Language and Style in Mamluk Historiography

Koby Yosef

1 Introduction*

The increasing use of nonstandard Arabic by Mamluk historians in the historical narrative (*hawādith*) of chronicles has been considered as one of the most noticeable characteristics of the process of “literarization,” or the popularization of Mamluk historiography,¹ which went hand in hand with the increasing use of stylistic elements drawn from the literature of *adab*, perhaps most notably anecdotes or story-like reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech.²

While some, mainly editors of Mamluk historical works, made notes and observations on the language of specific works or historians, to date, there have not been too many attempts at an overall survey of different general trends of language use in Mamluk historical texts. Notwithstanding this, it has been suggested that usages of nonstandard Arabic are more typical of the 9th/15th century,³ and more specifically of Egypt in the second half of the 9th/15th century (the so-called “Cairo narrative style”).⁴ This chronological/geographical perspective, however, downplays the facts that many Mamluk historians used nonstandard Arabic before the 9th/15th century and that some Syrian historians also used nonstandard Arabic.

Alternatively, it has been suggested that differences in background and life experience of the historians affected their language and style. Ulrich Haarmann perhaps did not state explicitly that usages of nonstandard Arabic are typical of historians related to the military institution; however, he highlighted the fact that many of the historians who wrote “literarized” histories employ-

* I would like to thank my friend and colleague Almog Kasher for reading a draft of this paper and making some very useful comments on issues relating to Arabic grammar.

1 See, for example, Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 175–6; Auflösung 56; Review of Weltgeschichte 134–5; Guo, Introduction 94; Parry, Review 148; Mauder, *Gelehrte* 24.

2 See, for example, Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 178–9; and see also Guo, Introduction 95–6; Little, *Historiography* 420.

3 See most recently, Elbendary, *Crowds* 82.

4 Ibn al-Ṣayrafī, *Inbāʾ* 17–21 (esp. 20); Petry, *Protectors* 6. And see in detail in section 5 below.

ing nonstandard Arabic were soldiers⁵ and labeled as “conservative” several historians who were religious scholars.⁶ Donald Little noted that the lack of rigorous academic training of “historians closely associated with the Mamluk military institution either as fully-fledged soldiers or as sons of Mamluks” is betrayed by their Arabic prose, which is “permeated with colloquialisms.”⁷ Frédéric Bauden noted that in contrast to historians related to the military institution who did not hesitate to include nonstandard usages of Arabic in their historical works, religious scholars who wrote history were very careful not to allow themselves such deviations from standard Arabic.⁸ In what is probably the most elaborate discussion of language and style in Mamluk historiography examining “Mamluk historians as groups ... who were associated with particular settings ... or who shared ideological and professional bonds,”⁹ Li Guo noted that differences in career paths and social, ethnic, cultural, and intellectual backgrounds of historians must have had some influence on the language and style of their writings.¹⁰ Like other scholars, Guo noted that the tendency to use nonstandard Arabic characterizes historians related to the military institution, particularly those of non-Arab origin.¹¹ This social/cultural/professional perspective, however, downplays the fact that some religious scholars who wrote historical works were employing nonstandard usages of Arabic. This is not to say that the latter were totally ignored. Haarmann was, of course, well-aware that the Syrian religious scholar al-Jazarī (d. 739/1338) incorporated *adab*-like elements and nonstandard Arabic in his chronicle; however, he highlighted the fact that this trend was best exemplified in the chronicle of Ibn al-Dawādārī (d. after 736/1335), the Egyptian historian who was a *mamlūk*'s descendant.¹² Guo noted that not only al-Jazarī but also the Syrian religious scholar al-Yūnīnī (d. 726/1326) was incorporating anecdotes, stories, and nonstandard usages of Arabic in his chronicle;¹³ however, he concluded that “the introduction of entertaining stories in a *taʾrīkh* work and the use of colloquial language in its narrative were, to be sure, still

5 Haarmann, *Auflösung* 59; and see also Mauder, *Gelehrte* 25.

6 Haarmann, *Auflösung* 54.

7 Little, *Historiography* 420.

8 Bauden, *Maqriziana* VIII 36–7.

9 Guo, *Mamluk* 29.

10 *Ibid.* 29–32; and see also *ibid.* 41–3.

11 *Ibid.* 30, 43.

12 Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 176–9; *Auflösung* 55; Review of *Weltgeschichte* 134–5; Parry, Review 148; and see also Guo, Introduction 96.

13 Guo, Introduction 94–5.

far from being fully developed in al-Yūnīnī's and al-Jazarī's works, compared to later Egyptian chronicles ... such as those of Ibn al-Dawādārī ... wherein such a 'literarized' trend ... appears to be quite overwhelming."¹⁴ Guo emphasized the dissimilarities between the trends of "literarization" in the chronicles of historians related to the military institution and those who were religious scholars. Whereas the trend in Ibn al-Dawādārī and historians related to the military institution is typified by the incorporation of elements of *adab* "in its 'lower' form" (perhaps most notably anecdotes, stories, and nonstandard Arabic) in the historical narrative, the trend in al-Yūnīnī and al-Jazarī is typified by the incorporation of "high *adab* elements" (mainly poetry in a classical form) in the obituaries (*wafayāt*).¹⁵ According to Guo, it is thus not surprising to see in the works of the latter a struggle "with regard to language and style."¹⁶

Some have made a connection between the different backgrounds of historians, which affected their language and style, and their different geographical settings. As noted by Guo, who focused on the Turkish period of the Mamluk Sultanate (648–784/1250–1382), practically all chroniclers related to the military institution were Egyptian, whereas practically all Syrian chroniclers were religious scholars. In fact, during the Turkish period "none of the major Egyptian chronicles" were written by religious scholars.¹⁷ Thus, "it is undeniable that there are certain traits that ought to be seen as characterizing Mamluk Egyptian authors."¹⁸ This combined perspective, however, downplays the fact that during the Circassian period of the sultanate (784–923/1382–1517), many Egyptian historians were religious scholars.

So, to date, there is no general survey of trends of language use that covers all major historians throughout the Mamluk period. In addition, to date, it has not been properly explained why some Mamluk historians who were religious scholars were willing to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic while others refrained from doing so. In what follows I will offer such a survey and suggest that in order to better understand trends of language use in Mamluk historiography, a further differentiation should be made between subgroups of historians who were religious scholars.

In order to check in detail usages of Arabic, it is necessary, of course, to consult manuscripts and autographs when they exist; however, it is better to

¹⁴ Ibid. 96.

¹⁵ Guo, Mamluk 39; Introduction 96.

¹⁶ Ibid., Introduction 96.

¹⁷ Ibid., Mamluk 29–32.

¹⁸ Ibid. 41.

emphasize in advance this is not the intention here. The intention is to survey general trends of usages of nonstandard Arabic and standardization thereof. Using the existing printed editions (some based on autographs) and relying on observations mainly made by editors of Mamluk historical works (some based on autographs) should allow a preliminary survey of such general trends (standardization by copyists and the occasional standardizing of a text by the editor without indication should be considered).

Appendix A includes a survey of observations regarding usages of Arabic in the works of Mamluk historians, mainly in chronicles but also in biographical dictionaries. As mentioned, the observations were often made by editors of historiographical texts, some of which are based on autographs (this fact is indicated in the appendix). To these observations, I have added my own observations, which are based on printed editions, some, again, are based on autographs (this is also indicated in the appendix). My observations also include cases of standardization made by some Mamluk historians of nonstandard usages employed in earlier historical works that were incorporated into their own works.

I have divided the appendix into five groups of historians. The first group (group A) is historians related to the military institution (*mamlūks* and soldiers, and descendants of *mamlūks*). The four other groups are historians of civilian background, that is, religious scholars related to three schools of law, the Ḥanafī, Ḥanbalī, and Shāfiʿī (groups B, C, and E), and *udabāʾ-kuttāb* (group D). It will be shown that usages of nonstandard Arabic are typical of historians related to the military institution (section 2 below) and non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars (section 3 below). On the other hand, Shāfiʿī religious scholars refrained from using nonstandard Arabic (section 4 below) because of the importance of “Arabness” and the Arabic language in their ethos (section 4.2 below). The trends of language use will be examined in tandem with one stylistic element—the incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues and direct speech in accounts of contemporary events¹⁹ in the historical narrative in chronicles. This will allow a more nuanced differentiation between trends of language use and style prevalent among chroniclers of the three aforementioned major groups of historians: those related to the military institution, non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars, and Shāfiʿī religious scholars (section 5 below). Finally, the survey will allow a reevaluation of Nasser Rabbat’s observation that conversations between *mamlūks* are reported in colloquial Arabic

19 By that I mean historians’ reports on their own time and not reports on past events taken from earlier sources.

as part of a deliberate negative representation of the *mamlūks* by Mamluk historians (section 6 below). It will also allow some general observations concerning language and style in works pertaining to history that were written by *udabāʾ-kuttāb* and language use in biographical dictionaries (section 6.1 below).

2 Historians Related to the Military Institution (*Mamlūks* and Soldiers, and Descendants of *Mamlūks*)

There should be no doubt that almost all historians related to the military institution (group A in appendix A) allowed themselves to employ usages of nonstandard Arabic in a significant manner when describing contemporary events.²⁰ In fact, the only historian in this category that did not employ nonstandard Arabic (at least not in any significant manner) is Baybars al-Manṣūrī (d. 725/1325), who, as a *dawādār* and chief of the chancery, was related to the *inshāʾ* tradition, which favors ornamented language, poetry, and rhymed prose in impeccable Arabic.²¹ The nonstandard usages in the writings of members of this group appear in quoted dialogues or utterances in direct speech (mainly in the frame of story-like reports), as well as in the narrative line itself. Of course, some were more inclined toward such usages and some less. Roughly (and in an impressionistic manner) it is possible to divide the members of this group into three subgroups:

1. Al-Yūsufī (d. 759/1358) and Ibn al-Dawādārī, whose chronicles contain an abundance of story-like reports with dialogues in the description of contemporary events (in al-Yūsufī's chronicle it is hard to find what may be called a formal informative narrative line), are also, as a result, the most inclined to employ nonstandard Arabic, quantitatively and qualitatively.
2. Qaraṭāy (d. after 708/1308), Baktāsh al-Fākhirī (d. 745/1344), al-Shujāʾī (d. after 756/1356), Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407), al-Malaṭī (d. 920/1514), and Ibn Iyās (d. ca. 930/1524) employ nonstandard usages extensively in the formal informative narrative line. Their chronicles, however, contain less story-like reports with dialogues or direct speech than the chronicles of

20 See appendix A group A.

21 See appendix A group A (exception); and see Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 179; Irwin, *Mamluk history* 163; Little, *Historiography* 423–4. On the *inshāʾ* tradition, see chapter 1, footnote 14 (3).

al-Yūsufī and Ibn al-Dawādārī.²² As a result, it would seem that nonstandard usages in their writing are more restricted (especially qualitatively).

3. Ibn Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1470) restricts nonstandard usages mainly to dialogues or utterances in direct speech in story-like reports.

It may be added that it would seem that Ibn Taghrībirdī and Ibn al-Dawādārī were less inclined to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic in the formal narrative line,²³ and Qaraṭāy was possibly less inclined to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic in quoted dialogues.²⁴

3 Historians Who Were Religious Scholars: Ḥanbalīs and Ḥanafīs

Among the historians related to Ḥanbalī circles (group C in appendix A), it is clear that al-Yūnīnī and al-Jazarī were willing to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic in a significant manner when describing contemporary events,²⁵ whether in dialogue quotations in the frame of story-like reports or in the more formal narrative line.²⁶ As for al-Birzālī (d. 739/1339), his chronicle is almost totally “deliterarized” and contains almost no story-like reports. This perhaps

22 The chronicles of al-Shujāʿī and Qaraṭāy seem to contain more dialogues or utterances in direct speech than the chronicles of Ibn Iyās and Ibn Duqmāq, which, in their turn, seem to contain more dialogues or direct speech than the chronicle of al-Malaṭī. The chronicle of Baktāsh al-Fākhirī does not seem to contain many dialogues or utterances in direct speech.

23 On Ibn Taghrībirdī, see appendix A group A (*mamlūks*' descendants no. 3—footnote 178). On a vernacular poem incorporated in a story-like report, see Guo, Songs 189–90. As for Ibn al-Dawādārī, in comparison to members of subgroup 2 it would seem that he was less inclined to employ nonstandard Arabic in the more formal informative narrative line; see also Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 177–8. In contrast to Ibn Taghrībirdī, however, he seems to be more inclined to employ nonstandard Arabic in story-like reports also outside of dialogues; see, for example, Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz* ix, 195–204 (195–7: informative accounts that are relatively clean of nonstandard usages. 198–204: a story-like report about the arrest of an amir which includes many dialogues with nonstandard usages of Arabic; however, some nonstandard usages are found outside the dialogues. See especially 200 line 15—colloquial usages in dialogue [*b*-imperfect], line 17—*annahum yabitū* [standard, *yabitūna*] not in the dialogue but still in the frame of the story-like report); and see also *ibid.* ix, 210–6 (210–1: informative accounts in the beginning of the year 711/1311–2 that are relatively clean of nonstandard usages. 212–6: a story-like report with dialogues employing many nonstandard usages, mainly in dialogues but at times not [see 216 line 4—a double usage of the *b*-imperfect not in the frame of a dialogue]).

24 Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 179; Irwin, *Mamluk History* 164–5; and see appendix A group A (*mamlūks* no. 1—footnote 168).

25 See appendix A group C nos. 1–2.

26 Guo, Introduction 95.

partially accounts for the fact that there are hardly any usages of nonstandard Arabic in his chronicle. There is evidence, however, that he perhaps did not object to such usages in principle. In the rare cases in which his chronicle does contain story-like reports, we find within the reports some usages of nonstandard Arabic.²⁷

As for historians who were Ḥanafī religious scholars (group B in appendix A), it is clear that Ibn al-Furāt (d. 807/1405) and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī (d. 900/1495) were willing to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic extensively when describing contemporary events, whether in dialogue quotations or in the more formal narrative line.²⁸ In accounts of his own time, Ibn al-Furāt's chronicle *Ta'riḫ al-duwal wa-l-mulūk* is full of usages of nonstandard Arabic. However, these accounts generally do not contain many story-like reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech; thus, the usages of nonstandard Arabic are mainly found in the narrative line.²⁹ This seems to be the case also with *Inbā' al-ḥaṣr bi-abnā' al-ʿaṣr*, Ibn al-Ṣayrafī's chronicle dedicated to his own time. However, Ibn al-Ṣayrafī apparently incorporated a few more story-like reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech than Ibn al-Furāt did.³⁰ Typically, the nonstandard usages in the narrative line of Ibn al-Furāt's and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī's chronicles are related to morphology or morphosyntax (i.e., case endings, mood endings, concord, genetive constructs, etc.) and not to vocabulary (words or expressions drawing on colloquial language).

As for Ibn Ṭulūn (d. 953/1546), it is clear that he allowed himself to employ some nonstandard usages of Arabic in his chronicle *Mufākahat al-khillān fī ḥawādith al-zamān*.³¹ Richard Hartmann concluded that "vulgar forms" are not uncommon in the autograph manuscript of a fragment of *Mufākahat al-khillān* and mentioned that, because of that, Ibn Ṭulūn was criticized by his contemporaries. Except for orthography- or numeral-related usages, Hartmann mentioned that the absence of the accusative *alif* is very common and added that many of the usages described by Zetterstéen in the introduction to his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlükensultane* are occasionally also found in *Mufākahat al-khillān*.³² It would seem, however, that Ibn Ṭulūn incorporated,

27 See appendix A group C (exception: footnote 200); and see chapter 1 footnote 12.

28 See appendix A group B nos. 1, 3.

29 See chapter 1 at footnotes 48, 54.

30 For examples of story-like reports with dialogues (some containing usages of nonstandard Arabic), see Ibn al-Ṣayrafī, *Inbā'* 34 (especially at footnote 3), 130, 141–2, 146, 154–5. Note that normally, the editor of *Inbā' al-ḥaṣr* gives standardized versions in the body of the text and mentions the original nonstandard wording only in footnotes.

31 See appendix A group B no. 4.

32 Hartmann, *Tübinger* 103–4 (esp. 103 footnote 2).

in his chronicle, nonstandard usages of Arabic in a less conspicuous manner than the aforementioned Ḥanafī historians. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, who edited the autograph manuscript examined by Hartmann, noted that the language of Ibn Ṭūlūn in *Mufākahat al-khillān* is in general standard (*salīm al-ʿibāra bi-ṣifa ʾamma*), but sometimes colloquial expressions (*taʿbīrāt ʾammīyya/muṣṭalahāt Dimashqīyya aṣīla*) infiltrate his text.³³ Indeed, in Muṣṭafā's edition of *Mufākahat al-khillān*, nonstandard usages related to morphology or morphosyntax in the narrative line are not as numerous as in the chronicles of Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī.³⁴ On the other hand, in comparison with the chronicles of Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī, expressions that seem to draw on colloquial vocabulary are more common in the narrative line.³⁵ Indeed, except for Hartmann,

33 Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā ii, 20; and see also İbīsh, *Taʾrīkh* 73.

34 This is not to say that they are rare: 1) For the absence of the accusative *alif*, see, for example, Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā i, 6 (see the editor's note in line 5). On the phenomenon in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 44 (no. 74); on the phenomenon in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Haarmann, *Kanz* 37; Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 20. 2) For active participles of *tertiæ yāʾ* verbs appearing with a final *yāʾ* in indefinite forms of the nominative/genitive, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā i, 7 (editor's note in line 21). On this phenomenon in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 41 (no. 57); in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Brinner, *Chronicle*, xxiv. 3) For the *-n* of the sound masculine plural ending preserved in the construct, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā i, 13 (editor's note in line 9), 31 (editor's note in line 8). On the phenomenon in Middle Arabic see Blau, *Handbook* 42 (no. 61); in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 21. 4) Imperfect forms in all moods may terminate with and without the ending *n*, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā i, 29 (editor's note in line 12), 31 (line 11). On the phenomenon in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 45 (no. 77). Such usages are found (perhaps somewhat more often) also in the narrative line in *Iʿlām al-warā*. For the absence of the accusative *alif*, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʿlām* 111 (line 14—as a *khavar kāna*, the adjectives *khafif*, *thaqīl*, *qarīb*, and *baʿīd* appear without accusative *alif*), 113 (line 6—as a direct object, the noun *māl* appears without accusative *alif*). For sound masculine plurals in the *obliquus* instead of the *casus rectus*, see *ibid.* 108 (line 5—*mukhtalifīna* instead of *mukhtalifūna*). On the phenomenon in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 44 (no. 74); in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 21; Haarmann, *Kanz* 36. On the other hand, one finds nouns in the nominative when in standard Arabic they should have been in the accusative, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʿlām* 109 (line 9—*muntazīrūna* as a circumstantial adverb instead of *muntazīrīna*).

35 See, for example, Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 115, 134 (employs the nonclassical verb *ghawwasha ʿalā* in the meaning of “reprimanded in shouting,” see Dozy, *Takmilat* vii, 441); and see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 159, 223, 375 (the nonclassical verb *ittaqaʿa*, apparently in the meaning of “clashed”); and see *ibid.* 179–80, 267–8 (the nonclassical and colloquial *azʿar* in the meaning of “a brigand,” and see Dozy, *Takmilat* v, 327; ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, *Mawsūʿat* i, 136; for *azʿar*, see also Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʿlām* 118); and see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 373 (the colloquial *khashākhīsh*, sing. *khishkhāsh* for “grave houses,” see ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, *Mawsūʿat* i, 850).

scholars who have made observations regarding the language of Ibn Ṭūlūn seem to have focused on his vocabulary that draws on colloquial language.³⁶ This also seems to have been the emphasis of Ibn Ṭūlūn's contemporaries, who criticized him for incorporating colloquial expressions (*alfāz*) in his writing.³⁷ Be that as it may, Ibn Ṭūlūn seems to be more inclined to employ nonstandard usages in the frame of quoted dialogues or utterances in direct speech that appear in story-like reports or anecdotes in *Mufākahat al-khillān*.³⁸ Such reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech are more common in *Mufākahat al-khillān*³⁹ than in the chronicles written by Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafi (at least in accounts of contemporary events).

