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Abstract
In 887/1482, two Damascene Ḥanbalī judges, Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Zurayq (d. 900/1495) and Naġm ad-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muflīḥ (d. 919/1513), stood accused of confiscation of waqf property and were summoned to Cairo to be interrogated and investigated by Sultan Qāʾitbāy. In this article I investigate this incidence of waqf manipulation, the lives of the accused parties after this event, and the ways in which later biographers, particularly Ibn Zurayq’s favorite student Šams ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Ṭūlūn (d. 953/1546) and Ibn Mufliḥ’s grandson Akmal ad-Dīn b. Mufliḥ (d. 1011/1603), sought to reframe the event and, thereby, the legacy of the participants.
Introduction

After the death of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071), the author of Ta’rīḫ Baġdād, his biographers deployed various approaches to representing his life and writing. Fedwa Malti-Douglas has analyzed thirteen biographies written between the 5th/11th and 11th/17th centuries that impugn his work and reputation, those that celebrate his life and accomplishments, and those that take a more tempered stance to it all. To understand the motivations for each biographer’s narrative strategy, she has parsed the polemics and the praise, the silences and the chatter to show how local politics, magḥab affiliation and religious debates shaped the viewpoints of the biographers and led them to recount or omit certain dreams, allege or deny al-Ḥaṭīb’s affair with a young boy, and support or discredit charges of drunkenness.¹

In this article, I propose to apply this methodology to biographies of Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Zurayq (d. 900/1495) and Naḡm ad-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muflīḥ (d. 919/1513), two Ḥanbalī judges in late Mamluk Damascus, whose engagement in waqf fraud came to a head in 887/1482. Although corruption in the handling of Damascene waqfs was rampant, this case was so egregious that contemporary chroniclers in Damascus and Cairo reported the incident. The judges’ biographers later had to grapple with the politics of representing this event. In this particular historical moment, Arab biographers and autobiographers wrote more explicitly about their authorial subjectivity and the politics of (self-) representation. Dwight Reynolds has found that “beginning in the late fifteenth century, Arabic autobiographers become more and more concerned with the careful framing of their texts, the articulation of their motivations, and defending themselves from potential charges of vanity, falsification, and innovation.”² In this regard, Muḥammad b. Ṭūlūn ad-Dīmašqī (d. 953/1546) is an exemplary author. He wrote biographical dictionaries and even composed an autobiography in which he theorized about the ethics of biographical and autobiographical writing. There, he claimed that biographies were ethically preferable to autobiographies, though he elected to write one all the same. Perhaps to offset the complicated associations of vanity, he incorporated a lengthy biography of his teacher Ibn Zurayq into his autobiography.

In addition to this biographical sketch of Ibn Zurayq, I have located two others that Ibn Ṭūlūn composed independently of his peers. (He also cited others’ portraits of Ibn Zurayq in his works.) In each, Ibn Ṭūlūn honored his teacher by emphasizing his scholarly identity which threatened to be overshadowed by the crimes of 887/1482, and in each Ibn Ṭūlūn focused on a different strategy: his use of a particular performance-enhancing drug preferred by ḥadīṯ scholars, his deep entrenchment in the scholarly networks of 9th/15th-century Damascus and aṣ-Ṣāliḥiyya, and his role as a mentor to young scholars. Ibn Ṭūlūn did not write an original biography of Naḡm ad-Dīn ʿUmar b. Muflīḥ, but his grandson Akmal ad-Dīn b. Muflīḥ did wrestle with questions of representing his grandfather and chose a manner of representation that preserved the family’s dignity.

Biography of Ibn Zurayq

The available sources concur on various aspects of Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān Ibn Zurayq’s biography. He was born in Šawwāl 812/February 1410 in aş-

¹ Malti-Douglas, Controversy.
² Reynolds, et. al., Interpreting the Self, 66.
Šāliḥiyya, a Ḥanbaḷī enclave northwest of Damascus, and grew up there with his large extended family.  He appears to have been named after his paternal uncle, Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muhammad b. Zurayq, who died in 803/1400. His father, a judge also known as Ibn Zurayq, or Son of the Shiny Blue-Eyed Man, had a total of seven children with two wives; ʿAbd Allāh (d. 848/1444), ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān (d. 838/1434), and Sitt al-Quḍāt (d. 864/1459 or 1460) were full siblings, and our Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 900/1495), Asmāʿ, ʿAbd al-Wahlāb (d. 845/1441) and Abī Ḥamīd (d. 891/1486) constituted a younger set of full siblings. 4 Ibn Zurayq studied ḥadīth, jurisprudence, and the Quran in Aleppo, Cairo, Damascus, and Mecca with such luminaries of the time as Burḥān ad-Dīn ʿĪbrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 841/1438), Ibn Ḥaḍar al-ʿAsqālānī (d. 852/1449), and Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dīmaṣqī (d. 842/1438). He wrote short ḥadīth compilations, kept audition notes (ṭibāq), and also wrote a ṣabāt, or scholarly autobiography, in two volumes. Only the latter autograph volume survives, and it consists of a record of his teachers, the works they taught him, the dates of transmission, and the chains of authorities leading back to the original authors. 5

He was a descendant of Ṣaḥḥ Abū ʿUmar b. Qudāma (d. 607/1210), one of the earliest and most venerated settlers of aṣ-Ṣāliḥiyya, and eventually became supervisor (nāzar) of Abū ʿUmar’s eponymous school, al-Madrasa al-Umariyya. Ibn Zurayq’s student Ibn Ṭūlūn claimed that the Zurayq family had been granted custodianship after a separate family line had run out. When Ibn Qāḍī al-Ḥalabī (d. 771/1370) married into the Zurayq family, he authorized one of them to control the waqf, and this unnamed person was corrupt in his tenure, the madrasa opened up to non-Ḥanbalīs. Šāfiʿī, Ḥanafī, and for a time even Mālikī teachers had designated days and places to teach their students there. 6

Our Nāṣir ad-Dīn b. Zurayq was this individual’s successor, and several contemporary observers indicate that his tenure as supervisor was fraught. An-Nuʿaymī (d. 927/1521) claimed that when Ibn Zurayq assumed the supervisorship, the mosque interior was orderly, and houses surrounded the mosque, but under his leadership, everything inside the mosque was broken, and the homes were destroyed. This destruction was especially lamentable because the madrasa had been built during the 6th/12th-century reign of the Zengid ruler Nūr ad-Dīn. 7 Ibn Ṭūlūn related several anecdotes about Ibn Zurayq’s reputation for poor treatment

