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Abstract This article aims at analysing notes left by the renowned Mamlūk historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442) in dozens of manuscripts representing sixteen works. Two categories of notes are considered: consultation notes and marginalia. Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes, dated or datable over a period spanning some fifty years, allow us to demonstrate which texts he accessed, when he consulted them, what his reading practices were and from whom he borrowed the books. Thanks to his marginalia, which consist of corrections, additions, and emotional notes, it is also possible to shed light on al-Maqrīzī’s assessment of the work of some authors.
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1 Introduction

Studies devoted to the history of reading have flourished during the last three decades, shedding light on readers and reading practices over various periods since Antiquity. In the Islamic context, with the exception of Gregor Schoeler’s book that addressed, en passant, This paper was written in the frame of Ex-libris ex Oriente (ELEO), a project dedicated to paratextual marks related to the history of the book in Islam and funded by the F.R.S-FNRS.
some issues linked to the transmission of books in the first centuries, we only have Hirschler’s study to establish an overview of some of the questions related to reading in the medieval period. Though this work greatly improved our knowledge of collective reading practices, whole topics remain understudied, especially with regard to individual reading practices. One of the reasons for this lacuna lies in the nature of the material: these practices are seldom described in books, rather we must focus on the materiality of reading. This materiality includes ownership marks stating that a book was in the library of a scholar, consultation notes attesting that a given scholar read and took notes from a book, and marginal annotations and other means by which readers altered the text (corrections, cancellations, underlines etc.). All these elements, which Gérard Genette (in the 1980s) broadly defined as ‘paratexts’, provide invaluable information on the reader’s interaction with the book. These elements imply that thousands of manuscripts are read and a scholar’s hand is known: a note signed by a scholar does not necessarily attest that this is really his handwriting and must be confirmed through a palaeographical analysis and a comparison with other samples of his handwriting. Once these impediments are overcome, paratextual marks related to reading provide their fair share of data by which we can study the reading techniques of a given scholar, and thus better approach readers that are made of flesh and bones, as stressed by Houari Touati. While scholars interested in reading practices in Europe, more particularly for Renaissance and Modern English books, have paid a lot of attention to marginalia, Islamic manuscripts and printed books have barely been studied from this point of view. Their collection and analysis will enable a new chapter of the history of reading in Islam to be written, but not exclusively. In fact, reading is often linked to writing: authors are also readers who need sources on which to build their own works. Thus, the traces they left in books offer insight into their interest in a text and marginalia help us better understand their assessment of the text. Moreover, the notes they took while reading that they used to create their own works provide us with invaluable infor-

1 For Ancient Greece and Rome, see more recently Johnson, Parker 2009; for the Middle Ages and Renaissance, Moulton 2004; for the modern period, see more particularly Chartier 1995 as well as Robert Darnton’s works.
2 Schoeler 2006.
3 Hirschler 2012.
4 For a first attempt regarding the Ottoman period, see Hitzel 1999.
5 Touati 2007, 12.
6 See Jackson 2001; Sherman 2008. For a recent similar approach regarding manuscripts from early medieval Europe, see Teeuwen, van Renswoude 2017.
7 For an early study that lacks any analytical perspective, see Fu’ād Sayyid 1999.
mation on the history and the process of writing. Consequently, the study of all the elements that led to the writing of a text (the avant-texte), a field that is deeply embedded in genetic criticism that aims to locate the creative act in its spatial and temporal contexts, is crucial to analyse a scholar’s reading and writing practices.

2 Al-Maqrizī as a Reader

To address some of the above-mentioned issues, I consider the case of the Egyptian scholar Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī (766-845/1364-1442). One may indeed argue that al-Maqrīzī’s relevance for such a study is not in doubt given his fame, a fame he owed and still owes to his output as a historian. A prolific scholar who authored dozens of volumes covering many aspects of the history of Egypt and its most significant actors from the Islamic conquest to his own time, he represents a case in point: there are many witnesses to his activity that have reached us in his own handwriting (notebooks, summaries, drafts, and fair copies). In total, these works with his handwriting cover more than 5,000 leaves. To produce his works, al-Maqrīzī, who often defined himself as a compiler (ǧāmiʿ), relied on hundreds of books that he found in various libraries, private and public, including his own. Thanks to his methodical practice of leaving his mark in each book he consulted, we know precisely which manuscripts he consulted, provided they have been preserved. The perusal of tens of thousands of manuscripts over the last twenty years has allowed me to collect thirty-nine consultation notes in volumes representing sixteen works (see table 1 and appendix). This number may seem negligible when compared to the quantity of manuscripts that I examined but for a scholar like al-Maqrīzī, who may have consulted several hundreds of volumes, the number of consultation notes identified already corresponds to a good percentage. We must also take into account several losses. Manuscripts that were extant in the ninth/fifteenth century are not necessarily still accessible, as some collections were lost for a wide variety of reasons. In some cases, multi-volume works were dismembered, a phenomenon that further complicates the process of locating the various volumes. Moreover, while I perused tens of thousands of manuscripts, these represent a tiny percentage of the manuscripts held in various libraries around the world. The digitalisation of manuscripts and their accessibility online, a phenomenon that is quickly expanding in Europe and North America, has greatly facilitated research focusing on the history of the book in Islam. Nevertheless, this process has not yet been fully

8 For the modern period, see D’Iorio, Ferrer 2001.
implemented in countries known for their rich collections, like Turkey, Egypt, and Syria. Though libraries in Istanbul offer researchers the possibility of examining digitised versions of their manuscripts, as yet access to these collections is only possible in person. Last but not least, manuscripts that have reached us may have gone through various processes, including obliteration and alteration. Ownership statements and consultation notes may constitute proofs in cases in which a manuscript has been stolen and/or acquired in obscure circumstances. Quite often, leaves where such marks and notes were left (usually the title page and the last leaf, or sometimes leaves that preceded and/or followed them) were altered, damaged, or even removed. In such cases, precious information related to the history of the book is lost. The preceding remarks serve to underline the fact that we may yet discover more notes jotted down by al-Maqrīzī in the manuscripts he consulted, but we are not likely to find significant numbers of them.

3 Methodological Issues

Of course, the identification of a note in al-Maqrīzī's handwriting may seem like searching for a needle in a haystack. It often results from a stroke of serendipity, though the most advantageous method consists of narrowing the scope by consulting copies of sources that he used to compose his works. Historical works must definitely be prioritised given his output in this field, but he was also active in other fields, like ḥadīth, theology, and law, for instance. Thus, we cannot reduce the scope as much as we would hope. Whenever al-Maqrīzī quotes a source and manuscripts of this source are still available, the research can be limited to copies that predate al-Maqrīzī's death. Unfortunately, al-Maqrīzī was not known for revealing his sources. Serendipity may thus still play a major role in spotting other marks left by al-Maqrīzī.

Besides the laboriousness involved in searching for traces of a particular scholar in manuscripts, identifying his handwriting with a certain level of confidence remains problematic. Even in the case of marks displaying the name of the person who penned them, we must always consider the possibility that these are forgeries. As in every domain in which economic interests may play a role, manuscripts could fetch higher prices when they were said to be in the author's handwriting, i.e. holographs, or to have been owned by some renowned scholar. In some cases, the production of the forgery may result from a less materialistic impetus: an owner may have reproduced a consultation note by another author, and written it in his own manuscript, or he might have copied an ownership statement found on another copy to document this historical witness. Generally speaking,
forgeries – whatever the underlying reason for their production – can be detected with the help of palaeography. Regrettably, palaeographical studies of scholars’ handwritings in the world of manuscripts in Arabic script are almost nonexistent.\(^9\) Given this, the identification of a scholar’s handwriting relies on one’s experience and knowledge of the handwriting. The more examples of a scholar’s handwriting are available, the greater our level of confidence. Even in the medieval and early modern period, scholars and booksellers were able to recognise a famous scholar’s hand and would indicate their identification.\(^10\) But such identifications of someone’s handwriting may also be misleading for a number of reasons. When a later owner of ms Reisülküttab 862 [fig. 1] spotted an ownership statement signed Ahmad ibn ‘Ali and dated 811/1408-09,\(^11\) he outlined it to emphasise its significance and wrote beneath it a note indicating the alleged identity of the author of the statement: “This is al-Maqrīzī’s handwriting”\(^12\). While both names and the date fit with al-Maqrīzī’s given names and the period he was active as a scholar, the handwriting differs completely from al-Maqrīzī’s hand as witnessed by thousands of leaves and the thirty-nine consultation notes listed in the appendix and by the detailed palaeographical study I recently carried out.\(^13\) The owner who highlighted the ownership statement was obviously misled in his attempt to recognise the author of this statement. His intention in doing so does not really matter. Ultimately, in his eyes and in the eyes of someone who is not an expert on al-Maqrīzī, the manuscript’s value significantly increased.

---

\(^9\) On this issue and for a broad outline of what needs to be done, with some examples of leads to be explored, see Bauden, Franssen 2020.

\(^10\) For an example regarding al-Maqrīzī, see Bauden 2020a, 164 fn. 98.


