LITERARY ACTIVITIES IN MAMLUK HALLS AND BARRACKS

B. FLEMMING

Anyone who studies the social context of Muslim literature produced and appreciated in Egypt and Syria under the Mamluks has to take into account not only "the streets and coffee-houses of Cairo"; but also the halls of the Four Chief Justices, the madrasas and sūfi fraternity houses (khānqāh) where other jurists and shaykhs lived, and the great households of the Mamluks. Here as well as in the Cadi's halls the sophistication of the entertainment depended on the degree of the owner's wealth, rank and education. If some day the Sultans' and the grand amirs' collections and activities can be viewed as a whole, it will be seen that their halls, and also those of other amirs of sufficient rank and income, were places where literature in the widest sense was appreciated.

The importance of the awlād an-nūs as a link between the Mamluk class and the native culture of Egypt has been justly emphasized. Chil-

2 Ibn Tughrī bird grew up in such a household: that of the Chief Hanafi Cadi, who was married to his sister. — On Cadi's halls see A. Schimmel, Kalif und Kadi im spätmittelalterlichen Ägypten, Die Welt des Islams 25 (1942), 111.
3 Here erotic poetry and satire were composed by Cadi on top of their official work; book-collecting was a favourite pastime. See A. Schimmel, "Kalif und Kadi," 66-67, 98-99. We hear of sumptuous banquets with musical performances organized by the Confidential Secretary, the Scribe of the bureau of Mamluks, and the Prefect of Markets (ibid., 76, 98 f., 108, where also poetry is mentioned which was inspired by a quarrel over 'Omar b. al-Fārābī's orthodoxy).
4 On the magnificence of these households see W. Popper, Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans 1382–1468 A.D. Systematic Notes to Ibn Tughrī bird's Chronicles of Egypt (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955), S. U. Haarmann, "Aljān ʿAbd and Čingišt ʿAbd bei den ägyptischen Mamluken," Der Islam 51 (1974), 3-7, cites a number of such households from the earlier Mamluk period.
of great Mamluk amirs were brought up in their fathers’ households, and learned their reading and writing from domestic kutub and from scholars called in from the outside; here the immigrants from Turkish countries to be mentioned below found employment. As regards connections with the local literature, the case of Ibn ad-Dawâdîrî, who numbered contemporary Arab writers among his friends, need not be an exception.

In investigating the biographical material it may be useful to draw a line between those reported qualities incumbent upon any exemplary ruler of Islam and those reported traits that are of a more personal nature. To the former may belong a respectful attitude towards descendants of the Prophet and scholars of Islam, and humility in the presence of Koran readers in deference to the Words of God; to the latter, the attitude shown toward music, play and jesting.

If it suited his taste, a great amir or a Sultan would maintain a number of performers (or attend samûl gatherings like Sultan Mu‘ayyad Shaykh). Whereas Sultan Jaqmaq disapproved so strongly of this that in his days “the fortunes of players and singers were low”; his son Muhammad was very fond of music “after the manner of the Siyâs”. We find this again in al-Ghawri, who delighted in music and jesting. His court musician and jester are known. While any conscientious ruler would continue his studies under scholars of repute, and invite learned men to his hall, the eminence of the visitors whom he could attract depended to some extent on his own education and special interests. Jaqmaq, for instance, was noted for his interest in, and good memory for, legal questions. But it is significant that it was Jaqmaq’s son, the talented, well-educated Nâşir-Addîn Muhammad, who attracted visitors of the greatest distinction to his father’s hall.

The latest records of formal gatherings in Mamluk times, where the names of visitors and the topics under discussion were taken down, seem to be the Nofi’s al-majlis as-Sulhânya by Hûsayn b. Mu‘ammad al-Hâlî and al-Kawkab ad-duarrî ft maddîl al-Ghawri (both in Arabic). Such “transactions”, which were actually written by insiders, are a very promising field for further study.

