Maqrîzî did savage Faraj, Shaykh, Barsbây, and their respective regimes, but his criticisms do not almost word for word, without identifying him as their source, especially his comments concerning the end of the Turkish state, but refrained from mentioning his litany about a conspiracy. Levanoni, “Al-Maqrîzî’s Account of the Transition,” 95, said that Ibn Taghrîbirdî was influenced by al-Maqrîzî’s account and indicated a page number in the Cairo edition of the Nuṣûm al-Zâhirâh. In the Beirut edition, however, I was not able to find this reference.

Kitâb al-Sulûk, 3:1:331. Ibn Taghrîbirdî presented no report on the incident, while Ibn Qâdî Shuhbah stated the facts and then noted that “a great humiliation befell the Turks the like of which they had never experienced before,” Al-Dhayl, 3:571. As for Ibn Hajar, Inbâ’ al-Ghumr, 1:265, he simply related that “they were greatly humiliated.” Finally, Ibn Iyâs stated the facts without referring to any humiliation, but concluded his report by saying “this was the first assault by the Atâbak Barquq on the Turkish mamluks and the first public manifestation of the Circassian regime,” Bada’i‘ al-Zuhûr, 1:334.

Faraj’s obituary is particularly telling since al-Maqrîzî does not seem to see anything redeeming about Barquq’s son, Kitâb al-Sulûk, 4:1:225–28. Al-Maqrîzî also reported without fail what would later become a distinguishing characteristic of Faraj’s reign, the long list of atrocities he committed against his enemies, for example, ibid., 4:1:113, 114, 148, 180, 187, 188, 192, 196.

Shaykh’s obituary, even though overwhelmingly negative, is not as devastating as Faraj’s, ibid., 4:1:550–1. Also, on one occasion, ibid., 4:1:532, al-Maqrîzî, while talking about the piety displayed by Shaykh, indicted his entourage rather than the sultan himself for the evils of his regime. As for Tatar (d. 824/1421), al-Maqrîzî stated that he did not rule long enough for his actions to be either lauded or denigrated, ibid., 4:2:550–1.

My edition of the Kitâb al-Sulûk did not include al-Maqrîzî’s negative obituary of Barsbây which is quoted by Broadbridge in her “Academic Rivalry,” 93–94. What appear to me to be the three major negative characteristics of Barsbây’s rule, namely the endemic rioting of the julbân (4:2:673, 793, 804, 805, 909, 930, 931, 965, 975, 1006, 1025, 1027, 1047), the systematic recourse...
come close to the *systematic* and *direct* attacks he made on Barquq and his rule.\textsuperscript{39} Secondly, al-Maqrîzî’s criticisms are all the more surprising since he did benefit from Barquq’s and later from his son Faraj’s patronage,\textsuperscript{40} and also since Sül, a favorite slave-girl of his, was given to him by no other than the sultan.\textsuperscript{41} Thirdly, al-Maqrîzî was the only one amongst the chroniclers of this period to systematically criticize Barquq, especially during his description of the sultan’s first reign.

In the light of what was said in the above paragraph, what is then, if any, the historiographical significance of al-Maqrîzî’s negative attitude towards Barquq? An analysis of a passage from Ibn Taghrîbîrdî’s *Al-Nujûm al-Zâhirah* is one way to tackle this issue. After rejecting point by point the very serious accusations levelled by his former teacher against Barquq in his assessment of his first reign, Ibn Taghrîbîrdî said:

\begin{quote}
Shaikh Taqî ad-Dîn was guilty of well-known inconsistency; he said now this and now that. . . . And my statement that the Shaikh Taqî ad-Dîn sometimes praises Barqûq and sometimes blames him rests on the fact that *when the author was friendly with al-Malik az-Zâhir during his second sultanate and az-Zâhir made him the object of his beneficence, he went to extremes in praising him in several passages of his works, and forgot this earlier statement of*
\end{quote}

to mulcting as a means to enrichment (4:2:619, 610, 621, 623, 631, 632, 633, 636, 644, 648, 662, 663, 673, 685, 688, 693, 709, 729, 735, 754, 747, 751, 754, 755, 757, 767, 768, 791–92, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 817, 819, 820, 821, 823, 824, 833, 860, 867, 868, 872, 887, 905, 906, 912, 913, 914, 919, 928, 929, 931, 933, 934, 936, 938, 950, 962, 965, 968, 1005, 1008, 1020), as well as the establishment of monopolies over the spice trade and other sectors of the economy (647, 824, 869, 905, 929, 1001), are very well documented in the *Kitȧb al-Sulu̇k*. But al-Maqrîzî directly attacks Barsbay only on one occasion: after the death of his arch-foe Jânbak al-Ṣûfî in 841, al-Maqrîzî stated that because of Barsbay’s injustice, God made sure he did not savor his victory as the sultan ended up dying shortly after, ibid., 4:2:1024.