As for al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451), in his own reports on contemporary events in his chronicle *Iqd al-jumān fī taʾrīkh ahl al-zamān*, he refrained from using non-standard Arabic.⁴⁰ It may be added that in this part of his chronicle, story-like reports with dialogues are almost totally absent.⁴¹ There is evidence, however,

36 The remarks made by Muṣṭafā were mentioned above. Similar remarks were made by Muḥammad Aḥmad Dahmān in his introduction to *Iʾlām al-warā* regarding Ibn Ṭūlūn's language in general. Dahmān mentions that colloquial words or words that draw on colloquial language (*kalimāt ʿammīyya aw qarība min al-ʿammīyya*) sometimes infiltrate into his texts, see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʾlām* 16; and see also Fück, *Arabīyya* 571 ("influenced by the local dialect, especially in vocabulary"). On the "peculiar language" in *Mufākahat al-khillān*, see Tritton, Review 54–5.

37 Ḥish, *Taʾrīkh* 78 (*salaka fī mā awradahu ʿalā ṭarīqat al-ʿawāmm wa-alfāzihim*).

38 See, for example, Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 15–16 (15 line 2: absence of a conjunction, *khudh-hā* instead of *fā-khudh-hā*; 15 lines 4–5: *ēsh* and "broken" syntax that are typical of colloquial language; 15 line 21: absence of interrogative, which is typical of colloquial language. For absence of interrogative see also *ibid.* 330 line 23); and see *ibid.* 24 (lines 4–5: *ēsh* and a derivative of the verb *rāḥa* in the meaning of "went [at any hour of the day]," which is typical of colloquial language, see Haarmann, *Kanz* 37); and see Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 87 (line 19: *fī ayna* in the meaning of "where?" which is not typical of standard Arabic and perhaps reflects the colloquial *fēn*; line 20: absence of interrogative); *ibid.* 145 (line 5: *innā kunnā dhahabnā*—repetition of pronouns typical of colloquial language; line 6: the colloquial *azʿar* in the meaning of "a brigand"; line 7: asyndetic subordinate object clause and/or imperfect plural masculine form in the indicative without the ending *n*—*arādū yajraḥūnī* instead of *arādū an yajraḥūnī*); *ibid.* 162 (line 22: imperfect masculine plural form in the indicative without the ending *n*—*yuqātilūnā* instead of *yuqātilūnanā*); *ibid.* 232 (lines 22–3: shortening of a long vowel in an unstressed syllable—*jawāri al-nāʾib*, "the governor's slave girls," instead of *jawāri al-nāʾib*, and see chapter 1 footnote 39).

39 For examples, see also Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr 31, 50, 106, 115, 218, 242–3, 288, 292, 376–7, 392, 394, 406, 411.

40 See appendix A group B no. 2 (footnote 189).

41 In the historical narrative of the years 824–7/1421–4, I came across two short dialogues; see al-ʿAynī, *Iqd*, ed. al-Qarmūṭ 152, 177.

that when describing past events, al-ʿAynī may have allowed himself to preserve some nonstandard usages employed by his quoted sources. Little observed that al-ʿAynī transformed al-Yūsufī's colloquial usages into standard Arabic.⁴² However, at least in a few cases, he preserved some of al-Yūsufī's nonstandard usages, mainly in the frame of quoted dialogues in story-like reports.⁴³ More importantly, al-ʿAynī was accused by the Shāfiʿī religious scholar Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449) of quoting Ibn Duqmāq without correcting his linguistic mistakes, and this was perhaps not merely propaganda, because there is evidence that al-ʿAynī actually preserved in the narrative line of *ʿIqd al-jumān* some nonstandard usages of Ibn Duqmāq's *Nuzhat al-anām*.⁴⁴ Only further research will be able to determine if Ibn Ḥajar's accusations are correct and to what degree al-ʿAynī was willing to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic, and if such usages were the result of lack of attention. At this point, however, it seems reasonable to assume that at least in accounts of past events, al-ʿAynī did not totally refrain from employing nonstandard usages of Arabic.

4 Historians Who Were Religious Scholars: Shāfiʿīs

As for historians who were Shāfiʿī religious scholars (group E in appendix A), the trend is quite different.⁴⁵ Almost all Shāfiʿī historians seem to have been trying consciously and systematically to refrain from nonstandard usages of Arabic. As far as I know, no modern scholar has observed that the Shāfiʿī historians surveyed in appendix A employed nonstandard usages of Arabic, at least not in any significant manner (one exception will be mentioned below). Of course, every effort has its limits and sometimes, due to lack of attention, such nonstandard usages slipped into their writing.⁴⁶ How important it was

42 Little, *Recovery* 44; *Analysis* 260.

43 See appendix A group B no. 2 (footnote 188).

44 See appendix A group B no. 2 (footnote 189).

45 It should be emphasized that the discussion here does not concern historians who were officially affiliated with the Shāfiʿī school of law but specialized as *udabāʾ-kuttāb*. I discuss this group (group D in appendix A) in section 6.1 below.

46 For some minor deviations from standard Arabic (mainly related to orthography) in al-Maqrizī's (d. 845/1442) draft notebooks, probably due to lack of attention and the speed of writing that are typical of drafts and notebooks, see Bauden, *Maqriziana* VIII 21–36; and see also, *Maqriziana* II 84–6; and see appendix B (no. 2 at footnote 225) for an example of a deviation (lack of standardization of a quoted source) in al-Dhahabī's (d. 748/1348) *Taʾrīkh al-Islām*; and see also appendix C (footnote 247) for an example of a deviation (lack of standardization of a quoted source) in Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbā's (d. 851/1448) chronicle.

for Shāfiʿī historians to keep their language as clean as possible from non-standard usages of Arabic, and how much effort they put into achieving this goal, becomes clear when comparing Shāfiʿī historians' quotations of earlier sources with the original texts. It soon becomes clear that Shāfiʿī historians consistently standardized nonstandard usages of Arabic that were employed by the historians they quote, whether related to the military institution, to the Ḥanbalī or Ḥanafī schools of law, or to the *kuttāb-udabā'* tradition (see especially appendixes B and C).⁴⁷ The importance that Shāfiʿīs ascribed to standard Arabic becomes clear also when realizing that accusations regarding improper usages of Arabic were always headed by Shāfiʿīs against historians of military, Ḥanbalī, or Ḥanafī background, and never the other way around.⁴⁸ Of course, accusations may be mere propaganda. However, even if only propaganda, it shows that the Shāfiʿīs aimed at constructing their image as guardians of the Arabic language. As far as we can tell at this point, however, the historians accused by the Shāfiʿīs of employing nonstandard usages of Arabic, in fact, really did so (the case of al-ʿAynī should be further examined). Moreover, it seems that Shāfiʿīs were making great efforts to keep their own theoretical standard also in practice.

At times it is possible to see how Shāfiʿī historians standardize nonstandard usages in sources used by them, whereas Ibn Taghribirdī, (a Ḥanafī) related to the military institution, preserves some of these usages (see table 2.1 below). The first example in table 2.1 is straightforward. It exemplifies how the Shāfiʿī

47 The Shāfiʿī al-Dhahabī standardizes al-Jazarī related to Ḥanbalī circles (see appendix A group E no. 1; for a detailed comparison and discussion, see appendix B). The Shāfiʿī Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) standardizes al-Birzālī related to Ḥanbalī circles (see appendix A group E no. 2; and see appendix A group C footnote 200). The Shāfiʿī al-Maqrīzī standardizes the military man al-Yūsufī and the Ḥanafī Ibn al-Furāt (see appendix A group E no. 3; and see chapter 1 table 1.2 and footnote 48). The Shāfiʿīs Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba/al-ʿAjlūnī standardize the military man al-Shujāʿī (see appendix A group E no. 4 and footnote 212; for a detailed comparison, see appendix C). The Shāfiʿī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī standardizes the *adīb* al-Ṣafadī [d. 764/1363] (see appendix A group E no. 5; and see appendix A group D no. 2 footnote 203; and see table 2.1 below).

48 The Shāfiʿī al-Dhahabī accuses al-Jazarī related to Ḥanbalī circles (see appendix A group E no. 1; and see appendix A group C no. 2). The Shāfiʿī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī criticizes al-Yūsufī and (the Ḥanafī) Ibn Duqmāq related to the military institution and the Ḥanafī al-ʿAynī (appendix A group E no. 5; appendix A group A [soldiers] no. 4; appendix A group A [mamlūks' descendants] no. 2; appendix A group B no. 2). The Shāfiʿī al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) criticizes (the Ḥanafīs) Ibn Duqmāq and Ibn Taghribirdī related to the military institution and the Ḥanafīs Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafi (see appendix A group E no. 7; appendix A group A [mamlūks' descendants] nos. 2, 3; appendix A group B nos. 1, 3). The Shāfiʿī Mūsā b. Yūsuf al-Ayyūbī al-Anṣārī (d. 1000/1592) criticizes the Ḥanafī Ibn Ṭūlūn (see appendix A group B no. 4).

TABLE 2.1 Trends of standardization

1. Ibn Ḥajar—al-Ṣafadī versus Ibn Taghrībirdī—al-Ṣafadī^aal-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi*al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān al-ʿaṣr*

يَقُولُ: رُوحٌ إِلَى الْأَمِيرِ بُوْسٌ يَدُهُ

يَقُولُ لَهُ: رُوحٌ إِلَى الْأَمِيرِ وَبُوْسٌ يَدُهُ

Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-kāmina*

يَقُولُ: رُوحٌ إِلَى الْأَمِيرِ بُوْسٌ يَدُهُ

يَقُولُ لَهُ: رُوحٌ إِلَى الْأَمِيرِ وَبُوْسٌ يَدُهُ

2. al-Maqrīzī—(Ibn al-Furāt?)—Ibn Duqmāq; versus Ibn Taghrībirdī—Ibn Duqmāq; and versus Abū Ḥamid al-Maḡdisī—Ibn Duqmāq

Ibn Duqmāq, *al-Nafḥa al-miskiyya*^b

فَقَالَ: أَنَا أَرْوُحُ بِشَرَطٍ أَنْ تَكُونَ سَائِرَ مَمَالِكِي وَقُفَاشِي وَكُلَّ مَالِي مَعِي

Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* / *al-Nujūm al-zāhira*^c

فَقَالَ: أَنَا أَرْوُحُ بِشَرَطٍ أَنْ يَكُونَ كُلُّ مَا أَمْلِكُهُ وَجَمِيعَ مَمَالِكِي مَعِي

Abū Ḥamid al-Maḡdisī, *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām*^d

فَقَالَ: أَرْوُحُ بِشَرَطٍ أَنْ يَكُونَ مَمَالِكِي وَسَائِرَ مَا أَمْلِكُهُ مَعِي

al-Maqrīzī, *al-Sulūk/al-Khiṭaṭ*فَقَالَ: لَا أَتَوَجَّهُ لِذَلِكَ إِلَّا وَمَعِيَ جَمِيعَ مَمَالِكِي وَقُفَاشِي وَكُلَّ مَا أَمْلِكُهُ^eفَقَالَ: لَا أَتَوَجَّهُ لِذَلِكَ إِلَّا وَمَعِيَ مَمَالِكِي كُلُّهُمْ وَقُفَاشِي وَجَمِيعَ أَمْوَالِي^f

a For references, see appendix A group D no. 2 (footnote 203).

b Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 212.c Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* xi, 60; *Manhal* iii, 42.d Al-Maḡdisī, *Duwal* 75.e Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk* iii, 213.f Al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ* iv, 257–8.

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī standardizes al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), whereas Ibn Taghrībirdī preserves al-Ṣafadī's nonstandard usages (for details, see appendix A, group D, no. 2, footnote 203).

The second example in table 2.1 is somewhat speculative; however, there is no doubt that the origin of the material is Duqmāqian. Considering what

we know about the sources of Ibn Taghribirdī and al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) for events of the last quarter of the 8th/14th century (the utterance in direct speech in the table is taken from a report on an event that took place in 775/1373), it is relatively safe to assume that Ibn Taghribirdī took the materials from *Nuzhat al-anām*⁴⁹ and that al-Maqrīzī's text is of Duqmāqian origin (*Nuzhat al-anām*); however, he probably took it from Ibn al-Furāt.⁵⁰ In Ibn Duqmāq's text we find the expression "*anā arūhu*" (I will go), which employs the verb *rāḥa* and repeats the pronoun, which are typical of colloquial language. Apparently, there is also a lack of concord between the subject *sā'ir mamālīkī* and the verb *takūna*.⁵¹ Ibn Taghribirdī preserves "*anā arūhu*" but bypasses the lack of gender concord by paraphrasing the sentence. Al-Maqrīzī on the other hand gets rid of all the nonstandard usages in Ibn Duqmāq's text.⁵² The Shāfi'ī historian and religious scholar Abū Ḥamid al-Maqdisī (d. 888/1483) undoubtedly took the text directly from Ibn Duqmāq's *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya*.⁵³ Al-Maqdisī drops the repetition of the pronoun and bypasses the lack of gender concord; however, he preserves the verb *rāḥa*. Al-Maqdisī's language is in fact an exception to the general trend

49 See Massoud, *Chronicles* 62.

50 See chapter 1 footnotes 47–53.

51 On lack of gender concord in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 46 (no. 82).

52 It has been generally noted (without giving examples) that in the *Khīṭaṭ* al-Maqrīzī employed nonstandard usages of Arabic, see Rizq Salīm, *al-Adab* 21. However, here we see that in the *Khīṭaṭ* al-Maqrīzī standardizes materials of apparently Duqmāqian origin. There is also evidence that al-Maqrīzī standardized in the *Khīṭaṭ* materials from al-Yūsufī: compare the report on *qanāṭir al-sibā'* in al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ* iii, 260–1 with al-Yūsufī, *Nuzhat* 264–5. Trends of standardization in the *Khīṭaṭ*, however, should be further examined.

53 Compare Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 212 (lines 1–7) with al-Maqdisī, *Duwal* 75 (lines 5–11). Al-Maqdisī standardizes most of the nonstandard usages in *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya* (see footnotes 1–2 in Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 212, where the editor mentions what the standard form should have been, and compare with al-Maqdisī's text). However, he preserves some of the nonstandard usages. Haarmann thought that in the account of events of the Mamluk period in *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām*, al-Maqdisī relied heavily on al-Maqrīzī, who was his teacher (and on Ibn Taghribirdī); see Haarmann's introduction in al-Maqdisī, *Duwal* 45–53. Moreover, according to Haarmann, al-Maqdisī allowed himself to transform the language of al-Maqrīzī into colloquial language—"al-Maqrīzī's correct Arabic is elegantly transformed into colloquial Arabic"; see Haarmann, al-Maqrīzī 158. I cannot elaborate on it in the scope of this paper, however, most of the accounts of events of the Turkish period of the Mamluk Sultanate in *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām* are in fact word-for-word quotations of *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya*, which makes up the backbone of extensive parts of *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām*. Al-Maqdisī standardizes many of the nonstandard usages in *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya* but keeps many other nonstandard usages. He is by no means turning al-Maqrīzī's standard Arabic into colloquial language.

of standardization exhibited by historians who were Shāfiʿī religious scholars.⁵⁴ As Haarmann has argued, however, al-Maḡdisī was far from being a typical religious scholar and historian. After being ridiculed by his colleagues who did not consider him intelligent enough, he wrote a treatise, praising the Mamluk rulers and criticizing his fellow *ʿulamāʾ*. His case is perhaps more a matter for the psychologist than the linguist.⁵⁵

4.1 *Some Notes on Language Use in Drafts and Diaries/Journals, and on the Level of Religious Education of the Historians*

Before concluding that the trend of standardization was specifically typical of Shāfiʿīs, three factors should be taken into consideration: the status of the manuscripts upon which the linguistic observations are based, the genre of the treatises, and the level of the authors. One would expect more usages of nonstandard Arabic in drafts or unedited diary-like records written on a daily basis without much revision.⁵⁶ Among the historians who were Ḥanafī religious scholars, Ibn al-Furāt's chronicle is, in fact, a draft manuscript,⁵⁷ and Ibn Ṭūlūn's *Mufākahat al-khillān* consists mainly of diary entries.⁵⁸ There is no evidence that Ibn Ṭūlūn edited or revised the diary-like material.⁵⁹ However, it has been suggested that the diary material in *Mufākahat al-khillān* starts, in fact, in 921/1515,⁶⁰ and nonstandard usages are found in this work also before that year. As for drafts of Shāfiʿī religious scholars, in the autograph draft notebooks of al-Maḡrīzī, Bauden found only some minor deviations from standard Arabic (mainly related to orthography), probably due to lack of attention and the speed of writing that are typical of drafts and notebooks.⁶¹ In the autograph draft of *Izhār al-ʿaṣr*, the chronicle of al-Biqāʿī (d. 885/1480), which has diary- or journal-like qualities, no conspicuous usages of nonstandard Arabic have been observed.⁶² This seems to be the case also with the autograph draft of

54 See appendix A group E (exception - footnote 219).

55 Haarmann, *Rather* 61–77 (esp. 71–2). It may also be noted that his historical works are only partially subjugated to the annalistic traditional form.

56 On unedited diary records, see Wollina, *Ibn Ṭawq* 343–7 (esp. 345); and see also Conermann and Seidensticker, *Remarks* 121–7.

57 See appendix A group B no. 1.

58 Conermann, *Ibn Ṭūlūn* 131; Hirschler, *Islam* 283.

59 Conermann, *Ibn Ṭūlūn* 131.

60 Ibid. On Ibn Ṭūlūn's revision of materials prior to this date, see the editor's introduction in Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufākahat*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā ii, 16–8.

61 Bauden, *Maḡrizīana* VIII 21–36; and see also, *Maḡrizīana* II 84–6.

62 See appendix A group E no. 6. On the diary-like qualities of *Izhār al-ʿaṣr*, see Guo, *al-Biqāʿī's* 132; *Tales* 119; but see Wollina, *Ibn Ṭawq* 345 (at footnote 48).

Inbā' al-ghumr, the chronicle of Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī dedicated to his lifetime.⁶³ In contrast, a substantial number of nonstandard usages of Arabic may be found in the autograph draft of the chronicle of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba (d. 851/1448). These, however, were in all likelihood parts of word-for-word quotations of selected sources used by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, which he intended to standardize in the fair copy, and they were eventually standardized by his student under his supervision.⁶⁴ Similarly, we find in al-Dhahabī's (d. 748/1348) autograph manuscript of a selection of reports from al-Jazarī's chronicle (*al-Mukhtār min Ta'rīkh Ibn al-Jazarī*) almost word-for-word quotations, which preserve some nonstandard usages of al-Jazarī. These reports were used by al-Dhahabī as raw material, some of which were later incorporated into his historical works, however, not before being standardized (see appendix B, especially at footnotes 226–8). In comparison to the abovementioned drafts of Shāfiʿī historians, in the draft of the chronicle of the Ḥanafī Ibn al-Furāt, the nonstandard usages are far more numerous and seem to reflect the language of Ibn al-Furāt himself and not necessarily the language of the sources he is quoting.

And what about the level of religious scholars? Perhaps the Shāfiʿī religious scholars refrained from employing nonstandard usages of Arabic because they were highly educated, and not specifically because they were Shāfiʿīs?⁶⁵ After all, al-Maqdisī, the only Shāfiʿī religious scholar employing nonstandard usages of Arabic in a conspicuous manner, cannot be considered a high-level religious scholar. Among the Ḥanafī religious scholars, Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī perhaps cannot be considered high-level religious scholars. Notwithstanding this, the fact that the relatively highly educated Ḥanbalī al-Yūnīnī and Ḥanafī Ibn Ṭulūn, and possibly also the highly educated Ḥanafī al-ʿAynī, allowed themselves to employ nonstandard usages of Arabic suggests that specifically Shāfiʿīs

63 On the draft, see the editor's introduction in Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Inbā' i*, 23. Nonstandard usages seem to be rare. Interestingly, in one of the manuscripts of this work in the possession of his student al-Biqāʿī, one such usage was remarked and corrected in the margins, suggesting that the aim of Shāfiʿīs was to avoid such usages as much as possible; see *ibid.* iv, 22 (footnote 4).

64 See appendix A group E no. 4 (footnote 212); and see appendix C. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba is known to have gathered a selection (*muntaqā*) of reports from the chronicles of Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn Duqmāq, some of which were later incorporated in his historical works; see Massoud, *Chronicles* 35, 83.