---

3 Ibn al-Mullā al-Ḥaṣkafī recorded his birth month as either Sawwāl or Ǧul-Qaʿda. See al-Ḥaṣkafī, Muʿtaʿat al-adhān, 2:593.
4 as-Ṣāḥīḥī, ad-Dawʿ al-lāmiʿ, 11:44. Princeton Garrett MS 178B, which will be discussed and analyzed later, contains more details about some of these siblings. For ʿAbdallāh, see fols. 33v, 76v, 82r. For ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, see fols. 28r, 72v, 73v, 83v, 88v, 94v, 96v, 100r, 111r. For Sitt al-Quḍāt, see fol. 25r.
5 Aside from this ḥadīṭ volume (British Library MS OR 9792), few of Ibn Zurayq’s writings are known to have survived. King Saud University MS 2578 is a copy dated 1076/1665-6 of Ibn Zurayq’s collection of 40 ḥadīṭ. Among works that he copied are Ibn Ḥaḍar’s Ta ḥlīl al-manfaʿa bi-zawādī ḥāl al-aʿimmat al-arbaʿa in 839/1435-6 (al-Asad Library Maṭmūʿa 12) and Ibn Quyyim al-Ǧawziyya’s Kitāb al-Ǧuyūḥ al-islāmiyya in Ǧumādā I 831/1428 (Berlin Ahlwardt MS 2090).
6 On Ibn Qāḍī al-Ḥalabī’s history of issuing controversial opinions about selling waqfs, see al-Matroudi, Hanbalī School, 113-4.
7 Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Qalāʿa id, 1:269.
8 an-Nuʿaymī, ad-Dāris, 2:84-5.
9 an-Nuʿaymī, ad-Dāris, 2:80.
of religious property. First, he pilfered books from the library of al-Madrasa al-Ḍiyā’iyya, then he removed a stone at the base of the ‘Umariyya’s miḥrāb, issued a fatwa stating that the distribution of meat at the ‘Umariyya for ʿĪd was not permitted. He ruled that dirhams must be distributed, but Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥādī reminded him that the waqf stipulated a feast for ʿĪd, so eventually a cooked wheat dish was distributed. However, none of this activity compares with an event widely recorded in late Mamluk chronicles. Ibn al-Ḥimṣī (d. 934/1527) noted in his diaristic chronicle that:

On Wednesday, 24 Ramaḍān 887 [/6 November 1482], the viceregent of Syria (nāʿib aš-ṣām) detained a group of people from the Abū ʿUmar madrasa in aš-Ṣāliḥiyya, Damascus, and he beat them with clubs and chained them up for one month. As he made a sudden attack on the madrasa, they [the detainees] escaped from him to the mountain. He managed to seize some of them again and then placed them in prison. The cause of all of this was a boy reciting the Quran at the Ḥanbalī Mosque in aš-Ṣāliḥiyya. When he had finished the recitation, people attacked a group who were stealing candles. Someone from the [Abū ʿUmar] madrasa stood up to strike [them], but the blow fell on the lamps, breaking them. Oil splashed on the boy’s robe of honor. So, they complained to the nāʿib, and it happened that someone said to the nāʿib: ‘These people from the madrasa are bad news.’

Ibn al-Ḥimṣī, a historian who was living in Damascus at this time, anonymized all of the participants in this incident—the viceregent, the boy, the candle thieves, and the people attacking the thieves. Ibn Ṭūlūn, however, was only seven years old at the time of this incident, and, similar to the young boy in the anecdote, was reciting a portion of the Quran in al-Kawāfī Mosque in aš-Ṣāliḥiyya that same week on 21 Ramaḍān 887/3 November 1482. Ibn Ṭūlūn inserted Ibn al-Ḥimṣī’s episode into his own chronicle Mufākahat al-ḥillān, only altering it to specify the names of the protagonists and to shift the sequence of events. He identified the boy at the Ḥanbalī Mosque as someone nicknamed Ibn Mūsak, named chief judge Naǧm ad-Dīn b. Mufliḥ (d. 919/1513) as an accomplice, and indicated that Ibn Mufliḥ had raided the madrasa before beating some of the congregants there. However, even with these biographical details, Ibn Zurayq is not mentioned here by name. Ibn Ṭūlūn takes up the subject again in a chapter on the Abū ʿUmar madrasa in al-Qalāʿiʿid al-gawhariyya, his topography of aš-Ṣāliḥiyya. There, he named Ibn Zurayq as a key protagonist, described the event in greater detail and even attributed a strange motive to Ibn Zurayq.

When ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. Dāwud died, the judge Nāṣir ad-Dīn b. Zurayq took control of it [the waqf]. He lost his mind. His mind and body were corrupted because he ate balāgur, which corrupted his hāl. He sold much of the [madrasa’s] waqf. His mind was the cause of its [the waqf’s] destruction, with help from his brother Šīḥāb ad-Dīn Aḥmad [d. 891/1486]. It is cited from him awful words and deeds of unbelief, among which is: ‘My intention was to destroy it [the madrasa].’ Onto its door he nailed a piece

12 Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Fulk al-mashhūn, 7.
13 Ibn Ṭūlūn, Mufākahat al-ḥillān, 1:60.
14 A treatise on exchange of waqf property has been attributed to this Šīḥāb ad-Dīn Aḥmad b. Zurayq. See his Fī l-munāqala bi-l-awqāf, 139-55. The treatise, being theoretical, does not reference this particular episode or even the ‘Umariyya.
of paper addressed to the Turks that read: ‘In here with me are 500 pupils and teachers
(hirāmī),’ so that the mamluks and others would hate them. He [Ibn Zurayq] and others helped until the group occupied [the madrasa]. He beat the people after they had ordered good and forbidden evil against anyone. They held their sovereignty over the madrasa so even if a criminal (garīm) entered it, no one from the military or even the viceregent (nāʾīb) could enter and take him. When a slain person floated by on the river, he was washed and buried against regulations(?). Eventually, its [the madrasa’s] sanctity was broken, and their affair was compromised. In this, he was supported by the Ḥanbalī judge an-Naḡm [ʿUmar b. Ibrahīm b. Muḥammad] b. Muḥliḥ.\footnote{Ibn Ṭūlūn admits that Ibn Zurayq and Ibn Muḥliḥ committed crimes, specifically selling portions of a waqf and occupying the madrasa. According to the Syrian historian al-Buṣrawī (d. 905/1499-1500), these were sufficiently common occurrences in Damascus during the 880’s that student attendance at madrasas fell dramatically and daily operations in Syrian madrasas frequently came to a halt. He points to the year 890 as the moment when student attendance returned to normal levels.\footnote{Unfortunately, judges, who were appointed as custodians and upholders of the law, were often perpetrators of these crimes. Carl Petry recently identified six waqf manipulation cases from late medieval Syrian and Egyptian chronicles, and five of these featured judges who had been accused of mismanaging waqf funds.\footnote{So the incident at al-ʿUmariyya was not singular for its time and for the high status of its accused. However, the justifications Ibn Ṭūlūn offered for Ibn Zurayq’s behavior are striking—eating balāḏur and keeping company with corrupt people. Balāḏur is a nut whose extract scholars frequently ingested to enhance their memorization capabilities.\footnote{Calculating the proper dosage was critical, because the drug had two well-known, frightening side effects: insanity or death. An anecdote from Ibn Ṣaddād (d. 632/1234) illustrates the convergence of scholarly identity around balāḏur usage, as well as the loss of mental stability such use could engender. One day, Ibn Ṣaddād observed four or five jurists at al-Madrasa an-Nīzāmiyya in Baghdad, who were discussing appropriate dosages of balāḏur. Because it strengthens one’s memory and comprehension, they had gathered with one of the physicians. They asked him about the amount of it that humans can use and about how to use it. Then they bought the amount that the physician had told them and drank it somewhere outside the school. Insanity overtook them. They dispersed and they did not know what had come over them. After some days, one of them—a tall fellow—came to the madrasa. He was naked, and wore nothing to cover his genitals. On his head was a large turban (biqyar kabīr) with a long piece of it hanging down, which was not custom. He threw it [the piece] behind him, and it reached his ankles. He was silent, exuding peace and dignity, not talking, not joking. One of the jurists present} to the endowment deed stipulated that two workers would be responsible for feeding 500 students, for which see Frenkel, Awqāf, 158.\footnote{al-Buṣrawī, Taʾrīḫ al-Buṣrawī, 106, 180. Cited in Mahamid, Waqf, 119.}\footnote{The editor of al-Qalāʿid al-gawhariyya transcribed this word as bi-lā durr, or ‘without pearls’, which makes no sense in this context. For more on the medicinal properties and medieval history of balāḏur, see Bos, Balāḏur. Ibn Ṭūlūn also wrote a lost treatise on balāḏur titled al-Lum’a an-nūrāniyya fī l-maṣāqāla al-balāḏurīyya (Luminous Shine: An Essay on Balāḏur). (Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Fulk al-maṣḥūn, 129) For the history of a 9th/15th-century Cairene scholar who overdosed on balāḏur, causing temporary insanity and an outbreak of painful boils, see Richardson, Difference, 40-60.}'}
approached him and asked him about his condition. He said to them: ‘We gathered together and drank the balāḏur nut. My friends became crazy, and I was the only one to escape. My mind grew strong and clear.’ The people mock him, and he is unaware of it.