A cursory glance at the surviving books — dedication copies or manuscripts commissioned for personal use — shows the predominance of Arabic in the upbringing and later reading of the educated Mamluk. The proportion of books in Turkish, the vernacular of the ruling class, is not high, even if we allow for losses of manuscripts. Arabic was primarily used for public written business, for most branches of literature, and even for recording themes of Turkish and Mongolian tradition. While Turkish was the prevailing spoken language of “Mamlûke oficidâlom”, and was indispensable for office-seekers, especially in Syria, as a written language it was used secondarily; chiefly for the edification and amusement of the Mamluk class. As such it underwent a change. It is known that the earlier Turkish literary idiom, Kipchak-Khwarazmian Turkish, was gradually replaced by the Turkish of the Oghuz (called Turkmen in the glossaries composed for Arabs) as a result of the growing linguistic, literary, and intellectual influences from Turkish Anatolia.

In continuation of an earlier Mamluk practice, in Circassian Mamluk circles jurists and officials (kuttub) were often of Turkish origin. They came from places under Mamluk dominion like Âmid, or they immigrated from Iraq or Anatolia. Towards the end of the 15th century many Turks and Persians emigrated from Azerbaijan as a result of the rise of the Shî‘ite Safawids. As usual, jurists and kuttub, who had obtained their first education in their home countries, liked to go to foreign madrasas.

---

6 One of them was Ibn Dânîyûl (c. 1310), the ophthalmologist and writer of shadow-plays. U. Haarmann, “Altun Ilan,” 16. The names of three more Arab poets who probably were acquaintances of Ibn ad-Dawâdîrî are given in U. Haarmann, ed., Die Chronik des Ibn ad-Dawâdîrî. 8. Teil. Der Bericht über die frühen Mamluken (Freiburg, 1971), 20.


9 The rare printed edition by ‘Abdalwahhib ‘Azîm (Istanbul, 1941) is inaccessible to me. F.E. Karatay, Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi Arapça Yezymlar Tanımları (Istanbul, 1966), 207, No. 5385, describes a copy of this work (Ahmet III 12601), to which M. Awad has drawn attention as early as 1938: “Sultan al-Ghawri. His place in literature and learning (three books written under his patronage),” in Actes du XXe Congrès International des Orientalistes, Bruxelles, 1958 (Louvain, 1940), 321 ff.

10 Part I, equally in Istanbul, Ahmet III 1277, was also described by M. Awad, op. cit., 322. See also Karatay, Arapça Yezymlar, 169, No. 5184.

11 After the pioneer study by M.F. Köprülü, followed by F. Stümper, U. Haarmann was the first scholar to discuss an illuminating way the first-rate material on Turkish, Kurdish, and Mongolian folklore and etymology which is contained in the annals of Ibn ad-Dawâdîrî, see his “Altun Ilan,” 9–31.

12 W. Popper, op. cit. (above, p. 4), 5.

13 Ibn Taghrîbîrî, as-Nâjîm az-Zâhîra (ed. W. Popper) von, 361.

for their advanced studies, and, combining this with the Pilgrimage often came to Syria and Egypt. Several remained there, at least temporarily, and found appointments under the amirs as well as the Sultans, whereas the religious often settled in khanqahs. The Mamluk chronicles tell us how, if these newcomers stayed in the service of the Sultan, they were supported and rewarded from the various revenues at the disposal of their employers and friends. We know how the well-known Badradzin al-Ayni, one of these newcomers, gained Sultan Barsbay’s favour by lecturing on history and related subjects and occasionally translating works into Turkish for him.15 Ya’qub Shah of Arzanjan, who studied in Tabriz and became Chief of the Chancellery of the Qaraqouyunlu ruler, later moved to Egypt, where the Grand Dawdar Yashbek min Mahdi found for him the posts of “host” (mihmuddar) and director of the foreign department of the Egyptian Chancellery.16 I assume he is the compiler of an Arabic book on the history of the Dhiqqadur Turkmen and other Turkish states.17 A Turk from Shiraz, Husayn b. Pir Haji Abi Bakr, who was educated in Herat where he held office as treasurer of the Timurid ruler, gained favour with the Grand Dawdar by means of his musical accomplishments, and was appointed to Yashbek’s Dome.18 Finally, there is the Sharif Husayn b. Hasan who was commissioned to compose the Turkish Shihindima version and was rewarded by being appointed, over the heads of the Dayrul family,19 as Shaykh of the Sufis of the Mu’ayyad Mosque.