65 And see the remarks of Thomas Bauer and Thomas Herzog that "highly educated" or "high-brow" *ʿulamāʾ* (they are not referring to historians specifically) avoided colloquial genres in order to not endanger their reputation and saw in the flawless mastering of Arabic grammar a means to differentiate themselves from lesser-educated aspirants; see Bauer, *Misunderstandings* 110; Herzog, *Mamluk* 145.

refrained from nonstandard usages of Arabic as a mechanism of social distinction and as a way to emphasize their “Arabness,” mainly in opposition to foreign Ḥanafī scholars.⁶⁶

4.2 *The Importance of Arabness and the Arabic Language for the Shāfiʿīs*

In Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated to prominent contemporary persons, roughly 30–40% of religious scholars identified as Shāfiʿīs have an Arab tribal *nisba* or (less commonly) a *nisba* that traces their origin to a prominent Arab historical figure.⁶⁷ The percentage is similar in most Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated exclusively to Shāfiʿī scholars. R.K. Jaques has noted that in Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba’s biographical dictionary dedicated to Shāfiʿī scholars (*Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya*), tribal affiliation is mentioned in 31% of the biographical entries.⁶⁸ However, according to my count, in biographical entries of Shāfiʿīs, who died in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, an Arab *nisba* is mentioned in roughly 40% of the biographical entries. In Ibn Kathīr’s (d. 774/1373) *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya*, in biographical entries of Shāfiʿīs who died in the years 651–710/1253–1311, an Arab *nisba* is mentioned in roughly 45% of the entries. In Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī’s (d. 771/1370) *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, in biographical entries of Shāfiʿīs who died in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, an Arab *nisba* is mentioned in roughly 25% of the biographical entries.⁶⁹

66 In this context, see also Levanoni, Who were 74–6; Supplementary 155–6.

67 In al-Ṣafadī’s *A’yān al-ʿaṣr* and in Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī’s *al-Durar al-kāmina* almost 30% of the Shāfiʿīs have a *nisba* indicating an Arab origin. In the first seven volumes of Ibn Taghribirdī’s *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*, almost 40% of the Shāfiʿīs have a *nisba* indicating an Arab origin. It should be made clear that the actual percentage of Shāfiʿīs who had (or at least claimed to have) Arab origin was probably somewhat higher. I have restricted myself to counting *nisbas* in specific sources and did not combine information from all sources, nor did I thoroughly examine the origin of scholars mentioned in biographical dictionaries. Some prominent Shāfiʿī scholars are mentioned in some sources with an Arab *nisba* and in other sources without that *nisba*. It is quite possible that in their cases, it was sufficient to mention only their lineage and “family name,” which were known to have been connected to an Arab origin. For example, members of the Subkī family are sometimes identified as Khazrajīs or Anṣārīs but at other times simply as Subkīs. In his *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī himself identifies his family members simply as Subkīs; however, in the biographical entry of his grandfather, he mentions that he found in his writings that the tribes in the area of al-Subkiyya (*maʾāshir al-Subkiyya*) are Anṣārīs; see al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* x, 91.

68 Jaques, *Authority* 263.

69 Al-Subkī, as mentioned, does not mention a tribal *nisba* in biographical entries of his family members. According to Jaques, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba’s interest in tribal affiliation seems to be untypical for Shāfiʿī *Ṭabaqāt* texts and is more typical of history works; see *ibid.* 263–

In contrast, only roughly 10–15 % of religious scholars identified as Ḥanafis in Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated to prominent contemporary persons have an Arab *nisba*.⁷⁰ On the other hand, in these dictionaries about 30–40 % of the Ḥanafis have a non-Arab ethnic *nisba*, or geographical *nisba*, suggesting an origin in Iran and its contiguous areas, Transoxiana, the Indian subcontinent, Central Asia, and Anatolia.⁷¹ Only roughly 15 % of religious scholars identified as Ḥanbalis in Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated to prominent contemporary persons have an Arab *nisba*,⁷² although only approximately 7 % of them have a non-Arab ethnic *nisba* or geographical *nisba*, suggesting an origin in the aforementioned areas.⁷³ Thus, it would seem that

4. Among the Mamluk Shāfiʿī *Ṭabaqāt* works, Jaques mentions the works of al-Subkī and al-Isnawī (d. 772/1370) but does not mention Ibn Kathīr's work. According to Jaques, al-Isnawī mentions tribal affiliation in only 6 % of biographical entries and al-Subkī in less than 10 % of the biographical entries. According to my count, however, al-Subkī mentions Arab *nisba* in roughly 20 % of the biographical entries and, as mentioned, in roughly 25 % of biographical entries of Shāfiʿīs who died in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries. It thus seems that, at least with respect to Mamluk Shāfiʿī *Ṭabaqāt* works, the exception is not Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba but rather al-Isnawī, who does not tend to mention tribal *nisbas* and focuses on geographical *nisbas*.

70 In al-Ṣafadī's *A'yān al-ʿaṣr* about 10 % of the Ḥanafis have a *nisba* indicating an Arab origin; in Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *al-Durar al-kāminā* about 15 %; in the first seven volumes of Ibn Taghribirdī's *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* about 12 %.

71 In al-Ṣafadī's *A'yān al-ʿaṣr* and in Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *al-Durar al-kāminā* about 30 %. In the first seven volumes of Ibn Taghribirdī's *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* about 40 %. In comparison, in these dictionaries only 10–15 % of Shāfiʿīs have a non-Arab ethnic *nisba* or geographical *nisba* suggesting an origin in the aforementioned areas. Moreover, among the Shāfiʿīs with foreign geographical *nisbas*, some scholars are also, at times, identified by an Arab tribal *nisba*, or are known to have been Arab, and/or are known to have been born in the territories of the Mamluk Sultanate. On foreign scholars who migrated to Cairo during the Mamluk period, many of them Ḥanafis, see Petry, *Civilian* 61–77, 154–7.

72 In al-Ṣafadī's *A'yān al-ʿaṣr* and in the first seven volumes of Ibn Taghribirdī's *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* about 15 %. In Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *al-Durar al-kāminā* about 12 %. The percentage is similar in Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated exclusively to Ḥanbalis. In Ibn Rajab's (d. 795/1393) *al-Dhayl ʿalā Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila* tribal affiliation is mentioned in about 15 % of the biographical entries of Ḥanbalis who died in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries. It should be noted that biographical dictionaries dedicated exclusively to Ḥanbalis give much more room for Iraqi scholars that are not mentioned in Mamluk biographical dictionaries dedicated to contemporary prominent persons, which normally focus on Mamluk scholars.

73 In al-Ṣafadī's *A'yān al-ʿaṣr* about 6 %. In Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *al-Durar al-kāminā* about 7 %. In the first seven volumes of Ibn Taghribirdī's *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* about 8 %. Such *nisbas* are mentioned in about 7 % of the biographical entries of Ḥanbalis who died in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries in Ibn Rajab's *al-Dhayl ʿalā Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*.

Shāfi'is emphasized their "Arabness" and considered it an important element of their collective identity.⁷⁴

Shāfi'is took pride in their eponym's Arab descent, and more specifically his Qurashī, and even Hāshimī-Muṭallibī, descent. As has been shown by Ella Landau-Tasseron, starting from the 3rd/9th century, Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi'ī's (d. 204/820) followers emphasized his meritorious descent as part of their efforts to construct his legitimacy and authority as a jurist, whereas his opponents tried to deny this descent in order to defame him.⁷⁵ Importantly, Shāfi'ī religious scholars of the Mamluk period, among them historians, were actively participating in this discourse. In *Manāqib al-Shāfi'ī* literature or biographies dedicated to al-Shāfi'ī during the Mamluk period, Shāfi'ī religious scholars preserve the image of their eponym as a Qurashī and Muṭallibī and "a cousin of the Prophet" (*ibn 'amm Rasūl Allāh*).⁷⁶ His affiliation with the Prophet's clan and his noble descent (*sharaf nasabihi*) is considered as one of his merits (*faḍā'il*).⁷⁷ He is said to have had the intelligence of the Qurashīs (*Qurashī al-'aql*).⁷⁸ He is described as a leading religious scholar from Quraysh (*imām 'ālim min Quraysh/imām Qurashī*), and this descent is used to claim his superiority over other religious scholars.⁷⁹ Thus, it is not surprising that Shāfi'is took pride in Qurashī descent⁸⁰ and even used it to construct their authority. As has been noted by Jaques, in his *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya*, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba was arguing that his meritorious Qurashī descent is an important part of his authority as a jurist.⁸¹

Al-Shāfi'ī, who, according to some traditions, was born in Yemen, is said to have been sent to Mecca by his mother because she wanted him to be like his family and was afraid that living in Yemen would blur the quality of his descent (*ilḥaq bi-ahlīka fa-takūna mithlahum fa-innī akhāfu an yughlaba 'alā*

74 Among the Ḥanafis, the non-Arab element was strong. The fact that Ḥanbalis normally do not have a non-Arab *nisba* but are still represented by Arab *nisbas* much less than Shāfi'is suggests that using an Arab *nisba* was not necessarily a matter of social background but a matter of ideology. However, one should consider also a regional factor: Most Mamluk Shāfi'ī religious scholars in biographical dictionaries are Egyptians whereas most Mamluk Ḥanbalis are Syrian.

75 Landau-Tasseron, Cyclical 100–2; and see also Ali, *Imam* 68.

76 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 60–1; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 18–9 (his mother is said to have been of the Azd tribe, which is the "source" of all Arabs [*jurthūmat al-'Arab*]); and see also Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 104 (*shaqīq Rasūl Allāh fī nasabihi wa-sharikuhu fī ḥasabihi*).

77 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 126; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 29, 102.

78 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 148; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 83, 95.

79 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 138; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 39; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 64–5.

80 See for example Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī, *Masālik* 156.

81 Jaques, *Authority* 258–66.

nasabika).⁸² Al-Shāfiʿī is said to have stayed with Arab (Bedouin) tribes from childhood and to have learned their poetry and language for 20 years. According to several traditions, al-Shāfiʿī stayed with the tribe of Hudhayl, considered to be the most eloquent among the Arab tribes (*afṣaḥ al-ʿArab*).⁸³ His descent from the Prophet's clan (*bayt al-nubuwwa*) and his upbringing among the Arab tribes explains why he was the most knowledgeable in the Arab science of physiognomy (*firāsa*), poetry (*shiʿr*), the battles of the Arabs (*ayyām al-ʿArab*), and the genealogy of the Arabs (*ansāb*).⁸⁴ During the Mamluk period, the focus that Shāfiʿīs put on Arab genealogy is also illustrated by the dominant role they played (at least in Egypt) in the production of treatises on the genealogy of Arab tribes. Probably the most conspicuous examples are *Nihāyat al-arab fī maʿrifat qabāʾil al-ʿArab* and *Qalāʾid al-jumān fī l-taʾrīf bi-qabāʾil ʿArab al-zamān*, written by Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Qalqashandī (d. 821/1418),⁸⁵ and *al-Bayān wa-l-irāb ʿamman fī Arḍ Miṣr min qabāʾil al-Aʿrāb*, written by al-Maqrīzī.⁸⁶ Interestingly, in the introduction, al-Maqrīzī dedicates the treatise to his Arab kinsmen (*abnāʾ jinsī*).⁸⁷

82 Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* i, 19.

83 Ibid., *Manāqib* 72–3; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 21; and see also Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 122.

84 Ibn Hajar, *Manāqib* 97 (he knew the genealogy of men and women), 104, 105 (experts of poetry came to consult him); Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* i, 52–3; *Manāqib* 203–4, 208, and see also 169; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 52–3, 60, 70, 73, 81–2; Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 119–20. On poetry written by al-Shāfiʿī, see for example Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 49–51.

85 See Bauden, Like 200–3; Brockelmann, *History* 142–3.

86 See al-Maqrīzī, *Rasāʾil* 123–54. Note that al-Maqrīzī authored a general history of humanity that dedicated an important place to the genealogy of the Prophet and the Arabs (*Kitāb al-Khabar ʿan al-bashar fī ansāb al-ʿArab wa-nasab sayyid al-bashar*). In this treatise, al-Maqrīzī puts emphasis on the importance of the Arabs (and their language), extolls their superiority, and in fact, suggests that the Arabs (and Quraysh in particular) are the only ones entitled to power in Islam; see Ghersetti, *Language* 145–6. To these may be added *Nihāyat al-arab fī maʿrifat ansāb al-ʿArab*, the work of the Shāfiʿī Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Qalqashandī (d. 876/1471), the son of Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Qalqashandī, which is an imitation (in fact, an appropriation) of his father's work; see Bauden, Like 200–3, 214; Brockelmann, *History* 143; and *Qabāʾil al-Khazraj* and *Qabāʾil al-Aws* attributed to the Shāfiʿī ʿAbd al-Muʾmin b. Khalaf al-Dumyāṭī (d. 705/1306); see al-Ṣafadī, *Aʿyān* iii, 180; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Manhal* vii, 372; al-Zarkalī, *Aʿlām* iv, 169–70; al-Bābānī, *Hadīyyat* i, 631. According to al-Bābānī, the Shāfiʿī Egyptian scholar Badr al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ayyūb (d. 866/1461), known as *al-sharīf al-nassāba*, composed a treatise on the genealogy of Arab tribes entitled *al-Jawhar al-maknūn fī l-qabāʾil wa-l-buṭūn*; see ibid. i, 286. This, however, seems to be a mistake stemming from the fact that a treatise by that name was written by Muḥammad b. Asʿad al-Jawwānī (d. 588/1192), also known as *al-sharīf al-nassāba*; see al-Maqrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ* iv, 351–2.

87 Al-Maqrīzī, *Rasāʾil* 125.

Most important to the discussion at hand, the Shāfiʿī tradition puts emphasis on al-Shāfiʿī's superior competence in the Arabic language. Before surveying the Shāfiʿī tradition, it should be mentioned that in his *Risāla*, al-Shāfiʿī himself was arguing that "God had sent down His Quran in Arabic, the mother-tongue of His Prophet" and "granted Muḥammad—alone among humans—a comprehensive and perfect command of the language."⁸⁸ Arabic is perceived as a "sacral" and superior linguistic medium.⁸⁹ Part of the genius of the Arabic language is that it is frequently ambiguous.⁹⁰ This ambiguity "ensures a role for interpreters steeped in Arabic" and accounts for al-Shāfiʿī's insistence on "the centrality of linguistic expertise for interpretation," his concern for nuances of the Arabic language, and his deep interest in words and language.⁹¹ Possibly, al-Shāfiʿī even claimed that Arabs are superior to non-Arabs when he offered a theory of "divinely sanctioned ethno-linguistic superiority" and asserted that "[t]he people most entitled to superiority in regard to language are those whose language is the language of the Prophet,"⁹² implying that "all Muslims have an unconditional obligation to learn Arabic at the level of a native speaker" and that "non-Arabic speakers were not directly addressed by the Quran." Such assertions were rejected by Ḥanafī (non-Arab) jurists.⁹³

Manāqib al-Shāfiʿī and Shāfiʿī biographical literature written during the Mamluk period give a prominent place to al-Shāfiʿī's competence in the Arabic language (*al-mahāra fī lughat al-ʿArab*), which is linked to his noble descent and him being a relative of the Prophet (*sharaf al-nasab/nasīb Rasūl Allāh/qarā-batihi min Rasūl Allāh*).⁹⁴ Al-Shāfiʿī is said to have been of Arab character and to have spoken an Arabic mother tongue (*ʿArabī al-nafs ʿArabī al-lisān*).⁹⁵ Al-Shāfiʿī is said to have been acknowledged as the most eloquent person (*faṣīḥ/aṣḥaḥ/aṣḥaḥ lisān*) by his contemporaries.⁹⁶ He is also said to have been the most knowledgeable in the Arabic language (*lisān al-ʿArab*).⁹⁷ The level of his Arabic was so high that when he wrote his books, he had to lower it

88 Burton, *Abū Ubaid* 21.

89 Lowry, Preliminary 509 (footnote 7); and see also Ali, *Imam* 67.

90 Burton, *Abū Ubaid* 22.

91 Ali, *Imam* 67–8; and see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 52–3.

92 Ali, *Imam* 67–8.

93 Lowry, Preliminary 517.

94 Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Manāqib* 29, 101; Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 165; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 20; and see Ali, *Imam* 68.

95 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 207; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 53; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Manāqib* 96.

96 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 143, 146, 205, 207; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 22, 37, 52–3; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Manāqib* 78–9, 86, 90, 97, 101; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 32, 72–3.

97 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 70, and see also 66.

down so that the people would understand him.⁹⁸ His contemporaries, among them experts of the Arabic language, agreed that he was a master (*ḥaylasūf*) of language (*lughā*) and an authority in linguistic matters (*kalām al-Shāfiʿī fī l-lughā ḥujja/mimman tu'khadhu 'anhu al-lughā/imām fī l-lughā/ḥujja fī l-naḥw*).⁹⁹ Experts in the Arabic language (*ahl al-ʿArabiyya*) came to consult him in matters related to the Arabic language.¹⁰⁰ Experts of the Arabic language who spent a long time with him are said to have reported that he never spoke ungrammatical Arabic (*laḥna*).¹⁰¹ It is said that when someone read to al-Shāfiʿī and made a mistake in Arabic (*laḥana*), al-Shāfiʿī became troubled.¹⁰² Al-Shāfiʿī is reported to have said that the people became ignorant only because they moved away from the language of the Arabs (*kalām al-ʿArab/lisān al-ʿArab*).¹⁰³ And one last anecdote: It is reported that al-Shāfiʿī related that when he was still a young boy, he saw the Prophet in a dream. The Prophet asked him who he was, and al-Shāfiʿī replied that he was a member of the Prophet's family (*min raḥṭika*). The Prophet asked al-Shāfiʿī to approach him and then took his saliva and rubbed it over al-Shāfiʿī's tongue, mouth, and lips and told him that he may leave and that now he was blessed. Since that day, al-Shāfiʿī never made another mistake in Arabic (*fa-mā adhkuru annī laḥantu*).¹⁰⁴ It has been noted by Jaques that the Shāfiʿī *Manāqib* literature constructed a hagiographic vision of al-Shāfiʿī that mimics the story of Muḥammad's life.¹⁰⁵ This anecdote is perhaps a reminder of the opening and purification of Muḥammad's heart and his initiation into Prophethood. The changing of bodily fluids suggests, in fact, that the two became one. After his speech organs were rubbed by the Prophet's saliva, al-Shāfiʿī acquired the Prophet's perfect command of the Arabic language.¹⁰⁶ Given this Shāfiʿī mythos and ethos, and given the fact that Shāfiʿī

98 Ibid. 51; Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 119.

99 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 154, 207; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 40; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 85, 96, and see also 102–3; Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 119, 131; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 32, 51, 60, 81.

100 Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 105; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 60.

101 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 206; *Ṭabaqāt* i, 53; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 96; Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib* 116; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 32, 73.

102 Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 208; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 115.

103 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 51–2.

104 Ibid. 60.

105 For example, al-Shāfiʿī is described as member of the tribe of Quraysh and the Prophet's clan, and his father is said to have died when he was young, see Jaques, *Other* 159; and see also Ali, *Imam* 110–1.

106 In another anecdote (if I understand it correctly), it is said that whoever meets al-Shāfiʿī will think that the Quran was sent down in his (i.e., al-Shāfiʿī's) language, see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 71–2.

historians were actively participating in its preservation, it is hardly surprising that Shāfiʿī historians would refrain as much as possible from nonstandard usages of Arabic.¹⁰⁷

Manāqib, or biographical literature, of other schools of law do not put emphasis on their eponyms' competence in Arabic (at least not in the manner or intensity of the Shāfiʿī tradition). The Shāfiʿī tradition polemicizes with other schools when it has their eponyms acknowledge al-Shāfiʿī's authority and eloquence in the Arabic language.¹⁰⁸ A special place, however, is reserved for the non-Arab Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767) and his followers. The Shāfiʿī tradition claims that al-Shāfiʿī was an expert in Arabic because he was an Arab (*tawaḥḥada al-Shāfiʿī bi-l-lughā li-annahu min ahlihā*), whereas Abū Ḥanīfa could not be blamed for any mistakes he made in Arabic because he was not an Arab (*kāna khārijan min al-lughā*).¹⁰⁹ It is reported that when someone claimed that the followers of Abū Ḥanīfa were eloquent, al-Shāfiʿī started reciting poetry verses, boasting of his eloquence and degrading his opponents.¹¹⁰ In Ḥanafī *Manāqib* (or biographical) literature written during the Mamluk period, one senses a defensive or apologetic tone. Al-Kardārī (d. 827/1424), for example, rejects the Shāfiʿī claim that because al-Shāfiʿī was a Qurashī from the Prophet's family and because he was more knowledgeable in the Arabic language he had greater authority as a scholar. Al-Kardārī mentioned that even the Qurashīs benefited from the knowledge of non-Arabs (*mawālī*).¹¹¹ Some tried to claim that Abū Ḥanīfa was of Arab origin; however, even Ḥanafīs did not accept this view.¹¹² Normally, the Ḥanafī tradition maintained that Abū Ḥanīfa was a descendant of a freed slave; however, some claimed that he was of non-Arab free origin, and others have ascribed to him a noble Persian descent.¹¹³ Most importantly, the Ḥanafī tradition claims that the accusations that Abū Ḥanīfa did not master the grammar of the Arabic language were not correct.¹¹⁴ Still, in chapters enumer-

107 It may be mentioned here that Mamluk Shāfiʿī religious scholars, among them historians, were dominant in the field of *taṣḥīf* (misreading). All treatises on this subject written during the Mamluk period that were surveyed by Konrad Hirschler were written by Shāfiʿīs, see Hirschler, *Written* 92.