He firmly believes that he has escaped what afflicted his friends. The moral associations with balāḏur were neutral, but the professional associations with the scholarly class conveyed a certain degree of prestige. Al-Ḡāḥīz and Ibn al-Ḡawzī admitted to taking balāḏur, in spite of the side effects. (Ibn al-Ḡawzī’s beard thinned, and Al-Ḡāḥīz was irascible when not using it.) The 9th/15th-century Cairene poet admitted to overdosing on it and losing his mind. The grandfather of the famed historian al-Balāḏurī apparently “died mentally deranged through inadvertent use of balāḏur,” and it is clear that the family took the name of the drug as their own, perhaps solidifying their connection to a serious scholar who ultimately martyred himself in pursuit of glory. Still, in spite of these examples of proud scholars who took balāḏur, I have not previously seen it used as justification for criminal mischief. I read Ibn Ṭūlūn’s mention of his teacher’s purported balāḏur use as an attempt to absolve him of criminal responsibility, since an insane person is not usually liable for his actions in Islamic law, and also to emphasize his identity as a scholar. Using balāḏur, like wearing one’s turban a certain way, marked one as a dedicated scholar.

No other chronicler of the period or biographer of Ibn Zurayq mentions his balāḏur use or attempts to explain the criminal behavior. The next known mentions discuss the events as they unfolded in Egypt. Ibn al-Ḥīmsī noted that five months later “on Thursday, 24 Ṣaḥar 888/[2 April 1483], the sultan decreed that Qāḍī al-quḍāt Naǧm ad-Dīn b. Muflīh al-Ḥanbalī and Aqḍāʾ al-quḍāt Naṣīr ad-Dīn b. Zurayq, supervisor of the Abū ʿUmar madrasa, be summoned. They both were brought to the Egyptian palaces because of a complaint from the people of the Abū ʿUmar madrasa who had been beaten with clubs, as previously mentioned.” Abd al-Bāṣīt al-Hanafī (d. 920/1514) claimed that two months later, in Rabīʿ II 888/June 1483, “the Ḥanbalī judge arrived from Damascus. With him was Ibn Muflīh, who had been summoned because of a dispute among some Syrians there. Misfortunes befall him, because of his desire for property. He returned to Damascus after that.” As-Sāḥāwī, a younger contemporary of Ibn Zurayq, offers more details, though he placed the events in the following year, 889/1484.

Al-Aṣraf Qāʾītībāy summoned him [Ibn Zurayq] there [to Cairo] in the year [8]89 because of a dispute between legal claimants (mustahqqaqi) to a madrasa. For a while, while in public office, he was obsessed with money. He was forced to confess to a form of forcible confiscation of property. He endured hardships and was threatened with banishment and other things. We felt sorrow for him. Then he returned to his homeland. He was a good, faithful, humble and friendly man.

---

19 Ibn al-Ḥallikān, Wafayāt al-aʾyān, 7:94.
20 Becker, Al-Balāḏurī.
21 Similarly, when Timur’s grandson Sultān Ḥusayn briefly defected to the Mamluks in 803/1400, Timurid chroniclers attributed this betrayal to drunkenness and corrupt counselors. Mamluk chroniclers did not attribute any motive to Sultan-Ḥusayn’s actions. On this incident, see Broadbridge, Spy or Rebel? 30, 33.
22 Ibn al-Ḥīmsī, Ḥavādīt al-zamān, 1:188.
24 as-Sāḥāwī, ad-Dawʾ al-lāmiʿ, 7:170-1.
As-Saḥāwī only wrote of threats of banishment, but on 6 Ṣafar 889/4 March 1484, Ibn Ṭawq (d. 915/1509) recorded rumors that Sultan Qāʾībāy had banished Ibn Zurayq to Qus and Aswan in Upper Egypt. Al-ʿUlaymī (d. 928/1522) made no mention of banishment, but did confirm that Qāʾībāy treated Ibn Zurayq harshly, and he also dated Ibn Zurayq’s return home to Ḥumādā II 889/June-July 1484.

Naḡm ad-Dīn b. Mufliḥ

The sources reveal far less about Naḡm ad-Dīn b. Mufliḥ’s biography and involvement in the episode at the ‘Umariyya and about his experiences in Cairo. He was born in aš-Ṣāliḥiyya in 848/1444-5 into a family of judges. His father, the Ḥanbalī chief judge of Damascus Burḥān ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Mufliḥ, and others taught him Quran and ḥadīth. He later taught at al-ʿUmariyya and at the Umayyad Mosque.

During his father’s lifetime, Ibn Mufliḥ served as deputy judge, and after the death of his father in Šaʾbān 884/October 1479, he was appointed chief judge. While chief judge, he had the occasion to hear Ibn Ṭūlūn, who was then a boy, recite from the Quran. Ibn Ṭūlūn recorded his praise in his autobiography: “This noble boy, a person of cultivation and intelligence, came before me and recited to me. May Allah guide him to obedience and urge him towards the people of tradition and unification.” Ibn Mufliḥ was removed from his position several times. He was last appointed in 910/1504-5 and remained in office until his death in 919/1513.

