

MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS IN THE MAMLŪK PERIOD, 1279-90

MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS  
DURING THE REIGN OF THE MAMLUK SULTAN  
AL-MALIK AL-MANSUR QA'LA'UN (678/1279 - 689/1290)

Linda S. Northrup

A thesis submitted to the Faculty  
of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree  
of Master of Arts

Institute of Islamic Studies  
McGill University  
Montreal

August 1974

# ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Linda S. Northrup  
TITLE OF THESIS: Muslim-Christian Relations during the Reign of the Mamlūk Sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn (678/1279 - 689/1290).  
DEPARTMENT: Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University.  
DEGREE: M.A.

---

Most modern studies have portrayed the Mamlūk period as that in which the Christian population of the Mamlūk empire reached its demise. Two reasons are most often given for this situation: 1) the effect of the Crusades in arousing anti-Christian sentiment and 2) the Mongol invasions to which several Christian powers gave active assistance. This study which is limited to the contemporary and later Arabic chronicles and which examines the reign of Qalā'ūn as a case study for the Mamlūk period, indicates that contrary to this view, no correlation exists between these two historical factors and the treatment of Christians in the Mamlūk period during the reign of Qalā'ūn. In fact, the situation of the indigenous Christians seems to have been relatively stable. Those measures which were instituted were taken against a particular category of Christians, not against the population as a whole. Not only do the Mamlūks of this period seem to have distinguished between various Christian parties in their treatment of them, but a variety of opinion concerning Christians seems to have existed among various elements of the Muslim population as well. Furthermore, Mamlūk policy at this period toward foreign Christian powers does not seem to have been motivated by purely religious considerations. Thus, our views concerning the Mamlūk period must be revised to recognize that, although the Mamlūk period was certainly a period of decline for Christianity, it should, nevertheless, not be described uniformly as being one of disaster for the Christian community.

## RÉSUMÉ

AUTEUR: Linda S. Northrup  
TITRE DE LA THÈSE: Muslim-Christian Relations during the Reign of the Mamlūk Sultan al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn (678/1279 - 689/1290).  
DÉPARTEMENT: Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University.  
DÉGRÉ: M.A.

---

La plupart des études modernes ont décrits l'époque des Mamelouks comme celle dont la population chrétienne de l'empire mamelouk a atteint son déclin. Deux raisons sont souvent données pour cette situation: 1) l'effet des croisades en éveillant des sentiments contre les Chrétiens, et 2) les attaques des Mongoles que plusieurs puissances chrétiennes ont aidées activement. Cet étude, qui se limite aux chroniques arabes contemporaines et tardives et qui examine le règne de Qalā'ūn comme exemple de l'époque des Mamelouks, indique le contraire de cette perspective. Il n'y a pas de rapport entre ces deux éléments historiques et le traitement des Chrétiens pendant le règne de Qalā'ūn dans l'époque des Mamelouks. En effet, la situation des Chrétiens indigènes paraît avoir été relativement fixe. Ces mesures, qui avaient été instituées, avaient été pris particulièrement contre une catégorie de Chrétiens et pas contre la population chrétienne entière. Les Mamelouks de cet époque pas seulement semblent avoir distingué entre les parties chrétiennes diverse, mais il paraît y avoir été aussi plusieurs avis sur les Chrétiens entre les éléments divers de la population musulmane. De plus, la politique des Mamelouks pendant cet époque vers les puissances chrétiennes étrangères ne paraît pas avoir été motivée par des considérations purement religieuses. Ainsi, nos avis sur l'époque des Mamelouks doit être revus pour reconnaître que, bien que l'époque des Mamelouks a sûrement été une période de décadence pour la Chrétienté, il ne faut pas néanmoins la décrire uniformément comme avoir été une période de malheur pour la communauté chrétienne.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Transliteration

### INTRODUCTION

Footnotes (7)

### CHAPTER I - THE SOURCES

Contemporary Sources (11)

Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir (11)

Ibn al-Mukarram (15)

Baybars al-Manṣūrī (16)

al-Birzālī and al-Jazarī (22)

al-Yūnīnī (29)

Abū al-Fidā (33)

al-Nuwayrī (34)

Later Sources (38)

Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il (38)

Ibn Kathīr (44)

Ibn al-Furāt (46)

al-Maqrīzī (50)

al-Aynī and al-Yūsufī (54)

Conclusions (59)

Footnotes (62)

### CHAPTER II - MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS DURING THE REIGN OF QALĀ'UN

Relations with Foreign Christian Powers (78)

The Mongol Allies: Armenians, Georgians, Greeks and Franks (79)

The Crusader Kingdoms (82)

The Byzantines (91)

European Christian Powers (97)

The Ethiopians (103)

The Christian Kingdoms of Nubia (107)

Conclusions (108)

Relations with Indigenous Christians (109)

The Political Situation of the Indigenous  
Christian Community (112)

The Economic Situation of the Indigenous  
Christian Community (120)

The Social Situation of the Indigenous  
Christian Community (121)

Footnotes (124)

CONCLUSIONS

138

APPENDIX

141

BIBLIOGRAPHY

154

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the help, concern and encouragement of many friends this thesis would not have been realized in its present form. I am especially indebted to H. Murtaḍā al-Naqīb, to Muḥammad A. Tawfīq, and to Sanī Zahradeen for their help in translating difficult Arabic passages and in checking transliterations, to Joseph Escovitz for several valuable references, to Professor Hermann Landolt and to Astrid Klein for help in translating German, to Flavia Awad for the French abstract, and to Martin Lyons for Spanish translation and many other things. I should also like to extend very special thanks for many favors to Eve Yuile as well as to Dr. Charles J. Adams for his continual encouragement. To Salwa Ferahian I owe an enormous debt of gratitude, for without her assistance, many materials would simply not have been available for consultation. I am most deeply grateful, however, to Dr. Donald P. Little, not only for his help in conceptualizing this project and his continual guidance throughout, but also for his constant encouragement and great patience. To these friends and others whose help has been given in less tangible ways, I shall always be grateful.

# TRANSLITERATION

The system of transliteration is that used by the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University.

initial: unexpressed; medial and final:

ب	b	ص	s	ه	h
ت	t	ض	d	و	w
ث	th	ط	t	ي	y
ح	j	ظ	z		
ح	h	ع	c		
خ	kh	غ	gh		
د	d	ف	f		
ذ	dh	ق	q		
ر	r	ك	k		
ز	z	ل	l		
س	s	م	m		
ش	sh	ن	n		

Vowels, diphthongs, etc.

short: ا a; إ i; ة u.

long: آ ā; و ū; ي ī

alif maqṣūra: ي ā

long with tashdīd يّ iya  
وّ ūwa

Diphthongs: اي ay; او aw.

tā' marbūṭa: ة a; in idāfa: at.



## INTRODUCTION

Muslim-Christian relations, and especially Muslim relations with the autochthonous Christian population living under Muslim rule, is not a subject that has been entirely neglected by Western orientalists. E. L. Butcher addressed the matter as early as 1897 within the context of her history of the Church of Egypt,<sup>1</sup> the chief value of which for us lies in the fact that it is based, for the most part, on Christian sources, though such Arabic and Muslim sources as were then available in translation were also utilized. This work, then, provides a different background against which to view this present study which employs the Arabic Muslim sources with the exception of one Arabic Coptic source, Mufaddal ibn abī al-Fadā'il.

In addition to numerous articles dealing with this question there exist lengthier studies based on the Arabic sources such as A. S. Tritton's The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects<sup>2</sup> and Antoine Fattal's Le Statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'islam.<sup>3</sup> These studies, however, tend to approach the problem in one of two ways, neither of which alone explains the vicissitudes of these relations. One type deals with the legal position adopted by Muslims in matters regarding non-Muslims living under their rule and, therefore, presents the normative situation. For example, Antoine Fattal's work treats the legal position of non-Muslims. Several fatwās<sup>4</sup> respecting dhimmīs<sup>5</sup> have also been published: for instance, those of Ahmad ibn al-Husayn al-Mālikī, published by Richard Gottheil<sup>6</sup> and Taqī al-Dīn Abū al-Hasan al-Shāfi'ī al-Miṣrī.<sup>7</sup> Several tracts, written at different

periods, which have come down to us, have as their goal to point out the discrepancies between the legal position of non-Muslims and their actual status and behavior: for example, those of <sup>c</sup>Uthmān ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nābulusī from the <sup>c</sup>Ayyūbid period, concerning employment of dhimmīs, especially Copts in administrative posts in Egypt,<sup>8</sup> and Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥasan al-<sup>c</sup>Umayy al-Qurayshī al-Asnawī, whose tract is discussed by M. Perlmann<sup>9</sup> in connection with other documents such as the piece written by Ghāzī ibn al-Wāsiṭī, published by Richard Gottheil.<sup>10</sup>

A second category is concerned with the historical expression of Muslim attitudes toward non-Muslim subjects. For example, the articles in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, "Dhimma" by Claude Cahen,<sup>11</sup> "Ḳibt" by Gaston Wiet<sup>12</sup> and "Naṣārā" by A. S. Tritton,<sup>13</sup> in addition to Tritton's The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects<sup>14</sup> and E. Strauss' study, "The Social Isolation of Ahl al-Dhimma,"<sup>15</sup> and Richard Gottheil's article "Dhimīs and Moslems in Egypt"<sup>16</sup> in the main simply trace the imposition of various restrictions throughout Islamic history. Such studies tend to be little more than chronological lists of the occasions on which various restrictions were imposed or renewed without the benefit of reference to the wider historical context at any given time. Some of these studies have covered such long periods of time that had they been based on detailed investigations which had taken into account the broader historical framework, the undertaking would have been of nearly impossible magnitude. Yet only studies which consider the problem

of Muslim-Christian relations in a wider setting and on a more modest scale to begin with, will eventually achieve any real understanding.

Furthermore, seldom do these studies, with the exception of the tracts and 1. wās published to date, count among their sources contemporary and original materials. For example, information concerning the Mamlūk period, even the early Mamlūk period, found in these works is derived almost exclusively from one or the other of al-Maqrīzī's two works, Kitāb al-sulūk li-ma<sup>c</sup>rifat al-mulūk<sup>17</sup> or al-Mawā<sup>c</sup>iz wa al-<sup>c</sup>tibār fī dhikr al-āthār.<sup>18</sup> Neither of these works had been examined critically at the time they were employed in these studies for such things as the author's sources, his accuracy, possible biases, etc., in regard to different periods in Islamic history and with respect to our subject.

About the most that can be gained from these studies is the recognition that the Muslim position vis-à-vis non-Muslim subjects did not really become well-defined until the second century hijra or so, and that in any case, practice rarely followed doctrine in that such restrictions were at best applied only sporadically. For example, the Mamlūk period, as portrayed by most studies, is notorious as being that in which indigenous Christians, and especially the Coptic community of Egypt, were dealt a nearly fatal blow. Yet, there are indications that even within this period, variations in the condition under which Christians existed were to be found. One passage, found in both

al-Maqrīzī's al-Khitat<sup>19</sup> and in al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī's ʿIqd al-jumān fī tārīkh ahl al-zamān<sup>20</sup> points to this fact. Here, Qalā'ūn's reign is pictured as being a period of relative austerity for Christians in contrast to the laxity which prevailed in their regard under Qalā'ūn's son and successor, al-Ashraf Khalīl. This leads to the conclusion that such restrictions or measures as were imposed must have been applied in response to specific causes or situations, not because of any constant, thoroughgoing attempt or, perhaps, even desire to adhere to the Muslim legal and theoretical position.

What is needed now then, are studies based on the original Muslim and Arab sources which examine Muslim behavior and attitudes toward Christians, both foreign and autochthonous, within the context of a particular historical period in order to determine what those causes or circumstances were which led to the imposition of restrictive measures, or, for that matter, to more-facile relations. The only study of which I am aware that makes any effort in this direction is that of Emmanuel Sivan entitled L'Islam et la croisade: idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmans aux croisades<sup>21</sup> wherein he traces the concept of jihād in relation to the historical events of the Crusades and Mongol invasions.

What I propose here is a study of Muslim-Christian relations, in particular Muslim relations with the Christian population of the Mamlūk empire within the framework of the events involving foreign Christian powers during the reign of the Mamlūk sultan al-Malik

al-Manṣūr, Qalā'ūn (678/1279 - 689/1290). Not only is his eleven-year reign a manageable span of time for investigation, but it is a period which witnessed a great deal of activity with regard to foreign Christians on all fronts (the Crusader kingdoms, the Byzantine empire, Little Armenia, Georgia, Nubia, Abyssinia and even the Christian West). Such a period, therefore, affords the opportunity to explore several aspects of Muslim-Christian relations. For example, we may ask whether all Christians--foreign and native--were regarded in the same way by all Muslims or whether distinctions were made in the treatment of different Christian factions. For example, were the local Christians differentiated from their fellow, but foreign, coreligionists? Can one distinguish between the treatment of various groups even within the local Christian population of the Mamlūk empire? Finally, we may ask what connection, if any, existed between the treatment of Christians living under Mamlūk rule with the events of the day involving other Christian parties as, for instance, the Crusaders.

Answers to such questions will enable us not only to understand more precisely Muslim-Christian relations in general, but also to indicate more clearly certain characteristics of the early Mamlūk period by suggesting, for instance, to what extent the ruling class was motivated by religious considerations of various kinds, what roles were played by other elements of the population--both Christian and Muslim--and so on.

Although there is certainly much information to be gained from

other types of material such as biographical dictionaries and, perhaps, collections of fatwās, I have limited my investigation here to the study of Muslim-Christian relations during the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn as reflected by the Arabic chronicles, both contemporary and later.

In Chapter One I shall analyze the contemporary and later sources with respect to Muslim-Christian relations for Qalā'ūn's reign in the light of several recent historiographical analyses of these sources to determine not only which are original, but also what differences exist between the earlier and later historians, as well as what kind of information can be derived from this type of material, and whether the nature of these materials itself might suggest conclusions regarding the subject. Chapter Two contains a reconstruction of the sources for a history of Muslim-Christian relations during the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn according to the Arabic chronicles and in the light of historiographical analysis. It is hoped that this investigation will produce answers to some of the questions posed here, thus shedding further light on the period as a whole.

# Footnotes

1. The Story of the Church of Egypt (2 vols.; London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1897).
2. (London: Oxford University Press, 1930).
3. (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1958).
4. A fatwā is a formal legal opinion given by one trained in the Islamic legal sciences who is called a muftī.
5. The term "dhimmī" refers to a person who is a member of a revealed religion other than Islām to whom the Muslim community, therefore, "accords hospitality and protection...on condition of their acknowledging the domination of Islam." Claude Cahen, "Dhimma," Encyclopaedia of Islam, ed. J. H. Kramers et al. (3 vols. to date of 2nd rev. ed.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-1971, hereafter referred to as EI<sup>2</sup>), II, 227.
6. "A fetwa On the Appointment of Dhimmis to Office," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie (1912), 203-214.
7. "An Unpublished XIVth Century Fatwā on the Status of Foreigners in Mamlūk Egypt and Syria," edited with introduction, translation and notes by A. S. Atiya in: Paul Kahle Festschrift, ed. W. Heffening and W. Kirfel (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1935), 55-68.
8. Claude Cahen, "Histoires coptes d'un cadī médiéval: extraits du Kitāb tadjrid saʿf al-himma l'stikrādj mā fī dhimmat al-dhimma de ʿUthmān b. Ibrāhīm an-Nābulusī," Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (BIFAO), LIX (1960), 133-150.
9. "Notes on Anti-Christian Propaganda in the Mamlūk Empire," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (BSOAS), X (1940-1942), 843-861.
10. "An Answer to the Dhimmīs," Journal of the American Oriental Society (JAOS), XLI (1921), 383-457.
11. EI<sup>2</sup>, II, 227-231.
12. Ed. Thomas Houtsma et al., hereafter referred to as EI<sup>1</sup> (4 vols. and supplement; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913-1938), 990-1003.
13. EI<sup>1</sup>, 848-851.

14. Supra, 1, n.2.
15. Etudes orientales à la mémoire de Paul Hirschler, ed. Dr. O. Komlós (Budapest: 1950), 73-94.
16. Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William R. Harper, ed. Francis R. Harper, et. al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), 353-414.
17. Edited with notes by M. M. Ziyāda and A. E. <sup>c</sup>Ashūr (4 vols. to date; Cairo: 1934-1972). French translation by M. Quatremère, entitled Histoire des sultans mamlouks de l'Egypte écrite en arabe par Takī-eddin-Ahmed-Makrīzī (2 vols.; Paris: 1837-1845).
18. (2 vols.; Bulāq, 1270 h.).
19. II, 497
20. Badr al-Dīn al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī, Iqd al-jumān fī tārīkh ahl al-zamān (69 vols.; Dār al-Kutub MS, 1584 ma arif āmma). (Photocopy of hand copy of fols. 160 vo. - 160 ro.). I am indebted to Dr. D. P. Little for making this portion of the manuscript available to me.
21. (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien Maisonneuve, 1968).



## CHAPTER I

### THE SOURCES

The sources for the period of Qalā'ūn have been submitted to rather thorough and comprehensive historiographical analysis in recent years by several scholars, especially Ulrich Haarmann,<sup>1</sup> Götz Schregle,<sup>2</sup> and Donald P. Little<sup>3</sup> among others. Schregle's analysis, though for an earlier period, is useful for what it reveals concerning the metamorphosis of historical fact as it is transmitted through several historians, generation after generation. In the case of the example he has used in his study--Shajar al-Durr--we witness the growth of a legend around an historical person. Thus, sources must be used critically, i.e., the facts must be extracted, as far as possible, from fiction or legend. Among the sources whose treatment of Shajar al-Durr Schregle has investigated are some of the same sources which we shall examine for Qalā'ūn's reign.

Haarmann's study, using a somewhat different approach, that of comparing two contemporary chronicles whose authors wrote in the "new style" of the times, has also arrived at certain conclusions regarding the process of "literarization" or "de-historicization" of history resulting from the language and style which became popular and certain other practices which became current in medieval Arabic historical writing.<sup>4</sup> For example, an increasing number of elements of adab--poetry, anecdotes, epigrams, and the like--were introduced into

historical writing which were not to be found in classical histories. Since Haarmann has used two of the sources for Qalā'ūn's reign as the vehicle of his study and has analyzed them for the years 682/1283-1284 - 687/1288-1289 which fall within that sultan's reign, his conclusions are of major significance for this present enquiry.

Little, on the other hand, who has attempted to establish what he quotes Claude Cahen as calling a "repertorium" of the sources (i.e., "an analytical survey of the sources which aims at classifying them in terms of their value to modern historians"),<sup>5</sup> has made the most comprehensive analysis of the three. Therefore, although his work deals with a very slightly later period, the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalā'ūn (especially the years 694/1294-1295, 699/1299-1300 and 705/1305-1306), we shall use his analysis as our point de repère in the discussion to follow of the sources for Qalā'ūn's reign as they appear in the light of these studies and others and in the light of my own work in which I have sought to analyze the sources in relation to a particular subject matter--Mamlūk-Christian relations.

One of the primary aims of Little's study was to isolate those works which are original or primary sources from those which are only secondary. This was accomplished by a careful word-by-word comparison which established the relationship of one chronicle or historian to another. His investigation showed "that there are three sources for the early reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir, on one, or more of which all other sources rely to some degree or other. These three are Zubdat al-fikra

by Baibars al-Manṣūrī, Hawādīt az-zamān by al-Ḡazarī, and Nuzhat an-nāẓir by al-Yūsufī.<sup>6</sup> At least two other contemporary and original sources exist for the reign of Qalā'ūn which do not figure among those sources for the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir--Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir and Ibn al-Mukarram.

In the following pages we shall examine the contemporary and later sources in chronological order insofar as this is possible, selecting for analysis accounts of events involving Muslim-Christian relations. The methodology used is that of Little, i.e., careful word-by-word comparison of these reports. In each case our findings will be compared with previous historiographical analyses in order to verify the results of these for the reign of Qalā'ūn with respect to our subject.

#### Contemporary Sources

##### Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir:

The author of Tashrīf al-ayyām wa-al-<sup>C</sup>uṣūr fī sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr<sup>7</sup> was born in Cairo in 620/1223, the son of a Qur'ān reader.<sup>8</sup> According to Murād Kāmil, editor of Tashrīf al-ayyām, Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir himself was a shaykh of the Qur'ān readers in his time and was noted as well for his proficiency in grammar and in the Arabic language.<sup>9</sup>

However, Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir also served as the chief of the dīwān al-inshā'<sup>10</sup> during the reigns of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn and al-Malik al-Ashraf Khalīl. In this capacity he was responsible for the official correspondence, the writing of documents, and the keeping of the official journal.<sup>11</sup>

Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir has left us a history of each of the sultans under whom he served which Cahen describes as a sort of edited version of the official journal of the daily activities of the rulers kept by Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir.<sup>12</sup> If the style of Tashrīf al-ayyām is somewhat journalistic, it has, however, been tempered by the inclusion of poetry (sometimes his own, sometimes that of others), and of other literary citations, especially on the occasions of great victories such as the conquest of Marqab or upon the deaths and births of members of the ruling family, etc. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's interests as reflected by Tashrīf al-ayyām are, for the most part, political and international. On rare occasions he discusses new buildings in Cairo, a flood in Damascus, the level of the Nile, and so on.

The potential value of Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir as a primary source for the period seems fairly obvious. The high position he held, by virtue of which he himself was a participant in the affairs of state, would have given him access to official documents of which he himself may often have been the author, as well as to other privileged oral and written information. Schregle, however, is skeptical of Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's reliability in relation to his period of study, for, according to him, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir seems to be carried away from the bare historical truth by his rhetorical style, and cautions that he should be consulted with reservation.<sup>13</sup> Haarmann's analysis, however, confirms our first assumption. He declares, "It is astonishing to what degree his lives of the princes constitute quantitatively and qualitatively three of the most important sources of

early Mamlūk history up to the year 692."<sup>14</sup>

Indeed, his chronicle is literally filled with copies of documents of the most impersonal nature, some of which are not to be found elsewhere. Those which most affect this study are the numerous treaties concluded with the Crusader kingdoms of the Syrian Littoral which close study shows to have been one of Qalā'ūn's most effective tools in bringing about their eventual liquidation. A glance at the tables will show the extent of this activity in Qalā'ūn's politique. In 681/1282-1283 Ibn<sup>c</sup> Abd al-Zāhir reports the text of the treaty concluded with the Templars of Tortosa,<sup>15</sup> in 682/1283-1284 the treaty with<sup>c</sup> Akkā,<sup>16</sup> and in 684/1285-1286 the treaty with the Princess of Tyre.<sup>17</sup> Also included are copies of agreements concluded with other foreign Christian powers such as the truce with the ruler of Sīs (Little Armenia) concluded in 684/1285-1286<sup>18</sup> and the treaties with Genoa<sup>19</sup> and with Aragon and Sicily<sup>20</sup> in 689/1290. In addition to treaties Ibn<sup>c</sup> Abd al-Zāhir takes interest in another category of diplomatic activity-- the arrival and dispatch of envoys to and from western Christian lands, Constantinople, Cyprus, Nubia, and Abyssinia.

Ibn<sup>c</sup> Abd al-Zāhir also reports on military ventures such as a raiding party which attacked a caravan from Sīs in 681/1282-1283,<sup>21</sup> the Nubian campaign which is discussed under the añal for 686/1287-1288,<sup>22</sup> the conquest of various fortresses such as al-Kakhtā in 682/1283-1284,<sup>23</sup> Qal<sup>c</sup>at al-Tīnī in 683/1284-1285,<sup>24</sup> Marqab<sup>25</sup> and Maraḳīyah<sup>26</sup> in 684/1285-1286, and Laodicea in 686/1287-1288.<sup>27</sup>

The affairs of the local Christian population are not neglected altogether, however, although information is not usually found in the context of a specific report on their situation. For example, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir reports that in 689/1290 a treaty was concluded with Aragon and Sicily which contained a clause providing that upon the death of any merchant who was a subject of the sultan, whether Muslim, Naṣārā (Christian), or dhimmī, within the domains of the kings of Aragon and Sicily, his money and goods, etc., were to be returned to the sultan.<sup>28</sup> Although the sultan may have been more concerned for the wealth that would be returned to his possession than for the welfare of his subjects, it is significant, perhaps, that Naṣārā and dhimmīs are mentioned on an equal basis with Muslims in the context of this treaty.

In this same year a treaty was also signed with Genoa in the presence of bishops (al-asāqifa) and monks (al-rahbān).<sup>29</sup> A bishop also wrote a testimony which was sworn upon by the ambassador,<sup>30</sup> was witness to the signing of an oath,<sup>31</sup> and wrote testimony,<sup>32</sup> an indication that the Christian clergy, at least, did enjoy certain status and played a useful part in effecting Qalā'ūn's policy especially in regard to his Christian allies. This sort of information, therefore, is not given so much for its own sake, but rather as it is related to some other event which is the actual focus of attention,

In one instance only does Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir ever mention an event in which a Christian played some central role. And even here the nature of the report leaves doubt as to whether the incident was mentioned on its own merit or whether, indeed, because a Christian and

a Jew had been involved. In 684/1285-1286, as the story goes, a Jew and a Christian were the accomplices of a Muslim, Shihāb al-Dīn ibn Dubaysī, who was a member of the ḥalqa<sup>33</sup> of Damascus and who had been engaged in forging the signature of the sultan on certain royal documents. The sultan's first reaction when he became informed of this, was that the tongue of the Muslim should be cut out and that he should be publicly disgraced, while the punishment of the Jew and Christian should be tasmīr.<sup>34</sup> Upon second thought, however, the sultan sought a fatwā from the fuqahā (lawyers), who recommended that all three be punished and imprisoned.<sup>35</sup>

At no point does Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir indulge in abusive rhetoric against Christians to an excessive degree. On only one or two occasions does he indicate his annoyance toward them, and understandably so, as for example, in regard to the Patriarch of al-Ḥadath who had given assistance to the Mongols.<sup>36</sup>

Thus, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir appears to be a valuable source for the period of Qalā'ūn especially with regard to the relations of the empire with foreign Christian powers. His reports which appear to be objective in nature are often original and sometimes are not to be found in other places.

#### Ibn al-Mukarram:

A second source for the reign of Qalā'ūn is Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Ruwayfi<sup>c</sup> al-Ifrīqī al-Miṣrī Ibn al-Mukarram (630/1233 - 711/1311). He is, apparently, still the object of some controversy, for some doubt yet exists as to whether the Ibn al-Mukarram so

often cited by Ibn al-Furāt, and who was employed in the dīwān al-inshā' under Qalā'ūn and who composed a work entitled Dhakīrat al-kātib<sup>37</sup>, or Tadhkirat al-labīb wa nuzhat al-adīb<sup>38</sup> is one and the same person as the author of Lisān al-<sup>c</sup>Arab. J. W. Flock thinks them to be so. The author of Lisān, who claims descent from Ruwayfi<sup>c</sup>ī b. Thābit, a governor of Tripoli in North Africa, ca. 48/688, was "kādī of Tripolis in North Africa," and according to Ibn Ḥajar, "all his life employed in the dīwān al-inshā'," thus making identification of the two as one in the same person fairly certain.<sup>39</sup> In any case the author of Dhakīrat al-kātib, by virtue of his position in the chancellery of Qalā'ūn, potentially ranks in importance as an original source with Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir. Unfortunately, we now have access to this work only through Ibn al-Furāt and al-Qalqashandī. Although little can be said of his work at this point, he should be kept in mind as a possible original source, especially as we shall have the occasion to meet with him again later when discussing Ibn al-Furāt's history.

#### Baybars al-Manṣūrī:

What we know of the life of Rukn al-Dīn Baybars al-Manṣūrī (d. 725/1354) has been outlined elsewhere, especially in the several articles of E. Ashtor, and so we shall not dwell upon biographical details here.<sup>40</sup> Suffice it to say that Baybars al-Manṣūrī was a high-ranking member of the military as early as Qalā'ūn's reign and was himself most probably a participant in many of the events about which he writes in Zubdat al-fikra fī tārīkh al-hijra.<sup>41</sup> For example, he reports on the



Battle of Hims in 680/1281-1282 at which he was present according to Ashtor.<sup>42</sup> I, however, found no explicit reference to his presence in Zubdat al-fikra although his report does sound as though it might have been written by someone who had been present.<sup>43</sup> Nor does he fail to include a copy of the document issued by the new sultan in which he was named governor of Karak in 685/1286-1287,<sup>44</sup> as well as some observations on his experiences there.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, we should expect to find some original information in Zubdat al-fikra for our period as well, based on the author's own experiences or on those of the people with whom he was in contact during these years.