108 On Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), see for example Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 154, 207; Ibn Ḥajar, *Manāqib* 85–6; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 66; on Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795), see for example Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib* 207–8. Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), who died in the same year al-Shāfiʿī was born, could not have met him.

109 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Manāqib* 81.

110 Ibid. 49–50.

111 Al-Kardārī, *Manāqib* 56.

112 Al-Dimashqī, *ʿUqūd* 56–7.

113 See Ibid. 53–7; Ibn Abī l-Wafā' al-Qurashī, *al-Jawāhir* i, 49–53.

114 Al-Dimashqī, *ʿUqūd* 167.

ating his merits in general (*jumal min makārim akhlāqihī*), knowledge of the Arabic language is not mentioned. On the other hand, knowledge of Persian is mentioned.¹¹⁵ Therefore, it is not surprising that non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars who were historians, and more specifically Ḥanafīs, felt less restricted by the norms of standard Arabic.

5 Language and Style in Mamluk Chronicles

At this point, it is possible to make two more general remarks regarding language and style in Mamluk chronicles. Ḥasan Ḥabashī (followed by Carl Petry) has posited a so-called “Cairo narrative style,” which may be characterized as “a blending of colloquial and formal language unique to the second half of the 9th/15th century” and represented by Ibn Iyās.¹¹⁶ According to Ḥabashī and Petry, the first representative of this style was Ibn al-Ṣayrafī.¹¹⁷ As noted by Haarmann, however, the term “Cairo narrative style,” as specifically characteristic of the second half of the 9th/15th century, is not appropriate, because “many sources of earlier times employ this amalgamation of the vernacular and *fushḥā*.”¹¹⁸ Guo mentioned Ibn al-Dawādārī as “just another example of this phenomenon”¹¹⁹ and noted that it is typical of Egyptian historians related to the military institution in general.¹²⁰ Guo concluded that “the enterprise of Ibn Iyās ... may better be placed within this long list of non-Arab Mamluk intelligentsia” whose linguistic and ethnic background must have had some influence on their language and style.¹²¹ As our survey has shown, not only is “the blending of colloquial and formal language” not specifically characteristic of the second part of the 9th/15th century, it is also not specifically characteristic of Egyptian historians, or even historians related to the military institution. We have seen that usages of nonstandard Arabic are typical of Egyptian historians related to the military institution (Baybars al-Manṣūrī being the exception), and of non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars in general (al-Birzālī and al-ʿAynī possibly being the

115 Ibid. 275.

116 Guo, *Mamluk* 41; and see also, Introduction 96 (footnote 60).

117 Ibn al-Ṣayrafī, *Inbāʾ* 17–21 (esp. 20); Petry, *Protectors* 6.

118 Haarmann, Review of *Twilight* 637 (footnote 2).

119 Guo, *Mamluk* 41.

120 Ibid. 43.

121 Ibid. And see Guo's remarks concerning the debate about the existence of a so-called “Egyptian School,” and his emphasis on differences in background and life experience and on the complex background of Egyptian historians in contrast to the more homogenous background of their Syrian counterparts, *ibid.* 29–30, 37–41.

exceptions),¹²² but untypical of Shāfiʿī religious scholars in general (al-Maqdisī being the exception).¹²³ Therefore, language by itself cannot be a differentiating criterion of an “Egyptian style,”¹²⁴ not even of a “military-related Egyptian style.”¹²⁵

Adding to usages of nonstandard Arabic the criterion of the incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues and direct speech in accounts of contemporary events in the historical narrative (*hawādith*) in chronicles perhaps may allow us a more nuanced differentiation between groups of historians. As already noted, the combination of nonstandard usages of Arabic and story-like reports with dialogues is typical of Egyptian historians related to the military institution.¹²⁶ In general, it is untypical of Shāfiʿī religious scholars, and not only because they refrained from employing nonstandard Arabic. Al-Maqrīzī’s *Sulūk* has proven to be “dry” of story-like reports with dialogues containing direct speech in accounts of his own time.¹²⁷ It would seem that *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* and *Wajīz al-kalām*, the chronicles of the Egyptian Shāfiʿī historians Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī and al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), are also “dry” of story-like reports with dialogues containing direct speech in accounts of contemporary events.¹²⁸ Apparently, this holds true also regarding chronicles of Syrian Shāfiʿī historians. The last parts of al-Dhahabī’s chronicle *Duwal al-Islam* contain no story-like reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech. However, it should be remembered that it is only a summary of important events in the history of

122 Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī are Egyptian. Al-Yūnīnī, al-Jazarī, and Ibn Tūlūn are Syrian.

123 Al-Maqrīzī, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, al-Biqāʿī, and al-Sakhāwī are Egyptian. Al-Dhahabī, Ibn Kathīr, and Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba are Syrian.

124 Therefore, it is not advised to consider Ibn al-Furāt as an “earlier exponent” of the “so-called ‘Cairo narrative style’” only based on his usages of the Arabic language, see Bora, *Mamluk* 121–2 (footnote 7).

125 And see Nelly Hanna’s remarks regarding usages of nonstandard Arabic in chronicles written in Ottoman Egypt by “civilians,” see Hanna, *Chronicles* 248–9. See also footnote 153 below.

126 See section 2 above; and see chapter 1 section 1 footnotes 1–5; and see chapter 1 table 1.1.

127 For a detailed discussion, see chapter 1 section 2 at footnotes 59–61.

128 This element seems to be almost totally absent from *Wajīz al-kalām*. I have checked the years 881–4/1476–80 and did not find even one story-like report with dialogues, see al-Sakhāwī, *Wajīz* 871–903. In *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* it seems to be relatively rare. I have checked the years 839–41/1435–8 in *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* and located two cases of what may be considered as a dialogue, which are actually cases of a combination of utterances in direct speech (one of them, in fact, is a combination of two consecutive utterances of the same person in the course of a legal discussion with not much “story” around); see Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbāʾ* iv, 44, 49–50. In a few other cases there are short utterances in direct speech (sometimes they consist of only two words). Normally, there is not much “story” around them, see *ibid.* iv, 13, 48, 70.

Muslim dynasties.¹²⁹ Al-Dhahabī's *Ta'rikh al-Islām* is less relevant for the discussion because it ends in the year 700/1300–1 and normally contains material taken from earlier sources. Still, it may be mentioned that in the historical narrative of the last ten years in *Ta'rikh al-Islām* (691–700/1291–1301), one finds only two short dialogues and a few short utterances in direct speech.¹³⁰ Importantly, however, it can be demonstrated that al-Dhahabī transferred long story-like reports with dialogues or many utterances in direct speech taken from the historical narrative (*ḥawādith*) of al-Jazarī's chronicle to the section of obituaries in *Ta'rikh al-Islām*.¹³¹ This suggests that al-Dhahabī found the section of obituaries a more appropriate place for the incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues or many utterances in direct speech. As for Ibn Kathīr, in the account of events of the years 750–67/1349–66 in his *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, I came across seven relatively long story-like reports with dialogues,¹³² and five other utterances in direct speech.¹³³ The number in itself is not that high, but not insignificant. However, most of the dialogues and utterances in direct speech do not appear in reports that are an integral part of the description of events but rather in disconnected stories that appear as digressions to the narrative line and are normally labeled as “strange” or extraordinary stories (*amr gharīb/u'jūba/nādira min al-gharā'ib*).¹³⁴ For example, three out of the seven dialogues appear in “strange” stories: one is taking place in a “strange” dream (*manām gharīb*) that Ibn Kathīr dreamed,¹³⁵ one is about a woman who suddenly grew a penis, which was questioned by Ibn Kathīr,¹³⁶ and another is about a Shi'ī who cursed the oppressors of 'Alī and was questioned by Ibn Kathīr.¹³⁷ Another dialogue appears in a story about the *khalīf* al-Ma'mūn (r. 198–218/813–33), integrated by Ibn Kathīr into the narrative, clearly as a digres-

129 The last 15 years of the chronicle (730–44/1329–44) have been checked and not even a single story-like report containing utterances in direct speech was found; see al-Dhahabī, *Duwal* ii, 273–92.

130 Al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh* lii, 12, 28, 51, 61, 72, 75, 79–80, 101.

131 See, for example, a story-like report on the murder of sultan al-Ashraf Khalīl that appears in the historical narrative in al-Jazarī's chronicle (al-Jazarī, *Ta'rikh* i, 191–3) that was transferred by al-Dhahabī to the obituary of al-Ashraf Khalīl (al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh* lii, 181–3). See also the story-like report on the fall of Ibn al-Sal'ūs in the historical narrative in al-Jazarī's chronicle (al-Jazarī, *Ta'rikh* i, 193–4) that was transferred by al-Dhahabī to his obituary (al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh* lii, 200).

132 Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xiv, 285, 287, 297, 319, 332, 355, 359.

133 Ibid. xiv, 269, 275, 324, 336, 354.

134 Ibid. xiv, 285, 287, 332, 336; and see also xiv, 269.

135 Ibid. xiv, 332.

136 Ibid. xiv, 285.

137 Ibid. xiv, 287.

sion.¹³⁸ Therefore, while the penchant of Ibn Kathīr for “strange” stories cannot be denied,¹³⁹ formalistically, the incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues as an integral part of the accounts of contemporary events in his chronicle (and not as marginal “strange” stories) is relatively rare. The Egyptian al-Biqāʿī, on the other hand, is a true exception to the trend exhibited by Shāfiʿīs in general regarding the incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues in the historical narrative of contemporary events. In general, reading through al-Biqāʿī’s chronicle one feels that he is being told story after story. It is relatively easy to find in his chronicle story-like reports with dialogues, some of them long, or utterances in direct speech, incorporated as an integral part in the account of contemporary events.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, Guo has noted that his chronicle is a “deviation, in many ways, from mainstream historiography”¹⁴¹ and labeled it as a remarkable and “somewhat odd” work that has an “extraordinarily intimate nature.”¹⁴² The narrative combines traditional narration, Quranic exegesis, and dream interpretation.¹⁴³ Al-Biqāʿī’s reports are not terse and matter-of-fact, and he puts emphasis on people’s stories.¹⁴⁴ His chronicle is full of anecdotes and dramatized “juicy stories” with gossip and sex scandals and bears a general mark of sensationalism.¹⁴⁵ Perhaps it is noteworthy that he had some kind of military career; thus, his background was also somewhat odd.¹⁴⁶

As for historians who were non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars, while it seems that, in general, they incorporated less story-like reports with dialogues in accounts of contemporary events in comparison to historians related to the military institution, they generally incorporated such elements more than their Shāfiʿī peers (however, never forget al-Biqāʿī!). The incorporation of these elements is common enough in the chronicles of the Ḥanbalīs al-Yūnīnī and al-Jazarī¹⁴⁷

138 Ibid. xiv, 319.

139 Indeed, his chronicle has been labeled “popular” history by Guo; see Guo, *History* 451.

140 I have checked in detail the year 863/1458–9. For story-like reports with dialogues, see al-Biqāʿī, *Taʾrīkh* iii, 17, 67, 72, 93. For utterances in direct speech, see *ibid.* iii, 6, 12, 14, 21, 53, 59, 68, 79, 92. For story-like reports with no dialogues or utterances in direct speech, see for example *ibid.* 70, 78. For story-like reports labeled as “strange” or extraordinary stories that contain utterances in direct speech, see, for example, *ibid.* iii, 86. For a report on a dream containing a dialogue, see *ibid.* 61.

141 Guo, al-Biqāʿī’s 121.

142 *Ibid.*, *Tales* 102.

143 *Ibid.*

144 Guo, al-Biqāʿī’s 127.

145 *Ibid.* 131, 140. On “bizarre stories,” miracles or wondrous stories, or dream-related stories, see Guo, *Tales* 110–2.

146 *Ibid.*, al-Biqāʿī’s 122.

147 See chapter 1 footnotes 8–9; and see also chapter 1 at footnote 1.

and the Ḥanafī Ibn Ṭūlūn.¹⁴⁸ While it is less common in the chronicle of Ibn al-Ṣayrafī,¹⁴⁹ and even less in the chronicle of Ibn al-Furāt,¹⁵⁰ the two apparently incorporated more such elements than most of their Shāfiʿī peers. For example, the chronicle of Ibn al-Furāt contains more such elements than the *Sulūk*, the chronicle of the Shāfiʿī al-Maqrīzī.¹⁵¹ The two exceptions to this general trend exhibited by non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars are the Ḥanbalī al-Birzālī and the Ḥanafī al-ʿAynī, in whose chronicles story-like reports with dialogues or utterances in direct speech are almost totally absent in the account of contemporary events.¹⁵²

To conclude the first remark, at least with respect to the two formalistic aspects that we have singled out here (i.e., usages of standard versus nonstandard Arabic and incorporation of story-like reports with dialogues and direct speech in accounts of contemporary events in the historical narrative in chronicles), the primary differentiation is not necessarily between Egyptian and Syrian writers but rather between historians related to the military institution (all Egyptian), Shāfiʿī religious scholars, and non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars.¹⁵³ Non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars seem to take a middle ground between historians related to the military institution and historians who were Shāfiʿī religious scholars. Still, just to remind us that things are not that simple, a secondary differentiation based on an Egyptian-Syrian dichotomy is perhaps useful. In general, Syrian Shāfiʿī religious scholars (most notably Ibn Kathīr) perhaps incorporated more story-like reports with dialogues than their Egyptian Shāfiʿī counterparts, and Syrian non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars (al-Yūnīnī, al-Jazarī, and Ibn Ṭūlūn) definitely incorporated more story-like reports with dialogues than their Egyptian counterparts (Ibn al-Furāt, al-ʿAynī, and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī). In addition, one may note that at least during the Circassian period, in general, it seems that Syrian non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars (Ibn Ṭūlūn) were more inclined than their Egyptian counterparts (Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī) to incorporate

148 See above at footnotes 38–9.

149 See above at footnote 30.

150 See above at footnote 29.

151 See chapter 1 footnotes 54–9; and see at footnote 127 above.

152 See chapter 1 footnote 12; and see above at footnotes 27, 41.

153 It has been noted that in chronicles written during the 17th and 18th centuries in Ottoman Egypt, employment of nonstandard Arabic, direct speech, and story-telling style was not restricted to authors of a military background (so-called “military chronicles”) but was prevalent also in the works of artisans and traders (“civilian chronicles”); see Hanna, *Chronicles* 248–9. At least during the Mamluk period, such elements were employed also by (non-Shāfiʿī) religious scholars, however, in general, apparently less than in chronicles written by authors related to the military institution.

vocabulary (words or expressions) drawing on colloquial usages. On the other hand, in general, Egyptian non-Shāfiʿī religious scholars (Ibn al-Furāt and Ibn al-Ṣayrafi) employed in the more formal narrative line some typical nonstandard usages of Arabic (mainly related to morphology or morphosyntax) more extensively than their Syrian counterparts (Ibn Ṭūlūn).¹⁵⁴

6 The Representation of *Mamlūks* by Mamluk Historians: A Reevaluation

The second remark has to do with Nasser Rabbat's theory regarding the representation of *mamlūks* by Mamluk historians. Our survey casts doubts on Rabbat's observation that numerous conversations between *mamlūks* are reported in colloquial Arabic as part of a deliberate negative (mis)representation of the *mamlūks* as uncouth and uncultured, and not only as a way to give the accounts an appearance of authenticity and immediacy, and make the accounts more entertaining and "popular" in order to attract a wider audience.¹⁵⁵ After all, the historians related to the military institution and Ḥanafī religious scholars who were closest to the Mamluk regime employ nonstandard Arabic in dialogues (and not necessarily in ones involving *mamlūks*),¹⁵⁶ whereas the Shāfiʿī religious scholars, who were the fiercest critics of the Mamluk regime, use standard Arabic when representing the *mamlūks*' speech in dialogues. This is not to say that representing a *mamlūk* as speaking colloquial Arabic could not have been used to construct a negative image in specific cases¹⁵⁷ but only to argue that Rabbat's observation cannot be generalized. Rabbat gave, as a specific example for the representation of *mamlūks* as speaking colloquial Arabic, a conversation between the amirs Bashtāk al-Nāṣiri (d. 742/1341) and Qawṣūn al-Nāṣiri (d. 742/1342) found in al-Ṣafadī's *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*.¹⁵⁸ It may be mentioned here that these two amirs were Mongols, and there is ample evidence that dur-

¹⁵⁴ See above at footnotes 30–7.

¹⁵⁵ Rabbat, Representing 70–5.

¹⁵⁶ It would suffice it here to mention that, as Guo noted, in al-Yūnīnī's *Dhayl Mūrāt al-zamān* even the Prophet Muḥammad occasionally utters colloquial words, see Guo, Introduction 95. According to Rabbat, whereas *mamlūks* are represented as speaking colloquial Arabic, the Arab amir Muḥannā is represented as speaking grammatically correct Arabic; see Rabbat, Representing 74. However, in the reference given by Rabbat to prove his assertion, it is possible to find several nonstandard usages of Arabic in Muḥannā's speech; see al-Yūsufi, *Nuzhat* 199–207.

¹⁵⁷ See Rabbat, Representing 74 (footnote 46).

¹⁵⁸ Ibid. 72–4.

ing the Turkish period, in contrast to Qipchaqs, Mongols tended not to know Arabic, which contributed to negative attitudes toward them.¹⁵⁹ More important to the discussion at hand, however, are issues of genre and professional background.

6.1 *Language and Style in the Historical Works of Uḍabā'-Kuttāb and Language Use in Biographical Dictionaries*

While al-Ṣafadī was a *mamlūk's* descendant, what seems to be a more important factor is his background as an *adīb* and *kātib*. Naturally, *udabā'-kuttāb* were strongly related to the *adab* tradition. Thus, it would not be surprising to find that historians of such a background were more easily willing to incorporate *adab* elements in their historical writing. Those of them who produced works pertaining to history that are practically *adab* works incorporated in these works in a very conspicuous manner nonstandard usages of Arabic and story-like reports or anecdotes with dialogues and direct speech.¹⁶⁰ In the chronological-historical section of the (*adab*) encyclopedia *Nihāyat al-arab*, which is much more related to "traditional" Mamluk chronicles, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333) incorporated in the account of contemporary events relatively many story-like reports (some very long) with dialogues and direct speech,¹⁶¹ although, at least officially, he was affiliated with the Shāfi'ī school. Still, it seems that al-Nuwayrī refrained as much as possible from employing nonstandard usages of Arabic (see appendix A group D no. 1), and it may be demonstrated that he systematically standardized nonstandard usages employed in his quoted sources (see appendix B). Biographical dictionaries written by *udabā'-kuttāb*, such as al-Ṣafadī's *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* and A'yān al-ʿaṣr and al-Kutubī's (d. 764/1363) *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, are full of anecdotes or story-like reports containing dialogues with direct speech. Moreover, in the

159 Yosef, Cross-boundary 170–3.

160 Among these works one may mention Ibn Ṣaṣrā's (d. after 799/1397) *al-Durra al-muḍī'a* (see Brinner, *Chronicle*, xix–xxv; and see also Blau, *State* 192; Irwin, *Mamluk history* 165; and see chapter 1 footnote 14 [(1)]); and al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī's (d. after 775/1373) *Kitāb al-Ilmām* (see the editor's introduction in al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī, *Ilmām* iii, 3; and see chapter 1 footnote 14 [(1)]); and al-ʿAbbāsī al-Ṣafadī's (d. ca. 717/1317) *Nuzhat al-mālik wa-l-mamlūk* (see the editor's introduction in al-ʿAbbāsī, *Nuzhat* 8–14; on al-ʿAbbāsī al-Ṣafadī's background and on the work's anecdotal nature, see also Krenkow and Little, al-Ṣafadī 759). On the different categories of works pertaining to history written by *udabā'-kuttāb*, see in general chapter 1 footnote 14. On royal biographies written in impeccable Arabic by "court historians" working in the chancery (*dīwān al-inshā'*) and on typical stylistic elements in these works, see chapter 1 footnote 14 (3).