In Mamluk circles of Egypt and Syria the dervishes found an appreciative audience. Mufti b. Umar ad-Darir, the blind Mawlawi author from Arzan ar-Rum in Anatolia, illustrates this. He came to Cairo at the beginning of the Circassian period, and, irrespective of his self-confessed deficiency in learning, was obviously accepted because of his proficiency as a religious writer. He stayed in Egypt to complete his Turkish Biography of the Prophet Muhammad for the Sultan (Barquq), which is appreciated in Turkey to this day, and survives in numerous manuscripts. He composed other Turkish works in Egypt and Syria.20

16 Dawa’ (above, n. 8) x, 280, No. 1104.
17 Karastay, Arapca Yazarlar III, 475, No. 616 = Ahmet III 3057.
18 Dawa’ III, 139.
19 My “Schrif,” 87.
20 See A. Bombaci, La Letteratura turca (Florence, 1969), 211 f.
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If we do use the term “court literature”21 for Turkish poetry and prose composed in the Mamluk halls, we should rather use it in its literal sense than with the connotation of refinement and esoterism. Typical examples of Turkish (and Arabic) religious poetry surviving from Mamluk libraries, for example the Kitab al-Dar’ (Revan 1727, mentioned below), copied for Sultan Qaytbay, and this Sultan’s own poems,22 are obviously influenced by oral dervish literature, and are themselves meant to be read aloud. It is true that Sultan Ghawri was personally interested in Ottoman court poetry, which he had copied for himself and to which he contributed some naqras, and has written sophisticated Arabic and “mixed” poetry; nevertheless he enjoyed poetry in the dervish style such as it was cultivated by Sheriff.23

According to general usage, copies were made not only by professional scribes and calligraphers, but also by occasional copyists, who may have been connected with the Sultans’ and the grand amirs’ assemblies. Book collecting was an expensive pursuit and could become a passion; we hear that Jaqmaq, in his days as Sultan and even before, would acquire precious books and pay for them prices which exceeded the reasonable price.24 Yashbek the Grand Dawdar was known to be a passionate book collector.25

From descriptions of surviving manuscripts a few names emerge of persons who transcribed manuscripts for Sultan Qaytbay:

Muhammad b. Hasan al-Tayyibi al-Ashari, who in Dhul Hijja 877/ May 1473 copied the two-volume Hadith work entitled Mashari’ al-ahanid al-ma’ajarin al-ushul.26

Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Hasani al-Farnawi al-mukattith, who transcribed an Arabic work on medicine, Gunyat al-labib ‘inda ghybat at-탈ib, in September 1483.27

Isma’il b. Qasim al-Hanafi, who in April 1484 finished a beautifully

21 U. Haarmann distinguishes between esoteric court literature in Turkish (“Altun İhâ,” 4) and popular Turkish concepts in history writing, which gained admittance to Arabic literature through the Arabic language (ibid., 36).
23 My “Schrif,” 86.
25 See my “Schrif,” 89.
27 Karastay, Arapca Yazarlar III, 840, No. 7233 = Ahmet III 2048.
executed calligraphic copy of an Arabic Biography of the Prophet Muhammad;28 Muhammad b. Muhammad b. 'Ali, known as ḥasan, the copyist of at least two juz' of the History of the Prophets by al-Kisā'i;29 'Ali b. Aḥmad b. Amīr 'Ali, who copied a mejmīl'a in Turkish, with which language he was apparently not quite familiar, in 1489/90;30 Aḥmad b. 'Ali al-Fayyūmī, the teacher of the Mamluk Saṃṣṭabāy, copied two works in Arabic, one collection of Forty Hadīths,31 and the Tafṣīl al-Jalīlīn.32

Among Sultan Ghaŵrī’s scribes we find:
Abī l-Faḍl Muhammad al-ʿArājī, the copyist of two works in Arabic, one on medicine by Qaysīnīzāde,33 dated 1506, the other a discussion of theological-ethical questions by al-Aṣfarī;34 Muhammad b. Aḥmad al-Maḏafi, who transcribed the work of a contemporary, Nuḥāt al-ahṣār fī manāqib al-ʾināna al-arbaʿa al-akhyār, by Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad b. at-Talūnī (1428/9 — after 1503).35