The Damascene historian Ibn Ḥādī (d. 909/1503) noted vaguely that “he appointed judges for money. He did things and committed crimes. May he seek refuge from this in Allah.” Paying for certain military, religious and administrative office had become standard procedure by the late Mamluk period. Ibn Ṭawq reported a rumor circulating in Raḡāb 888/August 1483, just ten months after the episode at al-ʿUmariyya, that Ibn Zurayq had paid 2,000 ašrafīs for his judgeship. Ibn Mufliḥ could very well have sold Ibn Zurayq his judgeship, though Ibn Zurayq may also have purchased it from another official. However, this rumor may have simply arisen to justify the cooperation between the two judges in the takeover of al-ʿUmariyya.

In both known drafts of at-Taḡr al-bassām fī ǧīkr man wulliya qaḍāʾ aš-Ṣām, a history of the judges of Damascus, Ibn Ṭūlūn made oblique references to Ibn Mufliḥ’s takeover of al-ʿUmariyya. Though the specific incident goes unmentioned in the earlier draft of this work, Ibn Ṭūlūn mentioned al-Bahāʾ b. Qudāma’s arrival in Damascus “after an-Naḡmī b. Mufliḥ had been removed from office several times.” In the later draft Ibn Ṭūlūn only added that an-Naḡm b. Mufliḥ “was a deputy judge (nāʾīb) during his father’s lifetime, then he was

26 al-ʿUlaymī, Manhāǧ al-aḥmad, 5:314. Unfortunately, Taʾrīḥ al-Buṣrāwī is missing the pages describing events in Damascus between Šaʾbān 884 and Šawwāl 888, which the author would likely have included information about this episode.
28 For additional biographies of al-Naḡm b. Mufliḥ, see Ibn al-ʿImād, Šaṭarāt aḥ-dahab, 10:132; al-Ḡazzī, Kawākhī š-sāʿ īra, 1:284-5; and al-Ḡazzī, an-Naʾī al-aḥmad, 92-4.
29 This comment is quoted in Ibn Ayyūb, k. Rawḍ al-ʿāṯīr, fol. 186r, and in al-Ḥaʃkašī, Muʿat al-aḍḥān, 1:542.
31 Ibn Ṭūlūn, Qudāt dimāsq, 304.
removed from his position (ʿazala), but reclaimed it several times.” Ibn Ṭūlūn based his discussion of Ibn Mufliḥ on a passage from an-Nuʿaymī’s Dāris, but he inserted the details about Ibn Mufliḥ’s dismissals and reappointments himself. In neither version does Ibn Ṭūlūn discuss the crimes or the sultan’s interrogation of Ibn Mufliḥ. The move toward even greater anonymization arguably shows up in the commonplace book of an-Naḡm’s grandson, Akmal ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar b. Ibrāhīm b. Mufliḥ (d. 1011/1603), a student of Ibn Ṭūlūn and, like so many of his ancestors, a Damascene judge. His interest in the history of Damascene judges, particularly those of his own family, was strong enough that he annotated the margins of both drafts of Ibn Ṭūlūn’s history of Damascene judges, al-Tağr al-bassām, even writing the name of his paternal grandfather an-Naḡm b. Mufliḥ in red ink next to his entry in both copies. In a volume of his own Taḵkira, Akmal ad-Dīn noted the following:

I saw a page in the hand of someone I did not know. This person related that the Ḥanbalī judge was in Cairo, his presence having been requested by the sultan. He was anguished by it. In his sleep one night, he heard someone recite verses. He memorized them. Even after he was released, what happened to him remained with him, and he feared it.

The six verses quoted after this paragraph were composed by Imām aṣ-Ṣāfī ʿĪ (d. 204/820) and they urge those suffering through trials to turn to God for succor and refuge. The identity of the Ḥanbalī judge in this excerpt remains anonymous, but the summons to Cairo and the judge’s anguish are certainly suggestive of Naḡm ad-Dīn b. Mufliḥ’s own ordeal. Several factors suggest that this may be an anonymized account of the aftermath of the ʿUmariyya incident. For one, Akmal ad-Dīn quoted extensively from his ancestors’ personal letters, fatwās, and notebooks in his Taḵkira and was knowledgeable about his family’s history. Not only would he have learned about an-Naḡm’s ordeal as family lore, but also from Ibn Ṭūlūn. Though Akmal ad-Dīn “undertook a multi-volume Taḵkira, following Ibn Ṭūlūn’s organization of day, month, year, in which he assembled many inappropriate things about people’s faults,” family members seem to have been spared such exposure. Anonymizing the account of his grandfather’s summons to Cairo may have been Akmal ad-Dīn’s chosen method of preserving a particular legacy for his family. Secondly, Akmal ad-Dīn recorded later in this same Taḵkira volume another poem by aṣ-Ṣāfī ʿĪ that he had found in an-Naḡm’s father’s handwriting, suggesting a familial interest in aṣ-Ṣāfī ʿĪ’s poetry. If Akmal ad-Dīn has indeed anonymized his grandfather’s experiences of 887-881482-3, then it can be read as an interesting impulse to preserve a dignified legacy for the Mufliḥ clan.
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32 Ibn Ṭūlūn, ʿArf al-zaharāt, fol. 97r.
33 an-Nuʿaymī, ad-Dāris, 2:47-8.
34 Ibn Mufliḥ, Untitled, fol. 1v.
35 aṣ-Ṣāfī ʿĪ, Dīwān, 52-3.
36 For Ibn Mufliḥ’s notices on his children’s births, see at-Taḵkira al-akmaliyya al-muflihiyya, American University of Beirut MS 1004, fols. 9r-10r. For death notices of family members, see Berlin Ahlwardt MS 8467, fol. 254v. For his transcriptions of his ancestor’s writings, see Berlin Ahlwardt MS 8467, fol. 61r-63r, 138r, and Bodleian Pococke MS 26, fol. 113r.
37 Güneş, Kitāb ar-raud, 106.
38 Ibn Mufliḥ, Untitled, fol. 40v.
Figure 1: Banū Muflīḥ Family Tree
Aftermath of the Umariyya Affair

Ibn Muflīḥ was reappointed judge soon after the incident, as he is mentioned in chronicles as the Ḥanbālī judge of Damascus at the start of 889/1484. Ibn Zurayq may have retained his judgeship, though I have found no explicit accounts of his subsequent involvement with the Abū ʿUmar madrasa. His brother Ḥāmid b. Zurayq retained his shares of the waqf, which his two sons inherited after his death two years later in 891/1486. Ibn Zurayq died in aş-Šāliḥiyā, eleven years after returning there, on 9 Ṣumādā II 900/7 March 1495, at the age of eighty-seven (lunar) years and seven months. He was survived by his sons Ġamāl ad-Dīn Ḏabdallāh (d. 921/1515) and Taqī ad-Dīn Abū Bakr (d. 917/1511) and by at least one daughter. His biographical legacy was largely crafted by his student Ibn Ṭūlūn.