161 See, for example, al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxiii, 4, 9–15, 33–5, 38, 48, 140, 150–1.

frame of the anecdotes or story-like reports that appear in the biographical dictionaries written by al-Kutubī and al-Ṣafadī, one finds many usages of non-standard Arabic, mostly in dialogues but also outside of dialogues, although the two were officially affiliated to the Shāfiʿī school.¹⁶² This is in contrast to Shāfiʿī religious scholars, who produced biographical dictionaries but refrained from nonstandard usages of Arabic also in this genre.¹⁶³ However, it is in line with the usages of Ibn Taghrībirdī, the most notable representative of historians related to the military institution, who produced a biographical dictionary.¹⁶⁴

According to Rabbat, “[t]he puzzling question is why did al-Ṣafadī use ... street vernacular in reporting a conversation between two amirs when his standard conversation language was a more classicizing one?”¹⁶⁵ Rabbat, however, is underestimating the amount of nonstandard usages of Arabic in al-Ṣafadī’s biographical dictionaries. In the realm of biography, the kingdom of anecdotes and stories, al-Ṣafadī the *adīb* employed nonstandard usages of Arabic much more than Rabbat would allow.¹⁶⁶ He did not only employ it when representing the speech of *mamlūks*, and even not exclusively in dialogues, but still only in the frame of anecdotes or story-like reports.¹⁶⁷

Appendix A: Usages of Nonstandard Arabic by Mamluk Historians and Standardization Thereof

A. Historians related to the **military institution** (including *mamlūks*’ descendants) employing nonstandard usages of Arabic in a notable degree in their historical writing

¹⁶² See appendix A group D nos. 2–3.

¹⁶³ See for example appendix A group D no. 2 (footnote 203); table 2.1 above; and see chapter 1 footnotes 117, 175–6, and 313.

¹⁶⁴ See appendix A group A (*mamlūks*’ descendants no. 3, footnote 178); appendix A group D no. 2 (footnote 203); and see table 2.1 above.

¹⁶⁵ Rabbat, Representing 74.

¹⁶⁶ On style and “literarization” in Mamluk biographical dictionaries, see chapter 1 sections 3 and 4.

¹⁶⁷ See appendix A group D no. 2 (footnote 203). While al-Ṣafadī (and other highly educated *udabāʾ*) perhaps had a compunction about quoting purely colloquial genres such as colloquial poetry (see Bauer, Communication 110; Ökzan, Drug 214), he certainly did not mind incorporating in story-like reports some nonstandard usages that draw on colloquial language.

Mamlūks and Soldiers

1. Qaraṭāy (d. after 708/1308)¹⁶⁸
2. Baktāsh al-Fākhirī (d. 745/1344)¹⁶⁹
3. al-Shujā'ī (d. after 756/1356)¹⁷⁰
4. al-Yūsufī (d. 759/1358)¹⁷¹ [note that al-Ṣafadī (followed by the Shāfi'ī Ibn Ḥajar) mentioned that he used colloquial Arabic]¹⁷²

Mamlūks' Descendants (Ignoring al-Ṣafadī Who Belongs More to the adab Tradition)

1. Ibn al-Dawādārī (d. after 736/1335)¹⁷³—based on an autograph¹⁷⁴
2. Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407)¹⁷⁵ [Ḥanafī—criticized by the Shāfi'ī Ibn Ḥajar (followed by the Shāfi'ī al-Sakhāwī) for using colloquial Arabic];¹⁷⁶ based on (an edition of) an autograph¹⁷⁷
3. Ibn Taghribirdī (d. 874/1470)¹⁷⁸ [Ḥanafī—criticized by the Shāfi'ī al-Sakhāwī for his less than perfect Arabic (*lahnuhu al-wāḍiḥ*)]¹⁷⁹

-
- 168 See the editor's introduction in Qaraṭāy al-'Izzī al-Khaznadārī, *Ta'rikh* 11–2; but see Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 179; Irwin, Mamluk history 164–5.
- 169 See the linguistic introduction in Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 1–33; al-Fākhirī, *Tā'rikh* 42; and see also Brinner, *Chronicle*, xx; Blau, *State* 192; Fück, *ʿArabīyya* 571.
- 170 Schäfer, *Beiträge* 110–5; *Chronik* 9–14. See also chapter 1 table 1.1 (footnote c); appendix A group E (no. 4, footnotes 211–2); and most importantly see appendix C.
- 171 Little, *Recovery* 48; *Historiography* 426; and see the editor's introduction in al-Yūsufī, *Nuzhat* 55.
- 172 Little, *Recovery* 48.
- 173 See the introductions in Haarmann, *Kanz* 29–38; Roemer, *Kanz* 21–4; and see also Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 176–7, 180; Irwin, Mamluk history 165; Little, *Historiography* 425, 440; Guo, *Introduction* 94.
- 174 Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 176.
- 175 See the editor's introduction in Ibn Duqmāq, *Nuzhat* 17–8; and see also Haarmann, Joseph's 81; Bauer, *Review* 260–2. For examples of usages of nonstandard Arabic in *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya* (indicated by the editor in footnotes), see Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 90 (footnote 9), 91 (footnotes 2, 10), 94 (footnotes 3, 5, 7, 9), 102 (footnote 5), 103 (footnotes 3–4), 144 (footnotes 1–2, 5, 7, 10), 155 (footnote 8), 156 (footnotes 2–7), 161 (footnotes 1, 2, 4, 6–9, 13, 16), 212 (footnotes 1–2), 218 (footnotes 7–8, 10), 219 (footnote 1), 223 (footnotes 1–2), 224 (footnotes 3, 6, 8, 11–2, 15–6); and see also chapter 1 footnote no. 3; and see table 2.1 above.
- 176 Massoud, *Chronicles* 28–9; Bauer, *Search* 153; *Review* 260–2; *Literarische* 105; Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 9–10.
- 177 An autograph of *Nuzhat al-anām* (Bauer, *Review* 260; Ibn Duqmāq, *Nuzhat* 15), and probably an autograph of *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya* (Ibn Duqmāq, *Nafḥa* 19).
- 178 See the introduction in al-Biqā'ī, *Tā'rikh* i, 47; and see Muhannā, *Ādāb* 9; Little, *Historiography* 440. For examples of usages of nonstandard Arabic in *al-Nujūm al-zāhira*, which normally appear in dialogues or utterances in direct speech in the course of story-like reports or anecdotes (not including references to usages of *esh* as interrogative, which

4. 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ b. Khalil b. Shāhīn al-Ẓāhirī al-Malaṭī (d. 920/1514)¹⁸⁰ [Ḥanafi]; based on (an edition of) an autograph (draft?)¹⁸¹

appear in many dialogues and seem to function as a marker of discourse in the spoken language), see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xii, 88 (as *jawāb al-amr*, the verb *tastariḥu* appears in the indicative instead of the jussive, or alternatively *tastariḥ* with a long vowel in the final closed syllable; see on that Blau, *Handbook* 30 [no. 6]; Lentin, *Levant* 186; Brinner, *Chronicle*, xxiv; Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 28; Haarmann, *Kanz* 36); and see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xiii, 83 ("anā mā qultu laka anā a'rifu Shaykh?"; Did not I told you I know Shaykh?: asyndetic object clause and repetition of pronouns, which is typical of colloquial language; see Blau, *Handbook* 52–3 [no. 128]; Haarmann, *Kanz* 36); and see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xiii, 140; xv, 413 (verbs in the indicative in plural masculine form end without *n* [*yatawajjahū* and not *yatawajjahūna*; *yaḥḍurū* and not *yaḥḍurūna*], and see Blau, *Handbook* 45 [no. 77]); and see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xiv, 193; xv, 46, 237 (colloquial *biyif'al*, *bitut'ib*, *biyirkab*—usages of the *b*-imperfect; see on that Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 28; Haarmann, *Kanz* 38; Brinner, *Chronicle*, xx [footnote 44]; Vrolijk, *Bringing* 155–6; Lentin, *Levant* 187–91); and see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xv, 56 (line 11: *lā* in the meaning of "lest" instead of the standard *li-allā*; such a *lā* is attested in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Dictionary* 619; and in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Haarmann, *Kanz* 37); and see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Nujūm* xv, 531 ("ya'tī wāḥid min hā'ulā'i al-jahala yamsiku kitāb fi l-fiqh," one of these ignorants comes [and] takes a book of law: omission of the conjunction and absence of the accusative *alif* in the object *kitāb*; on the absence of the accusative *alif* in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 44 [no. 74]; on the omission of conjunctions in Mamluk historiographical texts, see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 32; Haarmann, *Kanz* 37). And see also chapter 1 footnote 4. It is noteworthy that in *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*, Ibn Taghribirdī preserves some of the nonstandard usages in reports he is quoting from al-Ṣafādī; see appendix A group D, no. 2, footnote 203 below; and see table 2.1 above. Apparently, he also keeps nonstandard usages from Ibn Duqmāq's *Nuḥḥat al-anām*; see table 2.1 above. For another example of a usage of nonstandard Arabic in a dialogue in *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*, see Ibn Taghribirdī, *Manhal* iii, 380 (absence of accusative *alif*: "*lā takun ṣabi*").

- 179 Al-Sakhāwī, *Ḍaw'x*, 307; and see also Haarmann, *Arabic* 113; and see Rabbat, *Representing* 70 (footnote 32).

- 180 As far as I know, the language in al-Malaṭī's historical works did not receive attention; however, the editor's footnotes in the edition of *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim* often refer to nonstandard usages of Arabic. For conspicuous examples of usages of nonstandard Arabic in *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim*, many times found in personal reports or story-like reports containing dialogues and direct speech, see al-Malaṭī, *Rawḍ* i, 168 (footnote 3), 169 (footnote 3), 181 (footnote 2), 199 (footnotes 4–5), 230 (footnote 6), 288 (footnote 2), 319 (footnote 2), 323 (footnote 3), 347 (footnote 4), 382 (footnote 2); ii, 69 (footnotes 3–4), 71 (footnotes 4–5), 87 (footnotes 2–3), 104 (footnotes 1, 4, 6, 8), 114 (footnote 9), 119 (footnote 1), 147 (footnote 2), 153 (footnote 3), 177 (footnote 1), 183 (footnote 2), 186 (footnote 3), 187 (footnotes 1, 5), 223 (footnotes 1–2), 229 (footnote 5), 230 (footnotes 1, 4–5, 7), 233 (footnote 1), 234 (footnotes 1–2), 238 (footnote 5), 239 (footnote 2), 262 (footnote 1), 264 (footnote 2), 265 (footnote 3), 267 (footnote 2), 268 (footnote 3), 276 (footnotes 3, 5), 287 (footnote 10), 292 (footnotes 7–8), 293 (footnotes 1–6, 8), 294 (footnotes 1, 3), 295 (footnotes 1–2), 300 (footnote 9), 315 (footnotes 5, 8), 324 (footnote 2), 335 (footnote 1), 336 (footnote 2), 341 (footnote 4), 342 (footnotes 3, 4, 6), 343 (footnote 3), 350 (footnotes 3, 5), 368 (footnote 5), 372 (footnotes 2, 6, 7), 375 (footnote 1), 376 (footnotes 1, 4); iii, 30 (footnotes 3, 7), 102 (footnote 6), 117

5. **Ibn Iyās** (d. ca. 930/1524)¹⁸² [**Ḥanafī**]; based on an **autograph**¹⁸³

***Exception: **Baybars al-Manṣūrī al-Dawādār** (d. 725/1325)¹⁸⁴

B. Ḥanafī religious scholars employing nonstandard usages of Arabic in a notable degree in their historical writing

1. **Ibn al-Furāt** (d. 807/1405)¹⁸⁵ [criticized by the **Shāfiʿī** al-Sakhāwī for his colloquial style and lack of knowledge of Arabic grammar];¹⁸⁶ based on (an edition of) an **autograph draft**¹⁸⁷
2. [much less conspicuously] **al-ʿAynī** (d. 855/1451) [while normally transforming al-Yūsufī's colloquial usages into standard Arabic,¹⁸⁸ accused by the **Shāfiʿī** Ibn Ḥajar of quoting Ibn Duqmāq without correcting his linguistic mistakes];¹⁸⁹ partially based on (an edition of) an **autograph**

(footnotes 1–4), 193 (footnote 1), 201 (footnote 1), 207 (footnote 6), 209 (footnote 1), 210 (footnotes 1–2), 211 (footnote 3), 212 (footnote 2), 291 (footnote 5), 292 (footnote 1), 293 (footnotes 1–2), 296 (footnote 2), 336 (footnote 3), 337 (footnote 2), 338 (footnotes 1, 3, 5), 340 (footnotes 4, 6); iv, 44 (footnotes 1–2), 45 (footnote 1), 48 (footnotes 4, 6), 96 (footnotes 2, 4), 97 (footnotes 1–2). And see also footnote 4 above; and see chapter 1 footnote 5.

181 Petry, *Protectors* 7; al-Malaṭī, *Rawḍ* i, 79–83 (esp. 82).

182 Kahle, *Einleitung* 26–8; Guo, *Mamluk* 41–3; and see also Blau, *State* 192; Rizq Salīm, *Adab* 21; ʿĀṭif et al., *Adabīyyāt* 26; Fück, *ʿArabīyya* 571; Havemann, *Chronicle of Ibn Iyās* 89; Muhannā, *Ādāb* 9; Little, *Historiography* 440; Massoud, *Chronicles* 75–6.

183 Kahle, *Einleitung* 3.

184 As a *dawādār* and chief of the chancery, he was related to the *inshāʿ* tradition, which favors ornamented language, poetry, and rhymed prose in impeccable Arabic. On Baybars al-Manṣūrī al-Dawādār, see for example Irwin, *Mamluk history* 163; Little, *Historiography* 423–4.

185 Brinner, *Chronicle*, xx; and see also Bora, *Mamluk* 119. Brinner and Bora make a general assessment of Ibn al-Furāt's language without going into detail (Brinner gives one example for a usage of nonstandard Arabic, and Bora gives no examples). For examples of usages of nonstandard Arabic in Ibn al-Furāt's chronicle, which were standardized by al-Maqrīzī, see chapter 1 footnote 48.

186 Irwin, *Mamluk history* 166; Cahen, *Ibn al-Furāt* 768–9; Bora, *Mamluk* 121–2.

187 Ibid. 124–5.

188 Little, *Recovery* 44; An analysis 260; see, however, al-ʿAynī, *ʿIqd*, ed. Amīn iv, 67 (in a story-like report with dialogues in direct speech quoted from al-Yūsufī and labeled as a “strange” occurrence [*min al-ʿajāʾib*], al-ʿAynī employs the colloquial *jāba* in the meaning of “brought”; on *jāba*, see Guo, *Commerce* 132). In another story-like report quoted from al-Yūsufī, al-ʿAynī employs an asyndetic subordinate clause (“*esh aqdīru aʿmalu*,” what can I do?) and omits a conjunction (“*taqaddam ughīru anā wa-anta*,” step forward and you and I will fight—note also the peculiar usage of the verb *aghāra*); see al-ʿAynī, *ʿIqd*, ed. Amīn iv, 68. For an asyndetic object clause, see also ibid. iv, 125 (“*tataḥūna* [...] *tataḥaddathūna*”).

189 Bauer, *Review* 260. According to ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Taṭṭāwī al-Qarmūt, who edited the years 824–50/1421–47 in *ʿIqd al-jumān* based on an autograph, except for minor and mainly

3. **Ibn al-Şayrafī** (d. 900/1495)¹⁹⁰ [the **Shāfiʿī** al-Sakhāwī hinted in criticism that he used colloquial Arabic];¹⁹¹ partially based on an **autograph**¹⁹²

hamza-related orthographical deviations that became the norm by the Mamluk period, al-ʿAynī refrained from using “vulgar expressions” (*alfāẓ khāshina*); however, due to lack of attention, one may find few such expressions in his autograph; see al-ʿAynī, *ʿIqd*, ed. al-Qarmūṭ 46, 54. Imān ʿUmar Shukrī who edited the years 784–801/1382–98 in *ʿIqd al-jumʿān*, in which al-ʿAynī may have relied on *Nuzhat al-anām* (see Massoud, *Chronicles* 40, 109–10 [note that the relevant parts from *Nuzhat al-anām* are not extant]), mentions that al-ʿAynī constantly uses the verb *akhlaʿa* (*ʿalā*) in the fourth verbal theme in the meaning of “bestowed” instead of the standard *khalaʿa* in the first verbal theme; see al-ʿAynī, *Sultān Barqūq* 136 (footnote 105). Al-ʿAynī also sometimes employs the plural instead of the dual; see *ibid.* 149, 157 (footnote 43). Al-ʿAynī sometimes omits the accusative *alif* in proper nouns; see *ibid.* 162, 167 (footnote 9). Alternatively, he adds accusative *alif* in cases in which in standard Arabic the accusative *alif* would not have been added; see *ibid.* 214, 218 (footnote 8). Al-ʿAynī sometimes employs the ending—*ū* in *abū* where the ending—*ī* should have been used in standard Arabic; see *ibid.* 226, 230 (footnote 24). On usages of the fourth verbal theme instead of the first verbal theme in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 38 (no. 40); on the phenomenon in Mamluk historiographical texts and specifically on *akhlaʿa* instead of *khalaʿa*, see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 2. On plural forms superseding dual forms in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 42 (no. 59). On the absence of the accusative *alif* or its improper addition, and on the prevalence of the ending—*ū* in *abū* in Middle Arabic, see *ibid.* 44 (no. 74). Only further research, especially on earlier years in *ʿIqd al-jumʿān* where reliance on Ibn Duqmāq’s *Nuzhat al-anām* has been established (see Massoud, *Chronicles* 40), will enable us to determine if Ibn Ḥajar’s accusations are correct and to what degree al-ʿAynī was willing to employ non-standard usages of Arabic and if such usages were the result of lack of attention. The relevant parts of *ʿIqd al-jumʿān* and *Nuzhat al-anām* (the extant years are 768–79/1366–78) are still in manuscript form and have not been consulted by the author of this article. Interestingly, however, according to Massoud, who compared the accounts of the year 778/1376–7 in *Nuzhat al-anām* and *ʿIqd al-jumʿān*, “[f]or the year 778 ... *ʿIqd al-jumʿān* ... is but a mere replica of *Nuzhat al-anām*. Sometimes al-ʿAynī takes liberty with the text, as he moves, adds and/or changes generally small narrative elements within given reports. More often than not, however, he simply copies word-for-word, adds or removes words here and there, or introduces very slight changes”; see Massoud, *Chronicles* 40. Moreover, in the two short passages (three and four lines, respectively) from *Nuzhat al-anām*, which Massoud gives word-for-word in order to exemplify al-ʿAynī’s reliance on it, al-ʿAynī’s text preserves a nonstandard usage that appears in *Nuzhat al-anām*: “*fa-sāra ilayhim jamāʿa*” (lack of gender concord, standard: *fa-sārat*) and adds a nonstandard usage (a mistake?) of his own: “*kāna qarīb*” (standard: *kāna qarīban*); see *ibid.* 40, 44–5. On the lack of gender concord in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 46 (no. 82).

190 See the editor’s introductions in Ibn al-Şayrafī, *Nuzhat* i, 6–7; *Inbāʾ* 19–20; and see also Petry, *Scholastic* 334; *Protectors* 6; Massoud, *Chronicles* 134.

191 Massoud, *Chronicles* 134.

192 Ibn al-Şayrafī, *Nuzhat* i, 9–10.

4. **Ibn Ṭūlūn** (d. 953/1546)¹⁹³ [criticized by the **Shāfiʿī** Mūsā b. Yūsuf al-Ayyūbī al-Anṣārī (d. 1000/1592) for incorporating colloquial expressions in his writing];¹⁹⁴ based on an **autograph**¹⁹⁵

C. Ḥanbalī (-milieu) religious scholars employing nonstandard usages of Arabic in a notable degree in their historical writing

1. **al-Yūnīnī** (d. 726/1326)¹⁹⁶
2. **al-Jazarī** (d. 739/1338)¹⁹⁷ [criticized by the **Shāfiʿī** al-Dhahabī for using colloquial Arabic];¹⁹⁸ based on an **autograph**¹⁹⁹

*****Exception?:** [much less conspicuously, if at all] **al-Birzālī** (d. 739/1339)²⁰⁰

193 See Hartmann, *Tübingen* 103–4; and see also Fück, *ʿArabiyya* 571; and see the editor's introduction in Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Iʿlām* 16.

194 See Ībish, *Taʾriḫh* 78; and see also Hartmann, *Tübingen* 103.

195 Ībish, *Taʾriḫh* 70.

196 Guo, Introduction 94–6.

197 Haarmann, *Quellenstudien* 176–7, 180; Guo, Introduction 94–6; Little, *Historiography* 428–9; Lentin, *Levant* 179, 183, 186–7, 189, 197; and see appendix B.