\(^12\) In Ottoman Turkish: *Maqrizînin haṭṭîdir.*

\(^13\) See Bauden 2020a.
Another ownership statement by the same person [fig. 2] on ms Arabic 3315 at the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin allows us to rule out any link between this Ahmad ibn ‘Ali with al-Maqrizi as, in this specific case, we also find a note of consultation in al-Maqrizi’s hand on the same leaf (see fig. 55). Here, the ownership statement reveals that the book was purchased by Ahmad ibn ‘Ali in 825/1422 in Damascus while al-Maqrizi’s consultation note is dated 824/1421. The palaeographic comparison between the two marks means we can dismiss any link between the two: the hands that penned the marks had nothing in common. Moreover, al-Maqrizi wrote the number five differently from other scholars: he used the digit for four closed by a vertical line (٤) while he used the so-called Persian shape (۴) for the number four. In the ownership statement written by the person called Ahmad ibn ‘Ali, the digit used is the usual one (٥), found widely in Egypt and Syria at that time. These examples demonstrate how cautious one must be in attributing a mark to a given scholar without further palaeographic investigation.

Knowledge of the scholar’s life may prove essential too: al-Maqrizi did travel to Damascus and regularly spent several months there between 810/1407 and 815/1412, but after the latter year he stayed in Cairo, only leaving the capital to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca.

The examples considered above show how difficult it is to ascertain the attribution of a specific mark to a scholar when his nisba (his family name broadly defined) is not part of the name. Such cases cannot be regarded as fakes as they were penned by a namesake. Though seldom found in manuscripts, forged ownership statements and consultation notes usually resulting from bad intent should not be overlooked. Deception can be detected in some marks but a mark labelled as a fake can also result from the desire of a later owner or reader to keep a trace of a mark found in the same copy but on a leaf that was damaged or on another copy, as in the case detailed now, which concerns al-Maqrizi.

14 Min kutub | Ahmad ibn ‘Ali | bi-Dimašq sanat | 825 (from among Ahmad ibn ‘Ali’s books in the year 825).
15 See respectively figs 32 and 35 for digit 5 and figs 55, 72, and 73 for digit 4.
16 In his catalogue of Arabic manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library, Arthur Arberry paid heed to the 825 ownership entry, characterising it as being signed by al-Maqrizi without doubt. He did not say anything about the consultation note clearly signed by al-Maqrizi. See Arberry 1955-69, 2: 31.
17 Bauden 2014, 166.
On the title page of the seventh volume of Ibn Ḫaldūn’s (d. 808/1406) magnum opus, *al-ʿIbar*, a consultation note said to be by al-Maqrīzī states that he took notes from it in the year 833/1429-30 (see [fig. 3]). This note is tricky because this is a formulary that al-Maqrīzī customarily followed in his consultation notes. Though the form of the note looks convincing, two elements are contradictory. First, the handwriting does not compare, even minimally, with al-Maqrīzī’s. Second, it does not make sense that al-Maqrīzī would have taken notes from Ibn Ḫaldūn’s *al-ʿIbar* at the end of his life (twelve years before his death to be precise). Al-Maqrīzī attended Ibn Ḫaldūn’s teaching sessions in his youth, in the late eighth/fourteenth century, and knew Ibn Ḫaldūn’s work well. It has been argued that Ibn Ḫaldūn’s teaching and œuvre deeply impacted the young al-Maqrīzī and his work, and al-Maqrīzī expressed his admiration for his former master and his books in extravagant terms. As a consequence, should this consultation note be entirely dismissed on these grounds? The case might be more complicated than it seems.

The person who penned the note in question also wrote several marginalia throughout the manuscript, which is dated to the year 796/1394, i.e. during al-Maqrīzī’s lifetime. The same person also covered the leaf that precedes the title page with various notes, including the table of contents of the volume in question. Unfortunately, it is impossible to identify this person, though, from the contents of some notes, it appears that he was writing at the end of the tenth/sixteenth century. The detailed notes clearly point to a scholar – and probably a historian. On f. 3b, the list of contents ends with the following words: *min kutub Fatḥ Allāh* (from among Fatḥ Allāh’s books). These words clearly appear to be an ownership statement that was apparently copied by our anonymous annotator. As we see below, Fatḥ Allāh was the head of the chancery in Cairo at the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century and owned a remarkable library: his own-

---

18 See below.
19 See Rabbat 2012.
20 See Ito 2021.
21 On f. 5a, the date 985/1577-8 is quoted.
ership statements tally with the one quoted here. This information strengthens the impression that this annotator was indeed copying details found elsewhere and, more probably, on a leaf that preceded the title page. Thus, the consultation note attributed to al-Maqrizi should be considered credible, though we should not accept it at face value. The annotator perhaps faced a damaged note – something that justified the replacement of the leaf – and what he thought to be the year 833 could well have been 803, a date that would better fit with al-Maqrizi’s use of Ibn Ḫaldūn’s work. This example therefore shows how and why copies of notes may still be valuable, though the status of this particular note impairs its significance for our study.

In most cases, ownership statements and consultation notes are signed by their authors. Thanks to these signatures, such marks can be compared with other similar marks and, whenever possible, with other samples of a scholar’s handwriting (holograph manuscripts, autograph notes). However, autograph notes – usually marginalia – are less frequently signed because the annotator already indicated (on one of its leaves) that he owned or consulted the manuscript. As we saw, such marks may be altered, damaged, or even disappear entirely. In such circumstances, the autograph marginalia can only be spotted by a trained eye. Of course, the attribution must still be confirmed palaeographically. All in all, it appears that studies on reading practices in Islam can only be undertaken with any seriousness in coordination with an exhaustive palaeographical analysis of a given scholar’s handwriting. In the case of al-Maqrizi, I recently published such an analysis and thus I am in a better position to provide accurate information about his consultation notes and marginalia.

4 Al-Maqrizi’s Library

Born into a family of scholars, on both his paternal and maternal side, al-Maqrizi was raised in an intellectual environment and surrounded by books. His maternal grandfather, who played a decisive role in the education of the young al-Maqrizi, died when the latter was nineteen years old. His father followed him to the grave three years later. Thus, by the age of twenty-two, al-Maqrizi had lost the two most prominent figures of his childhood and youth. Both his grandfather and his father had personal libraries. Though nothing is known of these libraries, they must have included a few dozen books, as did most private libraries of that period. In the case of his grandfather, at least

22 The present leaf (f. 3) is a replacement as it was pasted on a band of paper that appears to be a remnant of the leaf that was cut out.

23 In fact, it is not listed in the appendix.
one work that has survived is known to be have been in his ownership; this was a volume that al-Maqrīzī consulted two decades after his grandfather’s death. The book then belonged to another person, whom al-Maqrīzī thanked. From this indication, we can understand that the book had been sold by his grandfather, or more probably after his death. As a scholar, al-Maqrīzī also studied various works during his education and afterward, according to the traditional method, i.e., in the presence of a master. As a result, he was granted licenses to transmit such works, of which he may have copied some during the sessions. The works that he transmitted included Kitāb Faḍl al-ḫayl (The merits of horses), a book composed by al-Dimyāṭī (d. 705/1306), and Ibn al-ʿAdīm’s (d. 660/1262) Buġyat al-ṭalab, a multi-volume history of Aleppo. Both works were later transmitted by al-Maqrīzī himself to another generation of scholars. The transmission could not have been done without al-Maqrīzī possessing a copy.

Beside these books related to his education, al-Maqrīzī collected books that certainly proved useful to fulfil his public duties (he held various positions) and in composing his own books when he started to write. While I retrieved some thirty-nine consultation notes over the last twenty years, it appears that not a single ownership statement has resurfaced. This absence can be explained by two reasons. Either al-Maqrīzī did not adopt a similar approach toward his own books, that is, he decided not to write ownership statements in books that were part of his library, or none of the books that he owned have survived or been found so far. Whatever the case may be, and despite our lack of knowledge about his private library, he left some clues in his own works, and these help us imagine how he built his library and which books were in it.

To procure books, al-Maqrīzī could rely on the book markets in the main cities where he lived and stayed. Cairo was his birthplace and the city where he spent most of his life, though he sojourned several years in Damascus and Mecca, two cities that were considered significant intellectual centres in the Mamlūk realm. In Cairo, the book market was located close to where al-Maqrīzī lived, i.e., in the formerly Fatimid quarter with its main street called Bayn al-Qaṣrayn (lit. ‘between the two palaces’). On one occasion, al-Maqrīzī, speak-

24 See no. 14 in the appendix.
25 The owner from whom al-Maqrīzī borrowed the book, al-Diǧwī, was an old acquaintance: the person in question played a role as a professional witness when the inheritance of al-Maqrīzī’s grandfather was divided between his heirs. It is probably at that time that al-Diǧwī could acquire the book in question. See al-Maqrīzī 2002, 3: 99-100 (no. 985).
26 On these aspects, see Davidson 2020.
ing of a wealthy Damascene scholar (Ibn al-Muğlî, d. 828/1424) whom he visited when he was in the Syrian capital and to whom he paid a call when the latter was in Cairo, states that Ibn al-Muğlî accompanied him during his visits to the book market (ṣūq al-kutub) in Cairo.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī 2002, 2: 469-70 (no. 789).} Such visits imply that al-Maqrīzī continually searched for books that might surface in one bookshop or another.