Of all the teachers Ibn Ṭūlūn named in his autobiography, he gave pride of place to Ibn Zurayq, penning a lengthy, laudatory biography of his cherished teacher. The portrait details Ibn Zurayq’s travels to study with scholars in Syria and Egypt and his competencies as a ḥadīṯ scholar; his judicial career, his legal troubles, and his supervisorship of the ‘Umariyya madrasa go unmentioned. Ibn Ṭūlūn proudly noted that he had read more than 700 agzā’ with Nāṣir ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Zurayq over a period of ten years (probably the last ten years of Ibn Zurayq’s life, after the incident at the madrasa, from 890 to 900) and eventually devoted a special mašyāhā to him. Ibn Ṭūlūn wrote of his teacher and mentor:

I witnessed his compassion, his kindness and his welcoming attitude toward me. His care of me surpassed description. The scholar Šīhāb ad-Dīn al-ʿAskārī, a member of his circle, asked him: ‘Who is currently the most worthy from your group of students?’ Speaking candidly, he indicated me, bent towards me, and explained: ‘He, in spite of his youth, outdid his predecessors through his zeal, his striving, his decisions and his maturity—which I had wished for him.’

Ibn Zurayq considered Ibn Ṭūlūn his most gifted student, and Ibn Ṭūlūn showed his considerable gratitude for this academic support by working in three ways to honor his teacher’s legacy. First, he downplayed the severity of the ‘Umariyya incident by blaming bad advisors and the ill effects of drugs. The balāḏur defense served to identify Ibn Zurayq to readers as a committed scholar. Secondly, Ibn Ṭūlūn wrote an extended biography for his teacher and placed it at the front of his own autobiography. Thirdly, he compiled an

39 Ibn Ṭawq, Taʿliq, 1:320; al-Buṣrawī, Ta riḥ al- Buṣrawī, 93.
40 Bakhit’s chronological account of the aftermath is certainly mistaken. According to him, “Janbirdi al-Ghazali dismissed the dishonest endowments supervisor of the Abū ʿUmar school, Muḥammad b. Zurayq, who had sold many of its endowments. In this connection he appointed al-Najm b. al-Mātānī on the 4th of Ramaḍān 926/30th of August 1520.” Bakhit, Ottoman Province, 26-7. al-Ǧazālī was only appointed governor of Damascus in 924/1518, long after Ibn Zurayq’s death. However, Bakhit’s notes that “this appointment was surrounded with pomp to such an extent that when he passed through the streets of Damascus and al-Šāliḥiyā, flutes were blown, drums were beaten and town criers announced the appointment, which no doubt reflects the importance al-Ǧazālī attached to the post.”
42 Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Fulk al-mašhūn, 35-6.
innovative mašyaḥa for his teacher, a draft of which I will identify and analyze for its relationship to Ibn Ţūlūn’s project of shaping Ibn Zurayq’s legacy.

Codicology of Ibn Zurayq’s Mašyaḥa

The manuscript considered here, Princeton Garrett MS 178B, is catalogued as an anonymously authored, untitled 113-folio treatise. The entire volume, on glazed oriental paper and bound with cloth, measures 18.2 by 13.6 cm, with twenty-three lines to a page. The written surface is 14 by 10 cm. Though the two works bear no scribal statements and lack colophons, the distinctive handwriting and the trademark twenty-three lines per folio indicate that the copyist of the entire manuscript is Ibn Ţūlūn.

It is provisionally titled in the catalogue Tarāǧim šuyūḥ dīmaṣq (Biographies of the Šayḥs of Damascus), though no such title is to be found in the manuscript. The manuscript opens with what can be considered the working title of the biographical dictionary from fol. 1r to 70v: Awān aš-šurūʿ fī tarāǧim aš-suyūḥ al-awwal (The Moment to Start the Biographies of the Šayḥs, Part One). This portion is a continuous sequence of alphabetically arranged biographical entries of 24 female and 239 male Muslim ḥadīṯ scholars who died in the 9th/15th century and taught ḥadīṯ to Ibn Zurayq. (The latest death date mentioned is Rabī’ I 870/November 1465, the year of Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad aẓ-Ẓamzamī’s death. ) The first biographical entry is for aẓ-Ẓamzamī, and the last one for Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Salmān b. Muḥammad aṣ-Sāliḥī an-Nayrabī, who was also known as Zurayq. The catchword at the bottom of fol. 70v is wa-ibn which does match up with the first word on fol. 71r, but fol. 71r is not the continuation of 70v. It appears that someone rubbed out the original catchword and overlaid it with one that makes the codex look intact. I would conjecture that the original catchword was Allāh.

Figure 2: Princeton Garrett MS 178B, Awān al-šurūʿ, fol. 70v
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43 Hitti et al., Descriptive Catalogue, p. 239; Bahḥīt et. al., Fihrist al-maḥṭūṭāt, 3:144-5.
44 Princeton MS 178B, fol. 1v. On folio 2r, Ibn Ţūlūn wrote that Ibrāhīm b. ʿAlī aẓ-Zamzamī was born in 797 AH and then received an iǧāza in the year 86, leading one to believe that the year 886 is meant. However, aẓ-Zamzamī’s birth year should read 777, which means that the iǧāza year should be understood as 786. With this correction, 870 stands as the latest date in the manuscript.
45 The scribe erroneously transcribed the name as Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Salmān b. Fahd. Neither al-Biqāʾī nor aṣ-Saḥāwī provided a death date for this individual, so the textual break in this manuscript, before Ibn Zurayq concluded the biographical entry with, presumably, a death date, is rather unfortunate. See al-Biqāʾī, ‘Unwān al-‘unwān, 344, and aṣ-Saḥāwī, ad-Daw’ al-lāmi’, 10: 93-4.
The designation of this part as “the first” suggests that, at the very least, a related second part must follow, and the fragment running from fols. 71r to 111v is the second section of *Awān aṣ-ṣurūṭ*. It is organized as a biographical dictionary combined with audition notes and comprises biographies of one female (Zaynab bt. al-Kamāl) and sixty-nine male Muslim scholars of the 3rd/9th through the 8th/14th centuries. This section is missing its beginning and end. The fragment opens in the middle of the biographical entry for Aḥmad b. Ḥusayn b. Ṭūlūn as auṭrūṭ. The middle of fifteenth century, the entries continue in alphabetical order until the end of fol. 111v, cutting off abruptly in the middle of the biographical entry for Ṭūlūn b. Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn b. Yazīd al-Baḵdādī (d. 344/955), a well regarded traditionist who was also known as Abū Ṭālib (b. al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn b. Ṭūlūn). The first half (likely titled *Awān aṣ-ṣurūṭ* al-tānī) was a biographical dictionary of famous ḥadīth transmitters, combined with intellectual genealogies extending from Ibn Zurayq to the ḥadīth transmitter. These two draft fragments, originally bound together, formed a unique maṣaḥaṭa that Ibn Ṣulaymān, see Richardson, *Reconstructing the Transmitters, Combined with Intellectual Genealogies*.