This preliminary assumption is challenged, however, by a comparison of Zubdat al-fikra with Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's Tashrīf al-ayyām. For those years in which the works of both authors are extant (i.e., 681/1282-1283 throughout the rest of Qalā'ūn's reign), comparison shows that Baybars relied heavily on Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, at least for those reports in which we are interested. The two chronicles correspond not only in selection of information given, but also in terms of textual comparison. For example, in the year 681/1282-1283 the four reports given in Tashrīf al-ayyām concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations are the same as those which are to be found in Zubdat al-fikra.<sup>46</sup> In most cases Baybars al-Manṣūrī's text appears to be an abridgement of Tashrīf al-ayyām. In addition to scattered and minor omissions, we find more important deletions as well. To cite one example, in 681/1282-1283, a treaty was concluded with the Templars of Tortosa. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir gives what appears to be the complete text,<sup>47</sup> whereas Baybars al-Manṣūrī has included only the pre-

amble.<sup>48</sup> Another example is Baybars al-Manṣūrī's account of a raid on Sīṭs in the year 682/1283-1284. Baybars concludes his version by stating that after defeating and routing the inhabitants of Ayās,<sup>49</sup> the army returned safely.<sup>50</sup> Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir, at this point, goes on to recount briefly the story of two prisoners, to describe how the raiders then went on to Nahr al-Jahān<sup>51</sup> and encountered a group from the Armenian army whom they killed and whose horses they seized. Only after all this did they return according to the account in Tashrīf al-ayyām.<sup>52</sup> Many other examples could be cited.

This is not to say that there is nothing at all new or original to be found in Zubdat al-fikra for these years, but where Baybars does add information, more often than not it takes the form of a precision to a reference already found in Tashrīf al-ayyām. For instance, in his account of an attack on a caravan from Sīṭs, Baybars identified the persons involved more precisely than did Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir.<sup>53</sup> In the report of the death of the Byzantine emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologus, Baybars includes the information that the sultan, after swearing an oath with the son in lieu of his father the late emperor, sent the son gifts.<sup>54</sup> Those additions may, indeed, represent an original contribution, but in general, what precisions are made are of relatively minor significance.

On the other hand, Baybars does give reports not found at all in Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir, not only in those years in which Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir's text is lacking, but also during those years in which we do have both works. In 681/1282-1283, as we have noted, the selection of reports corresponds perfectly. In 682/1283-1284, however, Baybars includes one

report not given by Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhīr concerning a raid on Armenia.<sup>55</sup>

Though it is not to be found in Tashrīf al-ayyām, it does not seem from the text that Baybars himself was present during the raid, nor does he cite his source for this information. We can only surmise that in this case his report may have been based upon an oral source, perhaps someone who was a participant or in some way associated with the incident. In 688/1289 Baybars reports on the decision of the sultan to attack Tripoli because its inhabitants had broken the treaty,<sup>56</sup> again, information not found in Tashrīf al-ayyām. Baybars describes neither the actual siege nor the preparations for it. In fact, his report contains no information not found elsewhere in greater detail.

Finally, we shall consider the reports Baybars has given for the years in which the text of Tashrīf al-ayyām is not available (678/1279-1280 - 680/1281-1282). In 679/1280-1281 Baybars reports on a Mongol foray into northern Syria in which the Mongols were aided by the king of SIs,<sup>57</sup> and an expedition against Marqab.<sup>58</sup> In 680/1281-1282 entries concerning the renewal of a treaty with the Hospitalers,<sup>59</sup> a plot against Qalā'ūn,<sup>60</sup> Christian aid to the Mongols during the Battle of Hims,<sup>61</sup> the arrival of envoys from Constantinople,<sup>62</sup> and the treaty concluded with Bohemond of Tripoli<sup>63</sup> are included in Zubdat al-fikra. Of these, the three treaties and the arrival of envoys are the type of information which we would expect someone like Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhīr to report, and so we may assume that, perhaps, here too, Baybars relied on the accounts in Tashrīf al-ayyām. In only one case, however, the

conclusion of the treaty with Bohemond in 680/1281-1282, does he give what appears to be the complete text of the document<sup>64</sup> which, as we have noted, probably came from the "archives" of Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir. In fact, this is the only instance during Qalā'ūn's reign in which he gives what appears to be a fairly complete version of a treaty. The other treaties on which he reports follow a pattern similar to that established for the years in which both Zubdat al-fikra and Tashrīf al-ayyām are available. The possibility exists that he may have derived the text from the work of Ibn al-Mukarram though this seems less likely since, as we have seen, he is in the habit of using Tashrīf al-ayyām as his source elsewhere. On the other hand, events such as the Mongol expedition against northern Syria, the expedition against Marqab and the Battle of Hims are of the sort with which we would expect a military man to be familiar, even if he himself were not a participant. Baybars' accounts of the latter incidents are so descriptive and lively that it would be difficult to conclude that he did not, in fact, have some first hand knowledge of these affairs. But, alas, there is no conclusive evidence that these reports are original with him.<sup>65</sup> Suspicion is aroused when one recalls that for the seige of the fortress of al-Kakhtā in 682/1283-1284, Baybars has relied on Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's account to the extent that he has copied it nearly verbatim.<sup>66</sup> One more remark should be made. Even a brief glance at the tables to compare Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's entries concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations with those of Baybars will show that after the year 682/1283-1284, Baybars' reports are few and far between, only four in number for the remainder of Qalā'ūn's career, whereas Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's

reports are numerous and frequent with the exception of the years 687/1288-1289 and 688/1289. Thus, Baybars al-Manṣūrī does not appear to be as original a source for our period and subject matter as he was for the years analyzed by Liddle. Contrary to Ashtor's claim then that "quoique Baibars (ou son secrétaire littéraire) ait connu et copié des oeuvres historiques traitant de cette époque, comme la 'Vie de Baibars' par Muhyi 'd-dīn Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abdazzāhir, il préfère toujours l'information orale,"<sup>67</sup> our analysis confirms Haarmann's judgment that Baybars' most important source is Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir.<sup>68</sup> This is certainly true in regard to our particular subject matter and period, though Baybars did from time to time include information based on his own experience or on a source whom he unfortunately does not name.

Before taking leave of Baybars, one further observation is in order relative to the type of information which he has chosen to include. In every case the events which he describes concern relations with foreign Christian powers, either Crusader states or Christian groups allied with the Mongols, in one instance Nubian affairs and on other occasions Christian lands in the West. Not one mention was found which informed us concerning the indigenous Christians of the Mamlūk empire. This is somewhat curious in view of the fact that Baybars al-Manṣūrī's scribe or secretary, Shams al-Dīn Riyāsat ibn Bakr,<sup>69</sup> was a Christian. One would have expected that through him some mention of the local Christian population would have arisen and, therefore, one may wonder whether this very lack might itself, be interpreted as some sort of comment

ambiguous to be sure, upon the situation.

al-Birzālī and al-Jazarī:

<sup>c</sup>Alam al-Dīn al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Birzālī (658/1260 - 739/1338-1339) was a Syrian historian whose interest in religious scholarship is revealed in his writing where, like al-Jazarī, al-Dhahabī, and al-Kutubī, his contemporaries, he tended to devote more space to biographies and, in the narrative part of his work, to religious affairs than had been the practice hitherto in historical writing.<sup>70</sup> Probably as a result of travels during his studies,<sup>71</sup> al-Birzālī was acquainted with many scholars throughout Egypt, Arabia and the Fertile Crescent who often served as sources for his history.<sup>72</sup> However, al-Birzālī spent most of his life as a teacher of ḥadīth in Damascus.<sup>73</sup>

Until now only one copy of al-Birzālī's work, al-Muqtafā li-tārīkh al-Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Abī Shāma, which covers the period 665/1266-1267 - 738/1337-1338, has been found--a manuscript preserved in Istanbul covering the years 665/1266 - 720/1320-1321.<sup>74</sup> Little's analysis of the work has shown al-Birzālī's penchant for detail and a tendency to mix what would normally be considered insignificant trifles with the momentous events of the day.<sup>75</sup> This trait would seem to lend itself to our purposes, for the information we seek concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations, especially in regard to indigenous Christians, may not have been considered of an order of magnitude worthy of the attention of historians such as Baybars al-Manṣūrī whose major concerns lay in the realm of political and international affairs of the Mamlūk empire.

Unfortunately, however, al-Birzālī's al-Muqtafā has not been

accessible to me. I shall, therefore, rely heavily on Little's analysis of and conclusions regarding this work which indicate that al-Birzālī's al-Muqtafā "underlies much of what contemporary and later historians wrote about Syria during the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir."<sup>76</sup> The inaccessibility of the text of al-Muqtafā has rendered the task of verifying this judgment in regard to our own period and subject matter more difficult. However, certain other findings of Little's investigation may be helpful in this respect. It was discovered, for example, that the anonymous author of the manuscript which covers the years 690/1291 - 709/1309-1310, edited by Zetterstéen, cited al-Birzālī for a passage which, however, does not actually appear in al-Muqtafā. Eventually, it became clear to Little "that Author Z. copied his account from al-Ḡazarī who in turn relied on what may have been an oral narration of al-Birzālī."<sup>77</sup> Similar instances occur in Hawādith al-zamān where al-Jazarī quotes al-Birzālī with phrases such as "Wa-hakā" and "Wa-qāla al-Birzālī" in regard to passages which are not to be found in al-Muqtafā.<sup>78</sup> On at least one occasion for our period as well--the obituary for a certain al-Farīqī in the year 689/1290--al-Birzālī seems to have been an oral source for al-Jazarī judging by the expression he has used: "That is what our shaykh, the learned imām <sup>c</sup>Alam al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad al-Birzālī related to me."<sup>79</sup> Unfortunately, it is not possible to collate this with al-Muqtafā to determine whether it was actually part of this work or not. Correlation with Ibn Kathīr's al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya fī al-tārīkh,<sup>80</sup> which is recognized as being based on

al-Birzālī,<sup>81</sup> yields negative results in this regard, so, in all probability, this example is another occurrence of the pattern which Little was able to establish.<sup>82</sup>

Thus, Little has concluded that al-Birzālī probably related orally a great deal of information to al-Jazarī which this historian transcribed rather fully while the narrator chose to summarize it in his own written account.<sup>83</sup> Although some have claimed that al-Birzālī actually wrote a résumé of al-Jazarī, Little deduces evidence to show that it is more probable that al-Jazarī actually relied heavily on al-Muqtafā as the basis for his work,<sup>84</sup> using "not only al-Birzālī's oral reports but also his written history as a source for Hawādīt."<sup>85</sup> Haarmann appears to concur in this conclusion,<sup>86</sup> and as we have shown, evidence is not totally lacking for our period.

The importance of the chronicle of Shams al-Dīn Abū <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Majd al-Dīn Abī Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Bakr Ibrāhīm ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-<sup>c</sup>Azīz al-Jazarī al-Dimashqī (658/1260 - 739/1338-1339),<sup>87</sup> entitled Hawādīth al-zamān wa anbā'uhu wa wafayāt al-akābir wa al-a<sup>c</sup>yān min abnā'ihī, was recognized quite a number of years ago by several scholars including H. Zayāt, <sup>c</sup>Abbās <sup>c</sup>Azzawī and Jean Sauvaget.<sup>88</sup> However, it is only through the recent work of Ulrich Haarmann and Donald P. Little that a full appreciation of the chronicle has been possible in terms of its originality and the extent to which other contemporary, as well as later, historians are indebted to it. Haarmann has determined that al-Jazarī is one of the most important sources for the early Mamlūk



period and that no other text for the period 680/1281-1282 - 705/1305-1306 can boast such a high degree of originality.<sup>89</sup> As noted earlier, Little's analysis showed that al-Jazarī, in fact, is one of the "three sources for the early reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir, on one, or more of which all other sources rely to some degree or other."<sup>90</sup>

Five manuscripts of Hawādith al-zamān are now known to exist:

1) the Paris manuscript which is a final version covering the years 689/1290 - 698/1298-1299;<sup>91</sup> 2) and 3) the Gotha manuscripts which are rough drafts, one of which covers 677/1278-1279 - 693/1294-1295 with lacunae and another which includes the years 683/1284-1285, 688/1289-1290, 694/1294-1295 - 695/1295-1296.<sup>92</sup> This is the text which Ulrich Haarmann has edited and compared with Ibn al-Dawādārī's Kanz al-duray for the years 682/1283-1284 - 687/1288-1289;<sup>93</sup> 4) the Istanbul manuscript, also a rough draft, covering 725/1324 - 738/1337-1338;<sup>94</sup> and finally, 5) the Ribāṭ manuscript which is a final version covering 608/1211-1212 - 657/1258-1259.<sup>95</sup>

The reports dealing with Mamlūk-Christian relations found in the extant years of al-Jazarī's chronicle are only four in number: 1) the conquest of the fortress of al-Kakhtā in 682/1283-1284;<sup>96</sup> the seige of Marqāb and Maraqīya in 684/1285-1286;<sup>97</sup> 3) the Nubian affair reported in the annal for 686/1287-1288;<sup>98</sup> and 4) the report of the Christian who was apprehended for drinking wine during the month of Ramaḍān in 687/1288-1289.<sup>99</sup> As is readily apparent two of the four entries concern relations with Crusader kingdoms, a third reports on the Christian land of Nubia, which was under what one might call the "colonial" control of the

Mamlūk empire, while only one--that of the Christian who drank wine during Ramaḍān--concerns local Christians. In at least three of the four reports, those concerning the siege of Marqab, the Christian who was seized drinking wine, and the Nubian affair, al-Jazarī has presented new and original information. For example, al-Jazarī includes, for the first time in our sources, the text of a letter composed by the secretaries of the sultan on the occasion of the conquest of Marqab, which was read to the people of Damascus in the mosque, informing them of the victory.<sup>100</sup> Al-Jazarī has also given exact information concerning the movements of the various divisions of the army leaving for Marqab found in no other contemporary source.<sup>101</sup>

The story of the Christian who was caught drinking wine during the daytime in Ramaḍān is also recorded for the first time by al-Jazarī.<sup>102</sup> It was found in no other source examined before al-Nuwayrī.

Similarly new material is found in al-Jazarī's report of the Nubian affair in 686/1287-1288.<sup>103</sup> We learn from al-Jazarī, for example, that the amīr<sup>c</sup> Alam al-Dīn Sanjar al-Masrūrī al-Ṣāliḥī, known as al-Khayyāṭ, was removed from his position as mutawallī of Cairo (a position which he had held for a period of twenty-two years) in that year and that it was his successor Shams al-Dīn Khaḍar who ordered him to go to Nubia,<sup>104</sup> whereas Baybars simply states that the sultan sent an expedition in al-Masrūrī's company.<sup>105</sup> Al-Jazarī also mentions the fact that the amīr<sup>c</sup> Izz al-Dīn Mawḍūd al-Kūrānī went along as well, a fact not mentioned at all by Baybars.<sup>106</sup> Al-Jazarī makes it clear that it was not until the

army, accompanied by these two men had reached the city of Qūṣ that they were joined by the amīr <sup>c</sup>Izz al-Dīn Aydamir al-Sayfī, the sīlāhdār,<sup>107</sup> the mutawallī (governor) of Qūṣ who had been the ustādār<sup>108</sup> of Aytimish al-Sa<sup>c</sup>dī,<sup>109</sup> whereas Baybars' version is not as precise as to how the army moved and when it was joined by <sup>c</sup>Izz al-Dīn Aydamir al-Sayfī.<sup>110</sup> Therefore, claims in behalf of al-Jazarī's originality are borne out for this period and material as well.

Before leaving al-Jazarī, however, one further problem has arisen in regard to our sources and should be discussed. Evidence, in the form of similarity of phrasing, was found for the existence of some relationship between al-Jazarī and Baybars al-Manṣūrī. Claude Cahen noted such a possibility in his Syrie du nord,<sup>111</sup> but made no statement concerning the precise nature of that relationship. More recently, Haarmann has stated that "there is probably no direct relationship between Baybars and al-Jazarī,"<sup>112</sup> but likewise gives no documentation. For our own part, it is not possible to solve the problem without checking all of the source materials, for the evidence found in the report on the surrender of the fortress of al-Rakhtā, suggests that if the information is not original with al-Jazarī, then some third as yet unidentified source must be involved. The possibility that a common source is involved may be enhanced by the fact that Baybars also gives some facts not found in al-Jazarī's version. The corresponding portions of each report follow in transliterated form to show the relationship between the two authors.

Baybars al-Manṣūrī: Wa lammā kānat hadhihi al-qal'a alā hadhihi al-sūra fī al-ḥaṣāna wa al-man'a ishtadda amal al-sultān alā taḥṣīlihā wa al-wu'ūd al-jamīla li-man huwa bihā ilā an ittafaqu wa amilū alā al-Shujā' Mūsā al-nā'ib bihā wa qatalūhu wa rattabū shakhsan yusammā Badr al-Dīn wa arsalū ilā nā'ib al-sultān bi-Halab al-mahrūsa bi-thalātha nafarin yuḥrifūnahu al-sūra wa yubdhilūna lahu taslīm al-qal'a al-madhkūra. Fa-jāhhaza al-amīr Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sarūwī wa al-amīr Rukn al-Dīn Baybars al-silāhdār wa al-amīr Shams al-Dīn Aqush al-Shamsī al-Ayntābī wa ma'ahum al-tashārīf wa al-khayl wa al-khizāna. Fa-hallafū man bi-al-qal'a li-sultān wa li-waladihi wa tasallamūhā wa sayyarū al-ladhīna kānū fīhā jamā'atan ba'd jamā'atin ilā al-abwāb al-sharīfa. Fa-aḥsana al-sultān ilayhim wa aqṭa'a man yastahiqqu al-iqṭā' minhum. Wa juhhizat wa sārāt ilayhā al-zardkhānāt wa al-ālāt wa istaqarrat fī al-mamlaka al-islāmīya wa sārāt ghussatan fī sadr al-bilād al-Armanīya wa ḥaṣala al-istizhār alā al-kuffār wa al-tamakkunu min al-ghārāt, alayhim ānā' al-layl wa aṭrāfat al-nihār.

al-Jazarī: Wa wa'ada man bihā al-mawā'id al-jamīla. Fa-aṭābū bi-al-samī wa al-tā'a. Wa qatalū al-nā'ib bihā, wa huwa al-Shujā' Mūsā, wa rāsū nā'ib al-saltana al-sharīfa bi-al-mamlaka al-Halabīya wa badhilū taslīm al-qal'a. Fa-jāhhaza ilayhim al-amīr Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sarsarī wa al-amīr Rukn al-Dīn Baybars al-silāhdār wa al-amīr Shams al-Dīn Aqush al-Shamsī al-Ayntābī wa man ma'ahum. Fa-tasallama al-hisn wa hallafū man bihi li-al-sultān wa li-waladihi al-Malik al-Sāliḥ, wa albasūhum al-tashārīf. Thumma jāhhazū man kāna bihā tā'ifatan ba'd ukhrā ilā al-abwāb al-sharīf al-sultānīya. Fa-aḥsana al-sultān ilayhim, wa aqṭa'a minhum man yastahiqqu al-iqṭā'a. Wa juhhizat ilayhim al-zardkhānāt wa al-āt[sic] al-hisār. Wa istaqarrat fī jumlat al-ḥusūn al-islāmīya. Wa sārāt hadhihi al-qal'a shajan fī hulūq al-Arman wa ḥaṣala al-istizhār bihā alā al-ghārāt. 114

The third source alternative gains further credence in view of the fact that even where the reports do not correspond verbatim, one or the other may have paraphrased the original, for equivalent phrases are often used (e.g., tā'ifatan ba<sup>c</sup>d ukhrā,<sup>115</sup> and jamā<sup>c</sup>atan ba<sup>c</sup>d jamā<sup>c</sup>atin<sup>116</sup>). Solution of this problem could cast some interesting light upon the relationship of Syrian and Egyptian sources as well as increase our knowledge of the sources themselves.

al-Yūnīnī:

Contemporary with al-Jazarī is Quṭb al-Dīn Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Quṭb al-Dīn al-Yūnīnī (d. 726/1325-1326), the author of a work entitled Dhayl mir'āt al-zamān fī tārīkh al-a<sup>c</sup>yān.<sup>117</sup> Whereas Little's analysis resulted in the conclusion that Dhayl is "nothing less than the text, only slightly abridged, of some of the lost annals of Hawādith az-zamān,"<sup>118</sup> for the years he studied, Haarmann's enquiry indicated that at least between 684/1284-1285 and 688/1289, al-Jazarī and al-Yūnīnī have consulted each other mutually, but that al-Jazarī's borrowings do not seem to go beyond 688/1289 and that after 694/1294-1295 (basing himself on Little's analysis), al-Yūnīnī has preserved intact almost the complete and literal copy of Hawādith al-zamān.<sup>119</sup> Haarmann's theory is this: al-Yūnīnī began the first draft of his history some time before al-Jazarī began his and continued it until 688/1289. Al-Jazarī used this draft for certain points which al-Yūnīnī reported at first hand and only later began composing his own chronicle. Then al-Yūnīnī incorporated parts of al-Jazarī's chronicle in the final version of his own work.<sup>120</sup> This means that between 684/1285-1286 and 688/1289 either al-Jazarī or al-Yūnīnī

may have been the original source, whereas al-Jazarī's reports after 688/1289 are probably based for the most part on personal knowledge. Prior to 684/1285-1286 it may be that we should look to al-Yūnīnī, yet if Haarmann is right, al-Yūnīnī may later have incorporated portions of al-Jazarī into his final version during these years. Regrettably, it has been impossible to verify this relationship prior to 682/1283-1284 or after 688/1289 since al-Jazarī is not extant for these periods. Between the years 682/1283-1284 and 687/1288-1289, years in which we do have the text of Hawādith al-zamān, al-Yūnīnī reports only one event concerning Christians in common with al-Jazarī--the conquest of Marqab and Maraqīya.<sup>121</sup> Textual evidence shows that, indeed, the two reports are in some way related. For example, the description of the fortress in one version shows similarity in phrasing to the other as the following excerpts show.

al-Jazarī: Qultu: wa hādhā ḥiṣn al-Marqab huwa min al-ḥuṣūn al-mashhūra bi-al-man'a wa al-ḥaṣāna, wa lam yaftaḥhu al-sultān al-shahīd Ṣalāh al-Dīn wa lā al-Malik al-Zāhir, raḥimahumā Allāh ta'ālā, bal iddakarahu Allāh li-al-Malik al-Mansūr. Wa kāna fīhi darar 'azīm 'alā al-muslimīn.<sup>122</sup>

al-Yūnīnī: Wa hādhā al-Marqab huwa min al-ḥuṣūn al-mashhūra bi-al-man'a wa al-ḥaṣāna, wa huwa kabīr jiddān, wa lam yaftaḥhu al-sultān al-shahīd Ṣalāh al-Dīn, raḥimahu Allāh. Fa-ḥāza aḥrahu wa shukrahu, wa law lam yakun min dararīhi illā mā fa'ala ~~shu~~ bi-al-muslimīn fī shuhūr hadhihi al-sana la-kafā.<sup>123</sup>

In this case, however, it is evident that it is al-Yūnīnī who has borrowed from al-Jazarī since al-Jazarī prefaces his report with the word qultu which implies that this information is based on his own personal knowledge.

Al-Yūnīnī, contrary to usual practice, has omitted the qultu.<sup>124</sup>

It is readily apparent that al-Yūnīnī has relied not only on al-Jazarī but also on other sources in addition to al-Jazarī whose passages form only a very small part of the text in Dhayl, for it is only the above-mentioned description of the fortress of Marqab and a line or two concerning Maraqīya, resembling what is found in Hawādith al-zamān, that reveals the indebtedness of al-Yūnīnī to al-Jazarī.

Al-Yūnīnī interrupts his report on Marqab to narrate the sultan's troubles with Sunqur al-Ashqar which most probably had some bearing on the sultan's plans in regard to Marqab.<sup>125</sup> Al-Yūnīnī also reports on a request from the Hospitalers seeking safe passage for the inhabitants of Marqab and their possessions to which the sultan did not respond.<sup>126</sup> Although the letter quoted by al-Jazarī, describing the siege and announcing the Muslim victory to the inhabitants of the city, which was read in the mosque at Damascus, is not carried by al-Yūnīnī, he does include a series of letters as follows: 1) from the sultan to his son al-Ashraf Khāṭil;<sup>127</sup> 2) a letter dictated by the sultan to Tāj al-Dīn addressed to the amīr <sup>c</sup>Alam al-Dīn al-Shujā<sup>c</sup>ī;<sup>128</sup> 3) from the amīr Husām al-Dīn Lājīn, viceroy of the sultan in Syria to the sultan's son al-Malik al-Sāliḥ which he has taken from the inshā of Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd, kātib al-darj;<sup>129</sup> and finally, 4) a letter dictated by Husām al-Dīn Lājīn to Kamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn al-<sup>c</sup>Atṭār addressed to <sup>c</sup>Alam al-Dīn al-Shujā<sup>c</sup>ī.<sup>130</sup> None of these letters or the qasīda composed by the aforementioned kātib al-darj are to be found in al-Jazarī or, for that matter, in any of the other sources to date. They are thus based on al-Yūnīnī's own information or

on some as yet unknown source. Although these letters contain no really new information, they do indicate the spirit in which the conquest of the fortress was viewed and thus have some importance in any assessment of the Maḥlūk attitude toward the Syrian Franks.

Unfortunately, therefore, we are not able to rely with as great certainty on Dhayl for the lost annals of Hawādith al-zamān for our period as Little was able to do for his. Although al-Yūnīnī does use or is perhaps used by al-Jazarī, as Haarmann has shown, he does include information not found in the latter but omits some which is found there as well.

As has already been noted, for those years in which we have both chronicles, of the four reports entered in Hawādith al-zamān which are of concern here, only one is found in al-Yūnīnī's Dhayl. As for the remaining years in which al-Jazarī is not extant, al-Yūnīnī gives several reports, some of which appear for the first time in any of our sources. Some are especially important since they concern local Christians. For example, in the year 680/1281-1282, al-Yūnīnī reports that the ahl al-dhimma among the mustawfīs and employees of the dīwāns were forced to embrace Islām.<sup>131</sup> Later, in that same year, he reports that a fatwā was issued permitting them to return to their former religion.<sup>132</sup> This event is recorded in only one other source as far as we know--Ibn Kathīr.<sup>133</sup> Whether it is original with al-Yūnīnī or whether both Ibn Kathīr and al-Yūnīnī have derived their account from al-Birzālī upon whom Ibn Kathīr based much of his work,<sup>134</sup> remains a problem, for at the present the text of al-Birzālī is not available for verification.



Similarly in the year 681/1282-1283, an obituary is given for Hibbat Allāh al-Sadīd al-Naṣarānī al-Qibṭī, a Christian mustawfī of Egypt,<sup>135</sup> whom al-Yūnīnī describes in glowing terms, not only praising his administrative abilities but also his personal qualities. This is an interesting entry not only for what it reveals about the position of Christians within the empire, but also, perhaps, with respect to al-Yūnīnī's attitude toward Christians. Indeed, he seems quite open-minded judging by this report.

Al-Yūnīnī in one further instance reports on this category of Mamlūk-Christian relations. In the annal for 689/1290, he states that a letter came from the sultan to the effect that no Christian or Jew should be employed in the dīwāns. However, no action was taken on this (Fa-lam yūmal bihi).<sup>136</sup>

On the whole, then al-Yūnīnī appears to gain importance for our period in contrast to the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir.

#### Abū al-Fidā:

Abū al-Fidā (673/1273 - 732/1331) was still too young when Qalā'ūn was sultan to be considered a contemporary or original source.<sup>137</sup> The evidence of his chronicle al-Mukhtaṣar fī tārīkh al-baṣhar<sup>138</sup> confirms this judgment, for though he himself was actually a participant in one of the most renowned campaigns of that era, his version turns out to be no more than a summary of Baybars al-Manṣūrī's version in Zubdat al-fikra, upon which Haarmann has concluded that Abū al-Fidā relied to a great extent throughout the period 679/1280-1281 - 689/1290.<sup>139</sup>

As far as Christian-Mamlūk matters are concerned, Abū al-Fidā's interests lie mainly in Frankish-Mamlūk and Frankish-Byzantine relations since his reports, which are also few in number, deal only with major campaigns--the Battle of Hims, Marqab and Tripoli--and the death of Michael Palaeologus, the Byzantine emperor. He reveals no interest in local Christian matters whatsoever.

Since Abū al-Fidā's chronicle al-Mukhtasār deals with so few items and then proves to be a summary of Zubdat al-fikra for the most part, he is of little importance as a source for this particular inquiry.

al-Nuwayrī:

Although Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (677/1279 - 732/1331-1332), lived throughout the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn, like Abū al-Fidā, he was probably too young during even the latter part of that period to be considered a contemporary source.