To help him find the objects he sought, al-Maqrīzī also resorted to booksellers. One of these, al-Amšāṭī (d. 823/1420), also known as al-Kutubī, i.e. the bookseller, was highly praised by al-Maqrīzī, who described him as a man with a high level of expertise in books (‘urifa bī-l-ḥibra al-tāmma fīhā), words that can be interpreted to mean that he was able to recognise collectors’ items and find rarities because of his knowledge of private libraries and their contents.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī 2002, 3: 104 (no. 991).} Al-Maqrīzī also discloses that he was a good customer of al-Amšāṭī from whom he bought and sold books.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī 2002, 3: 104 (no. 991).} This last piece of information reveals that al-Maqrīzī, like many book owners, parted with some of his books in order to buy new ones.

Apart from these small clues, al-Maqrīzī also occasionally reveals that he owned a particular work, as in the following case: “I copied it in this way from Ibn al-Kalbī’s hand in the book Kitāb Nasab al-abnā’ (Lineage of the sons) which is in my possession in his handwriting”.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī 2006, 2: 241 (hākaḏā naqaltu-hu min ḫaṭṭ Ibn al-Kalbī fi Kitāb Nasab al-abnā’ la-hu wa-huwa ʿindī bi-ḫaṭṭi-hi). If not otherwise stated, all translations are by the Author.} Al-Maqrīzī must have particularly valued this copy, as it was a holograph of a rare text (now considered lost) by an author who died in 204/819 or 206/821.\footnote{On him and his work, see Sezgin 1967, 268-71.} In some cases, al-Maqrīzī also speaks of the books that he received from colleagues, like a collection of poems (dīwān) from his friend and neighbour al-Awḥadī (d. 811/1408).\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī 2002, 1: 186.}

Nowadays al-Maqrīzī is also appreciated for passing on information about numerous works from the Fatimid period, works to which he still had access and many of which are no longer extant. One such work was a book composed by the Fatimid vizier Yaʿqūb ibn Killis (d. 380/991).\footnote{On him and his work, see Walker 2017.} The caliph al-Ẓāhir (r. 411-27/1021-36), who banned all other law books, urged that this compendium dedicated to Ismaili legal materials (fiqh), together with another work, should be committed to memory. According to al-Maqrīzī, the book was organised into chapters, as is usual for legal works, and was one-half the size of al-
Buḥārī’s (d. 256/870) well-known Ṣaḥīḥ. Al-Maqrīzī was able to provide such material details because, he said, he owned it and read it.  

5 Borrowing Books

If al-Maqrizī could rely on his personal library and continually sought to acquire new sources from the book market, in some cases he had no choice but to borrow books from private and public libraries. The loaning of books was such a well-established practice in Islam that the issue was considered in legal terms. A book deposit could be requested depending on the status of the library. Private owners were allowed, without restrictions, to ask for a fee, although this practice was not always applied. Close relationships between colleagues favoured the exchange of books and their loan for long periods, in some cases even for free. By contrast, the request of a fee was contested in the case of public libraries, particularly those endowed as charitable institutions. Book loans from public libraries were also considered a peril to the integrity of a collection, a situation that drove the founders of endowed institutions, including libraries, to refuse to loan books in any circumstances, even with the payment of a deposit. Despite these measures, librarians in charge of endowed libraries were subject to bribery, a situation that led to the dismemberment of collections.

Whenever al-Maqrizī borrowed a book, he added a consultation note in it. This practice seems to have been al-Maqrizī’s standard practice as is confirmed by the number of notes so far identified (thirty-nine) (see table 1). In many respects, such notes represent invaluable sources of information as they offer data on the copy that al-Maqrizī accessed, his purpose in reading the source, when he read it, at what pace, and how he reacted, as a reader, to some parts of the text. Considered together with the contextual paratexts, these notes also allow us to guess, in some cases, the identity of the lender.

38 See al-Suyūṭī 1958.
### Table 1  Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Shelf-mark</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya</td>
<td>Musṭalaḥ ḥadīṯ 96</td>
<td>Ibn ʿAdī</td>
<td>al-Kāmil fī asmāʾ al-maǧrūḥīn</td>
<td>nil [794]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya</td>
<td>Musṭalaḥ ḥadīṯ 96</td>
<td>Ibn ʿAdī</td>
<td>al-Kāmil fī asmāʾ al-maǧrūḥīn</td>
<td>nil [794]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya</td>
<td>Tārīḫ mīm 103</td>
<td>Ibn Saʿīd</td>
<td>al-Muǧrib (vol. 3)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya</td>
<td>Tārīḫ mīm 103</td>
<td>Ibn Saʿīd</td>
<td>al-Muǧrib (vol. 3)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sūhāġ</td>
<td>Maʿḥad Balaṣfūra al-Dīn</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Ibn Saʿīd</td>
<td>al-Muǧrib (vol. 6)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Topkapı Sarayi Kütüphane Muzesi</td>
<td>Ahmet III 2832</td>
<td>Ibn Duqmāq</td>
<td>Naẓm al-ğumān fi tabaqāt ašhāb imāmi-nā al-Nu mān (vol. 2)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>Or. 8050</td>
<td>Ibn Duqmāq</td>
<td>Naẓm al-ğumān fi tabaqāt ašhāb imāmi-nā al-Nu mān (vol. 3)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Topkapı Sarayi Kütüphane Muzesi</td>
<td>Ahmet III 1822</td>
<td>al-Ṭūfī</td>
<td>al-İntişārat al-islāmiyya fi kašf sunnat al-纳斯rāniyya</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Reisülküttab 157</td>
<td>al-Dāraqṭūnī</td>
<td>al-Sunun (vol. 1)</td>
<td>Dū al-Qaʿda 805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Fatih 3612</td>
<td>Ibn Waḥšiyya</td>
<td>al-Filāḥa al-nabatiyya (vol. 1)</td>
<td>Rabīʿ II 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vatican</td>
<td>Biblioteca apostolica vaticana</td>
<td>Arabo 904</td>
<td>Ibn Waḥšiyya</td>
<td>al-Filāḥa al-nabatiyya (vol. 4)</td>
<td>Ǧumādā I 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Bodleian Library</td>
<td>Huntington 326</td>
<td>Ibn Waḥšiyya</td>
<td>al-Filāḥa al-nabatiyya (vol. 5)</td>
<td>Ǧumādā II 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>San Lorenzo de El Escorial</td>
<td>Real Biblioteca de El Escorial</td>
<td>Árabe 534</td>
<td>al-Musabbihī</td>
<td>Abbār Miṣr (vol. 40)</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Maktabat al-Azhar</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb</td>
<td>al-İḥāṭa (vol. 4)</td>
<td>Rabīʿ I or II 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Shelf-mark</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Österreichische Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>AF 123</td>
<td>Ibn al-Furāt</td>
<td>al-Taqīq al-wādiḥ al-maslūk fi tarāǧim al-ḫulafāʾ wa-l-mulūk (years 672-682)</td>
<td>Ṣafar 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library</td>
<td>Arabic 3315</td>
<td>al-Nadīm</td>
<td>al-Fihrist (vol. 1)</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3416</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 1)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3418</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 3)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Laleli 2037</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 5)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>Add. 9589</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 6)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3428</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 7)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Arabe 2327</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 8)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3432</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 9)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>John Rylands Research Institute and Library</td>
<td>Arabic 16</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 10)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3437</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 11)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Yazma bağışlar 1917</td>
<td>Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī</td>
<td>Masālik al-ḥāṣār fī mamālik al-aṣmār (vol. 12)</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Millet Genel Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Feyzullah 549</td>
<td>al-Hayṭami</td>
<td>Mawārid al-ẓamān fī zawāl id Ibn Hibbān</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 3116</td>
<td>Miskawayh</td>
<td>Tağařīb al-umam wa-ʿawāfīr al-humam (vol. 1)</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi</td>
<td>Aya Sofya 2577M</td>
<td>al-Balḥi</td>
<td>Ağālim buldān wa-ṣūrat ǧamīʿ al-ard</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is most surprising in these consultation notes is how methodical and systematic al-Maqrizī was in registering his access to a particular book: such notes were added on every single volume of a multi-volume work. The contents of these notes vary only slightly over the years, from one work to another, but also from one volume to another in the case of a multi-volume work, and seem to have followed a formulary that al-Maqrizī maintained over some fifty years. The most frequently used form of note contained: (a) a verb indicating the purpose of the reading; (b) an invocation for the person who loaned the book; (c) al-Maqrizī’s name, rarely followed by an invocation for himself; (d) the date. I shall now review the various elements.