I hesitate to give three other names of Ghaŵrī’s scribes:
Aḥmad b. Ḥusayn at-Talūnī al-Miʿmārī, who is possibly to be identified with Sultan Ghaŵrī’s Controller of Public Works, repeatedly mentioned by Ibn Iyās; Ḥanūza ash-Shārīfī, who is supposed to have copied some Sūras in Istanbul in 1503/4;36

28 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım III, 427, No. 6032 = Ahmet in 2829.
31 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 288, No. 3122 = Ahmet in 360.
32 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 533, No. 2058 = Koğunlar 605.
33 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 864, No. 7380 = Ahmet in 1525.
34 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım III, 197, No. 5256 = Ahmet in 1621. It seems that the same person transcribed vols. III and IV of the Juz' al-Jalīlīn by al-Bukhārī; see Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 29, No. 2264 and 30, No. 2265, where the name Abī l-Faḍl Muhammad b. Abū al-Walīlīh as-Sunbūtī al-ʿArājī is given.
35 İstanbul, Silêymanîye, Fatih 4517; cf. GAL S n 39.
36 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım III, 14, No. 4718 = Ahmet in 1452.
37 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 75, No. 265 = Revan, 18.
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'Abdal-qadīr b. Ibrahim ad-Dimashqī, for whose transcript a date long before Ghaŵrī’s accession is given.38

It is not easy to verify these occasional copyists in contemporary sources. For this there is a better chance in cases where the authors themselves gave their works to a patron. Among such works which were committed to writing by the authors themselves or at least commissioned by them we may mention that of another protégé of the Grand Amir Yashbek and of Sultan Qaytbay, the Cadi of the Army Shamsaddin Muhammad b. Muhīm b. Khalīl Ibn Aįā (1414–1476/7). In addition to a number of works in Arabic, Ibn Aįā did also compose a Turkish version of the Fatḥah as-Sālim by al-Wāqudī. Until F. E. Karatay identified and briefly described part II of this “Conquest of Syria”,39 as-Sahkhwī had been the only source for the existence of such a book of “twelve thousand Turkish verses”.40 This Juz' II of the Turkish version is a beautifully executed copy, made for Sultan Qaytbay’s library, who in Dhu l-ḥijja 985/986. 16th October 1490 dedicated it to the library of the Dome which he had built on the outskirts of Cairo, near Pilgrims Lake (Bīrkat al-Ḥajj) and Siryaqaics.41

Among the autographs produced for Ghaŵrī there is an Arabic History of the Caliphs by ʿOmar b. Muhammad b. Aḥmad al-Hanafi.42 The Sharīf Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan, who translated the Šahānīna into Turkish verse, working first in the Dome of the Amir Yashbek, and later in the Mosque of Sultan Mu’aiyad, produced a fine autograph presentation copy for Sultan Ghaŵrī,43 which was further decorated by miniatures.44

Before I end this paper, which is dedicated to the memory of Gaston Wiet, the great Mamluk scholar, I wish to call attention to

38 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım III, 717, No. 6948 = Ahmet in 1396.
39 Karatay, Türkçeye Yazarlar I, 164, No. 489 = Koğunlar 883.
40 ʿAṣṣāwī I, 43; GAL II, 42; A. Schimmel, “Kalif und Kadi,” 40 f.
41 I should like to mention that the directors and staff of the Topkapı Sarayı Müzei Kültüphaneleri for their kindness, and Dr. Petra Kappert for bringing me a photograph of the title page of the last page of this ms, from which the above is taken.
42 Karatay, Arşeya Yazarlarım II, 436, No. 6058 = Ahmet in 2823.
43 Karatay, Türkçeye Yazarlar II, 50, No. 2155 = Hasına 1519. A. Załęczewski published parts of this work from this manuscript in his Turecka weręca Şah-nıme z Egiptu Mamełückiego (Warszaw, 1965), and in Rocznik Orientalistyczny; see Der Islam 45 (1959), 175–177.
a source of text reproduction apparently peculiar to the Mamluk institution.