\textsuperscript{39}Maybe it was the novelty of the new regime and the fact that it heralded new practices that later became commonplace that caused al-Maqrîzî to formulate very precise and scathing criticisms of Barquq. Also, it may be that, in his eyes, Barquq not only erected the new system but also came to epitomize it, so that he did not see the need to rehash at later stages of his writing things he had already observed.

\textsuperscript{40}See Broadbridge, “Academic Rivalry,” 89–90.

\textsuperscript{41}See al-Sakhȧwî, *Al-Daẇ‘ al-Lâmi‘ li-Ahl al-Qarn al-Tâsi‘* (Beirut, 1992), 12:66–67. This reference as well as the information concerning Sül was kindly brought to my attention by Nasser Rabbat.

\textsuperscript{42}Of the major historians of this period, Badr al-Dîn al-‘Aynî (762–855/1360–1451) is the only author whose work, *‘Iqd al-Jumān fi Târikh Ahl al-Zamān*, I have not been able to consult. As was noted throughout this paper, only Ibn Iyâs closely followed al-Maqrîzî in his denigration of Barquq by either copying or paraphrasing his *Kitȧb al-Sulu̇k*. 
his and others similar to it; it escaped his notice that he should have changed this earlier account, for, as the proverb runs, "Who praises and blames is as though he lied twice."

One can sense that the tone of al-Maqrīzī’s writings with regard to Barquq changed from one period to another: in the Kitāb al-Sulāḵ\textsuperscript{44} the criticisms started\textsuperscript{45} in full-swing in 778/1376–77 (the year that witnessed the successful coup led by the julbān and upstart mamluks against the sultan al-Ashraf Sha’bān), continued during al-Maqrīzī’s account of Barquq’s rise to power in 779/1378, and peaked during the early 1380s, only to subside during the second reign of the sultan, from 792/1390 until 801/1399.\textsuperscript{46} Strikingly, al-Maqrīzī’s obituary of Barquq in 801/1399 contained only a handful of comments that could be construed as strictly negative (his greed and his advancement of Circassians over Turks, etc.) drowned as they were in more than four pages of praise (his love of men of religion, the illegal taxes he abolished, the structures he ordered built, his largesse, etc.\textsuperscript{45}), a far cry

\textsuperscript{44}Ibn Taghrībirdī, \textit{The History of Egypt}, trans. Popper, 13:44–45. [Emphasis mine]

\textsuperscript{45}Both \textit{Kitāb al-Ighāthah} and the \textit{Khitat}, contain a fair number of passages in which al-Maqrīzī condemns Barquq and aspects of his rule, but it is in the \textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk} that they are the most pervasive and systematic.

\textsuperscript{46}The kind of dismay frequently expressed by al-Maqrīzī throughout the late 1370s and beyond can actually be encountered as far back as 768/1366–67 during the events surrounding the coup launched by his ajlāb against Yalbugha al-‘Umarī and his assassination on 10 Rabī’ al-Thānī 768/13 December 1366. Clearly discernible in al-Maqrīzī’s description of events are themes that will be recurrent in his criticisms against Barquq, namely the ascension of lowly mamluks to positions of authority, the shaking up of the social order at the hands of an increasingly riotous populace, etc. See \textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk}, 3:1:137–38, 143.


\textsuperscript{47}\textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk}, 3:2:937–47. Ibn Taghrībirdī made sure to note in his critique of al-Maqrīzī that the second reign of Barquq was more deserving of criticism than the first one because the sultan “was guilty of several abominable acts, such as putting some scholars to death and banishing and degrading others because after he had left al-Karak they had issued a decision legitimizing the war against him,” \textit{The History of Egypt}, trans. Popper, 13:42–45. Now compare this with what al-Maqrīzī had to say about this issue: “he felt a great deal of dislike for the fuqaha’ during his second reign because they had issued a fatwā allowing his killing, but he did not cease honoring them despite his anger towards them,” \textit{Kitāb al-Sulāk}, 3:2:944.
from the savaging he inflicted on the sultan in the report dealing with the end of his first reign.