This is made all the more certain by the fact that he did not compose his work Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab<sup>140</sup> until 714/1314-1315.<sup>141</sup>

Although he eventually came to occupy various posts in the Mamlūk administration, he did not do so until the reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn.<sup>142</sup>

Little remarks that the first office in which we have any record of his being employed was that of the directorship of the sultan's properties in Syria in 601/1301-1302 when al-Nuwayrī was in his early twenties.<sup>143</sup> Thus, we might expect him like other historians who also held administrative posts (Baybars and Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, for example) to have had access to documents or at least information concerning the affairs of state not available to some others.

One office held by al-Nuwayrī which is, perhaps, of particular interest for this study was that of "Director of the Bureau of Privy Funds (dīwān al-hāṣṣ) and of the Qalā'ūn complex of buildings (which consisted of Qalā'ūn's mausoleum, madrasa-mosque, and hospital)...."<sup>144</sup> One may assume that as a result of this connection, al-Nuwayrī may have taken more interest in the reign of Qalā'ūn than he might have otherwise, or that he may have learned things about that sultan in this position that he would not have known under different circumstances.

In any event his work, Nihāyat al-arab, is probably in large part one result of his experiences in various offices, for as Little, citing Kratschkowsky, points out, it is "a vast encyclopaedia designed to contain 'all the knowledge that was indispensable for a first-class scribe.'"<sup>145</sup>

Divergent opinions have been expressed concerning al-Nuwayrī as an historian. Blochet judged al-Nuwayrī's work to be an excellent one in comparison with that of Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il.<sup>146</sup> His opinion, however, seems to be influenced mainly by al-Nuwayrī's finer style and mastery of the Arabic language. Schregle, for an earlier period, judged al-Nuwayrī important because he alone had reproduced a document signed by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn which he himself had seen.<sup>147</sup> Ashtor, on the other hand, charges that "al-Nuwayrī often repeats himself, is inaccurate, transmits his sources inexactly," and so on.<sup>148</sup> Little, however, could verify only one of these charges, that of repetition, which he found almost inevitable in view of the innovative manner in which al-Nuwayrī presented materials

which deviated from annalistic style.<sup>149</sup> As Little has noted, al-Nuwayrī's historical section is divided by regions or dynasties.<sup>150</sup> In the case of Qalā'ūn the period of his reign is further divided into the campaigns and secondly, into other events such as treaties concluded, embassies received and other internal and external affairs. In this latter subdivision, al-Nuwayrī does relate information concerning two of the campaigns (the conquest of Marqab and the Nubian campaign) about which he had written at length in the proper place in his work. Neither of these second reports adds anything new to what we have learned from his more detailed entries. Though one may indeed accuse al-Nuwayrī of being repetitious, this would appear to be a very minor defect, at least in regard to the subject matter with which this investigation has dealt.

More serious is Ashtor's accusation that al-Nuwayrī has transmitted his sources inexactly--serious because al-Nuwayrī is an historian upon whom Ibn al-Furāt, as we shall soon see, relied very heavily, and it is upon Ibn al-Furāt in turn that other historians (for example, al-Maqrīzī) have relied. In those instances where al-Nuwayrī identifies his source by name, he provides us with the best circumstances under which his accuracy may be checked since we are fairly certain that he has borrowed directly. At one point in his version of the conquest of Tripoli in 688/1289 al-Nuwayrī cites al-Yūnīnī (Wā ḥakā al-shaykh Qutb al-Dīn al-Yūnīnī fī tārīkhihi).<sup>151</sup> The two versions correspond nearly word for word. In this instance, at least, al-Nuwayrī has not interfered with the sense of the story even when he does introduce some slight variation.

On another occasion, al-Nuwayrī cites al-mu'arrikh as the source for his account of the Battle of Ḥims in 680/1281-1282.<sup>152</sup> The mu'arrikh (historian) in question is, as it turns out, Baybars al-Manṣūrī with whose version al-Nuwayrī's coincides again nearly word for word. Later in the report he cites Baybars by name.<sup>153</sup> In this instance, we can accuse al-Nuwayrī of nothing more than abridging Baybars' report of the incident.

On a third occasion al-Nuwayrī does not identify his source in any way. However, we are able to recognize it as al-Jazarī, for we find that al-Nuwayrī has used al-Jazarī's version as his own, borrowing it in toto.<sup>154</sup> At another moment when reporting the Sanjar al-Shujā<sup>c</sup>ī affair, he has incorporated al-Jazarī's version within his own longer version.<sup>155</sup> Therefore, inaccuracy of transmission does not seem to be a charge which we can bring against al-Nuwayrī.

As for the question of originality, we may perhaps judge him for a lack of precisely that. On only one occasion did we find that al-Nuwayrī introduced any significant piece of new material. This occurred in his version of the Sanjar al-Shujā<sup>c</sup>ī affair.<sup>156</sup> In contrast with Baybars and al-Jazarī, al-Nuwayrī states that the reason for the demise of this amīr was that he had been accused of selling arms to the Franks. The information has come from some other source as yet unidentified whom al-Nuwayrī used in conjunction with other sources such as al-Jazarī, for example, whose report is contained verbatim within al-Nuwayrī's account of this incident. Thus, we are justified in our agreement with Little's

conclusion that "It might not be unfair...to characterize the section of Nihāyat al-arab which we [Little] have studied as a combination of materials borrowed from Zubdat al-fikra and the Syrian sources with relatively little original information."<sup>157</sup>

On the whole, however, al-Nuwayrī has to his favor that he has transmitted his sources faithfully in the instances investigated. Furthermore, he is the first to have made use of both the Egyptian and Syrian sources and has, as in the report on the siege of Tripoli, for example, juxtaposed information from both. Furthermore, while for the most part he appears to be little more than a compiler, he has, as in the case just mentioned, frequently combined several sources to give the fullest version found in our sources to date. Finally, on at least one occasion, he has presented information which has not been found in any earlier source, and although this piece of information is surely not original with him, he will remain important in this respect until the original source for it has been identified.

#### Later Sources

Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaddal ibn abī al-Fadā'il:

Of Sayf al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh ibn Aybak al-Dawādārī very little is known, not even the date of his birth or death.<sup>158</sup> It is known, however, that he was engaged in the writing of his chronicle, Kanz al-durar wa jāmi<sup>c</sup> al-ghurar,<sup>159</sup> between the years 709/1209-1210 - 736/1335-1336,<sup>160</sup> and that the volume which deals with Qalā'ūn was com-

pleted in 734/1334.<sup>161</sup> Although he should, therefore, probably not be considered a contemporary historian, he did have a reliable first hand source in the person of his father who served in various military campaigns and occupied several governmental posts.<sup>162</sup> Like al-Birzālī, Ibn al-Dawādārī was interested not only in the major political and military events of the day, but also in more minor, mundane happenings which would again recommend him as a source for news concerning the affairs of the local Christians. His chronicle, however, is somewhat disappointing in this respect, for although he does concern himself with several incidents involving foreign Christian lands, he does not include any information on the indigenous Christian population. This is somewhat surprising in view of the fact that both Haarmann and Little have deduced al-Jazarī to be a major source, either direct or indirect, for Ibn al-Dawādārī<sup>163</sup> and al-Jazarī does carry some such reports though they are not numerous as we have seen.

Mufaddal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il issues from quite a different background, for he was a Copt.<sup>164</sup> Blochet suggests that this may be one reason why he is not cited by other historians.<sup>165</sup> Mufaddal himself, however, has declared that he wrote his history, al-Nahj al-sadīd wa al-durr al-farīd fī-mā ba'd tārīkh Ibn al-Amīd,<sup>166</sup> for himself, and in the words of Blochet, "dans le but de fixer les détails historiques des événements auxquels il avait assisté ou qu'il avait entendu raconter, sans aucune intention précise de le livrer au public...."<sup>167</sup> which could also explain his noticeable absence among those cited by later historians.

Whatever the case may be his chronicle is now at our disposal. In its regard various opinions have been expressed. Blochet, for example, discredits it as the work of an ignorant person with mediocre education, which he deduces from the fact that he, a Copt, should qualify a Muslim ruler such as Qalā'ūn with titles such as "al-shahīd" and regard his actions against the Crusaders with favor.<sup>168</sup> A second possibility is that Mufaddal simply became so absorbed in copying that he was not aware of what he was writing. These views contrast with Little's conclusion regarding Mufaddal that he "shows striking ability to organize material meaningfully,<sup>169</sup> an ability which one would not expect to find in an ignorant person of mediocre education or in one so simple-minded as to become so completely engrossed in copying that he was oblivious to the material he was transcribing.

One further explanation for such confusion may be advanced. That is that the use of Muslim formulas may actually reflect the popular practice of the Coptic community and even indicate some sort of cultural assimilation among the two groups. That Mufaddal may actually have regarded the Muslim ruler Qalā'ūn with favor rather than hostility may betray the attitude of the Coptic community toward the invading Crusaders who, though their religious confrères, were of a different rite represented by the Pope with whom some hostility had existed and who had come upsetting what may have been a delicate balance in the modus vivendi of the Muslim and Christian communities in that part of the world.<sup>170</sup> Though it is not possible on the basis of so little evidence to arrive at any definite conclusion in this respect, it may be worthwhile to keep such a



possibility in mind when interpreting the information which does emerge concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations of the period.

Finally, it may be suggested that had the situation of Copts been particularly odious, and if Mufaḍḍal did, indeed, possess the ability described by Little, he would most likely have modified his language unless, of course, there was actually reason to conceal his real attitude.

As for more concrete information concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations found in al-Nahj al-saḍīd, Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il, like Ibn al-Dawādārī, includes reports concerning relations of the Mamlūk authority with foreign Christian powers, but fails to inform us concerning the indigenous Christian population except perhaps indirectly by his use of the Muslim formulas and the way in which he approves the actions of the Muslim ruler toward the Crusaders. Our evidence is inconclusive, however, for a large lacuna exists in al-Nahj al-saḍīd between the years 682/1283-1284 and 688/1289. Again, it is surprising that there should be no such entries in the extant annals since both Little and Haarmann agree that in the final analysis al-Jazarī was the common source, either directly or indirectly, for both Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il although other sources were used as well, unless, of course, Haarmann's theory, concerning the relationship of al-Yūnīnī and al-Jazarī is found to be correct. In that case, it may be that al-Yūnīnī was the originator of the information and Mufaḍḍal used Ḍhayl rather than Ḥawādith al-zamān.<sup>171</sup> In any case, Blochet's opinion,

that Mufaḍḍal's principal source was al-Nuwayrī, for which no documentation was given, seems to be mistaken.<sup>172</sup>

Differences of interpretation between Haarmann and Little exist within this specific area of agreement, however. For example, both Haarmann and Little recognize the close relationship of Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il to each other as well as the connection between both of them and al-Jazarī. Haarmann made a word by word check of Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il for the years 688/1289, 689/1290 and 683/1284-1285, analyzed samples from the years 688/1289-689/1290 and relied on Little's findings for the year's 694/1294-1295 and 699/1299-1300.<sup>173</sup> Collation of the texts showed ninety per cent of the texts to be the same to the extent that even the same errors in spelling and grammar were found in each.<sup>174</sup> Even within our special subject matter such a pattern is borne out to the degree that for those years in which both chronicles are extant, there is no report given by one that is not also given by the other. Furthermore, in every case these reports correspond nearly word-for-word with the exception of the report on the Battle of Hims which Mufaḍḍal has abridged slightly though not so greatly that the correspondence between the two is no longer visible. In Haarmann's view only three possibilities can exist: 1) Ibn al-Dawādārī copied Mufaḍḍal; 2) vice versa; or 3) that both used a common source.<sup>175</sup> Haarmann believes the third explanation to be the correct one, i.e., that Mufaḍḍal and Ibn al-Dawādārī used the common source quite independently of each other and that Mufaḍḍal did not copy at

all from Ibn al-Dawādārī.<sup>176</sup> Little's interpretation of the evidence, however, leads him to the conclusion that Mufaḍḍal used Ibn al-Dawādārī or the common source--al-Jazarī--or both.<sup>177</sup> Furthermore, Haarmann posits the existence of one or possibly two intermediaries between Mufaḍḍal and Ibn al-Dawādārī on the one hand and al-Jazarī on the other,<sup>178</sup> whereas Little seems less certain of the presence of an intermediary source.<sup>179</sup>

Unfortunately, however, a complete analysis is not possible since at no time during the period 678/1279-1280 - 689/1290 are all three chronicles extant at once. As noted earlier,<sup>180</sup> al-Jazarī is missing for the years 678/1279-1280 - 682/1283-1284 and 688/1289 - 689/1290 (except for the obituaries) and large portions are missing in Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il's work from the beginning of 682/1283-1284 until Muḥarram of 688/1289. Only Ibn al-Dawādārī's Kanz al-durar is fully extant. Thus, in no case are we able, under present circumstances, to compare all three for any one entry. We are able to compare al-Jazarī and Ibn al-Dawādārī in only one instance, the seige of Marqab and razing of the tower of Marāqīya in 684/1285-1286.<sup>181</sup> Here, the connection is obvious since, for the most part, the texts correspond nearly word for word. Even where it appears that Ibn al-Dawādārī has made an abridgement as, for example, in the opening paragraphs of the report where al-Jazarī gives precise information about the movements of the various divisions of the army which Ibn al-Dawādārī summarizes,<sup>182</sup> whole sentences still exist in both texts which correspond nearly verbatim. In one instance Ibn al-

Dawādārī has quoted a poem composed by Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir which was sent to the viceroy of Egypt, the amīr <sup>C</sup>Alam al-Dīn Sanjar al-Shujā<sup>C</sup>ī<sup>183</sup> which is not found in al-Jazarī. This simply indicates, most probably, that Ibn al-Dawādārī used other sources in addition to al-Jazarī on whom he relied most heavily. The letter read to the people of Damascus, previously mentioned<sup>184</sup> is carried intact, except for the numerous changes or errors in spelling, in Ibn al-Dawādārī.<sup>185</sup> It is perhaps possible that the instance of abridgement noted and the numerous errors or changes of spelling in the letter support Haarmann's supposition that one or more intermediary sources exist, but with only this one incident to check, no firm conclusion can be drawn.

#### Ibn Kathīr:

<sup>C</sup>Imād al-Dīn Ismā<sup>C</sup>īl ibn <sup>C</sup>Umar ibn Kathīr (705/1301 - 775/1373-1374), should be an interesting historian for study in the light of what we know of his background. Having been educated in Damascus where he studied fiqh as a member of the Shāfi<sup>C</sup>ī madhhab, Ibn Kathīr later came under the influence of Ibn Taymīya and his school. Like Ibn Taymīya, who participated in several inquisitions involving Christians, Ibn Kathīr took part in two inquiries, one of which passed judgment on a zindīq accused of ḥulūl (incarnationism),<sup>186</sup> and another which condemned to death a Shī<sup>C</sup>ī who had insulted the first three caliphs at the <sup>C</sup>Umayyad Mosque.<sup>187</sup> This would seem to indicate an attitude toward marginal groups in society or those who might threaten to disturb the established order which should be kept in mind when analyzing Ibn Kathīr's interpretation of the events

of Qalā'ūn's reign in his work al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya fī al-tārīkh<sup>188</sup> involving Christians.

As Little has pointed out, Ibn Kathīr himself states that his work is based on al-Birzālī's history<sup>189</sup> although he has had recourse to other sources as well; for example, al-Jazarī<sup>190</sup> and possibly some other source which, however, remains obscure.<sup>191</sup> Haarmann, citing Little, agrees that al-Birzālī and al-Jazarī, whom Ibn Kathīr used frequently, were Ibn Kathīr's principal sources.<sup>192</sup>

Evidence found in reports on Mamlūk-Christian affairs during the reign of Qalā'ūn confirms these findings. In addition to al-Birzālī and al-Jazarī, however, Ibn Kathīr has used Quṭb al-Dīn al-Yūnīnī whom he cites in his annal for 679/1280-1281 concerning the renewal of a treaty with the Franks of <sup>c</sup>Akkā.<sup>193</sup> His quotation, however, does not correspond word for word with the original and has been reorganized. The relationship remains obvious, nevertheless.

The other reports given by Ibn Kathīr all show resemblance to a greater or lesser degree with al-Yūnīnī and al-Nuwayrī, both of whom relied on al-Jazarī's Ḥawāḍith al-zamān to some extent. However, Ibn Kathīr's reports always show variation from and appear as abridgements of the corresponding entries in Nihāyat al-arab and Dhayl. Since al-Jazarī is extant for but one report, the siege of Tripoli, it is not possible to arrive at absolutely certain conclusions. It is possible that Ibn Kathīr merely abridged al-Yūnīnī's or al-Nuwayrī's reports or those of their most probable common source, al-Jazarī. Yet the variation from al-Yūnīnī

and al-Nuwayrī (whom, as we have seen, often copied al-Jazarī verbatim) is great enough that one suspects that here too Ibn Kathīr's source was actually al-Birzālī whose work, after all, was the skeleton upon which al-Jazarī constructed his history.

Ibn Kathīr's reports concerning Mamlūk-Christian relations, including those which concern the local Christian population, are few in number and are of little interest information-wise since, as we have noted, they are found in more detail elsewhere. However, in one instance Ibn Kathīr reveals his true feelings concerning the Christian minority, at least those employed in the administrative posts of the empire, for he terminates his entry concerning the order that ahl al-dhimma so employed should embrace Islām and their return to their former faith later that year with the following remark: "Sawwada Allāh wujūhahum yawma tabyaddu wujūhun wa taswaddu wujūhun" (May God blacken their faces on the day when he blackens and whitens faces),<sup>194</sup> whereas the only other source to mention this incident includes nothing of the sort, thus revealing that this must, indeed, represent Ibn Kathīr's personal attitude.

Ibn al-Furāt:

Both Little and Ashtor have recognized in their analyses of the work by Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Raḥīm al-Ṭālib al-Ḥanafī Ibn al-Furāt (734/1334 - 808/1405) entitled Tārīkh al-duwal wa al-mulūk,<sup>195</sup> that this historian is greatly indebted to al-Nuwayrī as a source for the early Baḥrī period. Ashtor, however, has concluded that Ibn al-Furāt's dependence on al-Nuwayrī is limited to "following him....mainly in the

choice of sources,"<sup>196</sup> whereas Little found that "Ibn al-Furāt's reliance on al-Nuwairī is greater than Ashtor indicates."<sup>197</sup> Moreover, although Ibn al-Furāt had access to al-Jazarī's Hawādith al-zamān as well as Nihāyat al-arab, Little concluded that "Ibn al-Furāt follows al-Nuwairī for all events recorded in Nihāyat al-arab, including those which took place in Syria and which were recorded at first hand by al-Jazarī. The only data borrowed from al-Jazarī are those which al-Nuwairī omits."<sup>198</sup> Our research for Mamlūk-Christian affairs during Qalā'ūn's reign confirms these findings in general. Ibn al-Furāt nearly always follows al-Nuwairī's account word for word, either in full or in part. Furthermore, in one instance, the Battle of Hims in 680/1281-1282, where he has obviously used Nihāyat al-arab, Ibn al-Furāt actually cites al-Jazarī<sup>199</sup> along with Ibn al-Mukarram<sup>200</sup> and someone who was actually present but who is not identified by name.<sup>201</sup> A second instance corroborates Little's findings concerning Ibn al-Furāt's methodology even more clearly. The Sanjar al-Shujā'ī affair had been reported by both Baybars and al-Jazarī without, however, any mention of the fact that the reason for his removal from office was that he had allegedly sold arms to the Franks.<sup>202</sup> As we have noted earlier, it is al-Nuwairī who introduces the information concerning the arms sale.<sup>203</sup> Ibn al-Furāt's report coincides nearly word for word with that of al-Nuwairī, including the mention of the arms sale, but like al-Jazarī and unlike al-Nuwairī, he concludes with the sultan's order to Husām al-Dīn Ṭarantay<sup>204</sup> showing that Ibn al-Furāt once again has used Nihāyat al-arab as his principal source but has used al-Jazarī or possibly

al-Jazarī's source for information not included in Nihāyat al-arab.

However, it is apparent that al-Jazarī was not Ibn al-Furāt's only additional source. Among the sources already cited for the Battle of Hims was Ibn al-Mukarrām to whom Ibn al-Furāt is further indebted for the text of the treaty concluded in 680/1281-1282 with the Byzantine emperor, Michael Palaeologus, although in this case he does not identify his source.<sup>205</sup> It was Marius Canard who noted that the text of the treaty is given by al-Qalqashandī in Ṣubḥ al-a<sup>c</sup> shā who does identify Ibn al-Mukarrām, a secretary in the dīwān al-inshā during Qalā'ūn's reign, as its author.<sup>206</sup> Furthermore, Canard concludes that Ibn al-Furāt has copied the text from Ibn al-Mukarrām even more accurately than al-Qalqashandī.<sup>207</sup>

It is also, on several occasions, apparent that Ibn al-Furāt has used Zubdat al-fikra rather than any of the sources previously mentioned. For example, one portion of Ibn al-Furāt's entry concerning the Mongol foray into northern Syria in 679/1280-1281 in which Armenian assistance was given, corresponds word for word with Baybars al-Manṣūrī's account.<sup>208</sup> Ibn al-Furāt's version, however, does not include the mention of Armenian aid. Similarly, the story of the seizure of the Georgian notable as reported by Ibn al-Furāt, bears close resemblance to the version found in Baybars al-Manṣūrī which in turn was a résumé of Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's report.<sup>209</sup>

In addition to these reports, whose source we are able to identify, Ibn al-Furāt gives several reports which are not to be found in any of the other sources examined. Among these are his report of the abolishment of



muqarrar al-Naṣārā,<sup>210</sup> the destruction of dayr al-khandaq,<sup>211</sup> the dismissal of Christian employees, especially kuttāb al-juṣūsh<sup>212</sup> in 678/1279-1280 and the order that Muslim scribes should be employed in their place,<sup>213</sup> the report of the embassy to Constantinople in 679/1280-1281 whose members included the Coptic patriarch Anbā Siyūs,<sup>214</sup> and the death of a Frankish envoy from Marseille in 680/1281-1282.<sup>215</sup> It must be noted, however, that one possible source for these reports, al-Jazarī, is not extant for these years. On the other hand, none of the sources which have been shown to use al-Jazarī (e.g., al-Yūnīnī, al-Nuwayrī, Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il) have included such information in their histories, which may indicate the possibility that Ibn al-Furāt has also tapped still some other source which we cannot identify at this moment.

During the years in which al-Jazarī is extant, one report occurs which is not found in Hawādith al-zamān or any other source we have previously examined, i.e., the entry concerning the fact that the jawālī (poll tax)<sup>216</sup> which was normally collected from the ahl al-dhimma in the month of Ramaḍān was in the year 682/1283-1284 collected during the month of Muḥarram.<sup>217</sup> This might be taken as further evidence that Ibn al-Furāt has access to still another source.

Thus, until Ibn al-Furāt's sources are fully identified, he remains an important source for Mamlūk-Christian affairs during the reign of Qalā'ūn, for it is he who has introduced several new reports, most of which concern indigenous Christians, a category of information which we have found for the most part sadly neglected by other sources.

al-Maqrīzī:

In contrast to Claude Cahen's judgment that Takī al-Dīn Abū al-<sup>c</sup>Abbās Aḥmad ibn <sup>c</sup>Alī al-Maqrīzī (776/1274 - 845/1142) is "peu intéressant, en dépit de la réputation de l'ouvrage, dans son Kitāb as-soulouk fī ma<sup>c</sup>rifa tārīkh al-Muluk..."<sup>218</sup> stands Little's opinion, based on his recent re-examination of this work, that on the whole al-Maqrīzī is a source still to be reckoned with since he does present material not to be found in any of the earlier sources, and because he does offer a "cogent presentation of facts which before seemed puzzling because they were expressed so concisely."<sup>219</sup> Yet, according to Little, al-Maqrīzī was not "lacking in the foibles of ordinary Muslim historians within the annalistic tradition," and accuracy was an occasional defect as well.<sup>220</sup>

Like Little who found a "striking resemblance" between the annals of al-Maqrīzī and Ibn al-Furāt for the year 694/1294-1295 which was confirmed by closer analysis,<sup>221</sup> we found upon comparison of entries that Ibn al-Furāt was not al-Maqrīzī's source for just one annal, but that Ibn al-Furāt was al-Maqrīzī's principal source for the entire period of Qalā'ūn's reign. Word for word correspondance characterizes al-Maqrīzī's reports in nearly every instance although, it is true, he has abridged nearly every report to some extent, as well. In fact, some events which were given considerable space by other historians, including Ibn al-Furāt, have been reduced to not more than one sentence by al-Maqrīzī, for example, the treaties concluded in 680/1281-1282 between the sultan and the Hospitalers

on the one hand and with Bohemond of Tripoli on the other.<sup>222</sup> His abridgement is less radical in some other instances. Furthermore, he has followed Ibn al-Furāt even in moments where we know he has additional information at his disposal. For example, al-Maqrīzī's report in al-Sulūk concerning the abolishment of the zakāt al-dawlaba<sup>223</sup> is nothing more than an abridgement of the related reports found in Ibn al-Furāt,<sup>224</sup> al-Nuwayrī,<sup>225</sup> and Baybars al-Manṣūrī.<sup>226</sup> He has, despite his shortening of it, included the information introduced by Ibn al-Furāt for the first time that the muqarrar al-Naṣārā was also abolished. That al-Maqrīzī had more to offer than what he reports here is shown by his report in al-Mawā'iz wa al-i'tibār fī dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa al-āthār,<sup>227</sup> concerning this same action by the sultan.

al-Sulūk: Among the first of those things initiated by him [i.e., the sultan] was the abolishment of the zakāt al-dawlaba which was raised from the subjects and the muqarrar al-Naṣārā which had been levied for the first time eighteen years before. He also lowered prices.<sup>228</sup>

al-Khiṭaṭ: When al-Malik al-Manṣūr Sayf al-Dīn Qalā'ūn al-Alfī came to power in the kingdom of Egypt, he abolished the zakāt al-dawlaba which was levied on a person instead of the zakāt on his wealth whether he could afford to pay or not, and if he died, it was taken from his heirs. He also abolished the tax that was raised from the inhabitants of the entire area of Egypt whenever news arrived concerning the conquest of a fortress or the like. Then he extracted money from the people of Cairo and Miṣr according to the ability of their rank and collected a great deal of money from that. He also abolished the tax which was levied on ahl al-dhimma which equaled one dīnār above and beyond the jālīya for each person<sup>229</sup> which was used for military purposes every year.

No source is cited for this information. A similar case is his entry concerning the destruction of dayr al-khandaq.<sup>230</sup>

Although al-Maqrīzī has relied principally on Ibn al-Furāt's Tārīkh for his entries in al-Sulūk, at least in regard to Christian-Mamlūk matters, he does, in this period too, offer some information not found in any of the other sources available for examination. For example, he relates that the fortress of al-Kakhtā was seized in 682/1283-1284 "at the request of its inhabitants," (Wa ukhīdhat ayḍan qal<sup>c</sup> at al-Kakhtā min al-Naṣārā bi-su'āl ahlihā).<sup>231</sup> This is a problem which cannot be resolved without access to all sources for the period.

Two reports are found in al-Sulūk which are reported in no other source studied to date. In 683/1284-1285, al-Maqrīzī states that the sultan set out for Damascus upon learning that the Franks were manoeuvring to seize Syria,<sup>232</sup> and in 685/1286-1287 he tells of the seizure of a caravan by some inhabitants of Marqab and the resulting scuffle in which some Mamlūks were killed.<sup>233</sup> However, the amount of original information is quite insignificant and Ibn al-Furāt remains the better source of the two.

Although al-Mawā<sup>c</sup>iz wa al-i<sup>c</sup>tibār fī dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa al-āthār contains many fewer entries pertinent to our purposes, they are in each case where they do occur, more valuable than those found in al-Sulūk in that they contain material found in no other earlier source examined. The case of the abolishment of the muqarrar al-Naṣārā, with which we have already dealt, is one example.<sup>234</sup> A second entry concerning the razing

of dayr al-khandaq offers another.<sup>235</sup> In this entry al-Maqrīzī relates the circumstances of its construction as well as some details as to its location and so on in addition to the fact of its destruction.

But perhaps the most interesting and significant entry is that in which he discusses the condition of Christians under Qalā'ūn's reign.<sup>236</sup> No other historian previous to al-Maqrīzī has taken any specific note of the state of local Christians as a group. All reports examined have only mentioned Christians in a very incidental way and in relation to some event in which the Christian factor was not always the dominant one. Unfortunately the report appears to be missing something for it is unclear in its present form. He states that in the year 682/1283-1284 an incident occurred involving Christians. This is confusing since the incident about which he speaks seems actually to have occurred in the reign of Qalā'ūn's son and successor al-Ashraf Khalīl. Furthermore he claims that among the reports of this incident was the information that the amīr Sanjar al-Shujā'ī was greatly respected and revered during Qalā'ūn's reign without ever specifying exactly what his relation to the event might be. Nor does al-Maqrīzī cite his source where we might find information to satisfy our curiosity.<sup>237</sup> Thus, in this case at least, al-Maqrīzī's report is not the "cogent presentation" we might expect or hope for.