Both fragments bear marginal additions from the same two writers. Because the marginalia are consistent throughout both fragments, it seems likely that they were originally bound together. One commentator only noted the name of each new biographee. The second commentator prefaced every comment with *qif*, often just marking the start of a female ḥadīth transmitter’s profile (“*qif* alā muḥaddita”), but also noting when a profiled male scholar had studied with a women teacher. For instance, in the margin next to Ibn Ṣulaymān b. Ṭūlūn b. Ṭūlūn b. Ṭūlūn named the work *Musalsal al-awliyya* and their grandfather ar-Raḍī’s as-Sabāʾ ʿiyāt. Elsewhere, this second commentator interpreted first-person constructions in the text as references from Ibn Ṣulaymān. So, a marginal gloss next to Sitt al-Quḏāḥ b. Ibn Zurayq’s biographical entry in *Awān aṣ-ṣurūṭ*, wherein the author refers to her as “my sister,” reads, “on the sister of al-Ḥāfiz at-Ṭūlūn.” Similarly, a comment next to “Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Zurayq’s profile describes him as someone “also known as Ibn Zurayq, the brother of al-Ḥāfiz al-Ṭūlūn.” The commentator was certainly familiar with Ibn Ṣulaymān’s handwritting, as s/he had also annotated one of his drafts of at-Taḡr al-bassām. Still, the details of Ibn Ṣulaymān’s biography must have eluded him or her, because additional textual clues pointing away from Ibn Ṣulaymān as author were determinedly ignored.

The first half (Awān aṣ-ṣurūṭ al-awwal) consisted of biographies of Ibn Zurayq’s teachers; the second half was a biographical dictionary of famous ḥadīth transmitters, combined with intellectual genealogies extending from Ibn Zurayq to the ḥadīth transmitter. These two draft fragments, originally bound together, formed a unique maṣaḥaṭa that Ibn Ṣulaymān fashioned from Ibn Zurayq’s autobiographical writings and narratives. Such an endeavor was common. “It was in fact standard practice for a student to compile a biography of his teacher, sometimes on the basis of autobiographical materials
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46 Princeton MS 178B, fol. 60r. In the manuscript text, Ibn Ṣulaymān named the work *at-Tusāʾ ʿiyāt*.
47 Princeton MS 178B, fols. 25r, 28v.
48 Cf. the scripts of the notes in Princeton MS 178B, fol. 6v, and Princeton MS 196b, fol. 29r. On the identification of MS 196B, fols. 10r-101v as a fragment of Taḡr al-bassām, see Richardson, *Reconstructing the Transmitters, Combined with Intellectual Genealogies*.
supplied by the teacher.”49 However, the student's use of the first-person appears to have been unconventional. Jan Just Witkam has said of scholarly autobiographies: “Often these texts were compiled by the subjects themselves and were written in the first person, although the third person is used in the autobiography as well.”50

Contents and Analysis of Ibn Zurayq’s Maṣyaḥa

Awān aš-ṣurūʿ al-awwal

The biographical dictionary of Ibn Zurayq’s teachers appears to have been greatly influenced by al-Biqā‘ī’s (d. 885/1480) ‘Unwān al-ʿunwān, an abridgement of his earlier and longer biographical dictionary ‘Unwān az-zamān. Perhaps not incidentally, Ibn Ṭūlūn himself wrote a biographical dictionary, no longer extant, entitled at-Tammatu bi-l-iqrān bayna tarāǧim aš-ṣuyūḥ wa-l-aqrān, of which he said, “I had arranged it by the subjects’ birth dates, but that became too difficult, so I organized it alphabetically. It can be considered a continuation of al-Burhān al-Biqā‘ī’s ‘Unwān az-zamān fī tarāǧim aš-ṣuyūḥ wa-l-aqrān, a work that he then abridged and named ‘Unwān al-ʿunwān [bi-taǧrīd asmāʾ aš-ṣuyūḥ wa-l-aqrān].”51

Awān aš-ṣurūʿ fī tarāǧim aš-ṣuyūḥ al-awwal shares four important structural similarities with al-Biqā‘ī’s ‘Unwān az-zamān. First, both works are alphabetically arranged by the subjects’ ism. Secondly, they both, like Ibn Ṭūlūn’s lost work, have the phrase tarāǧim aš-ṣuyūḥ in their titles. Thirdly, when ‘Unwān al-ʿunwān is read alongside Awān aš-ṣurūʿ, the order of the biographical entries track closely. Of the 263 biographical entries in Awān aš-ṣurūʿ, all but sixty-five are in ‘Unwān al-ʿunwān and ‘Unwān az-zamān. Very many of the entries in ‘Unwān al-ʿunwān are brief, with blank spaces for the birth and death dates. In Awān aš-ṣurūʿ, this missing information is provided. Fourthly, in both works, men’s and women’s profiles are integrated into the volume, as opposed to placing the women’s biographies together at the end.

Awān aš-ṣurūʿ al-ṭānī

In Part II, Ibn Ṭūlūn deftly integrated certificates of audition (mašmūʿ āt) and scholarly genealogies (silsilāt) with biographies of ḥadīth specialists. Each person’s entry follows the same format. After briefly introducing the person, Ibn Ṭūlūn mentioned a work s/he wrote or a collection of ḥadīth that s/he transmitted, and then the 9th/15th century scholar from whom Ibn Zurayq himself had heard it. All study sessions took place in Damascus, aš-Ṣāliḥiyya or Aleppo between Dū l-Qa’ da 836 and Sa’bān 838 (between June 1433 and October 1434). The audition dates in Volume Two of Ibn Zurayq’s tabat overlap with these study session dates, suggesting that for whatever reason at the time of composition, Ibn Ṭūlūn did not have access to volume one.