Was it then, as Ibn Taghrībirdī maintained, the fact that Barquq had made al-Maqrīzī “the object of his beneficence” which led the latter to tone down his criticisms in his reports on al-Zāhīr’s second reign, and, in the process, to suppress those sensibilities which had earlier made him prone to condemn the sultan? Ibn Taghrībirdī’s quotation actually raises more questions, historiographical and biographical in nature, than it provides answers. If it is indeed true that his Kitāb al-Sulūk reflected al-Maqrīzī’s changing relationship with Barquq, and if, as Ibn Taghrībirdī argued, this transformation took place during the sultan’s second reign, this means that a substantial portion of the Kitāb al-Sulūk, that which contains the most virulent criticisms against Barquq, must have been written before the rapprochement between the two, sometime during the second reign, which started in 792/1390. The dating of parts of the Kitāb al-Sulūk to this particular period raises a number of problems. First, if we take at face value the contentions that: one, the Kitāb al-Sulūk was the last of a series of historical works, starting with the Khiṭṭāt, depicting various periods of the history of Egypt;48 two, that the Khiṭṭāt was written between 819/1417 and 839/1436;49 and three, that evidence suggests that the first draft of the Kitāb al-Sulūk was written sometime around or after 1421–23 but no earlier than al-Maqrīzī’s return from Damascus following the death of Faraj in 815/141250—then al-Maqrīzī’s chronicle could not have been written during Barquq’s reign, and certainly not at the earliest stage of al-Zāhīr’s rule because he was simply too young. For Ibn Taghrībirdī’s assertion to be correct, one needs to postulate that al-Maqrīzī had already written down extensive notes, tainted by his prejudices, on the first part of Barquq’s reign during this reign, long before he started using these notes to write a full-fledged book. It can then be argued that al-Maqrīzī had no qualms about using the old “anti-Barquq” notes since he was no longer in danger of incurring the wrath of the sultan, who was then long dead.

This perspective makes good of the claim that the Kitāb al-Sulūk was written after al-Maqrīzī’s return to Cairo from Damascus in 820/1417,51 since it is probable that he would have made use of material composed or gathered in the past along

50 This information was kindly made available to me by Nasser Rabbat. See his article in this volume on the life of al-Maqrīzī.
51 Levanoni, “Al-Maqrīzī’s Account of the Transition,” 96. On the uncertainty concerning the date of al-Maqrīzī’s return to Cairo, see below, note 62.
with more recent data. But if, while writing the *Kitāb al-Sulūk* after 820/1417, al-Maqrīzī did more than simply record events but also "took a moral stance against Barquq both on personal and factional grounds," and thus embarked upon a retrospective revisiting of past events\(^{52}\) tainted by the prejudices of a bitter man, then we have a problem to solve: we would still have to account for the generally neutral tone of the annals covering the second half of Barquq’s reign and the dramatic decrease therein of criticisms directed at him by al-Maqrīzī. One way out of this problem would be to advance another albeit potentially weaker postulate: that al-Maqrīzī *did* write all of the *Kitāb al-Sulūk* starting after 820/1417 and that his retrospective assessment of events was influenced by his reliving, through a wide spectrum of moods, of the events he described in his chronicle.

Still, one might reject Ibn Taghrībirdī’s contention about a two-phased elaboration of al-Maqrīzī’s oeuvre. Despite the deference Ibn Taghrībirdī showed his former teacher qua historian,\(^{53}\) his *Al-Nuǧūm al-Zaḥīrah* is replete with criticisms directed at al-Maqrīzī. On top of indicating historical inconsistencies,\(^{54}\) Ibn Taghrībirdī, on a number of occasions, belittled al-Maqrīzī’s knowledge.\(^{55}\) It might be that pointing out alleged inconsistencies on the part of al-Maqrīzī was just another means used by Ibn Taghrībirdī to damage the reputation of his teacher and, in the process, to elevate himself. Within the framework of the intensive competition for patronage and for sheer intellectual glory amongst academics and thinkers during this period,\(^{56}\) this would come as no surprise. The possibility that it was his intention to discredit al-Maqrīzī is further supported by another statement made by Ibn Taghrībirdī. In the account of the year 841/1437–38 of his *Al-Nuǧūm al-Zaḥīrah*, Ibn Taghrībirdī again attacked his former mentor’s alleged historical inconsistencies, namely his criticisms against Barsbāy, and then said, as an explanation for al-Maqrīzī’s stand, that after the death of Barquq “he had no success with the rulers who came after him; they kept him away without showing him any favour, so he on his part took to registering their inequities and infamies.”\(^{57}\)

The fact that al-Maqrīzī was no kinder to later sultans than he was towards

---

\(^{52}\)Ibid., 95–96.


\(^{56}\)On this issue, see Broadbridge, “Academic Rivalry, ” Ziyādah makes of the antagonisms, jealousies, and enmities amongst ninth/fifteenth century historians a fundamental characteristic of the historiography of this period, *Al-Mu’arrikhu’n*, 84–88.