Finally, it must be said that contrary to what one might expect, al-Maqrīzī seems to show no important visible bias toward the Christian minority in Egypt or toward Christians in general despite the fact that he was a firmly entrenched member of the Muslim religious establishment

of his time and despite the fact that in other instances, for example, al-Maqrīzī's version of Shajar al-Durr's ascent to power, he is suspect of bias on the basis of an unauthenticated letter that al-Maqrīzī claims the Caliph to have dispatched to Egypt in which it is suggested that a woman is not suited for rulership.<sup>238</sup> In any event, he does not appear to be guilty of such schemes in relation to Christians in al-Sulūk. In only one case might he be accused of similar intentions. That occurs in his report concerning the lot of local Christians under Qalā'ūn,<sup>239</sup> but until all sources have been examined and the facts of Qalā'ūn's reign have been marshalled, we cannot hold him to account for bias or introduction of legend.

Al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī and al-Yūsufī:

Several years ago Calude Cahen wrote of Badr al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī (d. 845/1451) that he has scarcely little interest for us.<sup>240</sup>

En dehors de quelques citations de Hamadhānī concernant seulement l'Iraq, il n'utilise pour notre période que les ouvrages connus d'al-Azīmī (abrégé), Ibn al-Athīr, Kamāl al-Dīn, Sibṭ bīn al-Djauzī, Ibn al-Amīd, Ibn Wācīl (indirectement), Ibn Khallikān, Baibars Manṣūrī, Chāfī b. Allā (Nazm as-soulūk), Nouwafī, Abou'l Fēda, Ibn Kāthīr.<sup>241</sup>

Our interest in this historian, however, has been reawakened by Little's reconsideration of this chronicle for the early reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir, Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn.

That al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī's great universal chronicle <sup>c</sup>Iqd

al-ġumān fī tārīḥ ahl az-zamān should remain unpublished even though as a rich source for the Baḥrī period it rivals and often surpasses as-Sulūk, surpasses, indeed all other sources, published or not, in the amount of original material which it contains, is indicative of the unfortunate state of Mamlūk studies at the present time.<sup>242</sup>

One of the sources most frequently cited by al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī for al-Malik al-Nāṣir's reign was ṣāḥih Nuzhat al-nāzir<sup>243</sup> whom Little has identified as Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Yūsufī and who may be counted among the most original historians for the period of al-Malik al-Nāṣir.<sup>244</sup> In his work, Nuzhat al-nāzir fī sīrat al-Malik al-Nāṣir, which, Ibn Hajar claims, begins with the reign of Qalā'ūn and continues through 755/1354,<sup>245</sup> al-Yūsufī "recorded information on events and persons which he had gleaned from his own experience" and which "he was careful to verify...."<sup>246</sup> Furthermore, Little states that al-Yūsufī's accounts "invariably include analyses, interpretations, and details which cannot be found elsewhere."<sup>247</sup> Thus al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī's chronicle assumes particular importance for what it has preserved of the lost chronicle of al-Yūsufī.

However, in a more recent and more detailed comparison of al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī and al-Maqrīzī with al-Yūsufī based on the portion of al-Yūsufī's chronicle which Little discovered in an Istanbul library,<sup>248</sup> Little has revised his former opinion of al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī, the "faithful adaptor" who unlike al-Maqrīzī quoted rather than paraphrased his sources.<sup>249</sup> It now appears that

in the process of transcribing al-Yūsufī's text al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī has edited the language so as to eliminate colloquial features: obvious and fre-

quent grammatical errors are omitted; literary expressions are substituted for phrases from the vernacular; vague pronoun references are clarified; repetitious phrases are deleted; etc. Otherwise, <sup>al-</sup>Aynī often quotes passages almost verbatim.<sup>250</sup>

In any event, Little concludes that "we are on safe ground if we adopt the hypothesis that <sup>C</sup>Iqd al-jumān contains substantial, though edited and condensed, portions of the still lost sections of Nuzhat al-Nāzir."<sup>251</sup>

Despite the fact that Little found al-Maqrīzī to be even more heavily indebted to al-Yūsufī than he had previously thought,<sup>252</sup> he also showed that "al-Maqrīzī's version of al-Yūsufī is much more condensed than al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī's,<sup>253</sup> so much so that the point of particular items is sometimes lost in al-Sulūk."<sup>254</sup> Such a conclusion may be drawn in respect to the relationship of the chronicles of al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī and al-Maqrīzī for the period of Qalā'ūn's reign as well, as the following example, though not necessarily derived from al-Yūsufī, will show. As will be readily apparent, where al-Maqrīzī has confused (mainly by injudicious condensation) the passage to the point that it becomes nearly incomprehensible, al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī renders it in a fuller, and, therefore, more understandable form. The importance of this particular passage for its content as well as for its historiographical relevance has induced me to include it here as it appears in al-Khiṭaṭ and <sup>C</sup>Iqd al-jumān.

al-Maqrīzī: Wa fī sanat ithnatayn wa thamānīn  
wa sittimī'atin kānat wāqī<sup>C</sup>at al-Naṣārā wa min  
khabarihā anna al-amīr Sanjar al-Shujā<sup>C</sup>ī kānat  
hurmatuhu wāfiratun fī ayyām al-Malik al-Manṣūr  
Qalā'ūn. Fa-kāna al-Naṣārā yarkabūna al-ḥamīr  
bi-zanānirin fī awṣāṭihim wa lā yajsuru Naṣrānīyun  
yuhaddithu Musliman wa huwa rākībun wa idhā mashā



fa-bi-dhillatin wa la yaqdaru ahdun minhum  
yalbisu thawban masqulan. Fa-lammā māta  
al-Malik al-Mansūr wa taṣaltana min ba'dihī  
ibnuhu al-Malik al-Ashraf Khalīl, khadama  
al-kuttāb al-Nasārā 'inda al-'umarā' al-  
khāṣṣakiyā wa qawwū nufūṣahum 'alā al-Muslimīn,  
wa taraffū fī malābisihim wa hay'ātihim wa  
kāna minhum kātibun 'inda khāṣṣakiyīn yu'rafu  
bi-'Ayn al-Ghazāl, etc.<sup>255</sup>

al-'Aynī: Wa fihā kānat wāqī'at ahl al-dhimma  
wa islāmu kathīrin minhum wa kānū fī al-dawlat  
al-Mansūriya fī ghāyat al-dhilla wa al-ihāna  
khuṣūṣan fī ayyām al-Shujā' al-ladhī kāna  
lahu ḥurmatun azīmatun 'alā al-'amma wa al-  
kuttāb wa arbāb al-aqlām ḥattā innahu kāna  
akbaru man fihim yakūna rākiba ḥimārīn wa  
zuṣṣā'a fī wasāṭihī wa lā yajsuru yataḥaddatha  
ma'a Muslimīn wa huwa rākībun wa lā yumkinu  
an yurā 'alayhi farjīyatun masqūlatun wa lā  
baydā' illā al-qalīl minhum ma'a dhillatin wa  
maskanatin. Fa-lammā taghayyarat al-dawla wa  
malaka al-Ashraf wa ḥadathat al-umūr wa-intasha'at  
al-khāṣṣakiya wa kaburat nufūṣuhum kabura qadr  
al-Nasārā aydan bi-sabbabi ba'd al-khāṣṣakiya  
al-ladhīna yuḥāmūnahum wa kāna min jumlat al-  
khāṣṣakiya mamlūkun yu'rafu bi-'Ayn al-Ghazāl, etc.<sup>256</sup>

First of all, al-Maqrīzī, as we have already seen, has evidently confused the date, for the incident involving the Christians or ahl al-dhimma (according to al-'Aynī) seems to be that involving 'Ayn al-Ghazāl to which both reports refer, and this episode would fit more logically into the description of the situation which existed under al-Ashraf Khalīl as reported by al-'Aynī and al-Maqrīzī. Al-'Aynī's version clarifies to some extent Sanjar al-Shujā'ī's part in the affair. Whereas al-Maqrīzī's report implied that al-Shujā'ī was somehow involved in the incident (which as we have seen probably took place in 692/1292-1293 rather than 682/1283-1284), al-'Aynī's report lets us understand that during Sanjar al-

Shujā<sup>c</sup>I's term of office during Qalā'ūn's reign, Christians or ahl al-dhimma in general were experiencing the lowest point in the history of their relations with Muslims in the view of this historian (Wa kānū fī al-dawlat al-mansūrīya fī ghāyat al-dhilla).<sup>257</sup> Furthermore al-

<sup>c</sup>Aynī's report continues, giving more detail concerning that state of affairs than does al-Maqrīzī who has summarized the information.

Thus, the relationship between al-Maqrīzī and al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī illuminated by Little for al-Nāṣir's reign seems also to exist for the reign of Qalā'ūn, and al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī's chronicle, had a greater portion of it been available to me for this period, might have shed a great deal of light on other reports we have encountered especially in terms of their historiographical significance. Finally, if this pattern of relationship between al-Maqrīzī and al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī were to prevail throughout Qalā'ūn's reign, al-Maqrīzī's value would be still further reduced, and even Ibn al-Furāt's importance might be diminished, for it is tempting to conclude that perhaps the information he introduced for the first time and which did not appear in an original source such as al-Jazarī, might be attributable to al-Yūsufī of whose work, al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī has preserved so much, at least for the later period studied by Little. Thus, one is led to suspect al-Yūsufī's importance and originality for Qalā'ūn's reign as well.

The problem of al-Yūsufī's role in regard to Qalā'ūn's reign remains to be examined. Although al-Yūsufī's chronicle apparently began with Qalā'ūn's reign, the manuscript portion discovered by Little covers only the years 733/1332-1333 - 738/1337-1338.<sup>258</sup> Certainly al-Yūsufī, who was probably born in Cairo about 676/1277-1278<sup>259</sup> was too young

during Qalā'ūn's rule to have been an active participant in affairs. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that he based his information for Qalā'ūn's reign on the reports and information he received from acquaintances with persons in high positions who were, perhaps, active during those years and whose friendship he apparently cultivated assiduously.<sup>260</sup> Thus, although we cannot determine with certainty to what degree al-Yūsufī may be important as an original source for Qalā'ūn's reign, we may, nevertheless, note the possibility that reports such as the one included above<sup>261</sup> which are to be found in none of the earlier sources, may, in fact, derive from al-Yūsufī's Nuzhat al-nāzir. If this is, indeed, the case, then certainly al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī's chronicle gains stature among the sources for Qalā'ūn's reign.

### Conclusions

The results of this examination of the sources, focussing on Mamlūk-Christian relations during the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn, have corroborated the major part of both Haarmann's and Little's findings although some modifications are indicated, it is true. At least two of the three original sources cited by Little for the early reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn offer original material for our period and subject matter as well. Although al-Jazarī is certainly an original source for our period to whom many later historians (al-Nuwayrī, followed by Ibn al-Furāt, for example) are indebted, it is mainly our inability to examine his work for the entire period that prevents us from defining

the degree of his originality for Qalā'ūn's reign, and, as we have seen, al-Yūnīnī may share some of the credit for presenting information for the first time.

Although Baybars does present information which is most likely original with him, he loses importance for our period since, as we have shown, he is, for the majority of his reports, dependent upon Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir. In fact, his most important function appears to be that of transmittor since it is through him that so much of Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's work has entered later chronicles which have not drawn on Tashrīf al-ayyām directly. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, in whose work so many documents have been preserved, thus replaces Baybars al-Manṣūrī in importance for our period.

Finally, several later historians have presented information not derived from any of the earlier sources available for examination which leads one to suspect the existence of some as yet unidentified source. The most likely candidates for author of such information are perhaps Ibn al-Mukarram or the sāhib Nuzhat al-nāẓir, al-Yūsufī, if as Ibn Hajar claims, his chronicle did, indeed begin with Qalā'ūn's reign.

All of the later historians examined present information not found in contemporary sources. However, Ibn al-Furāt stands out for the fact that he has identified Ibn al-Mukarram on at least one occasion while on another, Ibn al-Mukarram has been identified as Ibn al-Furāt's source through al-Qalqashandī's citation for the same passage in Ṣubḥ al-a<sup>c</sup>shā.<sup>262</sup> Until Ibn al-Mukarram's work is found then, Ibn al-Furāt will retain importance for what he has preserved of it, if for nothing else. Al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī is important for what he has preserved of the unidentified

source--possibly al-Yūsufī. In any event, for one crucial passage concerning indigenous Christians, he has shown himself to be a more coherent source than al-Maqrīzī. Al-Maqrīzī's al-Sulūk proves to be of little importance, for most information is found in greater detail elsewhere, especially in Ibn al-Furāt's Tārīkh and in all probability in al-Aynī's Iqd al-Jumān as well. Only in al-Khitat does he offer any reports worthy of greater attention, and here, as we have shown, he has condensed a most important passage so as to render it less meaningful.<sup>263</sup>

While all our chronicles provide information concerning political and military events involving foreign Christians, it is to the Syrian sources that we must look for most of the little information which exists concerning local Christians, even in regard to their affairs in Egypt (e.g., the obituary for Hibbat Allāh, the Christian mustawfī of Egypt found in the Syrian historians al-Yūnīnī and Ibn Kathīr),<sup>264</sup> with the exception, perhaps of al-Yūsufī and Ibn al-Mukarram.

Finally, we have encountered no extreme cases of bias, at least on the face of those sources examined, though to be sure, occasional derogatory remarks in regard to Christians were found (e.g., Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir's characterization of the patriarch of al-Ḥadath<sup>265</sup> and Ibn Kathīr's remark concerning Christians employed in the diwāns cited earlier.<sup>266</sup>

Once again it should be emphasized that on only one occasion do we find any general statement concerning, and analysis of the affairs of the local Christian population as a whole. For the most part what information exists is found scattered and fragmented throughout our sources in the fashion we have come to expect of chroniclers who adhered to the annalistic tradition.

# Footnotes

1. Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit (Freiburg: D. Robischon, 1969).
2. Die Sultanin von Ägypten: Šağarat ad-Durr in der arabischen Geschichtsschreibung und Literatur (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961).
3. An Introduction to Mamlūk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1970), originally published as part of the series; "Freiburger Islamstudien" (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1970).
4. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 132-137.
5. Little, Introduction, 2.
6. Ibid., 95.
7. Ed. Muḥammad Kāmil (Cairo: U.A.R. Ministry of Culture and National Guidance, 1961).
8. Biographical information may be found in the article by J. Pedersen, entitled "Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir," EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 679-680. On the father and other members of this distinguished family, see P. Casanova, "L'Histoire Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd ad-Dhahir," Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique au Caire, VI, 493-505.
9. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, "Introduction," 9.
10. According to H. L. Gottschalk, "The dīwān al-inshā' was concerned with (a) correspondence (mukātabāt) with foreign powers as well as with the provincial authorities..., (b) appointments (wilāyāt), including the oath of allegiance (bay'at) and the document of investiture for the sultan's successor (cahd) as well as the governors of the provinces (taqlīd) and other officials (tafwīd, tawḳī'...); (c) the royal decisions upon complaints of the common folk (tawḳī'āt 'ala 'l-kīṣās,...)," "Dīwān," EI<sup>2</sup>, II, 330. See also, M. Gaudetroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des mamelouks ("Bibliothèque archéologique et historique," Vol. III; Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923), p. lxvi.
11. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, "Introduction," 6 and Claude Cahen, La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche ("Institut Français de Damas Bibliothèque Orientale," Vol. I; Paris: Paul Geuthner, 190), 74.
12. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 74.

13. Schregle, Die Sultanin, 15.
14. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 97.
15. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 20-22. English translation in Francesco Gabrielli, Arab Historians of the Crusades, trans. E. J. Costello (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957), 323-326. French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 221-223.
16. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 34-43. English translation in Gabrielli, Arab Historians, 326-331. French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 224-230.
17. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 103-110. French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 212-221.
18. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 92-93. French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 201-212.
19. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 165-169.
20. Ibid., 156-164.
21. Ibid., 1.
22. Ibid., 154-155.
23. Ibid., 28-30.
24. Ibid., 67.
25. Ibid., 77-86.
26. Ibid., 89-90.
27. Ibid., 151-153.
28. Ibid., 160.
29. Ibid., 166-169.
30. Ibid., 167.
31. Ibid., 168.
32. Ibid., 169.
33. Ḥalqa is the term used in <sup>c</sup>Ayyūbid and Mamlūk times for a socio-military

unit which, during most of the period of Mamlūk rule, was composed of non-Mamlūks," according to David Ayalon. However, under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the ḥalqa seems to have constituted an élite corps "which included a considerable number of pure Mamlūks....During the reign of Qalā'ūn, we still hear of 4,000 ḥalka soldiers participating in the war against the Mongols in 680/1281 as élite troops fighting in the center (kalb) of the Sultan's expeditionary force, the number of the Royal Mamlūks fighting in that force was only 800." "Ḥalka," EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 99. See the article by the same author, "Studies on the Structure of the Mamlūk Army," BSOAS, XV (1953), 204, as well.

34. Ziyāda, basing his remarks on specific incidents of this type of punishment narrated by Quatremère in his Histoire (I, 72, n.103), states that ṭasmīr consists in the accused first being stripped of his clothes, then fastened, probably nailed (yarbuṭu) to two pieces of wood in the shape of a cross after which he is placed upon the back of a camel. Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, ed. M. Ziyāda, II, 1, p. 305, n.5.
35. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 112.
36. Ibid., 47. On this incident see M. Salibi, "The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamlūk Rule (1099-1516)," Arabica, IV (1957), 294-295.
37. Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Raḥīm Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh Ibn al-Furāt, ed. Costi K. Zurayk and Nejla Izzedin (3 vols.; Beirut: American Press, 1936-1942), VII, 202, one of several references to this work in Ibn al-Furāt's chronicle. See also, J. W. Flück, "Ibn Manzūr," EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 864; Carl Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur (2 vols. and 3 supplements; 2nd ed., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1945-1949), II, 21 and Suppl. II, 14; Marius Canard, "Un traité entre Byzance et l'Egypte au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et les relations diplomatiques de Michel VIII Paléologue avec les sultans mamlūks Baibars et Qalā'ūn," Byzance et les musulmans du Proche Orient (London: Variorum Reprints, 1973), IV:197-224. This article was originally published in Mélanges Gauthier-Demombynes (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1934-1945), 197-224.
38. Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ al-a<sup>c</sup>shā fī sināt al-inshā' (14 vols.; Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Amīriya, 1913-1919), XIV, 70, cited by Cahen, Syrie du nord, 77, n.3.
39. Flück, EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 864.
40. See, for example, his articles, "Baibars al-Manṣūrī," EI<sup>2</sup>, I, 1127-1128; "Some Unpublished Sources for the Bahrī Period," Studies in Islamic History and Civilization, ed. Uriel Heyd ("Scripta Hierosolymitana,"



Vol. IX; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1971), 11-30; "Etudes sur quelques chroniques mamloukes," Israel Oriental Studies, I (1971), 272-297.

41. Vol. IX, Cairo University Library MS, 24-28 (Photographic copy of British Museum Or. MS, Add. 23325).
42. Israel Oriental Studies, I (1971), 275.
43. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 113 vo. - 118 vo.
44. Ibid., 157 vo.
45. Ibid., 158 ro. The translation of these observations is given by Ashtor, Israel Oriental Studies, I (1971), 276-277.
46. See Tables, infra, 141-153.
47. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 20-22.
48. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 139 ro.
49. A port of Sīs (Little Armenia) on the sea (i.e., the Mediterranean). See G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems (London: Alexander P. Watt, 1890), 38 and 405.
50. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 140 ro.
51. Or Jayhān. See Le Strange, Palestine, 62.
52. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 30-32.
53. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 128 ro. - 129 vo.
54. Ibid., 143 vo., cf. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 47-48.
55. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 147 vo.
56. Ibid., 164 vo.
57. Ibid., 105 ro.
58. Ibid., 109 vo. - 110 vo.
59. Ibid., 124 ro. - 125 vo.
60. Ibid., 110 ro. - 111 ro.
61. Ibid., 113 ro.

62. Ibid., 124 vo. - 124 ro.
63. Ibid., 125 vo. - 126 ro.
64. Ibid., 125 vo. - 126 ro.
65. As we have remarked previously, Ashtor claims that Baybars was, in fact, present at the Battle of Hims (Israel Oriental Studies, I, (1971), 275), but we found no conclusive evidence for this.
66. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 150 ro., cf. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Ẓāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 28-30.
67. Israel Oriental Studies, I (1971), 273.
68. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 98.
69. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 78. According to Ashtor, his name was Shams al-Dīn Riyāsāt ibn Kubr, in Studies in Islamic History and Civilization, ed. Uriel Heyd, 12.
70. Little, Introduction, 46.
71. F. Rosenthal, "al-Birzālī," EI<sup>2</sup>, I, 1238.
72. Little, Introduction, 46.
73. Ibid., 46 and Rosenthal, EI<sup>2</sup>, I, 1238.
74. Topkapisaray, Ahmed III MS, 2951. See Little, Introduction, 46-47 and 47, n.1.
75. Little, Introduction, 48.
76. Ibid., 46.
77. Ibid., 54.
78. Ibid., 54.
79. Shams al-Dīn al-Jazarī, Jawāhir al-sulūk fī al-khulafā' wa al-mulūk, Dār al-Kutub MS, 7575 H (Photographic copy of Bibliothèque Nationale MS, 6739, 3 ro. See also, Jean Sauvaget, La chronique de Damas (Années 689-698 H), (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1949),  
The various manuscripts which compose al-Jazarī's chronicle, Hawādith al-zamān wa-anbā'uhu wa wafayāt al-akābir wa al-a'yān min abnā'ihī, are discussed infra, p. 25.

80. (14 vols.; Cairo: Maṭḥa<sup>c</sup>at al-Sa<sup>c</sup>āda, 1932-1939).
81. Little, Introduction, 69.
82. Ibn Kathīr's relationship to al-Bīrẓālī will be considered under the section devoted to him, infra, 44. See also, Little, Introduction, 69-71.
83. Little, Introduction, 55.
84. Ibid., 55-56.
85. Ibid., 60.
86. Quellenstudien, 97.
87. Biographical information may be found in the following works:  
Bazmee Ansari, "al-Djazarī," EI<sup>2</sup>, II, 522; Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 12-22; Little, Introduction, 53.
88. Sauvaget, Chronique de Damas.
89. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 92.
90. Supra, 10-11.
91. Sauvaget, Chronique de Damas, iii.
92. Ibid., viii and Claude Cahen, Review of Chronique de Damas by Sauvaget, Oriens, IV (1951), 148-153.
93. Haarmann, Quellenstudien.
94. Cahen, Oriens, IV (1951), 150; Little, Introduction, 53, n.2.
95. See Claude Cahen, "Addenda sur al-Djazarī," Israel Oriental Studies, II (1972), 144-147. I have used Haarmann's edition for the years 682/1283-1284 : 687/1288-1289 and a microfilm copy of the Paris manuscript entitled Jawāhir al-sulūk fī al-khulafā' wa al-mulūk, covering 688/1289-1290, Bibliothèque Nationale Arabic MS, 6739.
96. al-Jazarī, Ḥawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, pp. 26 and 28 of Arabic text.
97. Ibid., pp. 54, 56 of Arabic text.
98. Ibid., pp. 94, 96 of Arabic text.
99. Ibid., p. 114 of Arabic text.

100. Ibid., pp. 52, 54 of Arabic text. The text of this letter is also quoted by Ibn al-Dawādārī (whom we shall discuss shortly) but with minor deviations in spelling, etc. However, as Haarmann and Little have shown, Ibn al-Dawādārī's source was, directly or indirectly, al-Jazarī (infra, 43 ), and we shall assume that this is also the case here while awaiting the appearance of further evidence for or against this conclusion.
101. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 52 of Arabic text.
102. Ibid., p. 114 of Arabic text.
103. Ibid., pp. 94, 96 of Arabic text.
104. Ibid., p. 94 of Arabic text.
105. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 161 vo.
106. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 94 of Arabic text.
107. According to Gaudefroy-Demombynes, the silāhdār, a commanding amīr is the arms-bearer of the sultan and chief of the arms depot (silāh-khāna), La Syrie, lvii. See also David Ayalon, BSOAS, XV, 2 (1953), 214.
108. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, citing al-<sup>c</sup>Umarī's Masālik al-absār fī mamālik al-amṣār, defines the ustādār as he who directs the royal storehouses, the kitchen, etc., La Syrie, lx-lxi.
109. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 96 of Arabic text.
110. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 161 vo.
111. p. 80.
112. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 97.
113. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 150 ro. - 151 vo.
114. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, pp. 26, 28 of Arabic text.
115. Ibid., p. 28 of Arabic text.
116. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 151 vo.

117. (4 vols. to date, Hyderabad: Maṭbāʿat Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-Uthmānīya, 1954-1961, of which I have used volume IV covering the years 678/1279-1280 - 686/1287-1288 in addition to a microfilm copy of Yale University Library-MS, Landsberg 139 for the remaining years of Qalāʾūn's reign.)
118. Little, Introduction, 57.
119. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 95.
120. Ibid., 95.
121. Dhayl, IV, 239-259; al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, pp. 50, 52, 54, 56, 58 of Arabic text.
122. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 56 of Arabic text.
123. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 241.
124. According to Little, "When al-Jazarī says qultu, hakā-lī or speaks of wālidī, al-Yūnīnī says qultu and hakā-lī and speaks of wālidī too." Introduction, 57-58.
125. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 240.
126. Ibid., IV, 240.
127. Ibid., IV, 241-244.
128. Ibid., IV, 244-248.
129. Ibid., IV, 248-253. According to Gaudefroy-Demombynes, "the secretaries of the darī compose and copy all of the documents which have received the formule exécutoire from the kātib es sirr [chief of the dīwān al-inshāʾ, infra, lxxi] or from the secretaries of the dast [those who alone have the right to affix the formule exécutoire to documents, infra, lxx]. La Syrie, lxx. See also Björkman, "Diplomatic," EI<sup>2</sup>, 305, who describes the secretaries of the darī as the "higher employees" of the dīwān al-inshāʾ.
130. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 253-256.
131. Ibid., IV, 92.
132. Ibid., IV, 98-99. E. Sivan cites al-Birzālī for this information. Islam et la croisade, p. 189, n. 172.

133. al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya, XIII, 296-297.
134. Little, Introduction, 134.
135. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 178.
136. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, Yale MS, Landsberg 139, 26 vo.
137. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 81; Little, Introduction, 42.
138. (Cairo: al-Maṭbāʿa al-Ḥusaynīya al-Miṣrīya, 1907-1908).
139. Quellenstudien, 98-99. Or, perhaps as Cahen suggests, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir to whom Baybars al-Manṣūrī is indebted, was Abū al-Fidā's source. Syrie du nord, 81.
140. I have used a microfilm copy of Bibliothèque Nationale Arabic MS, 1579.
141. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 81.
142. I. Kratschkowsky, "al-Nuwairī," EI<sup>1</sup>, 968.
143. Introduction, 24.
144. Ibid., 24.
145. Ibid., 24.
146. Blochet in his introductory remarks to al-Nahj al-sadīd wa al-durr al-farīd fī-mā ba'd tārīkh Ibn al-<sup>c</sup>Amīd by Mufaḍḍal ibn Abī al-Faḍā'il which he has edited and translated under the title Histoire des sultans mamlouks ("Patrologia orientalis," Vols. XII, XIV, XX issued as one volume; Paris: Fermin-Didot et Cie, 1919-1928), 352 [10], n.2. Cited hereafter as Blochet, Histoire.
147. Schregle, Die Sultanin, 18.
148. Ashtor in Studies in Islamic History and Civilization, ed. Uriel Heyd, 16.
149. Little, Introduction, 24.
150. Ibid., 24.
151. al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 21 ro.
152. Ibid., 13 ro.