After returning to aš-Ṣāliḥiyya from Cairo in 889/14/??, Ibn Zurayq pawned his books and they remained so until his death in 900/1495. “I had started editing a mašyaḥa for him and I had named it Qaṭf at-tamr min marwiyyāt aš-ṣayḥ Nāṣir ad-Dīn b. Abī Ῥmā. Its organization was based on that of his šayḥ Burhān ad-Dīn al-Ḥalabī’s mašyaḥa al-Mawrid al-’Adb az-zammī fī marwiyyāt Abī l-Wafāʾ Sibṭ b. al-ʾAğamī, which was edited by Nağm ad-Dīn

49 Reynolds, et al., Interpreting the Self, 67.
50 Jan Witkam, Human Element, 127.
51 Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Fulk al-mašḥūn, 33.
Muḥammad (known as ʿUmar) b. Muḥammad b. Fahd, but he died before completing it. After his death, I requested from his son, the aforementioned at-Taqawī Abū Bakr, the rest of his audition certificates that I did not have. He refused, and I ask God that he makes this easier.52

The title Qatāf at-tamr does not appear in Ibn Ṭūlūn’s list of his publications. Where possible, Ibn Ṭūlūn traced the chain of transmission back to the biographee. For example, Ibn Zurayq profiled Zāhir b. Ṭāhir (d. 533/1138), the musnid of Khurasan, who had related many ḥadīths as the fifth or sixth narrator. These were collected as his Ḥamāsiyyāt and Sadāsiyyāt and taught to students. Ibn Zurayq noted that while at his own home in as-Ṣāliḥiyya on Sunday, 21 Ğumādā 1 837, he heard both works directly from Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimaṣqī (d. 842/1438).53 He then named the six men who formed the chain of transmission back to Zāhir. The organization of these notices are singular, as they are ordered by biographies of past authorities, but the inclusion of the asānīd relentlessly draws the focus back to Ibn Zurayq – the teleological terminus of the network.

A mašyāḥa, such as this one, represents a perfect homage, as it only focuses on the successes of a scholar. The works he could not get authorized to teach, the teachers who rejected him are not addressed. In the Mamluk period, mašyāḥāt “were compiled by the individuals in question themselves, or by their students, or by some other interested party. as-Saḥāwī, writing in the late 9th/15th century, estimated that more than a thousand were extant.”54 Ideally, a student or colleague would compile the mašyāḥa during a teacher’s lifetime and present it to the person as a gift, as in the case of Šihāb ad-Dīn Aḥmad b. Aybak ad-Dumyāṭi who presented the mamluk Ḥāʾīl Ṭālīq with a mašyāḥa and read it aloud to him.55 Jacqueline Sublet has examined a mašyāḥa written by Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʾAsqalānī before 827/1423-4 for two scholars, the Jerusalem-based ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʿUmar al-Qībābī (748-838/1348-1434) and Fāṭima bt. Ḥaḥīl b. al-Kinānī al-ʾAsqalānī (d. 833/1429). Although the two of them probably never met, Ibn Ḥaḡar wrote a single mašyāḥa for them because they had studied with many of the same teachers. He wrote it in homage to them during their lifetimes.56 Ibn Ḥaḡar outlined his method in a biographical notice for al-Qībābī:

Je découvris … un recueil de transmission (tabat) dans lequel était consignée une somme de ‘licence d’enseigner’ (iḡāza) et de ‘certificats d’audition’ (samāʾ); à partir de ce recueil, je rédigeai un dictionnaire de ses maîtres [=maîtres de Qībābī] dans lequel je mentionnai ses transmetteurs les plus anciens et ses chaînes de transmission concernant les Musnad et les Ġuz.57

Ibn Ṭūlūn’s method appears to have been strikingly similar. A portion – 216 folios – of volume two of Ibn Zurayq’s autograph Ṭabat is preserved as British Library MS OR 9792. The copy bears copious notes that Ibn Ṭūlūn placed in margins, between entries and on blank pages.58 Some of these notes made their way into the mašyāḥa. Above Ibn Zurayq’s notice
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52 an-Naǧdī, as-Suhab al-wābila, 2:896-7.
53 Princeton MS 178B, fol. 92v. Ibn Ṭūlūn incorrectly rendered the date as Sunday, 21 Ğumādā 1 837.
54 Berkey, Al-Subkī, 6.
55 Berkey, Higher Islamic Education, 102.
56 Sublet, Les maîtres.
57 Ibid., 19.
58 For Ibn Ṭūlūn’s notations, see Ibn Zurayq, Ṭabat Ibn Zurayq, fols. 4v, 122r, 180r-181v, 203v, 206v, 207r, 208r, 211r, 212r, 215v, 216r.
about a study session with Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimaṣqī on 11 Ẓu l-Qa’da 836/29 June 1433, Ibn Ṭūlūn wrote

I saw this in the handwriting of al-ḥāfīz Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn, in a draft of his book Tawḍīḥ al-muṣṭabīḥ. Under the letter nūn comes his descriptions of the last clients of King an-Nāṣir Muḥammad Qalāwun and others, such as the amir Yalbugā an-Nāṣirī, the rebel killed in Aleppo. ‘I was the first to write an-Nāṣirī as his lineage, then I returned to his book and found that an-Nāṣirī was for my grandfather an-Nāṣirī Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad. May he rest in peace. End.’

The wording of this note suggests that Ibn Ṭūlūn personally viewed Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimaṣqī’s autograph. However, one finds this phrase nearly verbatim in Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimaṣqī’s profile in Awān aš-šūrū’. (The only change is the substitution of Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimaṣqī’s name for the pronoun ’him’, as the referent is clear in the context of his biographical profile.) Most likely, Ibn Ṭūlūn’s marginalia are dictations from Ibn Zurayq that along with the ṭabat were used to craft the mašyaḥa.

Additional marginal comments from Ibn Ṭūlūn are incorporated into Awān aš-šūrū’. On folio 112r of Ṭabat Ibn Zurayq, Ibn Ṭūlūn completed a chain of transmission that Ibn Zurayq had left unfinished. Ibn Zurayq recorded hearing a section of the ḥadīth of ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥamamd b. Ishāq al-Fākīhī (d. ca. 279/892), then listed a chain of three authorities who had transmitted this text. Appended to the end of Ibn Zurayq’s notice is a further extended chain, written by Ibn Ṭūlūn. The combined text from Ibn Zurayq and Ibn Ṭūlūn are seamlessly incorporated into a biographical notice for al-Fākīhī. Many of the passages in Part II come verbatim from Ibn Zurayq’s autograph entries in his ṭabat and also from Ibn
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59 Ibn Ṭūlūn, Princeton MS 178B, fols. 108r-v.
Ibn Ṭūlūn’s notes there, and later used the entire manuscript to construct a separate work, which has survived as Part II.

Ibn Ṭūlūn's use of another notice suggests that much time may have passed between recording the notes and using them to compile his maṣyaḥa. Next to a mention of al-Qibābī in ṭabat Ibn Zurayq, Ibn Ṭūlūn wrote: “He received an iǧāza from ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Farḥūn b. Abī l-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Farḥūn al-Ya’marī l-Andalusī l-Madanī l-Mālikī Badr ad-Dīn, who was born in 693. He heard at-Ṭaqafīyyāt from Ibn Aḥmad at-Ṭabarī. He received an iǧāza from Abī Aḥmad ad-Dimyahī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Fuwwī. He died in Raǧāb 767. His brother Muḥammad died sometime before 755, and before both of them in 746 [a brother] named ‘Aḥī died.”