Among the manuscripts of Mamluk origin we find a number of outwardly very similar volumes with ex libris in white ink on gold and blue and also with illuminated headpieces, usually written in large round characters. Some of them have the appearance of being copied by inexperienced hands, but others are in neat consistent Naskh. They are all signed by Mamluks with their typical Turkish names, often with the name of their former owner and that of the Sultan to whom they owed service, and in several cases with that of the barraks where they were brought up.

Transcripts were made by members of the following barraks:
al-’Arba‘ in:

members were Rühi al-Mamlık, named Qaraja, who wrote (and copied?) his Turkish dīwān of mostly religious poetry (London, British Museum, Or. 4128); and al-Mamlık Barsbay min Țumăn Bay, who copied an Arabic Qiyṣa Ǧisā’ (Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı, Bağdat Köşkü 41).47 al-Ĥawsh:48 al-Mamlık Sibtaysh ash-Sharifî, who describes himself as a pupil of the Shaykh Shihîbaddîn Ahmad al-Fayyûmî, copied a Mukhtasîr Șutât an-Nabî in Arabic, dated 1495 (Topkapı Sarayı Ahmet ii 2796);49 Tenibek min Tashbîk copied a book of prayers in Arabic and Oghzûr Turkish (Topkapı Sarayı, Revan Köşkü 1717).50 Whereas these manuscripts were clearly copied for Sultan Qaytbay, a certain Shâd Bek min Ǧezîm, a member of the same tribe tabaqâ (al-Ĥawsh), copied a collection of religious poems entitled al-Qusâ id ar-rabîbîyya in Arabic.

45 According to D. Aydon, L’Esculape du Memelk (Jerusalem, 1951), this tabaqâ is mentioned most rarely in the sources.
46 See G.M. Meredith-Owens, in Oriens 18-19 (1967), 497. By the kindness of the British Museum and of Prof. Meredith-Owens, I obtained a microfilm of this manuscript.
47 Karatay, Arapça Yazarlar 3, 410, No. 5984. The colophon reads kazahahu al-Mamlık Barsbay min Țumăn Bay min tabaqâ al-’Arba‘ in al-Mâlîkî al-Askîrî (fol. 20a). While in Istanbul in 1968, I took notes of some of these colophons, on which systematic research should be done.
48 This tabaqat is mentioned frequently according to Aydon, Esculape, 12.

On the Turkish poem see J. Eckmann, “Mamluk-kiptsachische Literatur,” p. 299, with earlier literature. Described as an Arabic manuscript in Karatay, Arapça Yazarlar 3, 262, No. 5559.

50 Literary Activities in Constantinople and the Mamluk Halls and Barracks and Turkish for Sultan Qaytbay al-Ghawi, who is the author of some of these poems (Topkapı Sarayı, Bağdat Köşkü 138).51 az-Zimâniyya:52 an anonymous Ktish al-mi‘rîj was transcribed for Sultan Ghawi’s library by the Mamluk Qaçabîrî mîn Ǧâybeh (Topkapı Sarayı, Koçgûlar 989).53 al-Askîrîyya:54 the Mamluk Jâmîr[d] min Ǧezîmîr, al-Mâlîkî al-Askîrî, on the 10th Dhî l-Qa‘da 915/19th February 1510 finished his transcript of an anonymous Arabic book entitled al-Târîq al-maslîk fi sīwâs al-mulîkî (Topkapı Sarayı, Ahmet ii 1608);55 and the Mamluk Bektîmîr ar-Ramâjîlî, also al-Mâlîkî al-Askîrî, transcribed the Kitâb Nûr al-aynîn ta‘lîfî sîyâr al-Âmîn wa l-Mâlîkî (Topkapı Sarayı, Ahmet ii 2032).56 A member of the tabaqat al-Ashrafiyya al-kubrâ, apparently the same barraks, was the Mamluk Esenbay min Sudun, who transcribed the Muqaddimat as-zalâmît by Âbil L-Layth as-Samarqandî with the Turkish interlinear translation by an unknown (Istanbul, Sülêmanîye, Aya Sofya 1451).57 al-Mustajadda:58 the Mamluk Berdîk min ‘Yusuf al-Mâlîkî al-Askîrî transcribed an “anonymous” Ǧidîth al-mulîkî in Arabic (Topkapı Sarayı, Bağdat Köşkü 91).59 as-Sunjîyatâ:60 the Mamluk Temîr, al-Mâlîkî al-Askîrî, transcribed an “anonymous” Nuzhat al-anâm wa miṣbâh as-zalâmî, a collection of prayers in Arabic (Topkapı Sarayı, Bağdat Köşkü 88).61