Each note starts with a verb indicating the purpose of his reading: istafāda (18 notes) or intaqā (19 notes). Sometimes, al-Maqrizī coupled them with another verb: ṭāla‘a, which means ‘to consult, to read’. In fact, the first two verbs clearly indicate another activity. On one hand, istafāda can be translated as ‘to take advantage of’, and in this specific context, ‘to take notes’. The word fā‘ida, belonging to the same root, refers to a useful note. On the other hand, intaqā has the idea of extracting what is useful in the reader’s mind. In rare cases, al-Maqrizī connected this verb with the word fā‘ida, indicating that he excerpted useful notes. Given these slight differences, al-Maqrizī seems to have used both terms to indicate different processes: summarising a source or excerpting from it. This assumption can be verified thanks to the summaries that have been preserved in al-Maqrizī’s hand and are found inserted in his notebooks or occupying a full volume. For instance, al-Maqrizī summarised Ibn ʿAdī’s al-Kāmil based on several volumes of this work now held in Cairo. His consultation notes on several of these volumes are introduced by the verb istafāda. The holograph volume containing his summary is now held in Istanbul; on the title page, al-Maqrizī characterised it as a muḫtaṣar, i.e. a summary. Yet in one of his notebooks, al-Maqrizī included excerpts that he made of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār; his consultation note found in several volumes of this work starts with the verb intaqā. On the basis of the chronological distribution of the consultation notes, we also note that he used the verb istafāda, for the most part, until 807/1404-5; by contrast, he used the verb intaqā over-

---

40 As in the case of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār (see nos. 26-35), a 27-volume work. Ten volumes that once belonged to the same set bear al-Maqrizī’s consultation note.
41 In the case of the consultation notes found on nos. 36 and 38, the verb is not visible anymore.
42 See no. 25 in the appendix (intaqā min fawā‘idi-hi).
43 See nos. 1-8 in the appendix.
44 Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Murad Molla 575.
45 On this issue, see Bauden 2008, 73-6 and 83.
whelmingly after that date. Such a variation might indicate a shift in the way al-Maqrīzī read and took notes after a certain period, a shift that corresponded to his activity as a writer: after starting with exhaustive summaries at the beginning of his career, he became more selective in his choices and instead opted for excerpts for his later works.

After indicating the purpose of his reading, al-Maqrīzī systematically proceeded with an invocation of the owner or lender of the book (dā‘iyan li-). The term he used to designate the owner is always mālik while the lender was referred to by the word mu‘īr. In just one case, al-Maqrīzī chose a circumlocution (li-man a‘āra-hu, ‘for the one who lent it’). The distinction al-Maqrīzī made between owner and lender could be significant, that is, in the case of a lender al-Maqrīzī meant a loan that implied a fee or a deposit. Be that as it may, the name of the owner or the lender is not mentioned. We are left to guess from whom al-Maqrīzī might have borrowed these numerous volumes. To determine this, a contextual study of the other paratextual marks may prove fruitful when such marks are contemporary with al-Maqrīzī’s dated consultation notes. Among the books al-Maqrīzī consulted, some belonged to famous book collectors.

One of these book collectors was certainly Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Bārizī (d. 856/1452) who, with his father Nāṣir al-Dīn (d. 823/1420), occupied the position of head of the chancery on various occasions at the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century. Both were acquaintances of al-Maqrīzī. Nāṣir al-Dīn donated five hundred of his books to the library attached to al-Mu‘ayyad Šayḥ’s funerary complex in Cairo. The ownership statement identified on the volumes of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār must have belonged to his son Kamāl al-Dīn, given that they do not bear endowment notes to al-Mu‘ayyad Šayḥ’s library and the volumes were later acquired by another book collector. Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes in these volumes are dated 831/1427-28, i.e. a time when Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Bārizī’s career had reached its apex. The quality of his library was renowned in his lifetime, but unfortunately had to be sold on his death to pay his debts. The auction fetched over 6,000 dinars, with some volumes selling for 250 dinars. Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Bārizī’s propensity to answer positively to a request from a borrower was proverbial. Moreover, it was known that he did not retrieve his loaned books unless someone else requested them or he needed them personally.

46 No. 37 in the appendix.
47 See Behrens-Abouseif 2018, 25.
48 See no. 26 in the appendix.
49 Al-Saḥāwī 1934-36, 9: 239.
50 Al-Biqāʿī 1992-93, 1: 190. Dozens of his ownership statements have been identified in the frame of the ELEO project.
Fatḥ Allāh al-Dāʾūdī al-Tabrīzī (d. 816/1413) was another famous bibliophile who was also among al-Maqrīzī’s close circle of acquaintances, as he frequented him for more than thirty years.51 Fatḥ Allāh was a physician who also headed the state chancery. His library became famous for its many rarities.52 Indeed, his ownership statements appear on dozens of manuscripts,53 and among those that were consulted by al-Maqrīzī, I counted no fewer than four volumes representing two different works.54 For Ibn Waḥšiyya’s al-Filāḥa al-nabatiyya, al-Maqrīzī even modified his standard and simple invocation (dāʿiyan li-) addressed to the owner, opting instead for a more elaborate one to display more overtly his appreciation and gratitude for Fatḥ Allāh.55

Besides libraries owned by close friends, al-Maqrīzī was sometimes allowed access to works composed by some of his colleagues. This practice was widespread among authors, even before the fair copy of a work was ready. In the case of al-Maqrīzī, we know that he lent some of his drafts to friends and colleagues.56 Unsurprisingly, al-Maqrīzī consulted their works too. One of these was a biographical dictionary of Ḥanafi scholars authored by Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407). In this case, al-Maqrīzī’s invocation referred to the lender as the author (ǧāmiʿ), meaning that Ibn Duqmāq loaned al-Maqrīzī the book directly.57 Al-Maqrīzī also greatly benefitted from Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Ṭarīq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk: he wrote consultation notes in several volumes and also acknowledged the extent to which he took advantage of when referring to the author in the entry he devoted to him in his biographical dictionary of contemporaries.58

Last but not least, like his colleagues al-Maqrīzī resorted to endowed libraries. Access to the books in such libraries was not necessarily public in the sense that anyone could consult them, but scholars like al-Maqrīzī managed to gain entry because of their status, fame, and acquaintances. In al-Maqrīzī’s time one such reputable library was located in the Maḥmūdiyya madrasa founded by Maḥmūd al-Ustādār (d. 799/1396). This amir purchased the private library of an Aleppan scholar, a library that was renowned for its high quality books and rare copies. He then endowed some four thousand volumes.

51 See al-Maqrīzī 2002, 3: 8-17 (no. 899); Behrens-Abouseif 1987.
52 See al-Saḫāwī 1934-36, 6: 166 (ǧamaʿa kutuban nafīsa, ‘he collected rare books’).
53 Collected in the frame of the ELEO project.
54 Nos. 16-18 and 38 in the appendix.
55 Dāʿiyan li-māliki-hi bi-l-baqāʾ wa-l-ʿizz al-madīd (no. 16); dāʿiyan li-māliki-hi bi-l-ʿizz al-sarmad wa-l-naʿīm al-madīd (no. 17); dāʿiyan li-māliki-hi bi-bulūġ al-daraḡāt al-ʿulā fī l-gaẓā al-awfā (no. 18).
57 See nos. 12-13 in the appendix.
58 Waqaftu ʿalay-hā ... wa-stafadtu min-hā. See Bauden 2020b, 97 fn. 119.
and placed the library under the supervision of a librarian. There, at the very end of his life al-Maqrīzī borrowed a six-volume set of Ibn Miskawayh’s Ṭaḡārib al-umam. This loan went against the policy set by the founder of the endowment, according to the note placed on the title page of the first volume. ⁵⁹

In their standardised form, al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes featured his name which is usually given as Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī, though in the case of two works, he signed his name without his family name (nisba). If al-Maqrīzī avoided mention of his family name, it might have been an expression of the humility of a young scholar. ⁶⁰

In a very limited number of cases, al-Maqrīzī appended an invocation in his own favour: latafa Allāh bi-hi (may God be kind with him). ⁶¹

Finally, with the exception of his consultation notes found in two works present in nine volumes, all his notes are dated, sometimes with a precise indication of the month (he did this between the years 805/1403 and 819/1416). Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes over a span of fifty years indicate that his scholarly reading was ongoing throughout his life and continued until his very last breath. These notes also provide us with incomparable data as they enable us to establish when al-Maqrīzī accessed a specific source and took notes from it, and, consequently, we can date his summaries and excerpts. Thanks to these details, the reuse of his notes in his own works can also be dated accordingly. Yet the date when he read and made notes from a specific source should not be considered the unique moment he gained access to that source. This was particularly true at the beginning of his career as a young author when his working programme was still limited. When focused on a specific project, al-Maqrīzī did not necessarily pay attention to all the data in a given source. Later, when working on other projects, he may have returned to a work he had previously summarised and, in another reading, extracted specific information. Such a case can be identified in the work of Ibn Saʿīd (d. 685/1286-87). ⁶² Al-Maqrīzī read al-Muġrib entirely ⁶³ in 803/1400-1

---

59 On this note, see Bauden 2020d, fig. 7 and the translation below the figure.

60 See nos. 1-8 and 39 in the appendix. In both cases, the date is also missing. However, it can be determined for Ibn ʿAdī’s al-Kāmil (nos. 1-8), thanks to the summary al-Maqrīzī prepared on the basis of this text which he dated to the first day of the year 795/1392: the reading of the volumes thus took place during the preceding year. The second consultation note (no. 39) is only partly visible now, but it looks very similar to the consultation note found in nos. 1-8. Given the similarity between the formulary and the handwriting (at that time, al-Maqrīzī was in his early thirties), no. 39 might indicate that it should be dated to that period of al-Maqrīzī’s life.