153. Ibid., 14 ro.
154. See conquest of al-Kakhtā, Ibid.; 46 ro. - 17 vo.; cf. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 26 of Arabic text.
155. al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 67 vo. - 68 vo.; cf. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 116 of Arabic text.
156. al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 66 ro. - 68 vo.
157. Little, Introduction, 32.
158. For what information there is, see Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 61-79; Abū Bakr Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar fī jāmi' al-ghurar, Vol. IX, al-durr al-fākhīr fī sirat al-Malik al-Nāsir, ed. Hans R. Roemer ("Quellen zur Geschichte des islamischen Ägyptens," Vol II, Cairo: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1960), "Einleitung," 17-18; Little, Introduction, 10-12.
159. For Qalā'ūn's reign we have used Haarmann's edition of Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar fī jāmi' al-ghurar, Vol. VIII. al-Durra al-zakīya fī akhbār al-dawla al-turkīya in his Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit (Freiburg: D. Robischon, 1969) for the years 682/1283-1284 - 687/1288-1289, hereafter cited as Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar in Haarmann, Quellenstudien. For the remainder of the period of Qalā'ūn we have used Haarmann's edition of this same work published in the series "Quellen zur Geschichte des islamischen Ägyptens," Vol. I (Cairo: Deutsches Archäologisches, 1971), hereafter cited as Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar, VIII.
160. Little, Introduction, 10.
161. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 109.
162. Little, Introduction, 11.
163. Ibid., 59; Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 106-107.
164. On the role played by various members of Mufaddal's family in Muslim-Christian affairs, especially during the occupation of Damascus by the Mongols during the reign of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, see the recently published work on this author by Samira Kortantamer, Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaddal b. Abī l-Fadā'il ("Islamkundliche Untersuchungen," XXIII; Freiburg im Breisgau: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1973), 5-6.
165. Blochet, Histoire, "Introduction," 353 [1].

166. Supra, p. 70, n.146.
167. Ibid., "Introduction," [5-6] 347-348 and [3] 345, n.1. This is a thesis which would seem to be supported by Kortantamer's suggestion that Mufaddal desired to disassociate himself from the reputation of his ancestors in Muslim-Christian affairs. Ägypten und Syrien, 5-6.
168. Blochet, Histoire, "Introduction," [18] 360.
169. Little, Introduction, 34.
170. See for example, the incident during the reign of the <sup>c</sup>Ayyūbid ruler, al-Kāmil, described by Butcher, Church of Egypt, II, 130, 133-137.
171. Little, Introduction, 46-57; Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 106-107.
172. Blochet, Histoire, "Introduction," [9-10] 351-352.
173. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 108.
174. Ibid., 108.
175. Ibid., 109.
176. Ibid., 109.
177. Little, Introduction, 26 and 59.
178. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 13.
179. Little, Introduction, 36-37.
180. Supra, p. 25.
181. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 52, 54, 56 58 of Arabic text; cf. Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 53, 55, 59 of Arabic text.
182. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 52 of Arabic text and Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 53 of Arabic text.
183. Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, p. 57 of Arabic text.
184. Supra, p. 31.
185. Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, pp. 53, 55 of Arabic text.



186. H. Laoust, "Ibn Kathīr," EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 817-818. Originally the term zindīq referred to "a dualist, ascetic, ... a Muslim who is secretly a Manichaen." However, the term has come to be used in Muslim criminal law "to describe the heretic whose teaching becomes a danger to the state" and "in practice, the polemics of the conservatives describe as a zindīk or free thinker any one whose external profession of Islām seems to them not sufficiently sincere." Louis Massignon, "Zindīk," EI<sup>1</sup>, 1228.
187. Laoust, EI<sup>2</sup>, III, 817-818.
188. (14 vols.; Cairo: Maṭbāʿat al-Saʿāda, 1932-1939).
189. Little, Introduction, 69.
190. Ibid., 70.
191. Ibid., 71.
192. Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 405.
193. al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya, XIII, 292; cf. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 54.
194. Ibid., XIII, 297.
195. Supra, p. 64, n. 37.
196. Ashtor in Studies in Islamic History and Civilization, ed. Uriel Heyd, 22.
197. Little, Introduction, 74.
198. Ibid., 73.
199. Tārīkh, VII, 217.
200. Ibid., VII, 218.
201. Ibid., VII, 218.
202. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 162 vo. - 162 ro.; al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, pp. 114, 116 of Arabic text.
203. Nihāyat al-arab, 67 vo.
204. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VIII, 63.

205. Ibid., 228-233.
206. Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:198.
207. Ibid., IV:198.
208. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 185-186; cf. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 105 ro.
209. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 251-252; cf. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 140 vo.
210. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 152: The muqarrār al-Naṣārā was an extra tax, first imposed on dhimmīs by al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars. According to Hassanein Rabie, "Despite its name which implies that it was limited to Copts, this tax of one dīnār per head was collected from both Copts and Jews in Egypt. The revenue from this source was spent on military affairs." The Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564-741/A.D. 1169-1341 (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 112. See also supra, 49.
211. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 158.
212. Ibid., VII, 158.
213. Ibid., VII, 158.
214. Ibid., VII, 179. See al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 680, n.3 for identification of the patriarch as John VII.
215. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 212.
216. According to Rabie, the jāliya (pl. jawālī) is more technically referred to as the jizya. The Financial System of Egypt, 108-112.
217. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 259.
218. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 87.
219. Little, Introduction, 78.
220. Ibid., 80.
221. Ibid., 77.
222. al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 685.
223. Ibid., I, 3, 664.

224. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 152.
225. al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 2 ro.
226. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 100 vo.
227. Supra, 8, n. 18.
228. al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 664.
229. al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭaṭ, I, 106.
230. al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 668; cf. al-Khiṭaṭ, II, 507.
231. al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 714; Quatremère, Histoire, II, 61.
232. Ibid., I, 3, 722.
233. Ibid., I, 3, 732.
234. Supra, 49.
235. al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭaṭ, II, 507.
236. Ibid., II, 497.
237. Ibid., II, 497.
238. Schregle has shown al-Maqrīzī's version to be suspect. Die Sultanin, 23.
239. Infra, 56-57 (transliteration) and 111 where a translation from al-Aynī's version may be found.
240. Gahen, Syrie du nord, 87.
241. Ibid., 87.
242. Little, Introduction, 80-81.
243. Ibid., 81.
244. Ibid., 81-85.
245. Ibid., 81. Ibn Hajar's claim that the chronicle began with Qalā'ūn's reign (Durar al-kāmina, IV, 381 as cited by Little) cannot be verified since this portion of the manuscript is not extant, and the manuscript discovered by Little was not written until after 758/1356-1357. See also, Donald P. Little, "The Recovery of a Lost Source for the Bahrī

Mamlūk History: al-Yūsufī's Nuzhat al-nāẓir fī sīrat al-Malik al-Nāṣir, "JAOS, XCIV, 1 (1974), 50-51.

246. Little, Introduction, 246.

247. Ibid., 82.

248. Little, JAOS, XCIV, 1 (1974), 42-43.

249. Ibid., 44.

250. Ibid., 44.

251. Ibid., 46.

252. "Collation of al-Maqrīzī's and al-Yūsufī's annals for 735...permits the somewhat startling conclusion that al-Maqrīzī copied material from al-Yūsufī on all the topics recorded in Nuzhat al-nāẓir and even presented them in the same order;..." Ibid., 45.

253. Although al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī omitted some reports of al-Yūsufī's, he usually gives a fuller version than al-Maqrīzī of those he does choose to include. Ibid., 44, 52.

254. Ibid., 45.

255. al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭaṭ, II, 497.

256. al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī, Iqd al-jumān, 160 vo.

257. Ibid., 160, vo.

258. Supra, 55.

259. "Even this information, however, is open to doubt. Little, JAOS, XCIV, 1 (1974), 46.

260. Ibid., 46.

261. Supra, 57.

262. Supra, 48.

263. Supra, 56 and 58.

264. Supra, 33.

265. Supra, 15.

266. Supra, 46.

267. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 57-61.

## CHAPTER II

### MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS DURING THE REIGN OF QALĀ'ŪN

#### Relations with Foreign Christian Powers

The reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn began peacefully enough by Mamlūk standards. Shortly after Qalā'ūn was named atabek of the young sultan al-Malik al-<sup>c</sup>Adil Badr al-Dīn Salāmish ibn al-Malik al-Zāhir, his charge was deposed without difficulty and Qalā'ūn at once became sultan (20 Rajab, 678/26 November 1279). As atabek, Qalā'ūn had been afforded the opportunity to surround himself with supporters and continued to do so once he had become sultan.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say, however, that Qalā'ūn was totally without opposition in his bid for the sultanate, for a group of Zāhirī amīrs (i.e., the mamlūks loyal to his predecessor al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars) held out in Syria and refused to serve the new sultan. It was, in fact, this internal disunity which brought to a close the period of external peace with which Qalā'ūn had been favored during the first few months of his reign and which was directly responsible for bringing to the fore, for the first time in that reign, the problem that governed almost every aspect of Mamlūk policy throughout the early Bahrī period toward foreign Christian powers, especially the Armenians, Georgians, Byzantines, and Frankish Crusaders of the Syrian Littoral. This problem was the threatening presence of the Mongols along the northern Syrian frontiers, and, it was Sunqur al-Ashqar, the leader of the Syrian dissidents, who wrote to the Ilkhan Abāghā urging him to come with his army to Syria.<sup>2</sup>

Though the Mongols had been defeated at <sup>c</sup>Ayn Jālūt in 1260, their real strength had not been broken, and they laid ready to pounce at first opportunity.<sup>3</sup>

The Mongol Allies: Armenians, Georgians, Greeks and Franks:

Having thus learned of the dispute between the two Mamlūk factions, the Mongols were encouraged to take advantage of the situation. News of the Mongol advance was received in the beginning of Jumādā II, 679/ September 1280.<sup>4</sup> The Mongols arrived in three groups, one from the direction of Rūm, a second from the East and a third from an unspecified direction composed of the major part of the Mongol army and accompanied by Hulākū's son Mankū Timur.<sup>5</sup> The king of Sīs (Little Armenia) joined the Mongol forces along the Darbsāk road.<sup>6</sup> On this occasion the Mongols penetrated only as far as Aleppo where a large group of them burned the mosque, madrasa, the dār al-saltāna, the homes of the most powerful amīrs, and generally caused havoc.<sup>7</sup>

The Franks of Marqab, having learned of the attack on Aleppo and of the evacuation of its army and inhabitants, aided in its destruction and increased their hostilities so that harm eventually came to the Muslims at the limits of that region.<sup>8</sup> The amīr Sayf al-Dīn Balbān' al-Ṭabākhī al-Manṣūrī, who at that time was viceroy of the sultan at Ḥiṣn al-Akrād (known as Krak des Chevaliers by the Crusaders),<sup>9</sup> sought revenge against these Franks for their assistance to the Mongols and was granted permission by the sultan to carry out a punitive raid in the vicinity of Marqab.<sup>10</sup> The Muslims, however, were defeated by the Franks in this encounter.<sup>11</sup>

Just one year later (reports of the Mongol advance were increasing by Jumada II, 680/August 1281),<sup>12</sup> the Mongols reappeared on the scene, but this time in much greater force--80,000 cavalry and troops of which 50,000 were Mongols while the rest were renegades or apostates (murtadda), Georgians, Greeks, Armenians and Franks.<sup>13</sup> The Mongol forces succeeded in reaching Hims this time where a great battle--known as the Battle of Hims--took place in the latter part of Rajab 681/October 1282. The Mongols were defeated.<sup>14</sup>

Though the Battle of Hims marked the last encounter of importance between Mongol and Mamlūk forces during Qalā'ūn's reign, those who had allied themselves with the enemy continued to reap the consequences. In the following year (681/1282-1283) a Georgian notable,<sup>15</sup> who is described by Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir as a partisan of the Mongols<sup>16</sup> as well as one of the greatest conspirators against the Muslims and sources of aid to the Mongols,<sup>17</sup> and his companion were seized in Jerusalem where they had attempted to travel secretly. From Jerusalem they were taken to Cairo where they were detained for their active assistance to the Mongol enemy.<sup>18</sup>

The Mamlūks were unrelenting in their revenge upon the allies of their greatest enemy, the Mongols, and in 682/1283-1284 launched an attack against Sīs and in particular, the city of Ayās<sup>19</sup> in defiance of the Armenian ruler Leon III (669/1270 - 688/1289)<sup>20</sup> because of the Armenian role in the perpetration of hostilities against Aleppo, including its part in the burning of the mosque. The Armenians were dealt a hard blow on this occasion.<sup>21</sup>

These events culminated in 684/1285-1286 with the conclusion of



a treaty between Qalā'ūn and Leon III of Armenia, apparently at the request of the latter (Leon III had sent envoys to the sultan for this purpose).<sup>22</sup> The treaty which was a triumph for Qalā'ūn brought Armenia to her knees. By it she became not much more than a vassalage of the Mamlūk empire. Among the provisions of the treaty was a clause which imposed a heavy tribute in money, kind and animals upon the king to be paid annually.<sup>23</sup> Another clause stipulated that the king was not to build any new fortresses.<sup>24</sup> But most important among the conditions of the peace were that the king should swear obedience to the sultan which was not to be contravened in any manner. For example, he was not to assist or reinforce the Mongols and their followers or any enemy of the sultan by any means.<sup>25</sup> The result of this treaty was to neutralize this most constant ally of the Mongols and to establish a degree of territorial isolation between the West and the Crusader kingdoms.<sup>26</sup>

Although the Armenian-Mongol alliance and that of the Georgians and Franks of Tripoli with the Mongols is not discussed per se in the Muslim chronicles at this period (it is mentioned only as it is realized within the context of specific incidents as we have seen in the case of the Armenians), perhaps because by this time the alliance was a well-recognized fact since it had been pursued vigorously since the middle of the century, that it was of major concern to the sultan is evident by the systematic manner in which he sought to sap these allies of whatever strength or effectiveness might still remain despite Baybars' harsh treatment of them.<sup>27</sup>

One thing is quite clear, however. Hostile relations between the

Mamlūks and the Christian allies of the Mongols were of a political and military nature. In every case Muslim sources have made explicit that the reason for Mamlūk actions against Armenia, Georgia or others such as the Franks of Mārqaḥ lay in their Mongol sympathies and active assistance to the enemy cause. The belligerencies were, therefore, not a result of religious differences though the antipathy between them may, indeed, have been reinforced thereby. Significantly, the Armenians are most often referred to simply as Armenians (al-Arman), Georgians as Georgians (al-Kurj), and Franks as Franks (al-Ifranj). On rare occasions the words Naṣārā and kuffār are used by the chroniclers in regard to these Christian groups, but not in such a manner as to arouse religious sentiments.

#### The Crusader Kingdoms:

In comparison with the Mongol menace, the problem of the Frankish Crusader kingdoms in the Syrian Littoral was one of only secondary magnitude. Two factors were responsible for this situation. First of all, the position of the Crusader kingdoms had been weakened by their own internal problems of succession, the rivalries between the military orders as well as between the several Italian commercial states which had establishments in the cities with which they were allied in the Syrian Littoral. Furthermore, the prospect of help from their western brethren was precluded by their preoccupation with their own disputes. The unlikelihood of help from the West became certain when Charles d'Anjou was defeated in the incident of the Sicilian Vespers in 1282 and had to recall his viceroy in the East, Roger de San Severino.<sup>28</sup> The deputyship fell to Odo Poilechien

whose power under these circumstances was not secure.<sup>29</sup>

Secondly, other than the Franks of Tripoli, none seemed to grasp the potential that a Mongol-Crusader alliance might hold. Charles d'Anjou's partiality to the Egyptians disposed his viceroy Roger de San Severino to conclude treaties with the Mamlūks rather than to seek alliance with the Mongols.<sup>30</sup> Of Charles' preference for the Mamlūks, Runciman says the following:

The Mongols were known to be sympathetic to the Christians and ready to join in any alliance against the Mameluks, as their embassy to the Council of Lyon had shown. To many Christians, including successive Popes, such an alliance seemed to offer salvation. But Charles thought otherwise. The Mongol alliance was particularly advocated by the Genoese, who had a practical monopoly of the Mongol trade in the Black Sea and in northern Syria. It was therefore opposed by the Venetians, and by Charles, who also had no wish to see Genoa enriched. Moreover the Templars, on whom he relied, always favoured an alliance with the Mameluks. They were now the chief bankers in the East, and many of the Muslim lords were their clients. They believed that the Mameluks, if unprovoked, would not upset a state of affairs which was financially convenient to them....His motive was not only to preserve his new dominion. The King of Tunis was in touch with Cairo. If he saw Charles was allied with the Sultan there, he would continue to pay his tribute to Naples regularly; and Charles needed the money.<sup>31</sup>

Cahen cites as further reasons for the Frankish partiality toward the Mamlūks the hostility of the Latin Church toward the Mongols due to the Mongols' insistence on the presence of a Greek patriarch in Antioch as well as the terrible reputation which the Mongols had acquired that did not endear them to the Franks farther south.

Or cette civilisation, Francs et Musulmans n'avaient

pas vécu plus de cent-soixante ans coté à coté  
(dont les deux dernier tiers de siècle avaient  
été de paix, coupé seulement deux fois par des  
étrangers, Khwarizmiens et Saint Louis) sans  
finir par se sentir instinctivement frères en  
elle.<sup>32</sup>

In fact, therefore, the problem of the Crusader principalities posed itself only as a corollary to that of the Mongol threat. Qalā'ūn knew how to take advantage of this favorable set of circumstances to win a free hand with which to deal with the more formidable enemy. It is in this light that he concluded a series of treaties with the Crusader kingdoms between 680/1281-1282 and 685/1285-1286.

The first of these treaties was concluded between Qalā'ūn and the people of Akkā in 680/1281-1282.<sup>33</sup> The one provision noted by Baybars is that the prisoners taken by the Franks in the skirmish at Marqab in 679/1280--and apparently there were many--were to be returned to the Muslims.<sup>34</sup>

In the same year Qalā'ūn also concluded a treaty with Bohemond of Tripoli upon which an oath was sworn by Nicholas Lorgne, the Commander of the Hospitalers.<sup>35</sup> Among the conditions of the treaty were that Bohemond would not repair any buildings except in accordance with the specifications of the treaty.<sup>36</sup> Likewise the sultan was not to repair any fortresses outside of those which the treaty recorded.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, Qalā'ūn obtained Bohemond's word that he would not favor any of the enemies of the sultan, nor come to agreements with the enemy either by secret code (ramz), in writing, or by the exchange of letters, messages and oral communications.<sup>38</sup>

An interesting sidelight to the conclusion of this treaty is the

fact that a group of amīrs in Syria, led by a certain Kawndāk advised the Franks not to conclude the treaty with Qalā'ūn since a conspiracy had been set in motion by which Qalā'ūn would be assassinated. The sultan, however, was warned and managed to foil the plot.<sup>39</sup> The story is an indication that the Muslim-Crusader struggle was perhaps not primarily viewed in religious terms by all Muslims. Here, a group of Mamlūks, nominally Muslim, actually gave advice to the Christian Franks, not out of any beneficent motive, of course, but rather in the interest of their own power. The conflict was, therefore, one of power, not of religion.

Third in this series was a treaty concluded by Qalā'ūn with the Templars of Tortosa in 681/1282-1283.<sup>40</sup> According to the agreement Qalā'ūn obtained the promise that no one from Tortosa should invade the lands of the sultan in return for a similar promise on Qalā'ūn's part in their regard. Once again a clause was included which provided that "in the territory of Tortosa mentioned in the treaty no fort or fortification is to be repaired, nor any reinforcement, entrenchment or the like built."<sup>41</sup>

In 682/1283-1284 Qalā'ūn granted the request of the inhabitants of <sup>c</sup>Akkā who sought to conclude a truce with the Mamlūks.<sup>42</sup> Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir clearly indicates in his text that the treaty was regarded as a humiliation to the Franks with whom it was concluded. According to the text of the preamble, "the agreement reached was that they should submit themselves to the will of the Sultan, although before this, at the expiration of the truce (of al-Malik az-Zāhir), they had put forward exorbitant

claims.<sup>43</sup> Gabrielli has noted that even the detailed list of lands belonging to each party covered by the treaty, though part of the normal formula for such documents, was intended here to demean the Frankish party.

The long, monotonous list..., enumerating the dominions of the Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt from south to north, has the eloquence of fact when one compares it with the brief description, a little further on, of the territories belonging to the other party to the treaty. The 'kingdom of Jerusalem' was in effect reduced to a narrow coastal strip extending from a short distance north of Acre as far as Carmel. Apart from this Tyre and Sidon, Beirūt and Tripoli and a few ports in Syria still held by the Templars and Hospitallers were all that remained of the Crusaders' achievements. The list of Qalwūn's possessions, beginning with the Holy city, is in fact a list of all the territories that the Crusaders had lost during the last century or attacked in vain.<sup>44</sup>

Furthermore, the agreement provided that the Frankish party, including anyone newly arrived in their lands, should guarantee the safety of the territories enumerated in exchange for the sultan's guarantee for the safety of Frankish lands.<sup>45</sup> Of special note is the clause which insures that

whenever one of the Kings of the Franks or of Outremer shall leave his land and invade the territory of our Lord the Sultan or of his son, where that territory is under treaty, the bailli of the Commune and the Grand Master of Acre shall undertake to give notice of their movements to our Lord the Sultan two months before their arrival.<sup>46</sup>

Thus the sultan gained some assurance against further Crusades by obtaining the neutrality of the Frankish colonies against their own brethren. Perhaps even more importantly, however, was that Qalā'ūn obtained what consisted,

in effect, of an alliance with the Franks) versus the Mongols! According to the treaty,

in case of attack by the Mongols or other enemies whichever of the two signatories is the first to receive news of it shall inform the other. If an enemy force which God forbid, whether Mongol or from some other hostile power, should attack Syria by the overland route and drive the (Sultan's) armies before it as far as the coastal territories affected by this treaty and invade these lands, the bailli of the Commune of Acre and the Grand Master shall have the right to make provision by means of treaties for the defence of their persons, their subjects and their territories, to the best of their ability.<sup>47</sup>

Finally, a clause similar to some we have seen previously concerning the restrictions upon building activities has been included here as well.<sup>48</sup>

The last in this series of treaties were concluded in 684/1285-1286 with the princesses of Beirut and Tyre each, whose districts had not

been included in the treaty signed in 682/1283-1284 with the Commune of

<sup>49</sup> Akkā. Of the agreement with the Princess of Beirut, little is said in the chronicles other than that the Princess was to pay for the ship, the water and foreign merchandise about 90,000 dirham, that of this sum she would pay 30,000 dirham immediately and the remainder within three

months.<sup>50</sup> As for the treaty concluded with Tyre, the conditions stipulated therein are similar to those found in the other treaties we have

examined. For instance, the Princess was to build no new citadels, repair no walls, dig no trenches, nor construct other fortifications and defence works.<sup>51</sup> She also agreed to defend the sultan against any Frankish nation

which might undertake an attack upon the lands of the sultan and would not assist such enemies in any way.<sup>52</sup> Although the sultan had pledged his

protection for the lands belonging to the Princess, one curious clause appears which would allow the Ismā<sup>c</sup>īlīs who were under the sultan to make attempts upon the Princess and her domains.<sup>53</sup> Quatremère feels that this provision may have been slipped into the Arabic text unbeknown to the Frankish authorities.<sup>54</sup>

In any case the sultan's aims are evident in the conditions of the agreements as related above. First of all, while they did assure the Frankish parties a measure of security with regard to their Muṣlim neighbors, the treaties were written in a contemptuous manner as is shown by the enumeration of the Mamlūk lands as compared to those belonging to the Frankish party in the Treaty of <sup>c</sup>Akkā in 682/1283-1284,<sup>55</sup> and by the clause concerning the Ismā<sup>c</sup>īlīs if this, indeed, was actually part of the original text. It is plain that Qalā'ūn in concluding these treaties did not do so out of any wish to benefit these principalities or to prolong their existence on Syrian soil, but rather in his own interest so as to free himself to attend to the more dangerous adversary--the Mongols.

That this is so is further indicated by the fact that from 684/1285-1286 on, when he no longer feared a Mongol invasion and as soon as the slightest justification could be found, Qalā'ūn launched several campaigns against the Crusader strongholds. The first and, perhaps, the most renowned of these campaigns was the conquest of Ḥiṣn al-Marqab and Maraqīya in 684/1285-1286.<sup>55</sup> Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's text clearly shows the kind of attitude which allowed Qalā'ūn to break the treaty he had sworn upon.



The Hospitalers who were in it [i.e., Marqab] had increased their outrages and hostilities, and their viciousness had grown to the extent that the people of neighboring fortresses had become as though they were imprisoned, nay, in the grave. The Franks believed that he [the sultan], would not overcome them either by force or by ruse, and that actually there was little trickery in him. So they continued their oppression and did not abide by this oath. Each shameful deed of treachery, captivity, and pillage brought calamity upon the small fortresses. Therefore, al-Malik al-Manṣūr laid in wait for them like a lion ready to pounce, and he attached importance to the subject of this fortress among other things.<sup>56</sup>

Marqab was punished for what was presumably deemed by the sultan to be a breach of the treaty with Tortosa which covered Marqab as well.<sup>57</sup> After a desperate struggle, the Franks sought the mercy of the sultan and begged for clemency, seeking nothing more than their lives. Qalā'ūn granted them their request and more. They were permitted to take their horses, mules and the clothes on their backs as well as a certain amount of money-- about one thousand dīnārs with them. In return, of course, the Franks surrendered the fortress.<sup>58</sup>

The conquest of Marqab was followed two years later in 686/1287-1288 by that of Laodicea.<sup>59</sup> In this case not motive is mentioned in the account of the incident, which is recorded by Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir alone among our chroniclers, other than the fact that the Franks derived much revenue from the port of Laodicea, and that in this respect, it compared with Alexandria.<sup>60</sup> Runciman, however, states that "the Moslem merchants of Aleppo had long complained of the inconvenience of having to send their goods through the Christian port of Latakia,"<sup>61</sup> and that Qalā'ūn justified his actions by

claiming "that Latakia, as part of the principality of Antioch, was not covered by his truce with Tripoli."<sup>62</sup> In any case, with the fall of Laodicea perished the last Frankish enclave of that principality. Its fall had, perhaps, further significance for the Muslims. Laodicea was among the territories which had been lost to the Muslims but which had been reclaimed by Hulākū for Bohemond.<sup>63</sup> It, therefore, was an enormous rebuke to the Mongols and their allies that it should once again fall into the hands of their enemy.

In 688/1289 Qalā'ūn undertook the conquest of Tripoli on the pretext that its inhabitants had broken the treaty by causing destruction and because of their support of the adversary.<sup>64</sup> Qalā'ūn seems to have carried out this conquest with more fury than any previous to it. As we have seen, the inhabitants of both Marqab and Laodicea had been guaranteed safety for their persons and even some of their possessions. On this occasion, however, Qalā'ūn showed no mercy. Those who attempted to flee to the island just off the coast from the city were pursued, then taken prisoner or killed.<sup>65</sup> Finally, he had the city completely destroyed, though he would later rebuild it in a nearby location.<sup>66</sup> The sultan's wrath in this case was occasioned not only by the fact that specific conditions of the treaty had been broken, but also by the fact that Tripoli had allied itself with the Mongols.

With the conquest of Tripoli Qalā'ūn had all but eliminated the Crusader kingdoms. Only <sup>c</sup>Akkā remained. It was, in fact, during preparations for the conquest of <sup>c</sup>Akkā that the sultan died. It was left to

Qalā'ūn's son al-Ashraf Khalīl to complete the reconquest of that city.

One thing, however, is clear--mere co-existence was not the goal of Qalā'ūn's politique. The fact is that as soon as conditions permitted, he did not tolerate the presence of a foreign power on Syrian soil. To what extent this attitude was a consequence of religion is hard to determine here. One suspects that although religion certainly was one factor, the sultan and his predecessors would not have tolerated any foreign power in that strategic location especially under the threat of Mongol advances, regardless of that power's religious associations.

The problem of the Crusaders had, indeed, diminished in importance when the Mongols came to pose the more serious threat, but when the opportunity arose, the sultan did not hesitate to rid himself of this irritation.

Alliance with the Mongols, therefore, was not the only reason for elimination of the Frankish power, for as we have seen, some of the Frankish kingdoms had chosen to cast their lot with the Mamlūks.

#### The Byzantines:

It was a special combination of historical circumstances which brought about an alliance between the Mamlūk and Byzantine empires during the reign of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars,<sup>67</sup> a policy which was continued by Qalā'ūn, culminating in what Canard has termed a treaty of commerce and friendship early in Qalā'ūn's reign.<sup>68</sup>

At the moment of Qalā'ūn's advent to the Mamlūk sultanate, the emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus, was besieged by enemies on all fronts. Hard pressed in the West by the Balkan powers and the Frankish states in

Greece,<sup>69</sup> Michael suffered from the fact that his authority in the East was being challenged by the Turks in Anatolia, a group of whom had laid siege to Tralles (Aydin).<sup>70</sup> The Mongols of Persia with whom he was allied (an alliance strengthened by the marriage of one of his daughters to Abāghā,<sup>71</sup> were at that moment engaged in expeditions against the Mamlūks in northern Syria (i.e., the expeditions of 679/1280-1281 and 680/1281-1282, the latter of which is known as the Battle of Hims) and were not, therefore, in a position to help Michael. The greatest menace, however, appeared in the form of Charles d'Anjou who had for years harbored a desire to launch a "crusade" against Michael and had been restrained from doing so in the past only by the press of more immediate problems or in deference to successive Popes who saw greater advantage in negotiating a union of the Greek and Latin churches under their own aegis.<sup>72</sup> It was Pope Gregory X (1271-1276), perhaps, who understood this most clearly. In Runciman's words, he realized that

a really successful Crusade would need the willing cooperation of the Eastern Christians. It was useless to imagine that a revived Latin Empire would help the cause. Past experience had shown the contrary. But a Greek Empire which had submitted voluntarily to Rome would be a precious ally.<sup>73</sup>

Such a union would open up the land route to the East.