In addition to this group of transcripts in which barraks membership is indicated, there is a greater series of manuscripts, copied also by Mamluks but without indication of their barraks, with the reservation that it...
may have been omitted in manuscript descriptions. I cite only two examples:


The Mamluk by the Muslim name of Mansūr b. Yusuf al-Maliki al-Ashrafi who transcribed Mi‘a kalima ... min kalim ... “Ali b. Abī Tālib, in Arabic with Turkish paraphrase (Topkapi Sarayi, Başdat Kışkş 122).63

With the exception of Revan 1727 and Ahmet 1590, all volumes enumerated above have less than 100 folios; Or. 4128, Ahmet 2796 and Revan 1582 consist of more than fifty folios, but the remainder contain only between 47 and 18 folios. In this group the small number of lines to the page (between seven and three) and the size of the script betray a tendency to fill up as much space as possible with the least quantity of writing. Whereas the scripts of the more bulky volumes tend to a calligraphic standard, in the other manuscripts we see more inexperienced hands, some neat, some cramped and rude. Section headings are often in red, blue, or white ink on gold. Most of these manuscripts have the characteristic circular, indented Mamluk medaillon of the period.64

The fact that each of these transcripts was made by a different Mamluk, the unequal quality of the scripts as well as the rich decoration, all seem to suggest that most of these manuscripts belonged to a larger number of texts which might be called special school-exercises of the Mamluks.65

62 Karatay, Arpaça Yezmaları, 428, No. 6035.
63 Karatay, Arpaça Yezmaları, 708, No. 6922. Published from this manuscript by A. Zajeczukowski, Sto sentencij i apostrofatach arabskich Kalifa “All‘ēgo w paraphrasisi Mamlucksco-Tureckoj” (Warsaw, 1968), with a complete facsimile (fols. 1a–18a).
64 Typical examples in print: Sultan Ghawrī’s ex libris in Rocznik Orientalistyczny 23/1 (1959), p. 75; see also the editions quoted in no. 57 (Maqaddim) and 43 (Shafih).
65 Comparable to the exercises written by the Jeanes de Langues in eighteenth century Peru, analyzed by V. L. Menaigo, “Another text of Urni’s Ottoman chronicle,” in Der Islam 47 (1971), 276–277.
66 F.E. Karatay’s catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the Topkapi Sarayi Muzesi, an inexhaustible mine of information on the libraries of the later Mamluk Sultanate, is tantalizingly reticent on the subject of colophons. I quote the numbers in his Arpaça Yezmaları t-v (1962–1969) of a few more manuscripts transcribed by what I take to be Mamluk graduates, all for Sultan Ghawrī’s library: 251, 3141, 4773, 5403, 5577, 5610, 5664, 5675, 6926, and 8539 (with an improbable date). With the exception of
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in which emphasis was laid on standards of calligraphy. We have seen how one successful student (Sanṭabāy) paid his respects to his teacher (Fayyūmī), from whom survive two manuscripts transcribed for Sultan Qaybāy (see above).

It is known that in the first stage of the student Mamluk’s education teaching concentrated on religion in its theological and practical aspects (Coran, Sharī’a, prayers); the principal subject was the reading and writing of Arabic, in which, after the earliest stages, most all instruction must have been carried on. Besides the eunuchs, in whose care were the kuttābīs, doctors of law and other scholars taught in the barracks.66 Qarīja, with the pen name Rūhī, the author (and scribe!) of Or. 4128 mentioned above, may have been among these teachers. Since teaching at the small (military) stage was done by soldiers, Turkish must have been used for oral instruction. In addition to the bulk of military textbooks and books on the veterinary art in Arabic,67 a number of such books were written in Turkish. Surviving manuals in Turkish on these and other matters, such as legal handbooks, have been described by J. Eckmann.68

The subject matter of the manuscripts inspected above and in no. 65 falls under the headings of Coran, religious prose, religious poetry in Arabic and Turkish, prayers, ethics, Biography of the Prophet Muhammad, and History of the Prophets.