198 Haarmann, *Kanz* 27.

199 Ibid., *Quellenstudien* 176.

200 Guo suggested that it is worthwhile considering that the trend of the “increasing use of colloquial in the historical narrative during the Mamluk period” has actually started in Syria at the hands of al-Jazarī, al-Yūnīnī, and al-Birzālī; see Guo, Introduction 94; however, while usages of nonstandard Arabic by al-Jazarī (Haarmann) and al-Yūnīnī (Guo) has been noted and partially documented (see appendix A group C nos. 1–2), usages of nonstandard Arabic in the chronicle of al-Birzālī have not received much attention. Tadmurī, the editor of al-Birzālī's chronicle, noted that its language is generally clean of deviations from standard Arabic (*ammā lughat al-makḥṭūt fa-hiya salīma ilā ḥadd kabīr*), and he mentions only deviations related to orthography and morphology of numerals that, according to Tadmurī, are typical of historical works during the Mamluk period; see al-Birzālī, *Muqtaḍī* i, 119. While it is clear that the deviations in al-Birzālī's chronicle are much less conspicuous and more minor in comparison to his Syrian Ḥanbalī colleagues, there are some deviations that are not restricted to orthography or related to numerals. This observation is based on a survey of remarks of Tadmurī in footnotes in the third and fourth volumes of *al-Muqtaḍī* regarding al-Birzālī's deviations from standard Arabic (the standard form is given by Tadmurī in the footnotes); see, for example, al-Birzālī, *Muqtaḍī* iii, 213 (footnote 4), 214 (footnote 2); iv, 21 (footnote 3), 30 (footnote 6), 66 (footnotes 1, 3), 85 (footnote 7), 202 (footnote 3), 239 (footnote 5), 247 (footnote 2), 305 (footnote 3), 306 (footnote 7), 322 (footnote 2), 360 (footnote 1), 379 (footnote 1), 436 (footnote 2), 439 (footnote 2), 440 (footnotes 2, 7–8), 455 (footnote 2). While it is possible that the deviations from standard Arabic in al-Birzālī are more conspicuous than the deviations that can be found in chronicles written by Shāfiʿī religious scholars, it may well be argued that in al-Birzālī's case, the relatively minor deviations are also the result of lack of attention. Still, the relatively low

D. Historians related to the *udabāʾ-kuttāb* tradition

It seems that at least those of them who wrote biographical dictionaries did not refrain from employing nonstandard Arabic, notably within anecdotes or story-like reports combining dialogues with direct speech.²⁰¹ The ones checked are all officially Shāfiʿīs:

1. al-Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333)²⁰²

number of deviations in al-Birzālī's chronicle may be partially explained by its "dry" nature and almost total absence of *ʿajāib* and story-like reports with dialogues employing direct speech; see chapter 1 footnote 12. In fact, in the rare cases that al-Birzālī mentions strange phenomena or story-like reports, the number of deviations from standard Arabic seems to be higher, and they are not restricted to orthography. For example, in a description of a weird animal that appeared in the Nile, al-Birzālī refers to its ears that look like the ears of a camel in the plural (*wa-ādhānuhā ka-ādhān al-jamal*) instead of the grammatically correct form of the dual (*udhnāhā*). He mentions that it had four fangs and refers to their length in the plural form (*ṭūluhum*) instead of the grammatically correct form of the feminine (*ṭūluhā*). He also mentions that the animal had three stomachs, using the masculine numeral (*thalāth*) instead of the grammatically correct feminine numeral (*thalātha*), see al-Birzālī, *Muqtaḍī* iii, 213–4. On plural forms superseding dual forms in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Handbook* 42 (no. 59). On plurals/nouns not denoting persons referred to as plurals in Middle Arabic, see *ibid.* 45 (no. 80). Interestingly, the Shāfiʿī religious scholar Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), who quotes al-Birzālī's report, standardizes all the abovementioned deviations from standard Arabic; see Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xiv, 26. Another story-like report in the chronicle of al-Birzālī about a strong wind that devastated a settlement of Turks employs direct speech with the nonstandard *ēsh* and the nonstandard plural *ajmāl* instead of the standard *jimāl* for "camels"; see al-Birzālī, *Muqtaḍī* iv, 306. On the plural *afʿāl* in Middle Arabic instead of the standard *fiʿāl*, see Blau, *Handbook* 42 (no. 64); on *ajmāl* in Mamluk texts, see al-Abbāsī, *Nuzhat* 14. The Shāfiʿī Ibn Kathīr condenses the report and omits the direct speech with the nonstandard *ēsh* and employs the standard plural *jimāl*; see Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xiv, 99. This would seem to suggest that although not much inclined to deviate from standard Arabic, al-Birzālī, in contrast to his Shāfiʿī peers, did not object to that in principle. For another story-like report in al-Birzālī with three deviations from standard Arabic, see al-Birzālī, *Muqtaḍī* iv, 353 (footnotes 1–3); and see perhaps also *ibid.* iv, 440 (footnotes 2, 7, 8), 441 (footnotes 1–2).

201 I do not include here authors who produced works pertaining to history that are practically *adab* works, which employ nonstandard Arabic in a conspicuous manner; see at footnote 160 above.

202 Nonstandard usages in *Nihāyat al-arab* are apparently very rare. As mentioned, al-Birzālī uses in a report the nonstandard plural *ajmāl* instead of the standard *jimāl* for "camels." The Shāfiʿī religious scholar Ibn Kathīr, who quotes al-Birzālī, employs the standard plural *jimāl*; see footnote 200 above. In al-Nuwayrī's report, the nonstandard plural *ajmāl* is employed; see al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxii, 219–20. Al-Nuwayrī does not quote his source, but he is known to have relied on al-Jazarī; see Little, *Introduction* 30–2. For another rare example of usages of nonstandard Arabic, see al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxix, 307–8 (in the course of a *ḥikāya* with dialogues and direct speech, quoted from al-Yūnīnī). More commonly we find cases in which al-Nuwayrī consistently standardized nonstandard usages of Arabic in al-Jazarī's reports; see appendix B. It would seem that al-Nuwayrī was much

2. **al-Ṣafadī** (d. 764/1363)²⁰³—based on (an edition of) manuscripts, parts of which are **autograph**²⁰⁴

less inclined (if at all) to incorporate nonstandard usages of Arabic in his writing than the two next representatives of the *udabāʾ-kuttāb*. This, however, should be examined further.

203 Just for example, in the biographical entry of the shaykh ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. ‘Urwa al-Ra’s ‘Aynī (d. 718/1318), after a short life résumé and a general description of about six lines, al-Ṣafadī dedicates the rest of the entry (about two and a half pages) to entertaining stories, which ‘Abd al-Ghanī used to tell (*kāna kathīran mā yaḥki*) about his happenings with members of the elite, that are full of dialogues in direct speech and bear unmistakable marks of colloquial language. In the anecdotes, we find the nonclassical or colloquial verb *darwaza* in the meaning of “begged for money,” the colloquial *walī* in the meaning of “woe unto me!” instead of the standard *wayl li*, and the conjunction *wa-illā* in the meaning of “or,” reflecting the colloquial *wallā* instead of the standard *am*. Except for the customary *ēsh*, we also find *lēsh* (why?) instead of the standard *li-mādhā*. In addition, we find the nonstandard imperative *rūḥ* (go!) instead of the standard *ruḥ* (or rather *idhhab*—while the verb *rāḥa* is found in dictionaries of Classical Arabic, it is much more common in the colloquial language). There is also a verbal temporal clause that appears after the word *ayyām* (“*ayyām ishtarā*,” in the days when he bought); see al-Ṣafadī, *A’yān* iii, 115–8. On the verb *darwaza*, see Taymūr, *Mu’jam* iii, 262; on *walī*, see ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, *Mawsū’at* iii, 2603; on *wallā* in modern Egyptian, see Badawi and Hinds, *Dictionary* 956; on *wallā* used alongside *willā* in a 9th/15th-century Mamluk literary text, see Vrolijk, *Bringing* 155; on *lēsh* in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Dictionary* 644; in a 9th/15th-century literary text, see Vrolijk, *Bringing* 154. On *yawm* opening a verbal temporal clause, see Haarmann, *Kanz* 37. In the biographical entry of the merchant Tawba b. ‘Alī al-Takritī, al-Ṣafadī incorporates an entertaining story with a dialogue in direct speech involving a drugged person (*maṣṭūl*—a “post-classical” word) that employs bad language. In this story it is possible to find the word *wāḥid* used as an indefinite article, the Egyptian colloquial *ablam* in the meaning of “stupid,” and of course the customary *ēsh*, see al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi* x, 439; *A’yān* ii, 140. On *maṣṭūl* and *ablam*, see Taymūr, *Mu’jam* ii, 225; iii, 112; on *wāḥid* as an indefinite article in Middle Arabic, see Blau, *Dictionary* 754; for another example of such a usage of *wāḥid* in *A’yān al-aṣr*, see al-Ṣafadī, *A’yān* ii, 122. In the biographical entry of Baktamur al-Sāqī (d. 733/ 1333) in al-Ṣafadī’s biographical dictionaries there are many anecdotes or story-like reports that employ direct speech and nonstandard language. We find *ēsh* and *lēsh*, the colloquial *bass* (stop), and the nonstandard imperatives *rūḥ* and *būs* (kiss!); see, *Wāfi* x, 195–6; *A’yān* i, 712–4. On *bass* see, Haarmann, *Kanz* 38; and see also Vrolijk, *Bringing* 155. For further examples, see Lentin, *Levant* 189. In his biographical dictionary *al-Durar al-kāmina* dedicated to important people who died in the 8th/14th century, Ibn Ḥajar relies heavily on al-Ṣafadī; see Little, *Introduction* 106–8. It is noteworthy that Ibn Ḥajar gets rid of practically all the nonstandard usages of al-Ṣafadī. Normally he does this by omitting or heavily condensing the anecdotes, turning them into bare statements of fact (on the condensing of reports, see *ibid.* 107). For example, the biographical entry of ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. ‘Urwa al-Ra’s ‘Aynī is reduced in *al-Durar al-kāmina* to four lines of a short life résumé and general description, clearly based on that of al-Ṣafadī. Ibn Ḥajar omits the two and a half pages of anecdotes with dialogues, including direct speech and nonstandard Arabic that appear in al-Ṣafadī; see Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 388. In another biographical entry, al-Ṣafadī gives a story-like report told to him by the subject of the biographical entry (*ḥakā*), which employs the nonstandard imperative *qūl* in direct speech (see al-Ṣafadī, *A’yān* v, 563). Ibn Ḥajar transforms the anecdote into a statement of

3. **al-Kutubī** (d. 764/1363)²⁰⁵

E. **Shāfiʿī religious scholars** that refrained from using nonstandard Arabic (at least in any significant manner)

1. **al-Dhahabī** (d. 748/1348)—standardized al-Jazarī, for example²⁰⁶ [criticized al-Jazarī's non-standard usages];²⁰⁷ based on (an edition of) an **autograph**²⁰⁸

fact in reported speech and totally changes the wording; see Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 416–7. In other cases, Ibn Ḥajar does not include in his dictionary the biographical entry (such is the case with Tawba b. ʿAlī al-Takrītī). In relatively few cases, however, Ibn Ḥajar preserves sentences in direct speech, and in such cases one may find direct standardizing of al-Ṣafadī's text. For example, in the biographical entry of Baktamur al-Sāqī, Ibn Ḥajar omits almost all anecdotes and story-like reports or heavily transforms their wording. Still, one may find a few short sentences in direct speech taken from the anecdotes in al-Ṣafadī. Al-Ṣafadī's text has "*rūḥ ilā al-amīr [wa-]būs yadahu*" (go to the amir [and] kiss his hand); see al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi* x, 195 (no conjunctive); *A'yān* i, 714 (with conjunctive). Ibn Ḥajar standardizes the imperative forms and follows the version with the conjunctive from *A'yān al-ʿaṣr*—"*ruḥ ilā al-amīr wa-bus yadahu*"; see Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 486; and see table 2.1 above. It is also worthwhile to compare the practice of Ibn Ḥajar with that of Ibn Taghrībirdī in *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*, who preserves many more anecdotes from al-Ṣafadī and does not omit all nonstandard usages. For example, in the biographical entry of the abovementioned Tawba b. ʿAlī al-Takrītī, while Ibn Taghrībirdī omits the word *ablām* (perhaps because he wanted to keep a clean language), he preserves the word *maṣṭūl*, the *ēsh*, and the nonstandard usage of *wāḥid* as an indefinite article; see Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Manhal* iv, 180. In the biographical entry of Baktamur al-Sāqī, Ibn Taghrībirdī preserves many of the sentences in direct speech that appear in al-Ṣafadī. The *lēsh* in al-Ṣafadī's report becomes an *ēsh*; however, Ibn Taghrībirdī preserves the colloquial *bass*, and has "*rūḥ ilā al-amīr būs yadahu*" with no conjunctive (i.e., the version from *al-Wāfi*); see *ibid.* iii, 393–6 (esp. 393); and see table 2.1 above. On Ibn Taghrībirdī's reliance in *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi* on al-Ṣafadī, see Little, *Introduction* 108; and see chapter 1 at footnote 133 and chapter 1 appendix A.

204 See the editors' introductions in al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi* i, i–iii; *A'yān* i, 25–6.

205 Just for example, in the biographical entry of the abovementioned Tawba b. ʿAlī al-Takrītī (see footnote 203 above), al-Kutubī uses the vulgar *qawwād* (pimp) instead of *ablām* that appears in al-Ṣafadī and employs the word *maṣṭūl* and the *ēsh*. He also employs in the anecdote the nonstandard form of the imperative *qūl* instead of the standard *qul*. Al-Kutubī also gives in the biographical entry an entertaining anecdote with a dialogue full of sentences in direct speech, which does not appear in al-Ṣafadī. In this anecdote, we find nonstandard imperatives such as *qūl* and *rūḥ*, circumstantial adverbs with no accusative *alif* (*bāki* instead of the standard *bākiyan*), and asyndetic object clauses whose object appears without accusative *alif* ("*ta'rifu ta'kulu aruzz?*"; [do] you know how to eat rice?, instead of the standard "[*hal*] *ta'rifu an ta'kula aruzzan?*"); see al-Kutubī, *Fawāt* i, 261–2. For further examples, see Lentin, *Levant* 184, 189.

206 See appendix B. On al-Dhahabī's reliance on al-Jazarī, see Little, *Introduction* 63.

207 See footnote 198 above.

208 See the editor's introduction in al-Dhahabī, *Ta'rikh* i, 7–8.

2. **Ibn Kathīr** (d. 774/1373)—standardized al-Birzālī, for example²⁰⁹
3. **al-Maqrīzī** (d. 845/1442)—standardized al-Yūsufī and Ibn al-Furāt, for example;²¹⁰ partially based on (editions of) **autographs**
4. **Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba** (d. 851/1448)—standardized al-Shujāʿī, for example;²¹¹ based on an edition of a manuscript copied by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba's student, but probably corrected and approved by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba²¹²
5. **Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī** (d. 852/1449)—standardized al-Ṣafadī, for example²¹³ [criticized al-Yūsufī, Ibn Duqmāq, and al-ʿAynī];²¹⁴ based on (an edition) of a manuscript in the hand of al-Sakhāwī that was corrected by Ibn Ḥajar²¹⁵
6. **al-Biqāʿī** (d. 885/1480)²¹⁶—based on an **autograph draft**²¹⁷
7. **al-Sakhāwī** (d. 902/1497) [criticized Ibn al-Furāt, Ibn Duqmāq, Ibn Taghrī-birdī, and Ibn al-Ṣayrafī]²¹⁸

***Exception: **Abū Ḥamid al-Maqdisī** (d. 888/1483)²¹⁹

209 See footnote 200 above.

210 See chapter 1 table 1.2 and footnote 48; and see also table 2.1 above.

211 See appendix C. On Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba's reliance on al-Shujāʿī, see Schäfer, *Chronik* 3–4.

212 See the editor's introduction in Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Taʾrīkh* ii, 57–61, 69–73. It should be noted that when it is possible to compare the student's copy (al-ʿAjlūnī) with an autograph manuscript of the chronicle covering the years 781–808/1379–1406, it is possible to find many instances in which al-ʿAjlūnī standardized the language of the autograph manuscript. However, such cases are found only in parts of the manuscript that were clearly still a draft. These parts of the autograph draft were written quickly and probably contained word-for-word quotations of sources used by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, including its original nonstandard usages of Arabic. Given the fact that Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba corrected his student's copy and approved it, it is very reasonable to assume that his student actually participated in the process of transforming Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba's draft into a fair copy.

213 See footnote 203 above; and see table 2.1 above.

214 See footnotes 172, 176, 189 above.

215 Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 3.

216 On the language in his autograph draft, see al-Biqāʿī, *Taʾrīkh* i, 47.

217 Guo, al-Biqāʿī's 126; al-Biqāʿī, *Taʾrīkh* i, 45.

218 See footnotes 176, 179, 186, 191 above.

219 On nonstandard usages of Arabic in his *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām al-sharīfa al-bahīyya*, see Haarmann's introduction in al-Maqdisī, *Duwal* 32–3; on nonstandard usages of Arabic in his *Taʾrīkh al-Malik al-Ashraf Qāyṭbāy*, see Tadmuri's introduction in al-Maqdisī, *Taʾrīkh* 10; and see also Haarmann, al-Maqrīzī 156–7.

Appendix B: Standardization of al-Jazarī by al-Nuwayrī and al-Dhahabī (the Story of the Murder of al-Ashraf Khalīl)²²⁰

The text in black is al-Jazarī's *Ḥawādith al-zamān*,²²¹ the text in purple is al-Dhahabī's *al-Mukhtār min Ta'rikh Ibn al-Jazarī*,²²² the text in green is al-Dhahabī's *Ta'rikh al-Islām*,²²³ and the text in red is al-Nuwayrī's *Nihāyat al-arab*.²²⁴ The instances of nonstandard usages of Arabic and its standardization are in orange color and preceded by blue numerals in brackets. The standardization in *Ta'rikh al-Islām* or *Nihāyat al-arab* is sometimes direct (see nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9–11, 13–7); however, at other times the nonstandard usage of al-Jazarī is avoided by its omission (see nos. 1, 12–3, 17), or by paraphrasing the author's text (see nos. 3, 7–8, 14). Because al-Nuwayrī's standardization is sometimes very different from that of al-Dhahabī, it is relatively clear that al-Nuwayrī's text is not dependent on that of al-Dhahabī (see nos. 3, 6–7, 13–4). This is also suggested by cases in which al-Nuwayrī's text reproduces al-Jazarī's wording, whereas al-Dhahabī omits parts of it (see before nos. 12–4, after no. 14, and before no. 15). Note that only the most conspicuous instances of usages of nonstandard Arabic were marked in orange color (and see the editor's footnotes in al-Jazarī's text regarding nonstandard usages of Arabic in this text and its standard form). I have reproduced the orthography of the printed editions, and orthographical deviations from standard Arabic are ignored. In addition, only the relevant parts are vocalized, and the text is not translated. I have only made brief comments in footnotes on the nonstandard usages because the purpose of this appendix is to illustrate a process of standardization and not analyze the linguistic peculiarities of al-Jazarī's text. Note that there is one case in which al-Dhahabī fails to standardize al-Jazarī's text (no. 2). This must be due to lack of attention since it is clear in this text, and in other cases where it is possible to compare between *Ta'rikh al-Islām* and *Ḥawādith al-zamān*, that al-Dhahabī put great efforts in standardizing al-Jazarī's text.²²⁵

220 The historians refer to the report as a "story" (*ḥikāya*), use the verb *ḥakā* in relation to the act of the transmission of the report by the informant, and call the informant *al-ḥākī*; see al-Jazarī, *Ta'rikh* i, 209 (line 7); al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār* 361 (line 12); al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxi, 164 (lines 3, 19–20).

221 Al-Jazarī, *Ta'rikh* i, 209–10.

222 Al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār* 362.

223 Ibid., *Ta'rikh* lii, 183. Al-Dhahabī mentions al-Jazarī as the source of his report, see lii, 182.

224 Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxi, 164. Al-Nuwayrī does not mention the name of al-Jazarī as a source, however, he is known to have relied on al-Jazarī; see Little, *Introduction* 30–2. Note that al-Nuwayrī cuts the end of al-Jazarī's report.