Michael, on the other hand, saw such union as the only way to maintain the neutrality of his empire against his western adversaries, for only by this means could he maintain the good favor of the Pope. Pope Nicholas (1277-1280), however, imposed more severe demands upon Michael in

regard to the union than had his predecessors. The Pope's legates arrived in Constantinople in 1279 with the more severe demands. Michael sought to comply realizing that it was his only hope for survival, even though by doing so he lost the support of his own people.<sup>74</sup> In fact, the union, it would seem, was maintained only by Michael's bribing the Pope with gifts of money, for by then the opposition to the union in the Byzantine empire had reached the Pope's ears, casting doubt upon Michael's sincerity.<sup>75</sup>

When Pope Nicholas died on August 20, 1280, matters turned from bad to worse. The new Pope, Martin IV (1281-1285) was of a completely different mind. Favoring Charles, Pope Martin broke off relations with Michael and supported a plan by which Charles in alliance with Venice, Pisa and others would launch an expedition against Constantinople which was actually projected for April 1282.<sup>76</sup>

Qalā'ūn too had reasons to continue the policy of friendship initiated by Baybars. Not only did the spectre of the Mongols loom large on the horizon, but there was also the ever-present fear of a new Crusade from the West. One partial assurance against such a possibility was to block the land route to Asia by neutralizing Byzantium with such a treaty. Nor did Qalā'ūn like the idea of Charles d'Anjou, who would most certainly be a stronger opponent than his recent predecessors, making solid his claim to the title of King of Jerusalem.<sup>77</sup> But in addition to these political and military considerations, Qalā'ūn hoped to insure the slave trade carried on with southern Russia then under the control of the Golden Horde.

which was after all essential to the survival of the Mamlūk system.

For this it was necessary to be on friendly terms with Michael who dominated the straits through which vessels transporting slaves might pass to and from the Black Sea ports.

Almost immediately upon assuming the powers of sultan, Qalā'ūn dispatched embassies to neighboring lands, among them, notably, Byzantium, to inform their rulers of his succession to the throne, a measure intended to establish his authority.<sup>78</sup> To Michael in Constantinople he sent the amīr Naṣr al-Dīn ibn al-Muḥsinī al-Jazarī and the patriarch of Alexandria Anbā Siyūs in 679/1280.<sup>79</sup> The envoys arrived at a propitious moment. The emperor, who was seeking allies against his enemies, seized the occasion to cement a more firm alliance with Qalā'ūn than had existed in the past and replied to the sultan by returning with the sultan's envoys the copy of the oath upon which he had sworn and which would form his half of the treaty.<sup>80</sup>

Among the political and military promises and demands made therein were the following: 1) that the emperor would not declare war on the sultan nor incite anyone else to do so, provided that the sultan acted in a similar manner;<sup>81</sup> 2) that the sultan's envoys would enjoy complete security and might travel wherever necessary throughout his empire;<sup>82</sup> 3) that Christians who were slaves in the territory of the sultan, if freed, could return freely by sea to the lands of the emperor and that subjects of the emperor might freely buy Christian slaves in the sultan's lands and return with them;<sup>83</sup> 4) that the practice of arresting and fining subjects of the emperor alleged to be engaged in acts of piracy for which

they were, in fact, not responsible, should cease;<sup>84</sup> 5) that complaints by subjects of the sultān, victims of exactions on the part of the emperor's subjects, would be transmitted to the imperial authorities, and if need be, compensation made if the sultan agreed to reciprocate;<sup>85</sup> and finally, 6) that if the sultan should so desire he might take steps to include in his text a clause providing naval assistance from Byzantium to Egypt against the "common enemy," etc.<sup>86</sup> Such clauses may have been included in previous agreements. However, in Canard's view, Qalā'ūn's situation at the time of this treaty had ameliorated to such an extent that the sultān no longer saw any need for such a clause.<sup>87</sup>

The most important commercial clauses of Michael's text assured the continuation of the slave trade and gave protection to all merchants in return for the payment of the usual duties on the condition of reciprocity and with the provision that any slaves being transported not be Christian.<sup>88</sup>

Qalā'ūn, whose text was dated Ramadān 680/December 1281, was more specific in regard to the friendship and assistance clauses. In addition to the promises made by the emperor, Qalā'ūn demanded that he should not assist or give an adversary the right of way across his territory no matter to what race or religion he might belong.<sup>89</sup> Likewise, he makes explicit that not just any envoys, but specifically those which he dispatches to the Golden Horde, as well as any who return with them, even slaves, should enjoy free passage and absolute security on land or sea.<sup>90</sup> As for the question of the corsairs, Qalā'ūn agreed to pursue the emperor's subjects only when it could be proven without doubt that they were engaged in acts

of piracy against the sultan and his subjects.<sup>91</sup>

The news of the death of the emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus in 682/1283-1284 was learned when an embassy (probably the same embassy as that which was returning with Qalā'ūn's portion of the treaty) reached Constantinople only to find the late emperor's son Andronicus II on the throne.<sup>92</sup> In any case, Andronicus swore the oath in his father's stead, desirous to carry on his father's policy. In the meantime, of course, Charles d'Anjou had lost Sicily as a result of the Sicilian Vespers affair which had been plotted successfully with Michael's help.<sup>93</sup> Thus, Byzantium's major enemy had been eliminated. Nevertheless, no change in policy seems to have occurred or, at least, none is noted by the Arab chroniclers. Qalā'ūn certainly had no reason to abrogate the treaty; for upon it depended the slave trade. Furthermore, an overland Crusade always remained a possibility to be taken into account. The treaty was probably esteemed beneficial as far as Byzantium was concerned for its stabilizing effect on relations with her neighbors to a certain degree as well as for the commercial benefits which she must have derived from the trade.

In all then, the formation of this alliance between a Christian and a Muslim power was dictated by political, military and commercial considerations and seems to have worked quite outside the religious sphere. In fact, Canard points to the fact that where religious concerns might have raised difficult juridico-religious questions, those clauses seem to have been passed in silence or simply ignored.<sup>94</sup> The treaty was enacted in the self-interest of each party. Religion entered the picture only in the sense that by this policy the Mamlūks succeeded in playing one Christian power against another.



European Christian Powers:

Although the information derived from the Arab chronicles for Qalā'ūn's reign concerning Mamlūk relations with western Christian powers is incomplete, it can be gleaned from what reports our chroniclers do give that Qalā'ūn intended to continue the policies of his predecessors and more particularly those of al-Malik-al-Zāhir Baybars whose political, military and commercial circumstances resembled his own.<sup>95</sup>

When ambassadors arrived from al-Fūnsh<sup>96</sup> in 678/1279, intending to present themselves to al-Malik al-Sa<sup>c</sup>id, they were received by Qalā'ūn instead who in the meantime had assumed the sultanate. After the envoys had delivered both their oral and written messages, Qalā'ūn wrote a reply and bestowed robes of honor upon them and facilitated their return.<sup>97</sup>

A second embassy from al-Fūnsh arrived at Alexandria on 17 Rabī<sup>c</sup> I, 681/25 June 1282.<sup>98</sup> Once again we are given no information concerning the mission of this embassy. As in the first case, we learn only that the envoys bestowed many gifts upon the sultan (enumerated in the sources), and that, for his part the sultan treated the ambassadors hospitably. One may surmise that the purpose of the embassy was perhaps in some way related to the volatile situation in western Christendom which had resulted in the overthrow of Charles-d'Anjou's government in Sicily on March 30, 1282 (in which both King Peter of Aragon and Michael Palaeologus had had a hand) at the very moment when Charles' fleet was to have set forth against Constantinople, an event which was to have important consequences in the East. For example, Charles was eliminated as a

threat to Constantinople. The Mamlūks perhaps considered Charles' demise a mixed blessing. Though Charles may have been considered a potential rival to the Mamlūks in the East, he also had preferred the Mamlūks over the Mongols as noted previously, and had been instrumental in urging his deputy to negotiate truces with the sultan.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, the defeat of Charles d'Anjou would also have an effect, at least temporarily, upon the possibility of sending another Crusade to the East since the strength of western Christendom had been sapped by these events. Suggestions to the effect that the mission was sent to gather information on the situation, however, must remain in the realm of pure speculation since we cannot even name with confidence the origin of this embassy. That some sort of awareness of these events did exist in the East which may have been gained as a result of such missions is indicated by Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's account of the western situation which includes a fragmentary report concerning a sea battle in the port of Naples between the Aragonese and Angevin fleets which occurred following the Vespers.<sup>100</sup>

It is not until 684/1285-1286 that we have any indication of an embassy dispatched in the other direction, that is, from Qalā'ūn to al-Fūnsh, which reached its destination in Muḥarram 682/April 1283.<sup>101</sup> In this instance al-Fūnsh is certainly to be identified with Alfonso X of Castille, for the revolt of that king's son Sancho is described in this report. The revolt apparently had an ill effect on the mission, for Qalā'ūn's envoys were detained by Alfonso who wished them to remain until the matter was decided. But as before, we are disappointed to find no explanation of the purpose of the embassy. It does seem, however, that Alfonso, though he had

reason for detaining the envoys, did not wish on the other hand, to offend the sultan, for according to Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir,

al-Fūnsh sent a reply to Abī Yūsuf, the Lord of Marrākash refusing [his proposal] , [saying] 'If I send the envoys to you and you send them back on your part, great disgrace will befall me. How could the envoys of this great sultan come before me, yet someone other than me prepare their return? What things would be said about me!' <sup>102</sup>

There are further indications of friendly relations. During the stay of the envoys in Castille, Alfonso X died. The new king, Alfonso's rebellious son Sancho, was crowned in Seville on a Friday in the early part of Rabī<sup>c</sup> I 683/ April 1284. The coronation, moreover, took place in a church which had formerly been a mosque. <sup>103</sup> During a procession which was part of the festivities it is reported that the new king rode with the banners of the sultan above his head and that the envoys were with him as he processed around the city. At the feast which followed, the envoys sat beside him. <sup>104</sup> It is significant, perhaps, that when envoys from Armenia and from the ruler of Marrākash arrived, at the court, it was the envoys of the sultan who sat on the right of the king. Finally, king Sancho conferred with the sultan's envoys and discussed their differences which, however, are not explained. Finally, the sultan's ambassadors sought Sancho's permission that they might return. Seemingly embarrassed by the fact that because of an empty treasury he was not in a position to send the ambassadors home accompanied by the usual fine gifts, Sancho sought to delay their departure by proposing that they go to Toledo until such time as he might procure the necessary presents. The ambassadors, however, refused and returned via Tunis with a sum of 500 dīnārs. <sup>105</sup> One may speculate that this matter of protocol may also have been Alfonso's

reason for delaying their departure..

Though the sources do not inform us in detail concerning Mamlūk relations with western Christendom other than to indicate that exchanges were being carried on, seemingly of a friendly nature, we may speculate concerning the subject of these exchanges. The momentous events of these years in the West which had led to the fall of the Angevin dynasty may also have led to discussions of a political nature or, perhaps, merely to fact-finding missions and the establishment of new or renewed alliances following the shifting of power in the West. On the other hand, these exchanges may have been primarily of a commercial nature. This is the explanation favored by Montálvez who cites the export of olive oil to Egypt as the basis of such commercial activity.<sup>106</sup>

Concerning the latter part of Qalā'ūn's reign we have evidence of a more concrete nature in the form of two documents, the first of which is the text of a treaty concluded with the king of Aragon, Alfonso III and his brother king James II of Sicily.<sup>107</sup> The clauses of this agreement may be divided into two categories or types: political and commercial. In regard to the former Alfonso III and his brother agreed to count the friends of the sultan as their friends and his enemies as their enemies,<sup>108</sup> to prevent hostilities by other Christian powers against the sultan and to give assistance should hostilities occur, as well as to inform the sultan of any movements intended against him.<sup>109</sup> The impression given by these clauses is that the sultan had reason to fear a new Crusade and, therefore, wished that such an alliance be formed. Although our sources are silent,

it is possible that the sultan was aware of the renewed discussions between the Mongols, England, France, and Rome in regard to an alliance in a crusading effort. These discussions were going on during the years 1285-1289.<sup>110</sup> From Alfonso's point of view, he had the rest of the Christian West, including the Pope, to contend with since the fight over Sicily continued to be waged in the aftermath of the Sicilian Vespers. He might, therefore, have considered it in his interest to be on friendly terms with the Mamlūks in the East. Finally, the king did obtain a guarantee of security for those who wished to perform pilgrimages to the Holy Land.<sup>111</sup>

The second half of the accord, however, is devoted to the facilitation of commercial matters. If a Muslim vessel were shipwrecked in the territories of the king or of his brother, the king would assure security for the persons aboard as well as for their goods, possessions and he would assume responsibility for repairs. The condition was to be reciprocal.<sup>112</sup>

If a subject of the sultan, whether Muslim, Christian or dhimmi died in the king's territories, his possessions and money were to be returned to the sultan. This condition was likewise to be reciprocal.<sup>113</sup> The king was also not to aid corsairs.<sup>114</sup> Of great importance was the clause which lifted any restrictions which might have existed against the import by the sultan of iron, linen, wood and other materials which were, of course, essential to the Mamlūks for the construction of their fleet and other military equipment.<sup>115</sup> Transactions were to be carried out according to Muslim law in the sultan's lands and according to the laws of the king's territory in his lands.<sup>116</sup>

The second document is the text, or partial text, of a treaty concluded with the Commune of Genoa in 689/1290,<sup>117</sup> which has as its principal aim to re-establish the friendly commercial relations with Genoa which had been interrupted by a series of hostile acts and reprisals between the two lands.<sup>118</sup> It is interesting to note that that part of the text given by Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir speaks only of Genoa's obligations toward Muslims such as protection for their persons and goods. Also in the humiliating manner of a practice we remarked earlier in regard to the treaties with the Franks of Syria, the most recent conquest of the sultan--Tripoli-- is mentioned in the enumeration of the sultan's lands covered by this treaty.<sup>119</sup> Again the sultan obtained a promise from the Genoans that they would not assist the enemies of the sultan.<sup>120</sup>

Admittedly, the information provided by the Arab chronicles concerning Mamlūk relations--political, military, and commercial--with the Christian West is filled with lacunae. Nevertheless, it is obvious that they were of a political and military nature where the defense of the sultanate was concerned and of a practical nature where commerce was in question. Furthermore, it does not appear that the Crusades created a rupture of enduring nature. On the contrary, they may have even stimulated certain alliances in some instances as for example is indicated by the political clauses of the treaty with Aragon. Once again religion does not seem to have played an important role in these relations, but was subordinate to political, military and commercial factors.

The Ethiopians:

Two factors emerge as having dominated relations between Islamic Egypt and Christian Ethiopia--the Red Sea trade and the long-standing affiliation between the Ethiopian Church and the patriarchate of Alexandria.<sup>121</sup> Little information exists, however, for our period concerning either of these elements, even in the Ethiopian materials available to date.<sup>122</sup> Most of what is known derives from a series of letters written by the negus Yagba-Šiyon (1285-1294), which has been preserved in one of our primary Arab sources, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir's Tashrīf al-ayyām.<sup>123</sup>

By the very form which this correspondence takes, one is able to discern some fundamental traits of Ethiopic-Mamlūk relations during the period. Although in addressing the sultan Yagba-Šiyon has placed himself on a par with Qalā'ūn in asserting that just as the sultan is the protector of Christians in his lands, he is the defender of Muslims in his territory,<sup>124</sup> the reality of his situation vis-à-vis the sultan is laid bare by the fact that it was only by the sultan's permission and through his agency that the Ethiopian ruler could obtain a replacement for the highest post in the Ethiopian Church, that of the metropolitan bishop.<sup>125</sup> And this--a plea to the sultan to dispatch a new metropolitan--was, in fact, the main purpose of Yagba-Šiyon's letter to Qalā'ūn. It is formulated in such a manner that the position of the negus relative to the sultan is clear.

Greetings, O Mansūr, Listen, O sultan of Egypt--may God protect you--Give the patriarch the authorization to send me a bishop. We and they [the Coptic Church] have been of one faith since the time of Mark until now. The order is up to you. I shall send you the [customary] gifts if you will

send me a bishop. And if you send him, I shall demand from him your instructions, and whatever they are, I shall execute them.<sup>126</sup>

The importance of this traditional affiliation for the very stability of the country is illustrated by the fact that when the practice was interrupted and Syrian metropolitans were accepted in their stead, the country was thrown into turmoil. This was the situation which obtained during the mid-thirteenth century A.D.<sup>127</sup> Yagba-Šiyon's father, Yikunno-'Amlak (1270-1285) had tried in vain to obtain a new metropolitan by seeking Baybars' consent. His failure to do so resulted in the situation described by Yagba-Šiyon in his letters to Qalā'ūn on the one hand and to the patriarch of Alexandria on the other. Therein he characterized the Syrian metropolitans as "those who created havoc in the time of my father,"<sup>128</sup> and explained that the Syrians had only been present because no metropolitan was forthcoming from Egypt, and that they despised the Syrians.<sup>129</sup> Thus, the very stability of the Christian kingdom of Ethiopia seems to have lain in the hands of a Muslim ruler, the Mamlūk sultan, by virtue of his power to approve or reject the request for the dispatch of new metropolitans to fill the highest office in the Ethiopian Church.

A case may be made that the sultan could and did use his power in regard to the selection of new metropolitans in such a way as to exercise some degree of influence over the internal affairs of this Christian land. He had the possibility to retaliate against any disagreeable actions, either on the part of the Ethiopian metropolitan or, for that matter, the negus, by refusing to approve the dispatch of a new metropolitan who, as we have



seen, played a role of some importance in that land. In fact, this sort of reprisal may have been at the root of the failure of the mission sent to Cairo by Yagba-Šiyon's father, Yikunno-'Amlak, the purpose of which was the submission of a request for a new metropolitan.<sup>130</sup> It should be noted, however, that the mission was also frustrated in the first instance by a lack of cooperation on the part of the ruler of Yemen in expediting the embassy's journey to Cairo.<sup>131</sup> The sultan, though he was aware that a mission had been sent and knew its purpose, did not comply because, he states, the emperor's envoy was not present. Yet he knew that the envoy had been detained and was, therefore, perhaps not being quite candid in regard to his own motives so that he might use the situation to his own advantage by impressing upon the negus his control over certain aspects of Ethiopian affairs.<sup>132</sup>

Tamrat attributes the deterioration of Mamlūk-Ethiopian relations that occurred in the latter part of Yikunno-'Amlak's reign (1270-1285) to the failure of that mission.<sup>133</sup> Another explanation, however, is suggested by Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir's text. As noted previously, Yagba-Šiyon in his letter to the sultan tried to convince Qālā'ūn that unlike his father who was "among the enemies of the Muslims, he was the protector of Muslims in his land."<sup>134</sup> In making this comparison, Yagba-Šiyon suggests that his father had acted against the Muslims in some way, though just how is not clear. It may be for that reason that the sultan did not gratify the emperor's request. This may also be an explanation of why Yagba-Šiyon tried so hard in his letter to convince the sultan that he was of another mind and hopeful of establishing friendly relations. Yagba-Šiyon seemed to expect

that friendly relations were the normal state of affairs and would be renewed without difficulty, for he was presumptuous enough to have sent various articles for the temples in Jerusalem and wanted the sultan to assure that they would be allowed to pass.

One further matter awaits consideration. Ethiopia is the first among the various foreign Christian powers thus far considered to have harbored a sizeable resident Muslim population.<sup>135</sup> This would, one would anticipate, have provided the emperor with an effective bargaining point vis-à-vis the sultan. But it was less so than might at first appear, for the sultan always held the patriarch as well as the relationship of the Egyptian Coptic Church to the Ethiopian Church in his hands as a means of control over events. Thus, the situation of Muslims in Ethiopia could not remain in jeopardy for long periods. During the latter part of Yikunno-'Amlak's reign, for instance, matters were not going well for Muslims in Ethiopia due to the failure of the mission about which we have spoken, but the situation changed for the better on account of Yagba-Şiyon's desire to re-establish good terms in order to have a new metropolitan.<sup>135a</sup>

Nothing is said by our sources directly concerning the Red Sea trade, the second factor governing Mamlūk relations with Ethiopia, but it is interesting to note that Yagba-Şiyon seems to have felt perfectly confident in this regard, for he does not seem to have foreseen the possibility that the ruler of Yemen would not cooperate in sending his embassy to Cairo via Yemen. As it happened the ruler of Yemen was not then disposed to facilitate the journey of the embassy. It is possible, therefore, that

the rivalry over the route between Egypt and Yemen which developed later was already operative at this date.<sup>136</sup>

It is perhaps true to say that in the case of Mamlūk-Ethiopian relations, religion was the issue more so than in other instances of Mamlūk relations with foreign Christian powers. Religion was not just a disguise for a political or military issue, but was often the issue itself. Furthermore, these relations might at times affect the population of either country at other than official levels. Yet here too, the motive seems to have been political to some degree. The sultan as well as the negus, to a lesser extent, could use religious factors to gain political ends--in the case of the sultan some influence over the affairs of his southern neighbor, in the case of the emperor an official of the Church somehow necessary to the stability of his rule.

#### The Christian Kingdoms of Nubia:

Mamlūk relations with the Christian kingdoms of the Sudan<sup>137</sup> seem to have been characterized not so much by missionary zeal or even the extension of direct rule over that land as by an interest in the regular payment of the baqt (i.e., tribute) which was instituted for the first time as early as the seventh century.<sup>138</sup> Failure to pay usually resulted in punitive expeditions against the land, none of which (at least up to and through Qalā'ūn's reign) had ever resulted in any direct control.<sup>139</sup> Such were the expeditions launched by Qalā'ūn against Nubia first in 686/1287-1288 and again in 688/1289-1290 against the recalcitrant king of Dongola, Shamāmūn who refused to pay the baqt.<sup>140</sup> The tribute is the only motive

discussed by our sources. No mention of religion is made whatsoever and our chroniclers' major concern is invariably the vicissitudes of these campaigns. Only one other reason for the expeditions comes to mind, but again is not discussed in the sources. That is that these campaigns may have been launched with a view to maintaining some kind of contact with and control over the regions through which the trade routes between the Red Sea and the interior passed (i.e., the area in Nubia between the west bank of the Nile and the Red Sea).<sup>141</sup> Yet, Arkell claims that "there is no reason for thinking that the kingdoms of either Dongola or Alwa [of which al-Abwāb formed the northernmost part]<sup>142</sup> were strong enough to have had any political influence west of the Nile," and that "there is no archaeological evidence of the cultural influence of Christian Nubia further west than in the Wadi Mugaddam some 20 miles west of Omdurman, and there that influence spread up the Wadi from the Dongola Reach and not directly from the Nile."<sup>143</sup> This, of course, militates against the latter hypothesis.

#### Conclusions:

An examination of the Arabic sources with respect to Mamlūk relations with foreign Christian powers suggests several conclusions. These relations were generally of a political and military or commercial nature. Their course was generally dictated by high-ranking state officials or their representatives and functioned within the context of the entire Mediterranean system. These relations, of course, often affected entire populations. Less often did they directly affect an individual in par-

particular. Perhaps merchants more than others experienced direct contacts as well as the effects of Mamlūk relations with foreign Christian powers. Direct encounters between ordinary Muslims and foreign Christians were naturally limited to a great extent except in the case of merchants engaged in commerce or between Christians and Muslims residing within the Crusader kingdoms.

The Arabic chronicles suggest that an awareness of religious differences was present, but that these differences played a minimal role in the formulation of policy in regard to one country or another. The Muslims behaved toward the Crusaders as one would expect anyone to behave toward an enemy on their own soil. With other countries they sought ties for commercial or politico-military reasons in which religion mattered little. Not one of our chronicles displays what might be called an excess of religious zeal and all maintain a rational objective tone, for the most part, in contrast to what one might find in propagandistic literature such as that documented by Emmanuel Sivan. This is interesting, for if it is true, as Haarmann suggests, that medieval Arabic historical writing was being popularized to suit the tastes of a growing audience, one would expect that these chronicles might reflect not only the attitudes of the authors, but also the attitudes of those whom they sought to please. In this light the fact that religion plays a minor role appears significant.

#### Relations with Indigenous Christians

Modern studies have generally portrayed the Mamlūk period as that

in which the Christian communities of the East living under Mamlūk rule reached their lowest ebb. For example, according to Richard Gottheil, "It was especially during the Mamluke rule that the Dhimmis were many times seriously threatened."<sup>144</sup> In special reference to the Christian community of Egypt, Ira Lapidus claims that "only then were the Copts reduced to the small minority they are today in Egypt."<sup>145</sup> Similarly Wiet states that "the government of the Mamlūks gave the coup de grâce to Christianity in Egypt, which ceased to mean anything but a small number of individuals."<sup>146</sup> This view is also held by Moshe Perlmann who quotes Wiet<sup>147</sup> and who observes "that after about 1250 the tide of theological polemical literature against Christians and Christianity rose to its highest."<sup>148</sup>

The reasons given for this turn of events are primarily two:

- 1) the effect of the Crusades in arousing anti-Christian sentiment,<sup>149</sup> which though implicit in the Muslim social order,<sup>150</sup> had been contained and channeled by that order so that its expression had rarely found a more serious outlet than the imposition of the restrictions prescribed for minority religions, in particular, ahl al-dhimma, by Muslim law,<sup>151</sup> and
- 2) the threat of the Mongol invasions which, in Cahen's words, "wherever they occurred, were of temporary advantage to the Christians, 'as there were Christians in the Mongol ranks, and because the Mongols held the balance between the various faiths; several acts of excess by Christians against Islam made the Christians pay for their behaviour..."<sup>152</sup> However, a third, perhaps less visible, explanation is advanced by E. Strauss who

attributes some of the blame to the fact that the Mamlūks as foreigners "oppressed cruelly the autochthone [sic] population" and "were ready to give an outlet to their feelings by decreeing restrictive laws."<sup>153</sup>

The statement made in both al-Maqrīzī and al-Aynī to which we have referred earlier,<sup>154</sup> however, suggests that the Mamlūk period should not be monolithically described as one devastating to Christians throughout.

In that year an incident occurred involving the ahl al-dhimma and many of them converted to Islām. During the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr they had been in the lowest degree of humiliation and disdain, especially in the time of al-Shujā'ī for whom the populace (i.e., the Christians) as well as the scribes and 'men of the pen' (arbāb al-aqlām) had great respect, to the extent that even the greatest among them rode a donkey, wore a sash (zunnār) around his waist and dared not to speak with a Muslim while he was mounted. Nor did one ever see a Christian wearing a fine robe (farajiyatan maṣṣūlatan) or dressed in white except for a few among them who did so then only with humility and humbleness. But when a change in rulership came about and al-Ashraf ruled, things happened and the khāṣṣakīya grew in importance and their personal power increased, the rank of the Christians increased as well because of some of the khāṣṣakīya who were protecting them.<sup>155</sup>

Herein Qalā'ūn's reign is described as more severe than that of al-Ashraf Khalīl when the power of the Christians grew. On the other hand, it does seem that the situation of the indigenous Christian populace during Qalā'ūn's reign was far better than that which prevailed not many years later during the third reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn (710/1310-1311 - 741/1340-1341).<sup>156</sup> From the Muslim point of view, the Christians appeared to be faring quite well indeed, at least up until

the end of the thirteenth century or early fourteenth century at which time Ghāzī ibn al-Wāsiṭī probably composed his tract in which he makes the point

that the protected people, who, not being subjected to fear, have been allowed to live freely in Egyptian and Syrian regions, some of them unbelievers belonging to the Jewish faith and others to sects of the Christians, are worse unbelievers and more stiff-necked than those who wield the sword and have kept their hold over Islam by oppression and tyranny.<sup>157</sup>

Thus, although it does seem to be generally true that the Mamlūk period as a whole did witness a general decline in the state of affairs of the Christian community, it also appears that that decline may have followed an uneven rather than a progressive, linear course. Now, therefore, it is time to examine in detail the information given by the Arabic chronicles in this regard for the reign of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalā'ūn.