If our assumption is correct that, at least in Qaybāy’s and Ghawrī’s times, Mamluk graduates were required to write exercises which then became part of the Sultan’s library, we still cannot say whether these were written at the end of the first stage of education, or whether they formed part of the coming-out formalities before manumission. If they were part
of an examination, the question is also whether all student Mamluks or only the elite, the Royal Mamluks, were required to take it.

The fact that a considerable number of these manuscripts are described as "anonymous" works or "abridged versions" raises the question whether some of the student Mamluks were set tasks going beyond mere copying, such as producing shortened versions like the Mükhtasar Sırat an-Nabi written for Sultan Iqamaq (Revan 1582, mentioned above), or translating into Turkish. The short interlinear Turkish translation contained in the ms Buğdat Köşkü 123, which consists of sayings spoken by the Imam 'Ali, seems to have just the right size for an examination paper in cases where competence in written Turkish was required.

If we accept the evidence that there existed a practice with a two-fold purpose, to train Mamluks and to supplement the sultans' libraries, we can hardly expect to find the names of these young scribes, who were just beginning their careers, in the biographical sources of the period. Incidentally, there is at least one manuscript in which an amir who has higher rank and a library of his own, has his barracks (az-Zimān) indicated in his ex libris.

The preceding remarks are necessarily incomplete. At a time when the cultural achievement of Mamluk Egypt and Syria, an "Islamic Byzantium," is being re-examined, the valuable material contained in books surviving from Mamluk libraries merits the attention of scholars.

---

69 Karatay, Arapça Yazarlar III, 707, No. 6919; not mentioned by Eickmann "Mamluk-kittehakische Literatur."

70 Compare Menage, Urun, 276.

71 On fol. 316b I read wa kanha bi-rum al-janah al-All Qayyid h. 'Abdallah min Tagibāši al-Hāzim min tabaqa az-Zimān; the date is the 15th Sha'ban 879/25th December 1474. Karatay, Arapça Yazarlar III, 407, No. 5972 = in Ahmet 2861.


Postscript note: I am most grateful to Professor P. M. Holt, London, for giving me a photocopy of 'Abdulwahhab 'Azrām, Majālis as-Sālih al-Ghawari. Sefākht min ta'rīf Miṣr fi l-qarn al-失望 al-qibla (Cairo, 1941), which contains a partial edition of the Naqāṣis (n. 9) and part 1 Kawkab (n. 10). Findings from these works and notes taken recently at the Topkapı Sarayi will be presented in a study in preparation.

---

TWO FURTHER INSCRIPTIONS FROM QAL'AT AL-JUNDI

S. H. TAMARI

Ever since J. Barthoux rediscovered Qal'at al-Jundi (Rūs Sadr) in 1909, and H. Sadèk sought to draw the attention of the archaeologists to it, in 1920, this fort in Sinai has rested in the oblivion of its ruins and desolation. The fort has not been comprehensively and systematically studied, despite its unique importance — in its specific association with the Moslem Crusader conflict, late in the 12th century (when Saladin had recourse to it for his construction and repair program, following the hostile action of Renaud de Chartillon against the sacred cities of Islam); and, further, in connection with the architecture of Islamic fortifications in general. Barthoux's work (as well as Sadèk's) therefore left several essential questions unansweried, including the date of its original construction and the identity of its builder; moreover, it seems that Barthoux's description of the plan is not entirely precise. The task was

1 The discovery of Qal'at al-Jundi should be credited to Na'um Shufqi (already in 1905; Tahrir Sinā) [Cairo, 1916], 533 and not to Barthoux; for the importance of Shufqi's pioneering work in the study of Sinai, see Sh. Tamari, "L'iscrizioni di 'Aqṣabat al-'Uqubah nel Sinai e Na'um Shufqi," Annali dell'Instituto Orientale di Napoli 35 (N.S. 25) (1915), 274-276. Though Barthoux prepared his material for publication in 1912/13, it was published only in 1922; see J. Barthoux, "Description d'une forteresse de Saladin decouverte au Sinai," Syria 3 (1922), 44-57.