61 Nos. 1-8 (dated 795), 16-17 (dated 806), 39 (undated but see previous note).

62 Nos. 9-11 in the appendix.

63 In his consultation note, he indicated that the work included fifteen volumes (si-fr). See no. 9 in the appendix.
but we know that he must have consulted it later because on the title page of the third volume he added a long biography of the author that he extracted from Ibn al-ハウスib’s al-Ihāṭa, a work we know he only accessed and extracted information from in 808/1405.

The dates that mention the month and concern a multi-volume work also help us analyse al-Maqrīzī’s pace of reading and excerpting information. As demonstrated from several samples, al-Maqrīzī summarised a text while reading it, i.e. he read a portion of text and took note (either verbatim or in a slightly modified form) of anything he was interested in. In the case of Ibn Wahšiyā’s al-Filāḥa al-nabatīyya, al-Maqrīzī managed to consult a copy in five volumes, of which only three are extant (volumes 1, 4, and 5). In his note in the first volume al-Maqrīzī stated that he completed reading and taking excerpts from it in Rabī’ II 806/18 October-15 November 1403. The same process was finished for the last two volumes, in Ġumādā I 806/16 November-15 December 1403 and Ġumādā II/16 December-13 January 1404 respectively. Thus, over the course of three months, he was able to read more than one thousand leaves while writing excerpts at the same time. Of course, he did not devote the entire day to reading, particularly in that period of his life when he was still engaged in public life, and filled various positions. Time constraints applied too, as the books had been borrowed and needed to be returned to the owner within a reasonable time limit.

The consultation notes were probably added at the end of the process and thus state that al-Maqrīzī had read and used a specific work on the given date. Otherwise, he would not have indicated, in some cases, the month when he read and excerpted information from them. We can marshal evidence that this was indeed the case by paying attention to some variations thus far not emphasised: instead of starting with the usual above-mentioned verbs (istafāda, intaqā, and ṭālaʿa), two notes are introduced by the verb anhā, which means ‘to finish’, and are followed by the nature of the activity (reading, excerpting). The addition of the consultation notes at the end of the process and the materiality of these notes cannot be overlooked. Until his early forties, al-Maqrīzī favoured a rather ostentatious position on the title page: the notes are predominantly found on the left side of the page,

---

64 See no. 9 in the appendix.
65 See no. 20 in the appendix.
66 For the study of this process, see Bauden 2008, 59-67; 2009, 101-9.
67 See nos. 16-18 in the appendix.
68 The total number of leaves in the three extant volumes (respectively 305, 253, and 190) is 748. In his consultation note on the last volume, al-Maqrīzī confirmed that he read the five volumes (no. 18: anhā-hu muṭālaʿatan wa-ntiqāʾan wa-l-arbaʿa qabla-hu). For another example, see also nos. 22-4 in the appendix and Bauden 2020b, 96-8.
69 See nos. 16 and 18 in the appendix; respectively anhā-hu muṭālaʿa-atan wa-ntiqāʾa’n.
in the upper left corner or in the centre of the outer margin, depending on the availability of free space. From the year 810/1407-8, he showed a preference for the right side (upper or lower corner, centre of the margin), with his text written parallel to the spine (vertically), as though he wanted to make it less visible. Such a choice impacted the conspicuousness of the notes as the inner margin, less subject to damage than the outer one, is nevertheless the one where the glue used to paste the quires in case of rebinding can overflow and lead to the disappearance of part of the text written near the spine. The evolution noticed in the placement of his consultation notes cannot be purely accidental as it does not result from a lack of space on the left side. However, any attempt to interpret it remains conjectural.

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes also allow us to better understand the competitive context that prevailed between scholars with regard to who was able to gain access to some texts. Even though scholars exchanged information about their findings, the dated notes established that a given scholar read the text in question before anyone else. Such a competition can be detected in several notes left by scholars whom al-Maqrīzī knew personally and sometimes considered friends. Three of these figures passed away before al-Maqrīzī had published any of his renowned works: Ibn al-Furāt (d. 807/1405), Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407), and al-Awḥadī (d. 811/1408). These three authored works – some of which they were not able to finish – in the field of history, including chronicles, and/or biographical dictionaries, and/or topographical compendia, three genres in which al-Maqrīzī later distinguished himself. In the case of al-Awḥadī, we can establish that al-Maqrīzī always followed him, by one or even several years. This confirms what we already knew: al-Awḥadī had been working on a project dealing with the history of the city of Cairo for a long time, well before al-Maqrīzī wrote his book on the same subject.

6 Libido Marginalium

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes offer a wealth of information on the texts he read, including which texts he took notes from, when, and from whom he borrowed them. Despite the quantity of data such notes reveal about al-Maqrīzī’s readings, they fail to convey al-Maqrīzī’s opinion of them. To address this issue we would be left in the dark if it were not for the marginal notes that he penned in some of the texts

70 This is the reason the first lines of some of his notes are not visible anymore (see nos. 27, 36-8).

71 See nos. 10-11, 19 in the appendix.
he read. Marginalia were rarely signed by their annotator\textsuperscript{72} and their attributions to a specific reader are even more challenging than the identification of a signed consultation note. Whenever a scholar left a consultation note in the manuscript, his marginalia are easier to compare with it. However, as in the case of al-Maqrīzī,\textsuperscript{73} these consultation notes have sometimes disappeared and it is only by perusing the whole manuscript that we can spot marginalia in his hand, and even then it must be confirmed through a palaeographical analysis.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{al-Maqrīzī's marginalia}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
No. & Author & Title & City & Library & Shelf-mark & Marginalia \\
\hline
1 & Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī & Masālik al-abṣār & Istanbul & Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi & Aya Sofya 3416 ff. 11a, 156b & 11a, 156b \\
2 & Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī & Masālik al-abṣār & Istanbul & Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi & Aya Sofya 3418 ff. 7b, 67a, 71a, 74a, 108b, 149b & 7b, 67a, 71a, 74a, 108b, 149b \\
3 & Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī & Masālik al-abṣār & Istanbul & Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi & Aya Sofya 3432 ff. 114b, 127a, 156b & 114b, 127a, 156b \\
4 & Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī & Masālik al-abṣār & Istanbul & Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi & Laleli 2037 f. 65a & 65a \\
5 & Ibn al-Furāt & al-Tariq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk & Vienna & Österreichische Nationalbibliothek & A.F. 122 f. 116a & 116a \\
6 & Ibn al-Furāt & al-Tariq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk & Vienna & Österreichische Nationalbibliothek & A.F. 125 ff. 197a, 226b & 197a, 226b \\
7 & Ibn al-Furāt & al-Tariq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk & Rome & Biblioteca apostolica vaticana & Arabo 726 f. 187a & 187a \\
8 & Ibn Saʿīd al-Muġrib & Tārīḫ mīm & Cairo & Dar al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʿiʿ al-Miṣrīyya & 103 (vol. 3) f. 105b (2 notes) & 105b (2 notes) \\
9 & Al-Nadīm & al-Fihrīst & Dublin & Chester Beatty Library & Arabic 3315 ff. 1a, 1b (2 notes) & 1a, 1b (2 notes) \\
10 & Al-Nadīm & al-Fihrīst & Istanbul & Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi & Şehid Ali Paşa 1934 f. 17a (2 notes) & 17a (2 notes) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{i} Note edited in Ibn Saʿīd 1970, 249 fn. 2.
\textsuperscript{ii} Note edited in al-Nadīm 2009, 1/1: 107 (of the introduction).
\textsuperscript{iii} Note edited in al-Nadīm 2009, 1/1: 10.
\textsuperscript{iv} Both notes were edited in al-Nadīm 2009, 1/2: 668.

Twenty-one marginalia were identified in ten volumes\textsuperscript{74} of four different works (see \textbf{table 2}). Compared with the total number of volumes listed in table 1, table 2 shows that al-Maqrīzī seldom resorted to annotations in the texts and that whenever he did, he limited them to

\textsuperscript{72} In the case of al-Maqrīzī, he only signed two of his marginalia. See below, fig. 9 and the marginalia in Ibn Saʿīd’s \textit{al-Muġrib}.

\textsuperscript{73} In two volumes of Ibn al-Furāt’s \textit{al-Tariq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk} (see Table 2, nos. 5-6) no consultation notes have been found, even though they contain marginalia in al-Maqrīzī’s hand.