225 Compare, for example, al-Jazarī, *Ta'rikh* i, 192 (line 13)–193 (line 15) (and see the editor's

Al-Mukhtār min Ta'riḥ Ibn al-Jazarī is a selection of reports from al-Jazarī's chronicle collected by al-Dhahabī. It is extant in an autograph manuscript.²²⁶ Such collections were used by the authors as raw material and were not meant to be published. Many times, the reports selected were copied almost word-for-word. Some of the material in the selections was later incorporated into the historical works, however, only after additional revision (at least in the case of some authors). As can be seen, although the process of transforming the wording of al-Jazarī's text and standardizing it is already noticeable in *al-Mukhtār*, it is clear that al-Dhahabī did not aim at totally standardizing al-Jazarī's reports in the initial stage of collecting them. In some cases, the original wording of al-Jazarī is preserved, including nonstandard usages of Arabic (see nos. 2, 3, 7, 13).²²⁷ Such nonstandard usages in *al-Mukhtār* were later standardized in *Ta'riḥ al-Islām* (except for no. 2).²²⁸ In other cases, it is clear that the wording of *al-Mukhtār* is closer to al-Jazarī's original text than *Ta'riḥ al-Islām*; however, nonstandard usages of Arabic are not involved. Such instances are written in bold font (see between nos. 1 and 2, before no. 10, after no. 13, before nos. 14 and 15, and after no. 17).

قال: (1) لَا شَكَّ 229 بعد رحيل الدهليز والعسكر جاء إليه الخبر أن بتروجة
(2) طَيْرٌ كَثِيرٌ 230
قال: (1) (omitted) بعد رحيل الدهليز والعسكر جاء إليه الخبر أن بتروجة
(2) طَيْرٌ كَثِيرٌ

footnotes regarding nonstandard usages of Arabic and its standard form), with al-Dhahabī, *Ta'riḥ* lii, 182 (line 9)–183 (line 9), and with *al-Mukhtār* 361 (line 12)–362 (line 9), and also with al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxi, 166 (all the page). Compare also al-Jazarī, *Ta'riḥ* i, 191 (line 7)–192 (line 12) (and see the editor's footnotes regarding nonstandard usages of Arabic and its standard form), with al-Dhahabī, *Ta'riḥ* lii, 181 (line 11)–182 (line 8), and with *al-Mukhtār* 360 (line 12)–361 (line 11). For comparison of texts that appear only in *Nihāyat al-arab* and *Ḥawādith al-zamān*, see, for example, al-Jazarī, *Ta'riḥ* i, 279–80 (esp. 280 footnote 1), and compare with al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat* xxxi, 186–7 (esp. 187 line 4).

226 See the editor's introduction in al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār* 52–3.

227 And see the editor's remark that *al-Mukhtār* contains nonstandard usages of Arabic (*al-alfāz wa-l-mufradāt al-āmmiyya*), see *ibid.* 53.

228 For other examples of nonstandard usages of Arabic in al-Jazarī's chronicle, which found their way into *al-Mukhtār* but later on were standardized in *Ta'riḥ al-Islām*, see al-Jazarī, *Ta'riḥ* i, 44 (line 16: "*lā takūn sabab halāk al-Muslimīna*")—a long vowel in a final closed syllable), and compare with al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār* 339 (lines 1–2: "*lā takūn sabab halāk al-Muslimīna*") and *Ta'riḥ* ii, 45 (lines 15–6: "*lā takūn sabab halāk al-Muslimīna*"). See also al-Jazarī, *Ta'riḥ* i, 194 (line 16: "*ḍarabahu alf wa-mī'a miqra'a*")—absence of accusative *alif*), and compare with al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār* 363 (line 10: "*ḍarabahu alf wa-mī'a miqra'a*") and *Ta'riḥ* iii, 200 (line 17: "*ḍarabahu alfa wa-mī'a miqra'a*").

229 Subordinate asyndetic clause comes after *lā shakka*; and see Blau, *Handbook* 52 (no. 128); Haarmann, *Kanz* 37.

230 Absence of the accusative *alif* (here in the case of *ism anna*); and see Blau, *Handbook* 44 (no. 74); Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 20.

قال: (omitted 1) جاء إليه بعد رحيل الدهليز الخبر أن بتروجة (2) طَيْرَ كَثِيرٍ

قال: (omitted 1) لما رحل الدهليز والعسكر جاء الخبر إلى السلطان أن بتروجة (2) طَيْرًا كَثِيرًا

فقال: (3) إِمَشِي²³¹ بنا حتى نسبق الخاصكية

فقال لي: (3) إِمَشِي بنا حتى نسبق الخاصكية

فقال لي: (3) إِمَش بنا حتى نسبق الخاصكية

فساق (3) وَأَمَرَنِي أَنْ أَسُوقَ فِي خِدْمَتِهِ فَسَقْتُ مَعَهُ. وقال لي: عجل بنا حتى نسبق الخاصكية

فركبنا وسرنا فرأينا (4) طَيْرَ كَثِيرٍ²³² فرما بالبندق (5) وَأَصْرَعَ²³³ شَيْئًا كَثِيرًا

فركبنا وسرنا فرأينا (4) طَيْرًا كَثِيرًا فرمى بالبندق (5) وَصَرَعَ كَثِيرًا

فركبنا وسرنا فرأينا (4) طَيْرًا كَثِيرًا فرمى بالبندق (5) وَصَرَعَ كَثِيرًا

فسقنا فرأينا (4) طَيْرًا كَثِيرًا (5) فَصَرَعَ مِنْهُ بِالْبَنْدُقِ

ثم (6) إِنَّهُ التَّفَتَ²³⁴ إِلَيَّ وقال: أنا جيعان فهل معك (7) شَيْئًا²³⁵ تُطْعِمُنِي؟...

ثم (omitted 6) قال: أنا جوعان فهل معك (7) شَيْئًا تُطْعِمُنِي؟...

ثم (omitted 6) قال: أنا جيعان فهل معك (7) شَيْءٌ تُطْعِمُنِي؟...

ثم (6) التَّفَتَ إِلَيَّ وقال لي: أنا جيعان فهل معك (7) مَا أَكُلُ؟...

ثم قال لي: أمسك فرسي (8) حَتَّى إِنِّي أُرِيْقُ مَاءً²³⁶

ثم قال: أمسك فرسي (8) حَتَّى أَبُولَ

231 Long vowel in a final closed syllable (here in the imperative); and see Blau, *Handbook* 30 (no. 6); Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 28; Haarmann, *Kanz* 36.

232 Absence of the accusative *alif* (here in the case of a direct object).

233 Usage of the fourth verbal theme instead of the first verbal theme; and see Blau, *Handbook* 38 (no. 40); Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 2.

234 Superfluous repetition of pronouns; and see Haarmann, *Kanz* 36.

235 Accusative *alif* in a noun in singular form that should have been in the nominative according to the rules of standard Arabic; and see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 19; Blau, *Handbook* 44 (no. 74).

236 Superfluous usage of *inna* and repetition of a pronoun. In addition, the expression *arāqa mā* in the meaning of "urinated" is apparently "post-classical," see Dozy, *Takmilat* v, 253.

ثم قال: امسك فرسي (8) حَتَّى أُبُولَ
ثم قال لي: امسك فرسي (8) حَتَّى أَتَزَلَ أُبُولُ

فقلت له: ما فيها حيلة أنت راكب حصان وأنا راكب حجرة وما (9) يَتَفَقَّهَانِ...²³⁷
فقلت: ما فيها حيلة أنت راكب حصان وأنا راكب حجرة وما (9) يَتَفَقَّهَانِ...
قال: فقلت: ما فيها حيلة أنت راكب حصان وأنا راكب حجرة وما (9) يَتَفَقَّهَانِ...
وكنت كثير البسط معه فقلت: ما فيها حيلة السلطان راكب حصان وأنا راكب حجر وما (9) يَتَفَقَّهَانِ...

قال: فنزلت وناولته لجام الحجره ثم (10) إِنِّي رَكِبْتُ²³⁸ خلفه...
قال: فنزلت وناولته اللجام ثم (10) رَكِبْتُ خلفه...
فنزلت وناولته اللجامها (10) وَرَكِبْتُ خلفه...
قال: فنزلت وناولته عنان فرسي فأمسكه (10) وَرَكِبْتُ خلفه...

ثم قام وركب حصانه ومسك لي الحجره (11) حَتَّى إِنِّي رَكِبْتُ²³⁹
ثم قام وركب حصانه ومسك لي الحجره (11) حَتَّى رَكِبْتُ
ثم قام وركب حصانه ومسك لي الحجره (11) حَتَّى رَكِبْتُ
ثم قام وركب حصانه ومسك فرسي (11) حَتَّى رَكِبْتُ

فبينما أنا وهو نتحدث وإذا بغبار عظيم قد ثار وهو (12) جَآي²⁴⁰ إلي نحونا
ثم إذا بغبار عظيم (omitted 12)
وإذا بغبار عظيم (omitted 12)
فبينما أنا وهو نتحدث وإذا بغبار عظيم قد ثار نحونا (omitted 12)

237 Employment of the plural instead of the dual; see Blau, *Handbook* 42 (no. 59). Also note that the verb in the indicative terminates without the ending *n*; see *ibid.* 45 (no. 77).

238 Superfluous usage of *inna* and repetition of a pronoun.

239 Superfluous usage of *inna* and repetition of a pronoun.

240 While the nonstandard usage in this case is perhaps related to orthography, it seems to reflect the pronunciation of the word in the spoken language (the *yā'* represents a glide); and see Bauden, *Maqriziana* VIII 33.

فقال لي السلطان: (13) ^{سُوقٌ} 241 واكشف لنا خبر هذا الغبار
 فقال لي: (13) ^{سُوقٌ} واكشف خبر هذا الغبار
 فقال لي: (13) ^{سُقٌ} واكشف الخبر
 فقال لي السلطان: (omitted 13) ^{اُكشِفْ} لي خبر هذا الغبار ما هو

قال: فسقت فإذا بالأمير بدر الدين بيدرا والأمراء معه فسألته عن سبب مجيئهم (14) ^{فَلَمْ يَرُدُّوا عَلَيَّ}
^{جَوَابٌ} 242 ولا التفتوا على كلامي
 فسقت فإذا بالأمير بيدرا والأمراء فسألته عن سبب مجيئهم (14) ^{فَلَمْ يَرُدُّوا عَلَيَّ}
 فسقت فإذا بيدرا والأمراء فسألته عن سبب مجيئهم (14) ^{فَلَمْ يَرُدُّوا عَلَيَّ}
 قال: فسقت وإذا أنا بالأمير بدر الدين بيدرا والأمراء معه فسألته عن سبب مجيئهم (14) ^{فَلَمْ يُكَلِّمُونِي وَلَا}
 التفتوا إليَّ

وساقوا على حالهم حتى قربوا من السلطان فكان أول من ابتدره بيدرا بالضربة (15) ^{قَطَعَ بِهَا}
^{يَدَهُ} 243
 وساقوا حتى قربوا من السلطان ثم ابتدره بيدرا بالضربة (15) ^{فَقَطَعَ يَدَهُ}
 وساقوا إلى السلطان فبدأه بيدرا بالضربة (15) ^{فَقَطَعَ يَدَهُ}
 وساقوا على حالهم حتى قربوا من السلطان فابتدره الأمير بدر الدين بيدرا وضربه بالسيف (15) ^{فَقَطَعَ يَدَهُ}

(16) ^{وَتَمَمُوا} 244 قتله الباقي من الأمراء كما تقدم
 (16) ^{وَتَمَمَهُ الْبَاقُونَ}
 (16) ^{وَتَمَمَهُ الْبَاقُونَ}

241 Long vowel in a final closed syllable (here in the imperative).

242 Absence of the accusative *alif* (here in the case of a direct object).

243 Absence of a conjunction; see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 32; Haarmann, *Kanz* 37.

244 The verb preceding a subject, which designates several persons, stands in the plural (however, the subject itself appears in the singular form); see Blau, *Handbook* 45 (no. 79); Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 31.

ومن بعد قتله بيومين (17) طَلَعَ والي تروجه وأهلها أَخَذُوا السلطان غَسَلُوهُ²⁴⁵ وكفنوه وتركوه في تابوت
 ثم بعد يومين (17) طَلَعَ والي تروجه وَغَسَلُوهُ وكفنوه وتركوه في تابوت
 ثم بعد يومين (17) طَلَعَ والي تروجه وَغَسَلُوهُ وكفنوه ووضعوه في تابوت

Appendix C: Standardization of al-Shujā'ī by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba

The text in black is al-Shujā'ī, and the text in green is Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba.²⁴⁶ It is just a small part of a much larger report (about three pages) quoted from al-Shujā'ī by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba and standardized systematically.²⁴⁷ The instances of nonstandard usages of Arabic and its standardization are marked in orange color and preceded by blue numerals in brackets. I have reproduced the orthography of the printed editions, and orthographical deviations from standard Arabic are ignored. Only the relevant parts are vocalized, and the text is not translated. I have only made brief comments in footnotes on the nonstandard usages.

وكان (1) هَذَا²⁴⁸ صلغان شیر بن جوبان (2) حَاضِر²⁴⁹
 وكان (1) omitted صلغان شیر ابن جوبان (2) حَاضِرًا
 فما هان عليه ان يكون الشيخ حسن بن (3) أَخُوهُ²⁵⁰ (4) حَاكِم²⁵¹ عليه
 فما هان عليه أن ابن (3) أَخِيهِ الشيخ حسن بن دمر داش يكون (4) حَاكِمًا عليه

245 Absence of conjunctions.

246 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh* ii, 131 (line 20)–132 (line 1); al-Shujā'ī, *Ta'rikh* 100 (lines 8–11).

247 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh* ii, 130 (line 5)–132 (line 16); al-Shujā'ī, *Ta'rikh* 98 (line 12)–101 (line 12). There are a few dozen cases of standardization in the report. In one case, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba reproduces the wording of al-Shujā'ī and fails to standardize it, see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh* ii, 132 (lines 5–6); al-Shujā'ī, *Ta'rikh* 100 (lines 17–8). It is clearly due to lack of attention. For other examples of standardization, see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh* ii, 159 (lines 2–17); al-Shujā'ī, *Ta'rikh* 122 (line 16)–123 (line 16). Apparently, in one case Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba reproduces the wording of al-Shujā'ī and fails to standardize, see Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'rikh* ii, 159 (line 14); al-Shujā'ī, *Ta'rikh* 122 (line 10).

248 The demonstrative pronoun precedes a noun that is not determined by the definite article; see Blau, *Emergence* 112.

249 Absence of the accusative *alif* (here in the case of *khavar kāna*); and see Blau, *Handbook* 44 (no. 74); Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 20.

250 On *akhū* instead of *akhī*, see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 22; Brinner, *Chronicle*, xxiii.

251 Absence of the accusative *alif* (here in the case of *khavar kāna*).

وخلاه (5) وراح²⁵² الى بغداد (6) واتفق²⁵³ مع الشيخ حسن بن حسين بن اقبغا الكبير وراسلوا طغاي بن سوتاي

سوتاي (5) وجاء الى بغداد (6) واتفق مع الشيخ حسن الكبير وراسلوا طغاي ابن سوتاي

على انهم (7) يرسلوا للسلطان الملك الناصر (8) ويتفقوا²⁵⁴ معه على اولاد دمرداش
على انهم (7) يرسلون السلطان الملك الناصر (8) ويتفقون معه على اولاد دمرداش

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- al-‘Abbāsī, *Nuzhat al-mālik wa-l-mamlūk fī mukhtaṣar sīrat man waliya Miṣr min al-mulūk*, ed. ‘U.‘A. al-S. Tadmurī, Ṣaydā and Beirut 2003.
- al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd al-jumān fī ta’rīkh ahl al-zamān*, ed. ‘A. al-R. al-Ṭanṭawī al-Qarmūṭ, Cairo 1989.
- al-‘Aynī, *al-Sulṭān Barqūq mu’assis Dawlat al-Mamālīk al-Jarākisa 1382–1398 Milādī/784–801 Hijrī: Min khilāl makhtūṭ ‘Iqd al-jumān fī ta’rīkh ahl al-zamān li-Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī*, ed. Ī.‘U. Shukrī, Cairo 2002.
- al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd al-jumān fī ta’rīkh ahl al-zamān*, ed. M.M. Amīn, 5 vols., Cairo 2009–10.
- al-Biqā‘ī, *Izhār al-‘aṣr li-asrār ahl al-‘aṣr Ta’rīkh al-Biqā‘ī*, ed. M.S. al-‘Awfī, 3 vols., Riyadh 1992–3.
- al-Birzālī, *al-Muqtaṭfī ‘alā Kitāb al-Rawḍatayn al-ma’rūf bi-Ta’rīkh al-Birzālī*, ed. ‘U.‘A. al-S. Tadmurī, 4 vols., Beirut 2006.
- al-Dhahabī, *al-Mukhtār min Ta’rīkh Ibn al-Jazarī al-musammā Ḥawādith al-zamān wa-anbā’ihī wa-wafayāt al-akābir wa-l-a’yān min abnā’ihī*, ed. K.‘A.M.K. al-Manshadāwī, Beirut 1988.
- al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhūr wa-l-a’lām*, ed. ‘U.‘A. al-S. Tadmurī, 53 vols., Beirut 1989–2004.
- al-Dhahabī, *Duwal al-Islām*, eds. Ḥ.I. Marwa and M. al-Arnā’ūt, 2 vols., Beirut 1999.
- al-Dimashqī, *‘Uqūd al-jumān fī manāqib al-imām al-a’zam Abī Ḥanīfah al-Nu’mān*, ed. M.M.‘A. al-Q. al-Afghānī, Jadda 1979.
- al-Fākhirī, *Ta’rīkh al-Fākhirī*, ed. ‘U.‘A. Tadmurī, Beirut 2010.

252 The non-classical verb *rāḥa* in the meaning of “went,” see Haarmann, *Kanz* 37.

253 Absence of a conjunction; see Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 32; Haarmann, *Kanz* 37.

254 Nos. 7–8: verbs in the indicative that terminate without the ending *n*; see Blau, *Handbook* 45 (no. 77); Brinner, *Chronicle*, xxiv; Zetterstéen, *Beiträge* 31; Haarmann, *Kanz* 36.

- Ibn Abī al-Wafā' al-Qurashī, *al-Jawāhir al-muḍr'a fī ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanafīyya*, ed. 'A. al-F.M. al-Ḥulw, 2 vols., Cairo 1978.
- Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi' al-ghurar*, 9 vols., Cairo 1960–92.
- Ibn Duqmāq, *al-Nafḥa al-miskīyya fī l-Dawla al-Turkiyya: Min Kitāb al-Jawhar al-thamīn fī siyar al-khulafā' wa-l-mulūk wa-l-salāṭīn*, ed. 'U.'A. al-S. Tadmurī, Beirut and Ṣaydā 1999.
- Ibn Duqmāq, *Nuzhat al-anām fī ta'riḫ al-Islām (628 H/1230 M–659 H/1261 M)*, ed. S. Ṭab-bāra, Beirut and Ṣaydā 1999.
- Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī, *Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār: Qabā'il al-'Arab fī l-qarnayn al-sābi' wa-l-thāmin al-hijrīyayn*, ed. D. Krawulsky, Beirut 1985.
- Ibn al-Furāt, *Ta'riḫ al-duwal wa-l-mulūk*, eds. Q. Zurayk and N. 'Izz al-Dīn, vol. 9, Beirut 1936–8.
- Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-kāmina fī a'yān al-mi'a al-thāmina*, ed. S. al-Karnūkī, 4 vols., Hayderabad 1929–31.
- Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbā' al-ghumr bi-anbā' al-'umr*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥabashī, 4 vols., Cairo 1969–98.
- Ibn Ḥajar, *Fī manāqib al-imām al-Shāfi'ī: Tawālī al-ta'sīs li-ma'ālī Muḥammad b. Idrīs*, ed. A. al-F.'A. al-Qāḍī, Beirut 1986.
- Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya fī l-ta'riḫ*, ed. 'A. Shīrī, 14 vols., Beirut 1988.
- Ibn Kathīr, *Manāqib al-imām al-Shāfi'ī*, ed. K.I.M. Khāṭir, Riyadh 1992.
- Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyya*, ed. 'A. al-Ḥ. Maṣṣūr, 2 vols., Beirut 2004.
- Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ta'riḫ Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba*, ed. 'A. Darwish, 4 vols., Damascus 1977–97.
- Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyya*, ed. al-Ḥ.'A. al-'A. Khān, 4 vols., Hyderabad 1978–80.
- Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Kitāb Manāqib al-imām al-Shāfi'ī wa-ṭabaqāt aṣḥābihi min Ta'riḫ al-Islām lil-ḥāfiẓ Abī 'Abdallāh al-Dhahabī*, ed. 'A. al-'A.F. Ḥarfūsh, Damascus 2003.
- Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *Manāqib al-a'imma al-arba'a raḍiya Allāh 'anhum*, ed. S.M. al-Ḥarsh, Beirut 1995–6.
- Ibn Rajab, *al-Dhayl 'alā Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*, ed. 'A. al-R. al-'Uthaymin, 5 vols., Riyadh 2005.
- Ibn al-Ṣayrafi, *Inbā' al-ḥaṣr bi-abnā' al-'aṣr*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥabashī, Cairo 1970.
- Ibn al-Ṣayrafi, *Nuzhat al-nufūs wa-l-abdān fī tawārīḫ al-zamān*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥabashī, 4 vols., Cairo 1970–94.
- Ibn Taghribirdī, *Kitāb al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa-l-Qāhira*, eds. F.M. Shaltūt et al., 16 vols., Cairo 1929–72.
- Ibn Taghribirdī, *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi wa-l-mustawfā ba'da al-Wāfi*, ed. M.M. Amīn, 12 vols., Cairo 1984–2006.
- Ibn Ṭulūn, *Mufaḥahat al-khillān fī ḥawādith al-zamān*, ed. M. Muṣṭafā, 2 vols., Cairo 1962–4.
- Ibn Ṭulūn, *I'lām al-warā bi-man waliya nā'iban min al-Atrāk bi-Dimashq al-Sha'm al-Kubrā*, ed. M.A. Dahmān, Damascus 1984.

- Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Mufaḥḥat al-khillān fī ḥawādith al-zamān*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr, Beirut 1998.
- al-Jazarī, *Ta'riḥ ḥawādith al-zamān wa-anbā'ihi wa-wafayāt al-akābir wa-l-a'yān min abnā'ihi al-ma'rūf bi-Ta'riḥ Ibn al-Jazarī*, ed. 'U.'A. al-S. Tadmurī, 3 vols., Ṣaydā and Beirut 1998.
- al-Kardārī, *Manāqib al-imām al-a'zam Abī Ḥanīfa*, Hyderabad 1903.
- al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, ed. I. 'Abbās, 4 vols., Beirut 1973–4.
- al-Malaṭī, *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim fī ḥawādith al-'umūr wa-l-tarājim*, ed. 'U.'A. al-S. Tadmurī, 4 vols., Beirut 2014.
- al-Maqdisī, *Kitāb Duwal al-Islām al-sharīfa al-bahīyya wa-dhikr mā ṣahara lī min ḥikam Allāh al-khaṭīyya fī jalb ṭā'ifat al-Atrāk ilā al-Diyār al-Miṣriyya*, eds. Ş. Labīb and U. Haarmann, Beirut 1997.
- al-Maqdisī, *Ta'riḥ al-Malik al-Ashraf Qāyṭbāy*, ed. 'U.'A. al-S. Tadmurī, Beirut and Ṣaydā 2003.
- al-Maqrizī, *Kitāb al-Khabar 'an al-bashar fī ansāb al-'Arab wa-nasab sayyid al-bashar*, ed. K.A. al-Suwaydī and 'Ā. 'Abd al-Ghanī, 8 vols., Beirut 2013.
- al-Maqrizī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-ma'rifat duwal al-mulūk*, ed. M.M. Ziyāda and S.'A. al-F. 'Āshūr, 4 vols., Cairo 1934–73.
- al-Maqrizī, *Kitāb al-Mawā'iz wa-l-i'tibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-l-āthār*, ed. K. al-Manṣūr, 4 vols., Beirut 1998.
- al-Maqrizī, *Rasā'il al-Maqrizī*, eds. R. al-Badrī and A.M. Qāsim, Cairo 1998.
- al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab*, eds. I. Shams al-Dīn et al., 33 vols., Beirut 2004.
- al-Nuwayrī al-Iskandarānī, *al-Ilmām bi-l-i'lām fīmā jarat bi-hi al-aḥkām wa-l-umūr al-maḥḍiyya fī waq'at al-Iskandariyya*, eds. E. Combe and A.S. Atiya, 7 vols., Hyderabad 1968–76.
- al-Qalqashandī, *Qalā'id al-jumān fī l-ta'rīf bi-qabā'il 'Arab al-zamān*, ed. I. al-Abyārī, Cairo 1963.
- al-Qalqashandī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī ma'rifat ansāb al-'Arab*, ed. I. al-Abyārī, Beirut 1980.
- Qaraṭāy al-Khaznadārī, *Ta'riḥ majmū' al-nawādir mim mā jarā lūl-awā'il wa-l-awākhir*, ed. 'U.'A. al-S. Tadmurī, Ṣaydā and Beirut 2005.
- al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, eds. H. Ritter et al., 30 vols., Wiesbaden 1962–2004.
- al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān al-a'sr wa-a'wān al-naṣr*, ed. 'A. Abū Zayd, 6 vols., Beirut 1998.
- al-Sakhāwī, *al-Ḍaw' al-lāmi' li-ahl al-qarn al-tāsi'*, 12 vols., Beirut 1992.
- al-Sakhāwī, *Wajīz al-kalām fī l-dhayl 'alā Duwal al-Islām*, ed. B.'A. Ma'rūf, 'I.F. al-Ḥarastānī and A. al-Khuṭaymī, 4 vols., Beirut 1995.
- al-Shujā'i, *Ta'riḥ al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn al-Ṣāliḥ wa-awlādihi*, ed. B. Schäfer, Wiesbaden 1977.
- al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya al-kubrā*, eds. M.M. al-Ṭanāḥī and 'A. al-F.M. al-Ḥulū, 10 vols., Cairo 1964.
- al-Yūsufī, *Nuzhat al-nāẓir fī sirat al-Malik al-Nāṣir*, ed. A. Ḥuṭayṭ, Beirut 1986.

Secondary Sources

- ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, Y., *Mawsū‘at al-‘Āmmiyya al-Sūriyya: Kurrāsa lughawiyya naqdīyya fī l-taḥṣīḥ wa-l-taṣīl wa-l-muwallad wa-l-dakhil*, 3 vols., Damascus 2012.
- Ali, K., *Imam Shafi‘i: Scholar and saint*, Oxford 2011.
- ‘Āṭif, M. et al., *Adabiyyāt al-lugha al-‘Arabiyya*, Cairo 2015.
- al-Bābānī, I., *Hadīyyat al-‘arīfīn asmā’ al-mu‘allifīn wa-āthār al-muṣannifīn*, 2 vols., Istanbul 1951.
- Badawi, E., and M. Hinds, *Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*, Beirut 1986.
- Bauden, F., Maqriziana 11: Discovery of an autograph manuscript of al-Maqrīzī: Towards a better understanding of his working method: Analysis, in *MSR* 12/1 (2008), 51–118.
- Bauden, F., Maqriziana VIII: Quelques remarques sur l’orthographe d’al-Maqrīzī (m. 845/1442) à partir de son carnet de notes: peut-on parler de moyen arabe?, in J. Lentin and J. Grand’Henry (eds.), *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l’arabe à travers l’histoire: Actes du Premier Colloque International*, Louvain-la-Neuve 2008, 21–38.
- Bauden, F., Like father, like son: The chancery manual (*Qalā'id al-jumān*) of al-Qalqashandī's son and its value for the study of Mamluk diplomatics (ninth/fifteenth century), in *Eurasian studies* 6 (2013), 181–228.
- Bauer, Th., Literarische Anthologien der Mamlūkenzeit, in S. Conermann and A. Pistor-Hatam (eds.), *Die Mamlūken: Studien zu ihrer Geschichte und Kultur. Zum Gedenken an Ulrich Haarmann (1942–1999)*, Hamburg 2003, 71–122.
- Bauer, Th., Review of *Nuzhat al-anām fī ta'riḥ al-Islām* (628 H/1230 M–659 H/1261 M), ed. S. Ṭabbāra, Beirut and Ṣaydā 1999, in *MSR* 7/1 (2003), 257–62.
- Bauer, Th., Mamluk literature: Misunderstandings and new approaches, in *MSR* 9/2 (2005), 105–32.
- Bauer, Th., In search of “post-classical literature”: A review article, in *MSR* 11/2 (2007), 137–67.
- Bauer, Th., Mamluk literature as a means of communication, in S. Conermann (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? Quo Vademus? Mamluk studies—State of the art*, Goettingen and Bonn 2013, 23–56.
- Blau, J., *The emergence and linguistic background of Judaeo-Arabic: A study of the origins of Middle Arabic*, Jerusalem 1981.
- Blau, J., The state of research in the field of the linguistic study of Middle Arabic, in *Arabica* 28 2/3 (1981), 187–203.
- Blau, J., *A handbook of Early Middle Arabic*, Jerusalem 2002.
- Blau, J., *A dictionary of mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic texts* [in Hebrew], Jerusalem 2006.
- Bora, F., Mamluk historian's holograph. Messages from a *musawwada* of *ta'riḥ*, in *Journal of Islamic manuscripts* 3/2 (2012), 119–53.
- Brinner, W.M. (ed.), *A chronicle of Damascus 1389–1397*, vol. 1, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1963.

- Brockelmann, C., *History of the Arabic written tradition: Volume 2*, trans. J. Lameer, Leiden 2016.
- Burton, J. (ed.), *Abū 'Uбайд al-Qāsim b. Sallām's K. al-Nāsikh wa-l-mansūkh*, Suffolk 1987.
- Cahen, C., Ibn al-Furāt, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm b. 'Alī al-Miṣrī al-Ḥanafī, in *EI*², iii, 768–9.
- Conermann, S., Ibn Ṭulūn (d. 955/1548): Life and works, in *MSR* 8/1 (2004), 115–39.
- Conermann, S., and T. Seidensticker, Some remarks on Ibn Ṭawq's (d. 915/1509) journal *Al-Ta'liq*, vol. 1 (885/1480 to 890/1485), in *MSR* 11/2 (2007), 121–35.
- Dozy, R.P.A., *Takmilat al-ma'ājim al-'Arabiyya*, 10 vols., trans. M.S. al-Nu'aymī and J. al-Khayyāt, Baghdad 1979–2000.
- Elbendary, A., *Crowds and sultans: Urban protests in late medieval Egypt and Syria*, Cairo 2015.
- Fück, J.W., 'Arabiyya: Middle Arabic, in *EI*², i, 569–71.
- Ghersetti, A., The language(s) of the Arabs in al-Maqrīzī's *al-Khabar 'an al-bashar*, in *QSA* 9 (2014), 145–60.
- Guo, L., Mamluk historiographic studies: The state of the art, in *MSR* 1 (1997), 15–43.
- Guo, L., Introduction: The *Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān* in modern scholarship, in L. Guo (ed.), *Early Mamluk Syrian historiography: Al-Yunīnī's Dhayl Mir'āt al-zamān*, vol. 1, Leiden 1998.
- Guo, L., al-Biqā'ī's chronicle: A fifteenth century learned man's reflection on his time and world, in H. Kennedy (ed.), *The historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800)*, Leiden 2001, 121–48.
- Guo, L., *Commerce, culture, and community in a Red Sea port in the thirteenth century: The Arabic documents from Quseir*, Leiden 2004.
- Guo, L., Tales of a medieval Cairene harem: Domestic life in al-Biqā'ī's autobiographical chronicle, in *MSR* 9/1 (2005), 101–21.
- Guo, L., History writing, in R. Irwin (ed.), *The new Cambridge history of Islam: Islamic cultures and societies to the end of the eighteenth century*, vol. 4, Cambridge 2010, 444–57.
- Guo, L., Songs, poetry, and storytelling: Ibn Taghrī Birdī on the Yalbughā affair, in Y. Ben-Bassat (ed.), *Developing perspectives in Mamluk history: Essays in honor of Amalia Levanoni*, Leiden 2017, 189–200.
- Haarmann, U., *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit*, Freiburg 1969.
- Haarmann, U., Auflösung und Bewahrung der klassischen Formen arabischer Geschichtsschreibung in der Zeit der Mamluken, in *ZDMG* 121 (1971), 46–60.
- Haarmann, U. (ed.), *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi' al-ghurar*, vol. 8, Cairo 1971.
- Haarmann, U., Arabic in speech, Turkish in lineage: Mamluks and their sons in the intellectual life of fourteenth-century Egypt and Syria, in *JSS* 33/1 (1988), 81–114.
- Haarmann, U., Rather the injustice of the Turks than the righteousness of the Arabs:

- Changing 'ulamā' attitudes towards Mamluk rule in the late fifteenth century, in *SI* 68 (1988), 61–77.
- Haarmann, U., Review of *Weltgeschichte und Weltbeschreibung im Mittelalterlichen Islam*, by B. Radtke, in *JAOS* 115/1 (1995), 133–5.
- Haarmann, U., Review of *Twilight of majesty: The reigns of Mamlūk sultans Al-Ashraf Qāyṭbāy and Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī in Egypt*, by C.F. Petry, in *IJMES* 29/4 (1997), 635–8.
- Haarmann, U., Joseph's law—The careers and activities of Mamluk descendants before the Ottoman conquest of Egypt, in Th. Philipp and U. Haarmann (eds.), *The Mamluks in Egyptian politics and society*, Cambridge 1998, 55–84.
- Haarmann, U., al-Maqrīzī, the master, and Abū Ḥāmid al-Qudṣī, the disciple—Whose historical writing can claim more topicality and modernity?, in H. Kennedy (ed.), *The historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800)*, Leiden 2001, 149–65.
- Hanna, N., The chronicles of Ottoman Egypt: History or entertainment?, in H. Kennedy (ed.), *The historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800)*, Leiden 2001, 237–50.
- Hartmann, R. (ed.), *Das Tübinger Fragment der Chronik des Ibn Ṭūlūn*, Berlin 1926.
- Havemann, A., The chronicle of Ibn Iyās as a source for social and cultural history from below, in M. Haddad et al. (eds.), *Towards a cultural history of the Mamluk era*, Beirut 2010, 87–100.
- Herzog, Th., Mamluk (popular) culture, in S. Conermann (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? Quo Vademus? Mamluk studies—State of the art*, Goettingen and Bonn 2013, 131–58.
- Hirschler, K., Islam: The Arabic and Persian traditions, eleventh–fifteenth centuries, in A. Feldherr et al. (eds.), *The Oxford history of historical writing: 400–1400*, vol. 2, Oxford 2012, 267–86.
- Hirschler, K., *The written word in the Medieval Arabic Lands: A social and cultural history of reading practices*, Edinburgh 2012.
- Ībīsh, A., *Ta'riḫ al-Sha'm fī maṭla' al-'ahd al-'Uthmānī 926–951 H/1520–1544 M istin-ādan ilā makḥṭūṭāt nādīra fī Maktabat al-Dawla (Staatsbibliothek) wa-i'ādat jam' al-ṣafahāt al-dā'i'a min Kitāb Muṣākahat al-khillān fī ḥawādith al-zamān li-Ibn Ṭūlūn al-Ṣāliḥ al-Dimashqī*, Abu Dhabi 2010.
- Irwin, R., Mamluk history and historians, in R. Allen and D.S. Richards, *Arabic literature in the post-classical period*, Cambridge 2006, 159–70.
- Jaques, R.K., *Authority, conflict, and the transmission of diversity in medieval Islamic law*, Leiden 2006.
- Jaques, R.K., The other Rabi': Biographical traditions and the development of early Shāfi'i authority, in *Islamic law and society* 14/2 (2007), 143–79.
- Kahle, P., Einleitung, in M. Muṣṭafā and P. Kahle (eds.), *Kitāb Badā'i' al-zuhūr fī waqā'i' al-duḥūr*, vol. 4, Leipzig 1931, 1–29.
- Krenkow, F., and D.P. Little, al-Ṣafādī, al-Ḥasan b. Abī Muḥammad 'Abdallāh al-Hāshimī, in *ET*², xiii, 759.

- Landau-Tasseron, E., The "cyclical reform": A study of the *mujaddid* tradition, in *SI* 70 (1989), 79–117.
- Lentin, J., The Levant, in C. Holes (ed.), *Arabic historical dialectology: Linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches*, Oxford 2018, 170–205.
- Levanoni, A., Who were the "salt of the earth" in fifteenth-century Egypt?, in *MSR* 14 (2010), 63–83.
- Levanoni, A., A supplementary source for the study of Mamluk social history: The *taqārīz*, in *Arabica* 60/1–2 (2013), 146–77.
- Little, D.P., *An introduction to Mamlūk historiography: An analysis of Arabic annalistic and biographical sources for the reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalā'ūn*, Wiesbaden 1970.
- Little, D.P., An analysis of the relationship between four Mamluk chronicles for 737–45, in *JSS* 19 (1974), 252–68.
- Little, D.P., The recovery of a lost source for Bahrī Mamlūk history: Al-Yūsufī's *Nuzhat al-nāzīr fī sirāt al-Malik al-Nāṣir*, in *JAOS* 94 (1974), 42–54.
- Little, D.P., Historiography of the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk epochs, in C.F. Petry (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Egypt: Islamic Egypt, 640–1517*, vol. 1, Cambridge and New York 1998, 412–44.
- Lowry, J.E., Some preliminary observations on al-Shāfi'ī and later *uṣūl al-fiqh*: The case of the term *bayān*, in *Arabica* 55/5 (2008), 505–27.
- Massoud, S.G., *The chronicles and annalistic sources of the early Mamluk Circassian period*, Leiden and Boston 2007.
- Mauder, C., *Gelehrte Krieger: Die Mamluken als Träger arabischsprachiger Bildung nach al-Ṣafadī, al-Maqrīzī und weiteren Quellen*, Hildesheim 2012.
- Muhannā, M.N., Ādāb al-mulūk: Katabahu al-mamlūk Bardi Bak min Ṭabaqat al-Mustajadda al-Malikī al-Ashrafī, in *AI* 22 (1986), 1–9.
- Ökzan, H., The drug *zajals* in Ibrāhīm al-Mi'mār's *Dīwān*, in *MSR* 17 (2013), 212–48.
- Parry, V.J., Review of *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit*, by U. Haarmann, in *BSOAS* 35 (1972), 148–9.
- Petry, C.F., *The civilian elite of Cairo in the later middle ages*, Princeton 1981.
- Petry, C.F., Scholastic stasis in medieval Islam reconsidered: Mamluk patronage in Cairo, in *Poetics Today* 14/2 (1993), 323–48.
- Petry, C.F., *Protectors or praetorians? The last Mamlūk sultans and Egypt's waning as a great power*, Albany 1994.
- Rabbat, N.O., Representing the Mamluks in Mamluk historical writing, in H. Kennedy (ed.), *The historiography of Islamic Egypt (c. 950–1800)*, Leiden 2001, 59–75.
- Rizq Salīm, M., *al-Adab al-'Arabī wa-ta'rikhuhi fī 'aṣr al-Mamālīk wa-l-'Uthmāniyyīna wa-l-'aṣr al-ḥadīth*, Cairo 1957.
- Roemer, H.R. (ed.), *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi' al-ghurar*, vol. 9, Cairo 1960.
- Schäfer, B. (ed.), *Beiträge zur mamlukischen Historiographie nach dem Tode al-Malik an-Nāṣirs, mit einer Teiledition der Chronik Šams ad-Dīn as-Šuġā'is*, Freiburg 1971.

- Schäfer, B. (ed.), *Die Chronik aš-Šuġāʿīs*, Wiesbaden 1985.
- Taymūr, A., *Muʿjam Taymūr al-kabīr fī l-alfāz al-ʿāmmiyya*, 6 vols., Cairo 2002.
- Tritton, A.S., Review of *The chronicle of Ibn Tulun*, ed. by M. Mostafa, Cairo 1962, in *JRAS* 96/1 (1964), 54–5.
- Vrolijk, A., *Bringing a laugh to a scowling face: A study and critical edition of the Nuzhat al-nufūs wa-muḍḥik al-ʿabūs by ʿAlī Ibn Sūdūn al-Bashbughāwī* (Cairo 810/1407–Damascus 868/1464), Leiden 1998.
- Wollina, T., Ibn Ṭawq's *Taʿlīq*: An ego document for Mamlūk studies, in S. Conermann (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? Quo Vademus? Mamluk studies—State of the art*, Goettingen and Bonn 2013, 337–62.
- Yosef, K., Cross-boundary hatred: (Changing) attitudes towards Mongol and “Christian” *mamlūks* in the Mamluk Sultanate, in R. Amitai and S. Conermann (eds.), *The Mamluk Sultanate from the perspective of regional and world history: Economic, social and cultural development in an era of increasing international interaction and competition*, Goettingen and Bonn 2019, 149–214.
- al-Zarkālī, Kh., *al-Aʿlām: Qāmūs tarājīm li-ashhar al-rijāl wa-l-nisāʾ min al-ʿArab wa-l-Mustaʿribīn wa-l-Mustashriqīn*, 8 vols., Beirut 2002.
- Zetterstéen, K.W. (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlükensultane in den Jahren 690–741 der Hīġra nach arabischen Handschriften*, Leiden 1919.