4 The elevated area between the "small" mosque (I) and the "Governor's House" (G) is defined by Barthoux (op. cit., 30) as a "place publique intended, in all probability, for the private or community worship of the garrison people," since "a small qibla had been built into the outer wall . . ." where its elevated top, served
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PREFACE

Gaston Wiet, one of the three scholars elected Honorary Members of the Institute of Asian and African Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, was in his own way even closer to this centre of Islamic studies than this honour bestowed on him would indicate. His associations with numerous Jerusalem scholars, his continuous help, advice and encouragement — to both established scholars and the up-and-coming generation — revealed his deep concern for their problems and fields of interest; it was not for him to remain an outsider, but to become a true colleague.

The deep attachment and indebtedness to Wiet felt by many scholars here underlies the enthusiastic response towards participation in this memorial volume, dedicated to Wiet the Man and the Scholar. It was further felt that this homage should also express the acknowledgement and friendship of his friends and admirers abroad, as well as reflect the wide range of fields of research and interests which the long list of Wiet’s writings illustrates. We regret that, in the meantime, several of those who expressed their readiness to contribute to this publication have died; Père J. de Ménasche, Professor M. Plessner and Professor M. Avi-Yonah had all submitted titles but were unable to complete their manuscripts; and the death of Professor Otto Kurz adds to our burden of sorrow, though, fortunately, his article was received and is printed here.

The very character of Wiet and his scholarly career dictates the nature of any publication dedicated to his memory. Even so, contributors could readily tie their subject — be it history, literature, art or archaeology — to one facet or another of Wiet’s broad interests. The chronological range, too, of the various subjects submitted is considerable, making it most appropriate to arrange the articles according to chronological order. Thus, the volume encompasses studies concerning the pre-Islamic Sassanian empire, and proceeds through practically every significant chapter of Islamic history, down to and including modern times.

The devotion of Mr. Nathan Efrati, secretary of the Institute of Asian and African Studies at the Hebrew University, toward realizing the publication of this volume is fully appreciated. Most precious help was
provided by Mr. R. Grafman, who was involved in all the manifold
tactivities of preparing the manuscripts, translating Miss Milstein’s
article, laying out the plates and bringing the entire volume through the
press.

Finally thanks should be expressed to Professor M. Maoz, former
Head of the Institute of Asian and African Studies at the Hebrew Uni-
versity, who initially encouraged this enterprise; and to the present
Head of the Institute, Dr. Y. Friedmann, who has been equally encour-
aging in its subsequent stages.

M. R.-A
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IN MEMORIAM

The death of Gaston Wiet may well spell the end of a period, the disappearance of a particular type of scholar — besides being a great loss to Islamic studies and to all who knew him. His activities were varied, all of them bearing the unmistakable stamp of a scholar. He was of that particular class of Islamist whose mastery was in no way limited to one field — one of the last of a generation who did not “specialize” but who studied Islam as a whole, and whenever he worked on a specific subject it was not because of specialization but because it was one of the phenomena of Islamic culture.

Gaston Louis Marie Joseph Wiet was born in Paris on December 18, 1887. His formal academic training was practically completed by the age of 21. Already in October 1908 he graduated in Law (Licence en Droit) and simultaneously obtained diplomas at the École Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes, both in Classical Arabic and in Colloquial Arabic, as well as in Persian and Turkish. He was then offered a scholarship as “Pensionnaire” at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, from 1909 to 1911. In the latter year he was invited to start a teaching position in Arabic and Turkish at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Lyon, where he remained until 1926, except for the period of the First World War, in which he served, winning the Croix de Guerre with bronze star. Toward the end of the war, his orientalist background brought him to serve as an interpreter in the Georges Picot negotiations.

In 1926 a major change occurred in the life of Gaston Wiet, for he was asked by King Fuad I of Egypt to take over directorship of the Museum of Arab Art in Cairo, which important position he retained until 1951, combining his activities at the Museum in Cairo with his academic teaching in Paris. For in the meanwhile he had successively been appointed Professor of Geography and History of the Near East at the École des Langues Orientales in Paris (1931) and Professor of Islamic Art at the École du Louvre (1936). From 1938 on, however, he remained mainly in Egypt. During the Second World War, he was a militant