\textsuperscript{74} In al-Maqrīzī’s time there were nine volumes, given that al-Nadīm’s \textit{al-Fihrīst} was in one volume and that it was split into two volumes much later.
four texts: Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*, Ibn al-Furāt’s *al-Ṭarīq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk*, Ibn Saʿīd’s *al-Muğrib*, and al-Nadīm’s *al-Fihrist*. As we saw, all the books mentioned in table 1 were loaned to al-Maqrīzī. As these books were someone else’s property, he may have been reluctant to alter the text. In fact, in his treatise on the technique of the written transmission of learning, Ibn Ǧamāʿa (d. 733/1333) specifically stressed that marginal notes should not be made in borrowed books, with the exception of corrections to the text, and these should only be made with the owner’s permission. Ibn Ǧamāʿa recommended that “the blank space (which is found on the pages that contain) the introductory and final formulas of a book should be left blank,” and that “[n]otes may be made in that space, however, if one can be sure that the owner of the book would approve of it”. Despite the prescriptive nature of these recommendations, it seems that readers of borrowed books annotated them whenever they felt the need to do so and these recommendations did not prevent al-Maqrīzī from annotating the four above-mentioned texts whose reading must have triggered some reaction. Two questions thus arise: What was the nature of his irrepressible desire to add notes in a volume that had to be returned to its owner, an impulse that Daniel Ferrer characterised as *libido marginalium*? And *cui bono* (for whose benefit) did he add these notes? In what follows, I address these issues by reviewing al-Maqrīzī’s marginalia according to their nature. Scholars studying marginalia in European printed books from the Renaissance to the Modern period have established various kinds of typologies to which each marginal note, taken broadly as a paratext linked or not to the main text, can be attributed. However, such typologies do not necessarily apply fully to manuscripts, given that most of the scholars who worked on European printed books mostly took into consideration the private libraries of writers. In al-Maqrīzī’s case, the situation is clearly different, as all the books containing his marginalia were not part of his private library, rather they were borrowed. Thus, I divide his marginalia according to the purpose of the annotation: corrections, additions, comments.

---

75 Rosenthal 1947, 10.
76 Rosenthal 1947, 10
78 Regarding the particular case of Dürenmatt, see the more recent work of Wieland 2015. For other schemes formulated by Elaine Whitaker and Carl James Grindley, see Sherman 2008, 16-17.
Corrections

Among all of al-Maqrizi’s marginalia, I only identified one example of a correction regarding not the contents but the formulation of the sentence. In this case [fig. 4], because the sentence did not make sense, al-Maqrizi noticed that the copyist of the text had forgotten a word. Instead of reading “ʿAbd al-Ḡanī headed to Isfahan with a pouch of money” (ḥaraǧa ʿAbd al-Ḡanī ilā Iṣbahān wa-maʿa-hu kīs fulūs), al-Maqrizi indicated in the margin that the last part of the sentence (“with a pouch of money”) read “without” (ṣawābu-hu wa-laysa maʿahu). Al-Maqrizi inserted the word ṣawābu-hu (that which is correct is…), then clearly indicated where the marginal correction should be placed in the text with a sign pointing in the direction of the outer margin, where the correction is. The sign was inserted after the word ʾIṣbahān. As we saw, in his treatise Ibn Ǧamāʿa approved of this kind of correction, which was intended to improve the text. Here, al-Maqrizi could not help adding the correction given the misinterpretation. For someone who was writing a summary of the text while reading it, this correction must have felt almost compulsory, as it meant he had to temporarily stop reading and write the marginal correction.

Figure 4  A marginal note by al-Maqrizi in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Aya Sofya 3418, f. 108b)

Additions

Compared with the correction analysed above, additions were much more frequent and point to another kind of impulse in the reader. We have already seen that on two occasions al-Maqrizi added the biography of the author on the title page of the text that he read, thus helping to contextualise the work. It was also perhaps a way for him to express his gratitude to the book owner from whom he borrowed it by providing interesting information regarding the life of the author. The examples that I review below also show that al-Maqrizi regarded his additional notes as a means to supplement the text. In most of these cases, he introduced them with an abbreviation clearly indicating their function: the letter ḥāʾ for ḥāšiya, i.e. note, gloss.

79 One can see that the copyist hesitated as the word kīs seems to have first been written fa-laysa. The copyist then cancelled the fāʾ but failed to correct the sentence.

80 See nos. 9 and 25 in the appendix.

81 See figs 5-6, 9.
In the following four examples, al-Maqrīzī provided additional information to enrich the text. In fig. 5, the marginal note conveys that the city of Delhi was ruined by Tīmūr Lang, information that the author of the work, Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī (d. 749/1349), could not be aware of, as he died well before Tīmūr Lang’s political career even started [fig. 5]. Given that at this point in the text the author describes the city of Delhi in detail, based on the testimony of an informant, al-Maqrīzī wanted to point out that the description was no longer accurate.

Figure 5
A marginal note by al-Maqrīzī in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Aya Sofya 3416, f. 11a)

Note
The city of Delhi was ruined by Tamerlane in the year 802.

In the next example [fig. 6], Ibn Faḍl al-Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s text gives the biography of a person and states that he taught in various institutions, including the Mosque of the amir Mūsak in the Fatimid quarter of Cairo. In front of this mention, al-Maqrīzī supplies information regarding the mosque in question, stating that it disappeared when it was integrated into the mausoleum of al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn inside his complex in the Bayn al-Qaṣrayn quarter. By the time al-Maqrīzī penned this marginal note, he had already completed the first version of his topography of Cairo where he indeed refers to this event.82 Thus, the note may be considered a way for al-Maqrīzī to establish his standing in issues linked to the history of Cairo.83

82 Al-Maqrīzī 2013, 2: 500.
83 On the same leaf, he added a marginal note regarding the Ṭaybarsiyya madrasa.
In other cases, the marginal additions may seem trivial. While reading and taking notes from Ibn al-Furāt’s chronicle, al-Maqrīzī came across a passage where the author mentions the amir Sayf al-Dīn Šayḫ al-Mahmūdī. He felt the need to explain that this amir was later known under his regnal title: al-Malik al-Muʾayyad [fig. 7a]. Some thirty leaves later, al-Maqrīzī read another passage where the same person was evoked under a slightly different name: Šayḫ ibn Maḥmūd Šāh. This time, he indicated in his marginal note that this person became sultan after the caliph al-Mustaʿīn [fig. 7b]. Ibn al-Furāt died a few years before Šayḫ’s career as a sultan unfolded (r. 815-24/1412-21), but al-Maqrīzī wanted to communicate that the rather obscure amir Ibn al-Furāt mentioned was the same one who later became sultan.
This Šayḫ became sultan of Egypt after the caliph al-Musta‘īn. This Šayḫ is al-Malik al-Mu‘ayyad.

Al-Maqrīzī’s desire to supply additional information to the text he was reading can also be detected in the following example [fig. 8]. Here, the author, once again Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, speaks of the famous poet Ibn Dāniyāl (d. 710/1310). It is not really a biography, rather the text details several episodes in which Ibn Dāniyāl’s eloquence was better expressed. In fact, the author does not even mention his full name, limiting himself to his surname (Ibn Dāniyāl). This lack of detail triggered al-Maqrīzī’s desire to add more information about Ibn Dāniyāl’s full pedigree as well as his main profession (as a physician and oculist) and to specify his exact date of death.
Marginal additions also gave al-Maqrīzī the occasion to boast about his own accomplishment as a scholar. When Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī opened his chapter on poets with Imruʿ al-Qays, who lived in the pre-Islamic period, al-Maqrīzī wrote a marginal note [fig. 9] giving an example of his knowledge and demonstrating that he knew that two poets bore the same name Imruʿ al-Qays: the first was the one Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī meant, who lived before the Prophet and whom al-Maqrīzī undoubtedly identified based on the initial words of his most famous poem; and the second one, who was not mentioned by the author, was a Companion of the Prophet and converted to Islam and did not apostasize, but remained firm in his faith even after the Prophet’s death. Al-Maqrīzī further stressed that he had dedicated a booklet (ḡuzʾ) to the namesakes of the pre-Islamic poet and he signed his addition in case future readers wanted to know the identity of the annotator.
Imruʾ al-Qays the poet who said “Halt, both of you. Let’s weep…”: He is the son of Ḥuǧr – with vowel u on the unpointed letter ḥāʾ – Ibn al-Ḥāriṯ the King ibn Amr ibn Ḥuǧr the myrrh eater al-Kindi. He lived about forty years before the birth of the Messenger of God – God bless him and grant him salvation. As for the Companion of the Prophet, he was Imruʾ al-Qays ibn Amr ibn Muʿāwiya ibn al-Ḥāriṯ the elder ibn Muʿāwiya ibn Ṭawr ibn Murtiʿ ibn Kinda al-Kindi. He was sent as an envoy to the Messenger of God – God bless him and grant him salvation – and went back to the land of his people, firm in his faith in Islam. He did not apostatize with those who did and took part in the battle of Yarmuk. He was also a poet. I compiled a very useful booklet on those named Imruʾ al-Qays. Written by Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī.
Emotional notes

Several of al-Maqrīzī’s marginalia can be characterised as notes that were caused by his emotional reaction to what he was reading. In such cases, it seems that al-Maqrīzī could not help expressing his disagreement in a marginal note. The first example of this clear exhibition of *libido marginalium* regards Ibn Saʿīd’s *al-Muġrib* which al-Maqrīzī read and summarised in 803/1400-1. In a passage where Ibn Saʿīd talked about Ibn Sūrīn, a secretary who was active at the state chancery in the Fatimid period, the author acknowledged that he could not find any details about this person until he consulted the work of another secretary from the same period. Al-Maqrīzī expressed his irritation in a colourful way, addressing the author directly, as though he was talking to him - even though Ibn Saʿīd was long dead: “May God forgive you!” Al-Maqrīzī was indignant because he knew that Ibn Saʿīd had consulted the work of a Fatimid historian, al-Musabbiḥī - whose work al-Maqrīzī also accessed - , where Ibn Sūrīn appears on numerous occasions, and he noted this. Al-Maqrīzī took the occasion to show the breadth of his knowledge and outlined the major elements of Ibn Sūrīn’s life and character. The note ends with a reference to a personal work that al-Maqrīzī was currently writing and hoped to soon prepare the fair copy of. He once again signed his marginal note to help the reader identify the author of the annotation, or, more probably, the author of the work-in-progress.