#### The Political Situation of the Indigenous Christian Community:

An examination of both contemporary and later Arabic chronicles has revealed relatively little information concerning the native Christian population in contrast to the great amount of information pertaining to foreign Christian powers, or for that matter, to any other subject with the exception of the Mongols. Since we have seen that the major concern of our chroniclers was to document the important political and military events of the day,<sup>158</sup> this very lack of information may in itself be regarded as an indication that the Christian community as a whole played no strong political role. Such a hypothesis is supported by the fact that the Arab



chroniclers show no overwhelming bias in reporting the matters concerning indigenous Christians which they did choose to record. These reports were made, for the most part, in a most matter of fact manner, and as we have seen, some information appears only as it occurs within the context of a story whose focus lies elsewhere.<sup>159</sup>

On the other hand three reports show indigenous Christians playing a political role. In 679/1280-1281 the patriarch of Alexandria was among the members of an embassy sent to the Byzantine emperor.<sup>160</sup> The treaty concluded between Qalā'ūn and the emperor was signed in the following year in the presence of the patriarch of Alexandria.<sup>161</sup> Though not precisely defined by our sources, the role of the patriarch in these negotiations may have been that of a token Christian presence or for display meant to impress the emperor and to facilitate the negotiations and formalities of this treaty with a foreign Christian power. That his possibilities of exercising any real political influence were limited, however, is demonstrated by what we know of his role in the selection of the metropolitans who were sent to Ethiopia to head the Church there. It was only with the sultan's permission that the process of selection might be undertaken and only with his approval of the person chosen that a new metropolitan might finally be dispatched.<sup>162</sup> The patriarch's role as the leader of his community within the empire is not discussed by our sources at all, however.

Secondly, the treaty concluded with Genoa was signed in the presence of bishops (al-asāqifa) and monks (al-rahbān).<sup>163</sup> Both incidents

indicate that the Christian clergy at this time still enjoyed a certain status and played a useful part in effecting Qalā'ūn's policies especially in regard to his foreign Christian allies. Such a role, however, does not necessarily imply that the clergy exercised political power or influence either in the formulation of these policies toward foreign powers or in regard to their own community within the empire although it is possible that they received certain favors in recompense for their services on such occasions.

Thirdly, we learn that a certain Hibbat Allāh who was a Copt (al-Qibtī al-Naṣarānī) held the position of mustawfī of Egypt<sup>164</sup> or according to another historian, mustawfī al-ṣuḥba.<sup>165</sup> According to Gaudefroy-Demombyne's description of this position which is based on al-Qalqashandī, the mustawfī al-ṣuḥba was the second deputy of the wazīr.

Son autorité s'étend sur tout l'Empire, sur la Syrie comme sur l'Egypte. Il écrit les décrets (marāsīm) sur lesquels le sultan appose sa marque (ḥalāma), que ces décrets soient relatifs à l'administration du pays, ou que ce soient des concessions de faveurs ou des ordres de service pour des affaires petites ou grandes. Le bureau de ce fonctionnaire serait, selon Qalq. le plus considérable des bureaux de finances; c'est lui qui enregistre les décisions du sultan en matière de dotations et de décrets (tawāqīḥ et marāsīm). Les autres bureaux de finances ne sont qu'une branche de celui-là, et c'est à lui qu'aboutit leur comptabilité.<sup>166</sup>

This then, was a post of some import. In al-Yūnīnī's words he was the pivot (al-madār) of the dīwāns and the wazīr was guided by him in the rest of affairs.<sup>167</sup> When Hibbat Allāh died, Qalā'ūn saw fit to appoint his son to fill the post.<sup>168</sup>

Although it is evident that Christians like Hibbat Allāh did

fill official positions, even very high positions, in the government during Qalā'ūn's reign, whatever political influence or stature they might have been able to acquire was probably partially offset by the intermittent dismissals of Christians and other minority groups from these positions. Dismissals of officials occurred twice during Qalā'ūn's reign--in 678/1279-1280 and in 689/1290. Ibn al-Furāt records that in 678/1279-1280 Qalā'ūn became irritated with the Christians, "especially the Christian scribes of the dīwān al-jaysh.<sup>169</sup> He dismissed the kuttāb al-juyūsh and ordered that they be replaced by Muslims. He also appointed the Qādī Amīn al-Dīn, the shāhid of the ṣandūq al-naḥḥāt<sup>170</sup> to the secretariat of the army (kitābat al-jaysh) in place of al-As'ad Ibrāhīm, the Christian.<sup>171</sup> It is perhaps worthy of note that the sultan directed his attention to the kuttāb al-juyūsh in particular. The dīwān al-jaysh in which they were employed was, according to Rabie (citing al-Nuwayrī) "the only dīwān to deal with the registration, evaluation, and conferment of the iqṭā'as."<sup>172</sup> It seems that this dīwān and therefore those who were employed therein had become especially important since according to Rabie, "as time went on the dīwān al-jaysh gained complete independence,"<sup>173</sup> which may explain in part the sultan's actions in regard to the Christian employees. Apparently he wished this important dīwān to be in the hands of Muslims rather than in the hands of those who were in theory second-class citizens. On the other hand he seems to have done nothing about the fact that a Christian filled the high position of mustawfī of Egypt and indeed encouraged this situation by appointing his son as successor to the post.

It is also recorded that on that very same day on which he dismissed the Christian scribes employed in the dīwān al-ṭaysh, the monastery called dayr al-khandaq was destroyed by order of the sultan.<sup>174</sup> One may surmise that these actions, taken early in his reign, were intended to gain the support of the Muslim population, especially the ulamā', in order to strengthen his rule.<sup>175</sup>

In 689/1290 a letter was received in Syria containing orders from the sultan that no Christians or Jews should be employed in the dīwāns.<sup>176</sup> It is possible that his order was never fully executed, for though most reports give the impression that the Christian and Jewish employees were, indeed, dismissed, one is left in doubt by the fact that al-Yūnīnī concludes his account of the incident stating that "no action was taken on the order," ("fa-lam yumilu bihi").<sup>177</sup>

In any case, in the instances related, none of the orders for dismissals of Christian officials were followed through in a definitive way. Not only did Qalā'ūn appoint Hibbat Allāh's son to succeed him just three years after the first decree was issued concerning the dismissal of Christian employees, but as we have just remarked, it is not certain that similar orders issued in 689/1290 were ever carried out. Further, the orders did not always apply uniformly throughout the empire, for as we have just noted, the second of these decrees was to be effective in Syria only. 4

Although the dīwāns apparently never functioned for long without employing Christians and Jews, the uncertainty and instability of their

employment probably affected in a negative way the possibilities for acquiring any high degree of political power, whether individually or in terms of their community as a whole.

One other measure--perhaps of an even more serious nature since it clearly infringed on personal religious freedom and was extraordinary in its imposition<sup>178</sup>--was taken against Christians during Qalā'ūn's reign. Once again the provocation is not indicated, but it seems that the measure may have been intended to cater to those who found the employment of ahl al-dhimma in administrative positions offensive while retaining in those positions those who had acquired expertise in the field, namely, dhimīs and perhaps especially Christians. In 680/1281-1282 a decree was issued by the sultan offering ahl al-dhimma among the mustawfīs<sup>179</sup> and employees of the dīwāns the choice of either embracing Islām or being put to death. When a group of Christians and Samaritans among the mustawfīs and employees gathered and the choice was presented to them, they refused conversion whereupon they were taken out to the Sūq al-Khayl outside Damascus<sup>180</sup> where the gallows were made ready and the rope was fastened around their necks. At that they immediately embraced Islām and were brought before a judge in Damascus in whose presence they affirmed their conversion.<sup>181</sup> Not long after, however, in that same year as a matter of fact, the ahl al-kitāb who had been converted by force to Islām sought a legal opinion concerning their case. A council was convened and the Qādī Jamāl Al-dīn al-Mālikī was ordered to hear their case and make a ruling in accordance

with his madhhab. The defendents were then summoned. A group of Muslims witnessed in their behalf that they had, indeed, been converted by force. The result was that most returned to their former religion and the jizya<sup>182</sup> was reimposed upon them.<sup>183</sup> Since the jizya was imposed on all ahl al-dhimma, its re-imposition should not be seen as a special punishment for Christians in this case. Once again, as we have seen, the measure was of short duration, yet must have been a cause for anxiety among the Christian population, though it was directed only against a certain category of the community. On the other hand the Christians were not alone to suffer in this instance. In any case it was an unusually harsh reminder of the place of minorities within the social order. Thus it seems that while the Christians were, indeed, employed in governmental posts, often at high levels, posts which may have offered some possibility for acquiring political influence, it does not seem that such gain was looked upon with favor by some segments of the Muslim population.

Several questions are raised by our examination of the foregoing incidents. First of all, though it was in each case the sultan who issued the orders, his seriousness of intent, indeed, his personal desire that such orders be strictly enforced in regard to the minority communities, is called into question by the fact that he seems to have been quite unenthusiastic in assuring their application. Furthermore, as we have seen, it was only a very few years after his first decree prohibiting employment of dhimmīs in the dīwāns that Qalā'ūn himself appointed al-As<sup>c</sup>ad Ibrāhīm son of Hibbat Allāh the Coptic mustawfī, to replace his father when the

latter died.<sup>184</sup> These indications perhaps confirm the assertion of several modern historians that it was not so much the Mamlūk government as the ‘ulamā’ who urged such actions.<sup>185</sup> The chronicles, however, offer no conclusive evidence for the role of the ‘ulamā’. In fact, we saw earlier that both al-Yūnīnī and Ibn Kathīr, whom we may consider to be ‘ulamā’, were appreciative of the Christian mustawfī Hibbat Allāh and his good qualities as a person as well as an administrator.<sup>186</sup> Thus one cannot make general statements concerning the attitudes of the ‘ulamā’, either.

A second question concerns the motives for the measures taken in the name of the government. Did the government, in fact, consider the local Christian population to be an enemy element, a "fifth column" so to speak, by associating that community with their foreign Christian co-religionists who were, indeed, involved in activities hostile to the Mamlūk empire such as the Crusades and the formation of alliances with the Mongols and then retaliate with the measures described above.<sup>187</sup> Earlier we saw that the explanation most often given for the decline of the Christian community during the Mamlūk period was the effect of the Crusades in provoking retaliatory measures upon the community which was suspected of collaboration with the enemy.<sup>188</sup> Yet, the orders which were issued initiating action detrimental to Christians most often refer not to Christians in particular, but to ahl al-dhimma or ahl al-kitāb. Thus, it does not appear that these orders were in any way directly connected with the fact of the Crusades. In the sphere of foreign policy, moreover, the Mamlūks did distinguish between one Christian power and another, i.e. those which were friendly and those which were not. They were in alliance with the

Byzantines while at war with Crusaders and allies of the Mongols. Our chroniclers have shown themselves ever ready to condemn the allies of either Crusaders or Mongols and have even stated explicitly those specific actions which brought retaliation against them from the Muslim side. It is perhaps significant, therefore, that on no occasion are actions of local Christians in this regard indicated as the cause for repressive measures taken against them. If one does make a link between the fact of the Crusades or the fact that some Christian powers allied themselves with the Mongols and the repressive measures instituted against Christians (among others) from time to time, such a connection is necessarily speculative and is not supported by the information found in either the contemporary or later Arabic chronicles. Furthermore, it should be remarked that the real "time of troubles" for the Christian population appears to have come at a slightly later period. Thus, the demise of the Christian community cannot be attributed to these factors and it must be concluded that the Mamlūk government did distinguish between various groups of Christians.

#### The Economic Situation of the Indigenous Christian Community:

Although such political power as Christian functionaries were able to obtain rested on a shaky foundation as a result of their theoretical legal position as ahl al-dhimma within the community as well as the interruptions in employment which they experienced from time to time, it is possible to conceive that these officials were able, nevertheless, to acquire some degree of economic power, especially since we know that a sizeable



number seem to have been employed in the financial structure of the empire (i.e., in the dīwān al-jaysh or in the staff of the iqṭāʿ<sup>c</sup>s, etc),<sup>188a</sup> though our chronicles never address themselves specifically to this question. Such an assertion seems to be confirmed by the fact that the wealth of Copts is one complaint of the Muslim pamphleteers such as Ghāzī ibn al-Wāsiṭī.<sup>189</sup>

The treaty concluded with Aragon contains a clause which concerns dhimmīs, an indication that Christians were certainly also engaged in commerce. This clause states that "whenever any Muslim, Christian or dhimmī merchants, who are subjects of the sultan, die within the territory of the king of Aragon or that of his brother, the king should not make obstacles in regard to their possessions or merchandise, but should insure that they be transported to the sultan's territory in order that he might do with them as he chooses,"<sup>190</sup> an indication that Christian merchants had opportunities to acquire wealth to an extent that the sultan found it worthwhile to provide for its return to him should the merchant die. Moreover, no mention is made anywhere in our sources of any sort of restrictive measures being placed upon merchants belonging to the minority religions.

#### The Social Situation of the Indigenous Christian Population:

Despite the statement made in both al-Maqrīzī and al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī to which we have already referred several times, that Christians had reached their lowest state during Qalā'ūn's reign when even the greatest among them rode donkeys, wore the zunnār at their waist, did not dare speak

to a Muslim while he was mounted, etc.,<sup>191</sup> all of which things did not exceed the bounds of Muslim law,<sup>192</sup> there are indications that rank and file members of the community were not treated with undue harshness or severity at this time. For example, although it is clear that Christians had to pay the jizya prescribed by law, an additional burdensome tax, first imposed during the reign of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, was abolished.<sup>193</sup>

Two other incidents involving individual Christians recorded by our chroniclers reveal no unusual bias in their regard. In 684/1285-1286 Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir reports that a Jew and a Christian were discovered to be the accomplices of a Muslim member of the ḥalqa of Damascus, Shihāb al-Dīn ibn Dubaysī, who was engaged in forging the signature of the sultan on certain royal documents. As we have seen, the sultan's first reaction to the report was that the tongue of the Muslim should be cut off and that he should be publicly disgraced, while the punishment of the Christian and Jew should be tasmīr. In the end, however, the sultan followed the counsel of the fuqahā' who recommended that all three be punished and imprisoned, seemingly in a similar manner.<sup>194</sup> It seems that in the final analysis the religions of the three who were involved, do not seem to have been the primary consideration in assigning punishment.

Finally, in 687/1288-1289 Badr ibn al-Qasīs al-Nafīs, a Coptic Christian was arrested during Ramaḍān while drinking wine in the company of a beautiful Muslim woman. The Christian was naturally punished for drinking wine during Ramaḍān was illegal while the Muslim woman was punished as well by having her nose amputated.<sup>195</sup>

Though two later Arabic chronicles, those of al-Maqrīzī and al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī, both indicate that the state of the Christian population had reached its lowest point during Qalā'ūn's reign, there is nothing in the contemporary sources to confirm such a view. The social status of the community seems to have been inferior to be sure, but not so low that the Christian community had become desperate.

# Footnotes

1. Stanley Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages (London: Methuen & Co., 1901), 277.
2. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 104 ro.; Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 237; Blochet, Histoire, 480 [316]; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 172, 185.
3. Sivan, L'Islam et la croisade, 168.
4. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 105 vo.; al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 44; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 185.
5. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 105 vo. - 105 ro.; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 681.
6. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 105 ro.; Ibn al-Dawādārī simply states that there were both Mongols and Armenians in the invading party, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 238.
7. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 109 vo.; al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 45; Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il claims that it was the Armenians who carried off the minbar, Blochet, Histoire, 483-484 [319-320]; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 682.
8. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 109 vo.
9. Le Strange, Palestine, 452.
10. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 109 ro.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 195; al-Maqrīzī gives a much abbreviated version in which the sequence of events suffers somewhat, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 684.
11. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 109 ro. - 110 vo.; al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 52-53; Ibn al-Dawādārī and Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il though they mention the incident, fail to state the reason for the skirmish. Kanz al-durar, VIII, 238 and Blochet, Histoire, 484-485 [320-321].
12. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 113 vo.
13. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 113 ro.; Abū al-Fidā, al-Mukhtaṣar, IV, 15; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 692; but according to Ibn al-Dawādārī the number totaled 100,000, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 246.
14. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 114 vo. - 117 vo.; Ibn al-Dawādārī,

- Kanz al-durar, VIII, 243; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 695.
15. See Ziyāda's note on this personage in al-Maqrīzī's al-Sulūk, I, 3, 710, n.l.
  16. Tashrīf al-ayyām, 23.
  17. Ibid., 24.
  18. Cf. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 139 vo., who, however, fails to mention the Georgian's Mongol sympathies; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 40 vo. - 40 ro. who does likewise; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 251-252 who like al-Nuwayrī and Baybars al-Manṣūrī fails to mention his partisanship; and al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 710.
  19. A large seacoast city of Armenia. See Le Strange, Palestine, 405.
  20. See Kāmil's note, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 31, n.l.
  21. Ibid., 30-32; cf. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 140 ro.; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 17 vo. - 17 ro.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 276-277; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 716.
  22. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 92-103.
  23. Ibid., 93.
  24. Ibid., 101.
  25. Ibid., 100.
  26. A French translation of the treaty may be found in Quatremère, Histoire II, "Appendice," 201-212.
  27. A discussion of the alliance and the vicissitudes of the Armenian situation is to be found in the following works: Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia," A History of the Crusades, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, II. The Later Crusades, 1189-1311, ed. Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), 652-655, and Steven Runciman, "The Crusader States, 1243-1291," A History of the Crusades, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, II. The Later Crusades, 1189-1311, ed. Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), 572 575-578; Cahen, Syrie du nord, 693-721. On the alliance of the Franks of Tripoli with the Mongols and Armenians, see Runciman, Ibid., II, 567, 572, 577-578 and 589.

28. Charles had become the ruler in Jerusalem when Mary of Antioch sold him her rights to the title in 1277. Runciman, Ibid., II, 583-584.
29. On this aspect of the Frankish situation see Ibid., II, 588-593 and René Grousset, Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem, III. La Monarchie musulmane et l'anarchie franque (3 vols.; Paris: Librairie Plon, 1936), 727-728.
30. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, II, 586.
31. Steven Runciman, The Sicilian Vespers (Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1960), 201.
32. Cahen, Syrie du nord, 708.
33. Baybars al-Mansūrī specifies that the inhabitants of Marqab were the second party to the treaty, Zubdat al-fikra, 110 vo.; al-Yūnīnī and Ibn Kathīr state that both Akkā and Marqab were party to the treaty, Dhayl, IV, 86 and al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya, XIII, 293. According to al-Nuwayrī and al-Maqrīzī, Akkā alone was involved, Nihāyat al-arab, 32 vo. - 32 ro. and al-Sulūk, I, 3, 685. Ibn al-Furāt, who gives what appears to be a résumé of the text, indicates the Hospitalers of Akkā as being the official signatory although Marqab is covered by the provisions of the treaty, Tārīkh, VII, 204-205.
34. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 110 vo. - 110 ro.
35. Ibid., 110 ro.; cf. al-Nuwayrī's text, Nihāyat al-arab, 32 ro. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 205-206; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 685.
36. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 206.
37. Ibid., VII, 206.
38. Ibid., VII, 206.
39. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 110 vo. - 110 vo.; al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 86-87; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 33 ro. - 34 vo.; Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 240; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 206-207; Mufaḍḍal ibn al-Faḍā'il who, however, does not mention the Frankish involvement, Blochet, Histoire, 487-488; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 685 and Quatremère, Histoire, II, 29.
40. For the text of this treaty see Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 20-22; English translation in Gabrielli, Arab Historians, 323-326; French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 221-223; cf. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 139 ro.; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 40 vo.; Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 260;

Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 252.

41. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 22; Gabrielli's translation, Arab Historians, 325-326.
42. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 34-43 where the text is given; English translation in Gabrielli, Arab Historians, 326-331; French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 224-233; cf. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 141 ro.; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 43 ro.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 262-270 whose text differs somewhat from that in Tashrīf al-ayyām; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 713.
43. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 34; Gabrielli's translation, Arab Historians, 326.
44. Gabrielli, Arab Historians, 327, n.l.
45. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 38-40; Gabrielli Arab Historians, 328-329.
46. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 42; Gabrielli's translation, Arab Historians, 330.
47. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 42; Gabrielli's translation, Arab Historians, 330.
48. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 41; Gabrielli, Arab Historians, 329.
49. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, II, 588.
50. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 103; French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 212.
51. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 109; French translation in Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 220.
52. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 109; Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 220.
53. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 109; Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 220.
54. Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 220, n.l.
55. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 77-81; Supra, 86.
56. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 77. My translation.

57. Ibid., 22; Quatremère, Histoire, II, "Appendice," 222 where the list of those lands covered by the treaty is given.
58. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 79-80.
59. Ibid., 151-152; Abū al-Fidā, al-Mukhtaṣar, IV, 22.
60. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 151.
61. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, II, 590.
62. Ibid., II, 590.
63. Ibid., II, 578.
64. Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 164 vo.; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 21 vo and 71 vo.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VIII, 76-81; cf. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, Yale MS. Landsberg 139, 3 vo. - 12 ro.; Abū al-Fidā, al-Mukhtaṣar, IV, 23; Ibn al-Dawadārī, Kanz al-durar, VIII, 283-299; Ibn Kathīr, XIII, 313; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 747-748.
65. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VIII, 80.
66. Ibid., 80-81.
67. On Mamlūk-Byzantine relations during the reign of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, see Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:209-221.
68. Ibid., IV:223.
69. See John Lognon, "The Frankish States in Greece, 1204-1311," A History of the Crusades, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, II. The Later Crusades, 1189-1311, ed. Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), 259-260.
70. Runciman, Sicilian Vespers, 219-220.
71. Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV: 214.
72. On Charles vs. Byzantium, see Runciman, Sicilian Vespers, 156-157, 176-180.
73. Ibid., 176.
74. Ibid., 176-180, 182-186, 194-196, 206-210, 214-215.
75. Ibid., 210.



76. Ibid., 214-215; Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:232.
77. Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:222.
78. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 124 vo. - 124 ro; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 179, al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 680.
79. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 179; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 680. For identification of Anbā Siyūs as patriarch of Alexandria, see Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 231. See also Canard who thinks that the correct pronunciation of his name to be that given by Mufaddal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il, i.e., Anbā Yūnus, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:200 and 200, n.1.
80. On this unusual form of treaty, see Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:203-205.
81. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 229.
82. Ibid., VII, 229.
83. Ibid., VII, 230.
84. Ibid., VII, 230-231.
85. Ibid., VII, 231.
86. Ibid., VII, 231; Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:221-223.
87. Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:223.
88. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 229-230.
89. Ibid., VII, 232.
90. Ibid., VII, 232.
91. Ibid., VII, 233.
92. Confusion as to which embassy is concerned here is caused by the fact that Ibn Abd al-Zāhir states that envoys arrived with a copy of the oath for his son (Tashrīf al-ayyām, 54), while Baybars, more correctly it would seem, says that the oath was originally intended for Michael, but in view of his death, was signed by his son (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 146 ro.).
93. Runciman, Sicilian Vespers, 226-230.
94. Canard, Byzance et les musulmans, IV:206-209.

95. W. Heyd, Chap. VIII, "L'Égypte," Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen âge (2 vols.; Amsterdam: Aldolf M. Hakkert, 1959), I, 378-426 and especially, pp. 406-408, 425. See also, Lane-Poole, Egypt, 281.
96. The report gives no clues by which to identify which Spanish ruler is intended by this designation. The situation is a confusing one since as Ziyāda and Kāmil have pointed out, al-Fūnsh or the variation al-Funsh, was the colloquial or more commonly used word for the more correct Arabic form of Alfonso, Adfūnsh, and was apparently used indiscriminately to denote all the kings of al-Andalūs whose capitals were Barcelona or Toledo, whatever their real name might be. al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 666-667, n.2 and Ibn Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 2, n.2., respectively. Pedro Martínez Montalvez, who also relies on the Arab chronicles here, assumes that Alfonso X, king of Castille, is meant in this particular report; "Relaciones de Alfonso X de Castilla con el Sultán Mameluco Baybars y Sus Sucesores," Al-Andalūs, XXVII (1962), 371.
97. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 157; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 666-667.
98. Again al-Fūnsh cannot be identified with certainty since no pertinent details are given in any of the various reports. Quatremère has identified al-Fūnsh in this report as the king of France, mistakenly it would seem. (Histoire, II, 51). Nothing in al-Maqrīzī's report could lead one to such a conclusion. Quatremère must have based his translation not only on al-Sulūk, but also on information found in one of the other sources, perhaps Baybars al-Manṣūrī who identifies al-Fūnsh as "one of the Frankish kings" (aḥad al-mulūk al-firanj), the phrase which may be the source or error or on Ibn Abd al-Zāhir, Baybars or Ibn al-Furāt whose identification of the envoy, Quatremère may have confused with the reference to al-Fūnsh in the following sentences: Ibn Abd al-Zāhir: "Wa waṣala rasūl al-Funsh wa huwa al-ḥakīm yāyistar Filib al-isbanyūlī" (Tashrīf al-ayyām, 2); Baybars al-Manṣūrī: "Wa fihā waṣala ilā al-Iskandariya rusul min inda al-Funsh aḥad mulūk al-firanj, ismuhu al-fāris al-ḥakīm māyistar Filib al-isbanyūlī" (Zubdat al-fikra, 129 ro.); Ibn al-Furāt: "Wa fihā waṣala ilā al-Iskandariya rusul al-Funsh wa hum māyistar Filib al-isbanyūlī" (Tārīkh, VII, 246-247).
99. Supra, 83.
100. Tashrīf al-ayyām, 58-61. The Vespers per se are not commented on by Ibn Abd al-Zāhir.
101. The report is found only in Ibn Abd al-Zāhir. Tashrīf al-ayyām, 112-114.
102. Ibid., 112-113. My translation.
103. A fact mentioned in a most matter of fact way by Ibn Abd al-Zāhir, Ibid., 113.

104. Ibid., 113.
105. Ibid., 114.
106. Al-Andalūs, XXVII (1962), 374-375.
107. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 156-164.
108. Ibid., 159.
109. Ibid., 159-160.
110. Steven Runciman, A History of the Crusades (3 vols.; Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951), 398-402.
111. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 161.
112. Ibid., 160.
113. Ibid., 160.
114. Ibid., 161.
115. Ibid., 161; Heyd, Commerce du Levant, I, 407-408.
116. Ibid., 161.
117. Ibid., 165-169. According to Heyd, "le traité se compose, en réalité, de quatre parties: les concessions accordées par le sultan; la formule du serment par lequel le Naṭb Torontāṭ en jure l'observation; les engagements pris par Spinola et, enfin, son serment. Le livre des Chartes de la ville des Gênes donne les parties 1, 2 et 3 en latin, et encore manque la fin de la troisième, tandis que le biographe anonyme de Kelavoun, arrivé à ce point, a reproduit en langue arabe les parties 3 et 4, la troisième intégralement. Silvestre de Sacy d'abord (...) et depuis lui, Amari (...) ont publié ces textes arabes avec traduction et commentaires." Commerce du Levant, 416, n.2. For a summary of the contents of the complete document, see Heyd, Ibid., 415-418.
118. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 165 where our chronicler mentions Benito Zaccharia's exploits as a corsair and narrates his encounters with Muslim ships from the port of Alexandria and what occurred in consequence.
119. Ibid., 166.
120. Ibid., 166-167.

121. This becomes apparent in the work of Taddesse Tamrat, Church and State in Ethiopia, 1270-1527 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
122. Ibid., 129.
123. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 170-173. The correspondence includes letters from Yagba-Šiyon to Qalā'ūn, from Yagba-Šiyon to the patriarch of Alexandria and from Yagba-Šiyon to the Ethiopian monks in Jerusalem. There also exists a translation of this correspondence by E. Quatremère in his Mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Égypte et sur quelques contrées voisines (2 vols.; Paris: 1811), 267-273. Tamrat has used Quatremère's translation rather than Ibn Abd al-Zāhir's original text. Yagba-Šiyon is the transliteration from Ethiopic given by Tamrat. The Arabic version of this name as it occurs in Tashrīf al-ayyām is Yakbāb Šihyūn or as corrected by M. Kāmil, Yagbā' Šiyūn or Šihyūn, p. 170. See also, G. Wiet, "Les Relations Egypto-Abyssines sous les sultans mamlouks," Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte, (1938), 115-140.
124. "Wa innanī ahfazū al-muslimīn fī jamī<sup>C</sup> mamlakatī, wa mawlānā ahfazū al-Nasārā fī bilādihī hattā našīru mashwarātan wāhidatan wa yaddan wāhidatan wa tatawāšala al-rusul min al-jihatayn." Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 170.
125. The Ethiopian Church had, since the fourth century A.D., been subordinate to the patriarchate of Alexandria and dependent upon it for its metropolitans who, by tradition, were selected from among the Egyptian Coptic clergy. A. S. Atiya, History of Eastern Christianity (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 51-52, 152, Tamrat, Ethiopia, 22-23, 36 and a brief note on the organization of the Ethiopian Church, Ibid., 107-108. On the respect which the negus had for the Coptic Church of Egypt, see Quatremère, Mémoires, II, 273-275.
126. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 173. My translation.
127. Reference has been found to an earlier occurrence in the tenth century when "king George II of Nubia received a request from the king of Abyssinia that he should use his influence with the patriarch of Alexandria to induce him to resume the dispatch to Abyssinia of a properly ordained abuna, to the absence of which the king attributed all the troubles that were then assailing his land." A. J. Arkell, A History of the Sudan from the Earliest Times to 1821. (London: University of London Athlone Press, 1955), 190.
128. Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 170.
129. Ibid., 173.