The first sentence pertains to al-Qibābī, and the rest of this gloss actually describes Ibn Farḥūn. However, the biographical entry for al-Qibābī in Awān aš-šurūṭ works to make all of this information fit al-Qibābī’s life. Ibn Ṭūlūn wrote: “He died on Thursday, 7 Rabī’ II, and it is also said in Raǧāb, 838 in Jerusalem. His brother Muḥammad died before him in 755, and his brother ‘Aḥī died in 746.” Ibn Ṭūlūn does not appear to notice in this account that one brother died nearly 100 years before another. This example makes explicit Ibn Ṭūlūn’s method of composition. Working from Ibn Zurayq’s autograph ṭabat and his own additions to that text, Ibn Ṭūlūn compiled the maṣyaḥa that has survived at Princeton University.

As further indication that Ibn Zurayq did not compile this work himself, errors abound in both sections of Princeton Garrett MS 178B, particularly in the reporting of names and dates.

- Az-zamzamī’s birth year rendered as 797, instead of 777. (fol. 2r)
- Abū l-Wafāʾ Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī’s birth year rendered as 853, instead of 753. (fol. 3r)
- Ḥadīḡa bt. Ibrāhīm b. Ishaq b. Sulṭān’s name was incorrectly written as Ḥadīḡa bt. Ishaq b. Sulṭān (fol. 25a)
- Muḥammad b. Yūṣuf b. Salmān b. Muḥammad aš-Šālijī an-Nayrabī’s great-grandfather’s name was rendered Fahd, instead of Muḥammad. (fol. 70v)
- An audition date is given as Thursday, 27 Dūr l-Qa’da 837, but the day should be the 24th. (fol. 83r)
- An audition date is given as 737, instead of 837. (fol. 92v)

To counterbalance the laxity with dates, Ibn Ṭūlūn meticulously detailed the curricula of Ibn Zurayq’s teachers, and in the case of the female teachers, this emphasis sheds light on the women's teaching competencies. Ibn Ṭūlūn’s detailed lists differ from other biographical works of the period. For instance, a comparison of as-Saḥāwī’s, al-Biqā’ī’s, and Ibn Zurayq’s biographies of Ša’bān b. Muḥammad al-Kinānī al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 859/1455) show interesting differences. As-Saḥāwī mentioned one woman teacher (Maryam al-Aḏrāʾ), and al-Biqāʿī mentioned none. Ibn Ṭūlūn named not only four of Ša’bān’s women teachers, but also the titles of the books that the women authorized him to teach.

1. Ḥadīḡa bt. Ishaq b. Sulṭān (d. 803/1400 or 1401) taught him Ṣahih Ibn Ḥibbān.
2. Fāṭima bt. Muḥammad b. al-Munḡā (d. 803/1400 or 1401) taught al-Kaṭīr from Kitāb al-ʿilm by Yūṣuf al-Qaḍī; al-Qanā’a, Qamm al-lā’ir (?), and al-ʿizla by Ibn Abī d-Dūnyā; Kitāb al-bukāʾ by al-Firyābī; al-ʿilm by al-Muruti(?)

Ibn Zurayq, Ṭabat Ibn Zurayq, fol. 208v.
al-Ḍurays(?); *Faḍā’il as-ṣaḥāba* by Ṭūrād; [Kitāb] al-aṭ‘ima by ad-Dārāmī; al-Ḥīdāb by Ibn Abī Ṭāsīm; and *Awā’il* by Ibn Abī Šayba.

3. Fāṭima bt. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Ḥādi (d. 803/1401) taught *al-Maǧālis al-ḥamsa as-Salmāniyyāt* and *ad-Du‘ā‘*, by al-Maḥāmalī; *al-Arbī‘īn* by at-Ṭā‘ī; a *guz* of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭāsīm; a *guz* of al-Ḡārī; *al-Ḥanafī*, *Rubā‘iyyāt as-Ṣaḥāba* and the ninth section of a *Fawā‘id* by Yūsuf b. Ḥalīl; and *al-‘Aql* by Dāwūd b. al-Muḡabbir.

4. 'Ā‘īs bt. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Ḥādi (d. 816/1413), the younger sister of the above Fāṭima, taught *al-Arbī‘īn* by at-Ṭā‘ī, a *guz* of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭāsīm, and *Maǧlis Abī Mūsā al-Madīnī.*

The curricular details about these women scholars of the late 8th/14th and early 9th/15th centuries confirm patterns that others have noted. In Damascus and as-Ṣālihiyya Ḥanbalī women taught at significantly high rates, and they were primarily teachers of ḥadīṯ and works on ascetic piety by Ibn Abī Duniyā. The titles of books they were authorized to teach and names of their teachers are useful in reconstructing academic networks in late Mamluk Syria.

**Reception of the Mašyaḥa**

This mašyaḥa does not appear to have been widely disseminated or taught. There are several possible reasons for this. First, Ibn Zurayq could have effectively discredited himself professionally, making the study of his scholarly biography an unpopular option for younger aspiring scholars. In spite of the marginal comments on the Princeton fragments, one cannot interpret these signs of interest in Ibn Zurayq’s life. For one, one of the readers believed that s/he was reading Ibn Ṭūlūn’s scholarly autobiography. A second possibility for the lack of interest in this text may have been suppression of Ibn Ṭūlūn’s works. The Damascene scholar ‘Abd al-Ǧanī an-Nābulusī (d. 1143/1731) alleged that many of his 11th/17th- and 12th/18th-century contemporaries were deliberately concealing the works of earlier Damascene writers, because they had lost respect for past scholars.

How many works of erudite men of knowledge, of men who grew up among them, have they disregarded and lost, neither respecting them nor taking note of their books and writings until they had all disappeared and perished? And surely there was among them the best man of knowledge and the pride of all ḥadīṯ scholars, Ibn Ṭūlūn al-Ḥanafī, yet they disregarded him and lost his books and works, of which hardly any are now left; and those that are left are still in his own handwriting, since no-one cared to have them copied.

**Conclusion**

Ibn Zurayq is the only teacher that Ibn Ṭūlūn biographized in his autobiography *Al-Fulk al-mašḥūn*, and in spite of the extraordinary length of the piece and the admiration and indebtedness Ibn Ṭūlūn expressed in it, its significance has largely escaped notice. For one, modern interest in Ibn Ṭūlūn has centered on his historical and biographical writings, though there is much evidence that Ibn Ṭūlūn’s reputation among early modern Ottoman Arabs was chiefly that of a learned ḥadīṯ scholar. Ibn Zurayq taught ḥadīṯ, not history, and he left scant
manuscript traces, which likely explains the lack of interest in his influence on Ibn Ṭūlūn. However, Ibn Ṭūlūn’s biographies of his teacher give insight into his personal networks and his motivations as an observer and documentarian of late Mamluk Damascus. Ibn Ṭūlūn and Ibn Muflīḥ inherited the reputations of their teachers and family members, so as maintainers of a certain legacy, it was in their personal interest to shape the legacy through narrative means.
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