---

84 See no. 19 in the appendix.
85 The work, *Ḫulāṣat al-tibr fī aḥbār kuttāb al-sirr*, is no longer extant. The fair copy of this work was not yet completed more than ten years later. See Bauden 2017, 216-17.
May God forgive you! This Ibn Sūrīn is renowned and his standing among the secretaries of the Fatimid dynasty is reputed. I know that you copied from al-Musabbiḥī who mentioned Ibn Sūrīn in numerous places in his Kitāb al-kabīr fī aḥbār Miṣr (Great Book on the annals of Egypt). He also quoted a great deal of his compositions. He was Abū Maṃṣūr Bišr ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Sūrīn, the secretary in charge of the issuance of the decrees. He was a Christian and passed away on 17 Saḥāra 400. He distributed alms in the amount of three hundred dinars each year, pretending that they were an expiation for [his] mention of [God's] blessing over our lord Muḥammad – God bless him and grant him salvation – at the end of the decrees that he composed. He was a stern zealot in religion. I found several decrees he composed and I have never seen a secretary or a composer more inspired in quoting Qurʾānic verses that fitted the circumstances of what he was writing. I mentioned him in what I am currently writing about those who occupied the positions of composer and of secretary responsible for the issuance of decrees in Egypt. If God wills, He will make possible its completion and enable me to prepare the fair copy. Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī – may God be kind to him – wrote it.

Al-Maqrīzī’s marginalia sometimes also included disparaging comments addressed to the author. When he consulted Ibn al-Furāt’s chronicle, al-Maqrīzī’s eyes fell on a passage in which the author spoke about the mosque of al-Azhar and the Friday sermon there. Al-Maqrīzī showed his disagreement with the author [fig. 10], first by denigrating him (“This is a statement made by someone who has no knowledge at all of the annals of Egypt”), then by exhibiting his overwhelming knowledge.
This is a statement made by someone who has no knowledge at all of the annals of Egypt. In the annals of the Fatimid dynasty, starting after the reign of al-Hākim until it vanished, it is reported that the Friday prayer was never discontinued at the mosque of al-Azhar, except in the days of the sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf. [At that time,] the supreme judge, Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibn Dirbās, considered, in accordance with a legal opinion attributed to al-Šāfiʿī, that two sermons could not be held in the same city.

Al-Maqrīzī’s disparagement of the author is even more frequent in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s text. In one passage, the author argues that the Arabic spoken by Andalusis improved after the establishment of the Umayyad Amirate in 138/756 and that the scientific movement developed from that point until it reached the level of their Oriental counterparts. In the following marginal note [fig. 11], placed before the substance of the passage, al-Maqrīzī invoked God’s forgiveness for the author and explained that, despite his readings, the author’s discourse was based on his chauvinism.
Note
May God forgive you when you say “From this moment on they spoke Arabic”. You are well aware from your readings that Mūsā ibn Nuṣayr entered the Maghrib with Arab troops. Then Balǧ entered with Arab troops. This took place well before ʿAbd al-Raḥmān’s arrival. Far from being a secret, these facts are well-known except that your chauvinism led you to [say] that.

In another volume of the same work, al-Maqrīzī continued with his critical comments [fig. 12]. First, he stressed that the author was mistaken in stating that the name of the city of al-Manūfiyya was derived from the Memphis (Manf) of Antiquity. On this occasion, he drew the attention of future readers to his own work; namely, his book on the topography of Cairo. Second, he emphasised that the author was also mistaken about the origin of the name of Banū Naṣr Island. After expounding on the true origin of the name with a profusion of details, he concluded his annotation with a sarcastic comment: “Know, O Saʿd, that this is the way camels are brought to the watering place”. Al-Maqrīzī’s satire can only be understood by someone who has knowledge of the story related to this quotation. The context for the story linked to this quotation can be found in al-Qālī’s (d. 356/967) Ḍayl al-amālī, where al-Qālī explains that it regards the dumbest of the Ar-
abs. The message could not be clearer: here al-Maqrīzī is showing Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī that he had erred and needed to be put on the right path, i.e. corrected.

Figure 12 Two marginalia by al-Maqrīzī in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Aya Sofya 3416, f. 156b)

Note
This is pure imagination. Memphis (Manf), which was the capital of the land of Egypt in Antiquity, is now located on the edge of Giza and known as al-Badrašīn. I have several stories about it in the book *Kitāb al-Iʿtibār bi-ḏikr al-ḫiṭaṭ wa-l-āṯār* (Reflections on the quarters and monuments).

Note
That which is correct is that the Island of Banū Naṣr takes its name from the Banū Naṣr ibn Muʿāwiya ibn Bakr ibn Hawāzin. This is because the Banū Ḥamās ibn Zālim ibn Guʿayl ibn Amr ibn Dahmān ibn Naṣr ibn Muʿāwiya ibn Bakr ibn Hawāzin exerted a mighty power over the land of Egypt and they proliferated such that they occupied the lower part of the country and achieved supremacy over it until the Lawāta, one of the Berber tribes, dominated over them. The Banū Naṣr endured and settled in al-Ǧidār, and they became sedentary in a place known by their name in the middle of the Nile. This is the Island of the Banū Naṣr. Know, O Saʿd, that this is the way camels are brought to the watering place.

Al-Qālī 2001, 587 (the full verse reads: *awrada-hā Saʿd wa-Saʿd muštamil | mā hakaḏā tūrad yā Saʿd al-ibil*).
The above-mentioned authors were not the only ones whom al-Maqrīzī chided: al-Nadīm also bore the brunt of his irritation. The two following marginalia were added by al-Maqrīzī in relation to the same passage [figs 13a-b] where he identified some confusion (taḥlīṭ) in the data given by al-Nadīm about the genealogy of the Ismailis. These illustrate al-Maqrīzī’s desire to correct information that he deemed misleading. Here again, al-Maqrīzī addresses al-Nadīm directly, to show him that he is alone in pretending what he says.

Note
This is confused. The one that you name Saʿīd is [in reality] ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahdī, and Abū al-Qāsim is his son whose title was al-Qāʾīm. He came to Egypt with him and went with him to the Maghrib. Thus he is not the one you think he is.

Note
This is once again confused. The one who rebelled against him is Abū Zayd and the name of the one who was Ismāʿīl’s father is none other than Muhammad – and some say Abīd al-Raḥmān. As for [the name] al-Ḥasan, he was not called this way and you are the only one who says otherwise.
The marginalia detailed above allow us to address the questions laid out at the beginning of this section: why and for whom did al-Maqrīzī write these marginalia in books that did not belong to him? A partial answer regarding corrections and additions was given above. In such cases, it seems that al-Maqrīzī wanted to improve the text he was reading and, given that the book was borrowed, he did so for the sake of the book owner and all future readers and owners. Should we brush aside the idea that this was a one-sided transaction? The emotional notes, as we characterised them, demonstrate that another phenomenon is at play. As Heather Jackson notes, “all annotators are readers but not all readers are annotators. Annotators are readers who write”. The combination of both actions – reading and writing – is best expressed by a portmanteau word specifically created to describe the person who is a writer and a reader at the same time: the ‘wreader’. As a consequence, we must consider the relationship that the wreader establishes with the text and, through the text, with its author. As we see, al-Maqrīzī engages in some kind of debate or conversation with the author whom he addresses as ‘you’. Such a debate/conversation can only be fictitious as the authors al-Maqrīzī was talking to were all dead by the time he was reading their texts: these authors could not reply. His – sometimes offensive – comments could not be addressed to the authors directly: rather they constituted for him a kind of reward, as it enables him to have the final word over the authors whose texts he is reading. As some theorists of reading state, “the experience of reading always involves an element of contest or struggle, and an oscillation between surrender and resistance, identification and detachment”. In such circumstances, the reader may be seen as a rival of the author, and as someone who wants to show that he knows better. This characterisation best fits al-Maqrīzī’s marginalia, particularly those that reveal his indignation. Through them, al-Maqrīzī expresses his superior knowledge, something that is proven by his own output about which he does not neglect to boast. These marginalia, taken together with al-Maqrīzī’s consultation notes or, more rarely, with his signature, entail “a degree of self-assertion, if not aggression” that comes with a boomerang effect: his prickly notes, more than his annotations, put al-Maqrīzī in a bad light and the ‘wreader’ al-Maqrīzī has been hoisted by his own petard.