130. Ibid., 170.
131. Ibid., 171-172. See also Tamrat, Ethiopia, 173.
132. We are informed about his mission through Baybars' reply to Yikunno-'Amlak's request which Yagba-Šiyon had in his possession and enclosed with his own petition to the sultan. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 170-171.
133. Ethiopia, 126-127.
134. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 170.
135. Tamrat, Ethiopia, 43-45, 50.
- 135<sup>a</sup> Ibid., 126-127.
136. Ibid., 77.
137. The two kingdoms discussed by our sources are Dongola and al-Abwāb. On Dongola see Arkell, Sudan, 189, 191, 194 and on al-Abwāb, 191, 191,n.2.
138. Ibid., 186. See also Quatremère, Mémoires, II, 43-53 where it is stated that the tribute was paid in the form of a levy of slaves.
139. Arkell, Sudan, 186.
140. Rather than giving a year's account of the affair, Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir gives a summary of the various encounters with the Christian kingdoms of Nubia from the time of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars to al-Ashraf Khalīl; Tashrīf al-ayyām, 154-155. On the first expedition in 686/1287-1288 see Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdat al-fikra, 161 ro.; al-Jazarī, Ḥawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 94, 96 of the Arabic text; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 17 ro. - 18 ro.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VIII, 52-53; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 736-737. On the second expedition of 688/1289 see Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VIII, 82-84; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 749-750; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 19 vo. - 20 ro.
141. See Tamrat's map in which these routes are shown, Ethiopia, 81. Also see Quatremère, Mémoires, II, 162-167.
142. Arkell, Sudan, 191.
143. Ibid., 199.
144. Old Testament and Semitic Studies, II, 366.

145. "The Conversion of Egypt to Islam," Israel Oriental Studies, II (1972), 262.
146. Wiet, EI<sup>1</sup>, 996
147. BSOAS, X (1940-1942), 843.
148. Ibid., 843.
149. For example, see Perlmann, BSOAS, X (1940-1942), 843; Atiya, Eastern Christianity, 92-93; Sivan who dates the turning point in the affairs of the Christians to the Ayyūbid period when a Crusade was launched against Egypt itself and local Christians became suspect as collaborators of the Franks (L'Islam et la croisade, 180), a view also held by Cahen, "Dhimma," EI<sup>2</sup>, 229.
150. According to Gustave E. von Grunebaum, for example, "society in the medieval Muslim world was intersected by four principal lines of division: the first separating the Muslim from the non-believer..." Medieval Islam: A Study in Cultural Orientation (2nd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), 177.
151. These restrictions are best described in the article "Dhimma," by Claude Cahen in EI<sup>2</sup>, in Tritton's work, The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects and by Antoine Fattal in his Le Statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam.
152. "Dhimma," EI<sup>2</sup>, 229. See also Perlmann, BSOAS, X (1940-1942), 843, n.3. Also Sivan, L'Islam et la croisade, 181.
153. Etudes orientales, 81.
154. Supra, 56-57 where transliteration of the Arabic passages may be found.
155. al-<sup>c</sup>Aynī, <sup>c</sup>Iqd al-jumān, 160 ro.
156. Wiet, EI<sup>1</sup>, 992.
157. Gottheil, JAOS, XLI (1921), 384 and 416.
158. Supra, 61.
159. Supra, 14.
160. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 179; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 680.

161. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 231.
162. Supra, 103.
163. <sup>c</sup>Ibn Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 166-169.
164. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 188-189; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 257.
165. al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 41 ro.
166. La Syrie, "Introduction," lxviii; see also Rabie, Financial System, 157.
167. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 188.
168. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 257.
169. Ibid., VII, 158.
170. Sandūq al-nafaqāt is translated by Quatremère as "la caisse des dépenses," Histoire, II, 8. According to Rabie, "during the Mamluk period until the end of the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, the amirs received, in addition to the iqṭa', one special payment, the nafaqa. It is worth noting that the nafaqa was not distributed regularly, but occasionally, mainly on the eve of a campaign." Financial System, 33 and 33-34.
171. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 158.
172. Rabie, Financial System, 18.
173. Ibid., 39.
174. Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 158. Both reports are also found in al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 667.
175. On the <sup>c</sup>ulamā', see infra, 119.
176. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, Yale University MS, Landsberg 139, 26 vo.; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyat al-arab, 74 ro. - 75 vo.; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, VII, 93; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, I, 3, 753.
177. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 26 vb.
178. Tritton, EI<sup>1</sup>, 851 who says that the forced conversions were not strictly legal.
179. We have spoken earlier (Supra, 114) of Hibbat Allāh the mustawfī of Egypt according to al-Yūnīnī, but who was mustawfī al-ṣuḥba according to

al-Nuwayrī. According to Rabie, "there was a special office called istīfā' al-ṣuḥba, whose holder, called mustawfī al-ṣuḥba, was attached to the person of the sultan, on whose behalf he supervised the work of the kuttāb and checked all accounts." However, under the Mamlūks, besides the mustawfī al-ṣuḥba, one category of officials employed in the dīwāns was called mustawfī (Rabie, Financial System, 156) which explains why the term is used here in the plural. Most certainly it applies to these dīwānī employees in this instance.

180. According to al-Qalqashandī, the horse market was located at the foot of the citadel in Damascus. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie, 170.
181. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 92. Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya, XIII, 296-297.
182. Supra, 74, n.216.
183. al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, IV, 98-99; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya, XIII, 296-297.
184. Supra, 33.
185. "Les légistes proclament à l'unanimité que les Dimmīs doivent êtres exclus des fonctions publiques. On peut dire avec Ibn Naqqāsh, qu'il y a sur ce point consensus universalis de tous les docteurs de la loi." (Fattal, Le Statut légal, 236, who also gives an exposition of various opinions plus some relevant historical facts, 236-263); "It is true that,...non-Muslims frequently became influential in the government. But it is equally true that appointments to executive posts of non-Muslims were, strictly speaking, illegal, that the appointees held their places on sufferance, and that pious circles always fought such laxity of practice on the part of certain rulers." (von Grunebaum, Medieval Islam, 180); "It was especially during the Mameluke rule that the Dhimmīs were many times seriously threatened, largely because of fanatic Ulamas and others whose hot words incited dormant power to act." (Gottheil, Old Testament and Semitic Studies, 366); "...The public offices and the offices of management of the estates of the emirs, were full of Coptic scribes who often drew upon themselves the hatred of the population, and became the scapegoats when popular passions ran high." (Perlmann, BSOAS, X (1940-1942), 843), etc. The tracts of Ghāzī ibn al-Wāsiṭī (Gottheil, JAOS, XLI (1921), al-Asnawī (Perlmann, BSOAS, X (1940-1942), al-Nawawī (Goldziher, Revue des études juives, XXVIII, 75), Ibn Naqqāsh (published by Belin in Journal Asiatique, 1851), 431 as cited by Gottheil, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, 1912, 203), and Ahmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mālikī (See Gottheil, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, 1912, 203-214) may be cited here in this regard.



186. Supra, 33.
187. Ghāzī ibn al-Wāsiṭī does indicate that on occasion this was the case, (Gottheil, JAOS, XLI (1921), 438; Sivan, L'Islam et la croisade, 180.
188. Supra, 110, n.149.
- 188<sup>a</sup> Rabie, Financial System, 67.
189. Gottheil, JAOS, XLI (1921), 435, 439, 441-444, 445, 451.
190. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 160. My translation.
191. Supra, 111.
192. Tritton, The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects wherein it becomes apparent that these restrictions were imposed from the earliest times.
193. Supra, 49.
194. Ibn <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf al-ayyām, 122.
195. al-Jazarī, Hawādith al-zamān in Haarmann, Quellenstudien, 114 of Arabic text.

## CONCLUSIONS

The evidence of the contemporary Arabic chronicles, both historiographical and substantive, leads to the conclusion that Muslim-Christian relations during the reign of Qalā'ūn were neither particularly salutary nor particularly oppressive. Relations with foreign Christian powers were determined at high levels of government and depended upon the political and military rather than upon the religious considerations of each party. Perhaps the most radical example of such a view is the Nubian campaigns. Though the Nubian kingdoms were Christian, one has the distinct impression that had the king paid the tribute, no expedition would have been undertaken against his land. The attitude of the chroniclers confirms such a view. They have little to say in regard to friendly Christian powers while enemies are condemned, and even then, religion is mentioned only as it serves to bring additional blame upon the enemy. Although religion is a factor implicit in the Crusades and which certainly facilitated the formation of both realized and projected alliances between the Christians and the Mongols, it is evident that the Mamlūk state would have reacted in a similar manner to any foreign invasion regardless of the religion of that enemy. That religion was not a primary factor in the formulation of policy is supported by the fact that the manner in which the government of the Mamlūks reacted against the political and military enemy was not carried over to the Christian element of the population within the Mamlūk empire. Thus, one must conclude that Mamlūk relations with

foreign Christian powers were, in fact, normal, that is, neither distorted by nor revolving around religious factors.

As for the Christian population living within the Mamlūk empire, the sources do not support the view found stated in many modern studies that the entire Mamlūk period was one of disaster throughout for the Christian community. We must revise our views to recognize the fact that such claims are clearly based on reports concerning a slightly later period as well as on the later sources such as al-Maqrīzī and al-Aynī which indicate, as we have seen, that during Qalā'ūn's reign Christians had reached their lowest degree of humility. Nothing in the contemporary sources exists to indicate that Qalā'ūn's reign witnessed an abnormal state of affairs. In the context of Muslim society, in particular, and medieval society, in general, the situation at this time was normal. Though it is true that Christians bore the burden of restrictions imposed upon a subject people (restrictions of dress, personal relations with Muslims, transportation, the payment of a poll-tax, etc.), there is no evidence for mass persecution. At the most, Christian officials of the government bore the brunt of whatever anti-Christian sentiment (if it can, indeed, be labelled anti-Christian since other minorities were involved as well), existed. There is no evidence to suggest that the Christian population as a whole suffered in any extraordinary way. The very lack of comment in the Arabic chronicles confirms the probability that the situation was one of relative stability.

Similarly there is no direct evidence in the chronicles to support the assertion that the indigenous Christians were considered as belonging

to the same race as the foreign Christian enemy. It seems that just as the Mamlūk government distinguished between ally and enemy, basing its distinction on political rather than religious differences, it also viewed the local Christian population in the light of their behavior rather than in terms of purely religious sentiment. Nowhere in the Arabic chronicles examined is there to be found an explicit statement linking the dismissals and forced conversions to the actions of foreign Christian powers. Rather, such repressive measures, when imposed, seem to have been initiated to humor the religious element of the Muslim population, i.e., perhaps a certain segment of the ‘ulamā’.

Perhaps the greatest value of our examination of the Arabic chronicles then is to have indicated that within Muslim society itself there existed a variety of opinion. On the other hand, it is evident that the chronicles do not tell all. Other kinds of sources must be examined in conjunction with the chronicles if we are to verify our hypothesis that a variety of opinion did exist at this time, for example, that unlike the ruling Mamlūk class, the ‘ulamā’ may have viewed the situation in a very different light, one where religious factors did play a prominent role.

APPENDIX.

Tables of Reports, by Year,  
Involving Christians  
During the Reign of Qalā'ūn

IAZ	Ibn <sup>c</sup> Abd al-Zāhīr
BM	Baybars al-Manṣūrī
J	al-Jazarī
Y	al-Yūnīnī
AF	Abū al-Fidā
N	al-Nuwayrī
ID	Ibn al-Dawādārī
IF	Ibn al-Furāt
MIAF	Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il
IK	Ibn Kathīr
M	Maqrīzī
	s <u>al-Sulūk</u>
	k <u>al-Khiṭaṭ</u>
A	al- <sup>c</sup> Aynī

678/1279-1280

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	S	M	k	A
<u>Muqarrar al-Naṣārā</u> abolished								X				X		X
Arrival of envoys from al-Fūnsh								X				X		
Christian <u>kuttāb</u> dismissed from <u>dīwān al-jāysh</u>								X				X		
<u>Dayr al-khandaq</u> destroyed								X				X		X

679/1280-1281

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	s	M	k	A
King of Sīs aids Mongols		X					X		X					
Expedition to Marqab		X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X	
Franks of <sup>c</sup> Akkā seek renewal of treaty				X						X				
Patriarch in embassy to Constantinople								X					X	
Two <u>amīrs</u> sent to Syria		X				X		X					X	

680/1281-1282

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MEAF	IK	S <sub>M</sub> <sub>k</sub>	A
Treaty with Hospitalers of Akkā		X		X		X		X		X	X	
Plot vs. Qalā'ūn		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Mongols aided by Christians		X			X	X	X	X	X		X	
Treaty with Constantinople		X				X		X			X	
Treaty with Bohemond of Tripoli		X				X		X			X	
<u>Ahl al-dhimma</u> forced to embrace Islām				X						X		
<u>Ahl al-dhimma</u> return to their former religion				X						X		
Death of Frankish envoy								X				



681/1282-1283

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	s M k	A
Raiding party plunders caravan from SIs	X	X										
Envoys from al-Fūnsh	X	X						X			X	
Treaty with Templars of Tortosa	X	X				X	X	X				
Georgian notable seized	X	X				X		X			X	
Obituary for Sir Guy of Jubayl				X								
Obituary for Hibbat Allāh				X		X		X				
Envoy from Constantinople								X			X	

682/1283-1284

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	s M k	A
Conquest of al-Kakhtā	X	X	X			X		X			X	
Raid on Sīs	X	X				X		X			X	
Qal <sup>c</sup> at al-Tīnī	X											
Patriarch of al-Ḥadath	X	X				X		X				
King of Cyprus to Littoral	X	X				X		X			X	
Death of Byzantine emperor	X	X			X						X	
Treaty with <sup>c</sup> Akkā	X	X				X		X			X	
Jawālī collected from <u>ahl</u> <u>al-dhimma</u>								X			X	

683/1284-1285

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	s	M	k	A
Envoy to Byzantine emperor	X													
Internal Frankish affairs	X													
Report of Frankish intention to seize Syria										X				

684/1285-1286

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MLAF	IK	s	M	k	A
Marqab	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Maraqīya	X	X	X	X	X		X							
Peace with ruler of SIs	X													
Agreement with princess of Beirut	X													
Treaty with Tyre	X													
Letters from envoys who were dispatched to al-Fūnsh	X													
New of Pope's death	X													
Christian and Jew are accomplices in forgery	X													
Arrival of envoys from several Christian countries						X		X				X		

685/1286-1287

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	s M k	A
Expedition of King of Cyprus to Akkā	X											
Envoys to and from Nubia	X											
People of Marqab seize cara- van											X	

686/1287-1288

	LAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	S	M	k	A
--	-----	----	---	---	----	---	----	----	------	----	---	---	---	---

Laodicea

Nubia

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

687/1288-1289

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	<sup>M</sup> <sub>s</sub> <sub>k</sub>	A
Christian punished for drinking wine during Ramaḍān			X			X		X		X		
Sanjar al-Shujā <sup>c</sup> I sells arms to the Franks								X			X	
Nubia								X			X	

688/1289

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ID	IF	MIAF	IK	<sup>M</sup> <sub>S</sub> k	A
Tripoli		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Envoy from king.of SIs				X		X	X	X			X	
Nubia								X			X	



689/1290

	IAZ	BM	J	Y	AF	N	ED	IF	MIAF	IK	s	M	k	A
Treaty with Aragon	X													
Treaty with Genoa	X													
Abyssinia.	X													
Massacre of Muslim merchants in Akkā	X			X		X	X	X	X			X		
Nubia								X				X		
Jews and Christians not to be employed in <u>dīwāns</u>				X		X		X				X		
Préparations for seige of Akkā				X		X	X	X	X			X		

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Arabic Chronicles

Abū al-Fidā, al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad. al-Mukhtaṣar fī tārikh al-bashar.  
Cairo: al-Maṭba'at al-Ḥusayniya al-Miṣriya, 1907-1908.

al-<sup>C</sup>Aynī, Badr al-Dīn. Ḳid al-jumān fī tārikh ahl al-zamān. 69 vols.  
Dār al-Kutub MS, 1584 ma<sup>C</sup>ārif <sup>C</sup>amma. (Photocopy of hand  
copy of fols. 160 vo. - 160 ro.).

Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Rukn al-Dīn. Zubdat al-fikra fī tārikh al-hijra.  
Vol. IX, Cairo University Library MS, 24-28 (Photocopy  
of British Museum Or. MS, Add. 23325).

Ibn <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Zāhir, Muḥyī al-Dīn. Tashrīf al-ayyām wa al-<sup>C</sup>uṣūr fī sīrat  
al-Malik al-Manṣūr. Edited by Murād Kāmīl. Cairo:  
Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa al-Irshād al-Qawmī, 1961.

Ibn al-Dawādārī, Abū Bakr. Kanz al-durar wa jāmi<sup>C</sup> al-ghurar. Vol. VIII.  
al-Durra al-zakiya fī akhbār al-dawlat al-turkiya. Edited  
by Ulrich Haarmann. ("Quellen zur Geschichte des islamischen  
Ägyptens," Vol. 1h). Cairo: Deutsches Archäologisches,  
1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. Edited by Ulrich Haarmann in Ulrich Haarmann, Quellen-  
studien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit. Freiburg: D. Robischon,  
1969.

Ibn al-Furāt, Nāṣir al-Dīn. Tārikh Ibn al-Furāt. Edited by Costi K.  
Zurayk and Nejla Izzedin. 3 vols. Beirut: American Press,  
1936-1942.

Ibn Kathīr, <sup>C</sup>Abd Allāh. al-Bidāya wa al-nihāya fī al-tārikh. 14 vols.  
Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1932-1939.

al-Jazarī, Shams al-Dīn. Hawādith al-zamān wa anbā'uhu wa wafayāt al-  
akābir wa al-a<sup>C</sup>yān. Edited by Ulrich Haarmann in Ulrich  
Haarmann, Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit. Freiburg:  
D. Robischon, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. Jawāhir al-sulūk fī al-khulafā' wa al-mulūk. Dār al-  
Kutub MS, 7575 H. (Photocopy of Bibliothèque Nationale  
Arabic MS, 6739).

\_\_\_\_\_. La Chronique de Damas d'al-Jazarī. Summary translation

of Jawāhir al-sulūk by Jean Sauvaget. ("Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes," No. 294). Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1949.

al-Maqrīzī, Aḥmad ibn <sup>c</sup>Alī. al-Khiṭaṭ wa al-āthār fī Miṣr wa al-Qāhira. Bulāq, 1270 h.

\_\_\_\_\_. Kitāb al-sulūk li-ma<sup>c</sup>rifat duwal al-mulūk. Edited with notes by M. M. Ziyāda and A. F. <sup>c</sup>Ashūr. 4 vols. to date. Cairo: Maṭba<sup>c</sup>at Lajnat al-Ta'līf wa al-Tarjama wa al-Nashr, 1934-1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. Histoire des sultans mamlouks de l'Egypte, écrite en arabe par Takī-eddīn-Ahmed-Makrīzī. Translated by M. Quatremère. 2 vols. Paris: Oriental Translation Fund, 1837-1845.

Mufaḍḍal ibn abī al-Faḍā'il. Histoire des sultans mamlouks. Edited and translated by E. Blochet. ("Patrologia orientalis," Vols. XII, XIV, XX, issued as one volume). Paris: Fermin-Didot et Cie, 1919-1928.

al-Nuwayrī, Shihāb al-Dīn. Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab. 32 vols. Dār al-Kutub MS, 549 ma<sup>c</sup>ārif <sup>c</sup>amma (Microfilm copy of Bibliothèque Nationale Arabic MS, 1579).

al-Yūnīnī, Quṭb al-Dīn. Dhayl mir'āt al-zamān fī tārikh al-a<sup>c</sup>yān. 4 vols. to date. Hyderabad: Maṭba<sup>c</sup>at Dā'irat al-Ma<sup>c</sup>ārif al-Uthmāniya, 1954-1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Dhayl mir'āt al-zamān fī tārikh al-a<sup>c</sup>yān. (Microfilm copy of Yale University Library MS, Landberg 139.

#### Secondary Sources

Ansari, Bazmee. "al-Dīazarī," Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, II, 522-523.

Arkell, A. J. A History of the Sudan From the Earliest Times to 1821. London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1955.

Ashtor, E. "Baybars al-Manṣūrī," Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, II, 1127-1128.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Etudes sur quelques chroniques mamloukes," Israel Oriental Studies, I (1971), 272-297.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Some Unpublished Sources for the Bahrī Period," Studies

- in Islamic History and Civilization. Edited by Uriel Heyd ("Scripta Hierosolymitana," Vol. IX). Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1961. pp. 11-30.
- Ashtor-Strauss, E. "L'Inquisition dans l'état mamlouk," Revista degli Studi Orientali, XXV (1950), 11-26.
- Atiya, Aziz S. History of Eastern Christianity. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Unpublished XIVth Century Fatwa on the Status of Foreigners in Mamlūk Egypt and Syria," Edited with introduction, translation and notes. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Nahen und Fernen Ostens: Paul Kahle zum 60. geburtstag (überreicht von freunden und schülern aus dem kreise des Orientalischen seminars der Universität Bonn). Edited by W. Heffening and W. Kirfel. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1935, 55-68.
- Ayalon, David. "Ḥalka," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, III, 99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Muslim City and the Mamlūk Military Aristocracy," Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, II (1968), 311-329.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on the Structure of the Mamlūk Army," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, XV (1953), 448-459.
- Bosworth, C. E. "Christian and Jewish Religious Dignitaries in Mamlūk Egypt and Syria: Qalqashandī's information on Their Hierarchy, Titulature and Appointment," International Journal of Middle East Studies, III (1972), Pt. I, 59-74, Pt. II, 199-216.
- Butcher, E. L. The Story of the Church of Egypt. 2 vols. London:; Smith, Elder & Co., 1897.
- Cahen, Claude. "Addenda sur Al-Djazarī," Israel Oriental Studies, II (1972) 144-147.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dhimma," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, II, 227-231.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Djizya," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, II, 559-562.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Histoires coptes d'un cadī médiéval: extraits du Kitāb tadjrīd saff al-himma li'stikhrāj mā fī dhimmat al-dhimma de Uthmān b. Ibrāhīm an-Nābulusī," Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, LIX (1960), 133-150.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ibn al-Furāt," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, III, 768-769.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Islam et les minorités confessionnelles au cours de l'histoire," Table Ronde, CXXVI (1958), 61-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of La Chronique de Damas d'al-Jazarī, Oriens, IV (1951), 148-153.
- Canard, Marius. "Un traité entre Byzance et l'Egypte au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et les relations diplomatiques de Michel VIII Paléologue avec les sultans mamlūks Baibars et Qala'un," in Marius Canard, Byzance et les musulmans du Proche Orient. London: Variorum Reprints, 1973, IV:197-224. Originally published in Mélanges Gauthier-Demombynes. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1934-1945. pp. 197-224.
- Casanova, P. "L'Historien Ibn 'Abd adh-Dhahir," Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique au Caire. VI. pp. 493-505.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam. Edited by Thomas Houtsma et al. 4 vols. and supplement. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913-1938.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam. Edited by J. H. Kramers et al. 2nd rev. ed. 3 vols. to date. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-1972.
- Fattal, Antoine. Le Statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d'Islam. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1958.
- Fück, J. W. "Ibn Manẓūr," Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, III, 864.
- Gabrielli, Francesco. Arab Historians of the Crusades. Translated by E. J. Costello. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Gauthier-Demombynes, M. La Syrie à l'époque des mamelouks d'après les auteurs arabes. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923.
- Gottheil, R. J. H. "An Answer to the Dhimmis," Journal of the American Oriental Society, XLI (1921), 383-457.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt," Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper. 2 vols. Edited by R. F. Harper et al. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908, II, 353-414.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Fetwa on the Appointment of Dhimmis to Office," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, (1912), 203-214.
- Gottschalk, H. H. "Dīwān," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, II, 330-331.
- Grousset, René. Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem. Vol. III. La Monarchie musulmane et l'anarchie franque. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1936.
- Haarmann, Ulrich. Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit. Freiburg: D. Robischon, 1969.
- Heyd, W. Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1959.
- Kortantamer, Samira. Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaddal b. Abī l-Fadā'il. ("Islamkundliche Untersuchungen," Vol. XXIII). Freiburg im Breisgau: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1973.
- Kratschkowski, I. "al-Nuwaṣirī," Encyclopaedia of Islam. First Edition, 968-969.
- Lane-Poole, Stanley. A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages. London: Methuen & Co., 1901.
- Laoust, Henri. "La biographie d'Ibn Taimīya d'après Ibn Kathīr," Bulletin d'Études Orientales, IX (1942-1943), 115-162.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ibn Kathīr," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, III, 817-818.
- Lapidus, Ira M. "The Conversion of Egypt to Islam," Israel Oriental Studies, II (1972), 248-262.
- Le Strange, Guy. Palestine Under the Moslems: A Description of Syria and the Holy Land from A.D. 650 to 1500. Translated from the works of the mediaeval Arab geographers. London: Alexander P. Watt, 1890.
- Little, Donald P. An Introduction to Mamlūk History: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1970. Originally published as part of the series "Freiburger Islamstudien." Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1970.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Recovery of a Lost Source for Bahrī Mamlūk History: al-Yūsufī's Nuzhat al-Nāzir fī Sīrat al-Malik al-Nāsir," Journal of the American Oriental Society, XCIV, 1 (1974), 42-54.
- Montálvez, Pedro Martínez. "Relaciones de Alfonso X de Castilla con el Sultán Mameluco Baybars y sus Sucesores," Al-Andalus, XXVII (1962), 343-376.
- Muir, Sir William. The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt (1260-1517). London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1896.
- Pedersen, J. "Ibn <sup>c</sup> Abd al-Zāhir," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, 679-680.
- Perlmann, M. "Notes on Anti-Christian Propaganda in the Mamlūk Empire," Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, X (1940-1942), 843-861.
- Poliak, A. N. "L'Arabisation de l'Orient sémitique," Revue des Etudes Islamiques (1938), 35-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les Revoltes populaires en Egypte à l'époque des mamelouks et leurs causes économiques," Revue des Etudes Islamiques, (1934), 251-273.
- Quatremère, E. Mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Egypte et sur quelques contrées voisines. 2 vols. Paris: F. Schoell, 1811.
- Rabie, Hassanein. The Financial System of Egypt, A.H. 564-741/A.D. 1169-1341. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Rosenthal, F. "al-Birzālī," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, I, 1238-1239.
- Runciman, Steven. A History of the Crusades. 3 vols. Hammondsorth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sicilian Vespers. Hammondsorth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1960.
- Salibi, K. S. "The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamlūk Rule (1099-1516)," Arabica, IV (1957), 288-303.
- Sauvaget, J. La Chronique de Damas d'al-Jazarī (années 689-698 H.). Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1949.
- Schregle, Götz. Die Sultanin von Agypten: Šağarat ad-Durr in der arabischen

Geschichtsschreibung und Literatur. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961.

- Setton, Kenneth M. Editor-in-Chief. A History of the Crusades, II. The Later Crusades, 1189-1311. Edited by Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.
- Sinor, D. "Les Relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort d'Arghun," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, III (1956), 39-62.
- Sivan, Emmanuel. L'Islam et la croisade: idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmans aux croisades. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien Maisonneuve, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Réfugiés syro-palestiniens au temps des croisades," Revue des Etudes Islamiques, (1967), 135-148.
- Sobernheim. "Kalā'ūn," Encyclopaedia of Islam. First Edition, 685-687.
- Strauss, E. "The Social Isolation of Ahl adh-Dhimma," Etudes orientales à la mémoire de Paul Hirschler. Edited by O. Komlós. Budapest, 1950, 73-94.
- Tamrat, Taddesse. Church and State in Ethiopia, 1270-1527. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Tritton, A. S. The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects: A Critical Study of the Covenant of Umar. London: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Naṣārā," Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition, 848-851.
- Vadja, G. "Ahl al-Kitāb," Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition, I, 264-266.
- Von Grunebaum, Gustave E. Medieval Islam: A Study in Cultural Orientation. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Wiet, G. "Ḳibṭ," Encyclopaedia of Islam. First Edition, 990-1003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les Relations égypto-abyssines sous les sultans mamelouks," Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte, IV (1938), 115-140.