Barquq during his first reign is supported by evidence. What is interesting about the quotation above is the later statement, casually mentioned by Ibn Taghrībirdī, that al-Maqrízī was a boon companion of Barquq. That no other chronicler or biographer, not even the generally caustic al-Sakhawī, had related such a juicy accusation with high damage potential could indicate that Ibn Taghrībirdī might have been engaged in a low-level work of demolition of al-Maqrízī’s reputation.

Ibn Taghrībirdī could also have simply misunderstood the method used by his teacher in his writing of Kitāb al-Sulāk, so that he assumed that it was written during two distinct periods. But even if we reject Ibn Taghrībirdī’s original assertion about al-Maqrízī’s writing, we are still not out of the woods: again, what caused al-Maqrízī to change, in a significant manner, the tone of his comments on Barquq?

In the light of all that has been said, the easiest way out of the enigma is to posit two scenarios. First, al-Maqrízī probably started taking notes, from a variety of sources, very early on and this note taking reflected the mood he was in and his relationship with holders of political authority; upon his return to Cairo in 819/1417, he started turning the notes he had assembled into a full-fledged book. This, as has been argued above, weakens the “retrospective presentation of events” postulate. The second scenario, even though not yet supported by research, is that al-Maqrízī simply relied on another chronicle to write those sections of the Kitāb al-Sulāk that dealt with the sultan’s first reign.

* * * *

Of course, this is all conjecture. As a matter of fact, many matters have to be resolved before the historiographical problem posed above can be dealt with effectively. For one thing, the very biography of al-Maqrízī and the concomitant issue of the history of his literary production need to be addressed. Even though the general outline of his life is well known, some aspects of it are shrouded in uncertainty and are reported differently by scholars past and present. For example, when did he start working? How long did he stay in Damascus after he went

---

58 See Broadbridge, “Academic Rivalry.”
59 Ibn Taghrībirdī, Al-Națūm al-Zāhirah, 14:270.
60 Or no earlier than his return from Damascus following the death of Faraj in 815/1412.
61 Broadbridge says it was in the year 788/1386, “Academic Rivalry,” 87, and Ziyādah in 1388, Tārīkh Ḥayāt al-Maqrízī, 15. Al-Maqrízī, in his Khīṭat, said he started working in the dīwān al-inshā’ around “al-sab‘in wa-al-sab‘ mi‘ah,” 2:225. If he were born in 766, as is generally accepted, then al-Maqrízī was around 4 years of age when he started his career (!); it is therefore more than probable that a scribe made a mistake while copying the original or that the editor of the text himself erred in this respect. Surprisingly, the same inconsistency can be found in Ziyādah’s Al-Mu‘arrīkhān, 8, in which the date of birth is reported as 1364 and the year he started his career
there with Faraj in 810/1408 and, consequently, when did he return to Cairo?\textsuperscript{62} As we have seen above, much of the interpretations of al-Maqriz\'s historiographical output was made on the assumption that he wrote this or that work on given dates, so what would become of these interpretations if the dates are themselves not to be trusted?

The present state of knowledge concerning the issue at hand calls for two comments: first, to the extent allowed by the primary sources themselves, that a definitive biography of al-Maqriz\'i be produced, and second, that the "critical analysis of the originality, sources, and possible interdependence"\textsuperscript{63} of "Burji" historians be undertaken at the same level of scholarship as that of the "Bahri" historiographical output.\textsuperscript{64} Until then, the questions raised above will only be partially addressed.

\textsuperscript{62}Broadbridge, who probably based herself on al-Sakha\'w\, states that he went back and forth the same year, "Academic Rivalry," 91. Franz Rosenthal in his Encyclopaedia of Islam article reported the figure of around ten years: "In Damascus where he spent about 10 years beginning in 810/1408 . . .," 6:194, and so do Levanoni, "Al-Maqriz\'i\'s Account of the Transition," 96, and Ziya\dah, Al-Mu\'arrikhu\n, 9.

\textsuperscript{63}Donald P. Little, "Historiography of the Ayyubid and Mamluk Epochs," in The Cambridge History of Egypt 640–1517, ed. Carl Petry (Cambridge, 1998), 433. To my knowledge, the only studies that do just that are David C. Reisman, "A Holograph MS of Ibn Qa\d\ Shuhbah\'s \'Dhayl,\" in Maml\k Studies Review 2 (1998): 19–49 and Donald P. Little\'s article in this volume.

\textsuperscript{64}See Donald P. Little, An Introduction to Maml\k Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik al-N\d\r\n Muh\d\r\n ibn Qal\d\'\un. (Wiesbaden, 1970).