87 Jackson 2001, 90.
88 Wieland 2015, 147.
91 Jackson 2001, 90.
7 Conclusion

While our understanding of collective reading in the medieval period in the Islamic world has greatly improved thanks to the study of the reading certificates (samāʿāt), much work remains to be done to reach a similar level of knowledge about scholars reading books in solitude. A major obstacle – the collection and identification of the marks they left in books that belonged to them or that they borrowed from other owners – is in the process of being overcome thanks to digitalisation and the accessibility of manuscripts in online repositories. Other caveats still remain, like the authentication of a scholar’s handwriting or the decipherment of his notes. When these issues are solved, a scholar’s consultation notes and marginalia provide a wealth of information on his reading interests, his motivations and aims in accessing a given source, his interaction with the text, and his fictitious dialogue with its author. Furthermore, this consideration of notes left by other scholars can help to contextualise some aspects of a reader’s access to books and to recreate the network of book owners from whom he borrowed texts not extant in his own library.

In this case study devoted to al-Maqrizi, our aim was to demonstrate that a medieval scholar’s consultation notes and marginalia represent an ideal example of how the above-mentioned issues can be approached. Moreover, what I found in some of al-Maqrizi’s marginalia is only a token of a more general phenomenon that would seem to apply to other authors/readers in other periods and places. Indeed, in writing down his satirical and disparaging comments, al-Maqrizi was no exception: studies on readers’ marginalia in Renaissance and modern English books show that this phenomenon has already been observed.
Appendix

Detailed List of al-Maqrizi’s Consultation Notes

1 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 94


Description This work is a dictionary of some 2,212 persons whose probity and trustworthiness are assessed as transmitters of prophetic traditions; it was composed by ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAdī ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Ǧurǧānī, better known as Ibn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 365/976 or 360/971).

Bibliography Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279. Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the upper left corner)

Though the note is not dated, al-Maqrīzī’s access to this manuscript can be dated precisely to the year 794/1392 thanks to the summary he made of Ibn ʿAdī’s text. The holograph of the summary has been preserved and is available at the Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi in Istanbul, ms Murat Molla 575. In the colophon (ff. 216a-b), al-Maqrīzī states that he completed the summary on the first day of the year 795/17 November 1392, implying that he read and took his notes during the previous months:

الله لطفه علي بن أحمد لممالكه داعيا منه استفاد به

الرواة من المجروحين أسماء في الكامل من اليه الفكر دليل وقاد عليه الاختيار رائد دل ما وكمل انتهى ببن إبراهيم بن محمد بن تقيم النبي بلغه الله بلغه المقريزي تميم بن محمد وأحسن في الدارين ماهه بذلك عند غروب الشمس من يوم الأحد المبارك مفتح عام 795.

---

1 In this appendix, we provide all the details that prove useful for our study. Ownership statements, endowment notes, and consultation notes added by other people are only mentioned when they provide a context for al-Maqrīzī’s notes.

2 The information regarding the presence of al-Maqrīzī’s notes of consultation in this source (nos. 1-8) is based on the data provided in the following references: Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279; Fuʾād Sayyid 2013, 121; and Ibn ʿAdī 2014, 1: 46-9. The discrepancies, contradictions, and inconsistencies in the descriptions of these three references prevent any reconstruction of the volumes without verification of the manuscripts. For instance, Fuʾād Sayyid 2013, 121, mentions the presence of al-Maqrīzī’s notes of consultation on mss Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 94 and 97, though the catalogue of the library, Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279, does not mention a shelf mark Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 97 for this work. I was only able to check the presence and the text of al-Maqrīzī’s note on ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 94. Consequently, the information regarding mss Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 54, 95, 96, including the history of the various volumes, must be taken with caution pending further confirmation after examination of the manuscripts.

3 In the preserved version.


5 Sic. This repetition is due to a modification that al-Maqrīzī made by erasing part of the religious invocation in order to modify it, which he did later in life, as it is clear from his handwriting.
History of the Manuscript  It was copied by Naṣr ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Nawwār al-Iṣkandarī; this first volume was completed in Ṣafar 523/January-February 1129; it was bequeathed as a waqf by the Mamlūk sultan al-Muʿayyad Šayḫ to his mosque at Bāb Zuwayla in Cairo completed in 824/1421.  

2 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭṭāʾiq al-Miṣrīyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṯ 94  
Manuscript  Same as no. 1 above. The volume contains biographies starting with the letter sin until the letter ta. Maqribī script. 213 ff. Part of the same set as no. 1 above.  
Description  Same as no. 1 above.  
Bibliography  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.  
Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the upper left corner)  

History of the Manuscript  Like no. 1.  

3 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭṭāʾiq al-Miṣrīyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṯ 96  
Description  Same as no. 1 above.  
Bibliography  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.  
Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a)  

History of the Manuscript  This copy was made for the library of the Almoravid amir Ibrāhīm ibn Yūsuf ibn Tāšufīn and completed on Ṣafar 523/January-February 1129.  

---

6 According to the editor of Ibn ʿAdī 2014, 1: 46, the copyist was a student of the Damascene traditionist Ibn ʿAsākir (571/1176). Given the date of the copy (523/1129), this looks highly improbable and it might indicate that the date of the copy was read incorrectly.  
7 The document establishing the religious endowment was issued on 4 Jumādā Il 823/16 June 1420. See Meinecke 1992, 2: 319.  
8 In Fihrist al-kutub 1888-92, 1: 243, the date is Ṣafar 593/December 1296-January 1297. Any of the two dates is problematic as the amir in question is reported to have died in 520/1126 or 515/1121-2.
4 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 54

Manuscript  Same as no. 1 above. The volume contains biographies starting with ‘Uṯmān ibn Maqsam and finishing with ‘Utba ibn ’Alqama. Maġribī script. 139 ff. Part of the same set as no. 3 above.

Description  Same as no. 1 above.

Bibliography  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a)

History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 1 above.

5 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 96

Manuscript  Same as no. 1 above. The volume contains biographies starting with ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Zayd and ending with Fiṭr. Maģribī script. 150 ff. Part of the same set as no. 3 above.

Description  Same as no. 1 above.

Bibliography  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a)

History of the Manuscript  As no. 3.

6 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḥadīṭ 95

Manuscript  Same as no. 1 above. The volume contains biographies starting from Muḥammad ibn Yazid and ending with Maṭar. 106 ff.

Description  Same as no. 1 above.

Bibliography  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a)

History of the Manuscript  It was copied by Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Muq-bil and dated 784/1382.
Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḫadīt 96

**Manuscript**  Same as no. 1 above. The volume contains biographies starting with Muʿāwiya and ending with Wahb. Maġribī script. 158 ff. Part of the same set as no. 3 above.

**Description**  Same as no. 1 above.

**Bibliography**  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.

**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a)

> استفاد منه داعيا لمالكه أحمد بن علي لطعنه الله به.

**History of the Manuscript**  Same as no. 3 above.

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Muṣṭalaḥ ḫadīt 96

**Manuscript**  Same as no. 1 above. This is the last volume of the work, it starts with the biography of Yaḥyā ibn Muslim. Maġribī script. 137 ff. Part of the same set as no. 3 above.

**Description**  Same as no. 1 above.

**Bibliography**  Fihrist al-maḫṭūṭāt 1956, 279.

**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a)

> استفاد منه داعيا لمالكه أحمد بن علي لطعنه الله به.

**History of the Manuscript**  Same as no. 3 above.

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Tārīḫ mīm 103


**Description**  This work was authored by several members of the family of the Banū Saʿīd over a period of some 115 years, but was completed in its present state by ʿAlī ibn Mūsā Ibn Saʿīd al-ʿAnsī (d. 685/1286-7). It consists of fifteen volumes (sifr) covering a geographical area including Egypt (six volumes), North Africa (three volumes), and al-Andalus (six volumes). The work mixes geographical descriptions of cities with biographical entries of famous persons from the past and the present; the whole work is chronologically organised.¹⁰


---

⁹  See below no. 10.

¹⁰  On the author and his work, see Cano Ávila 2004. The contents of this volume were published: Ibn Saʿīd 1953.
Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the left half of the upper margin)

Beside this note, al-Maqrizi also added, on the same folio in the available space, a long biography of Ibn Sa‘īd that he extracted from Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb’s al-Iḥāṭa.\footnote{For al-Maqrizi’s consultation of al-Iḥāṭa, see no. 20 below.}

History of the Manuscript  The volume is a holograph and was copied for the library (ḫizāna) of the Aleppan historian Ibn al-ʿAdīm (d. 660/1262) in Aleppo between 645/1247 and 647/1250; there is an undated consultation note by Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407)\footnote{Ṭālefah, see note 12 below.}; it was bequeathed as a waqf by the Mamlūk sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Šayḫ to his mosque at Bāb Zuwayla in Cairo completed in 824/1421.\footnote{Waqf, see note 13 below.}
10 Cairo, Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms Tārīḫ mīm 103

Manuscript As no. 9. Volume 3 contains book (ṣifr) 4. Maġribī script. 189 ff.\textsuperscript{14}

Description As no. 9.


Figure 16

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Saʿīd’s al-Muġrib.
(Courtesy Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms 103 Tārīḫ mīm, f. 132a)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 132a, in the upper left corner)

History of the Manuscript As no. 9. In addition, there is an undated consultation note by Ḫalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) in which he states that he owned this volume [fig. 17]; there is an undated consultation note by Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407) [fig. 18]; there is a dated consultation note by Aḥmad ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Awḥadī (d. 811/1408) [fig. 19]; and there is a consultation note by Fath Allāh (d. 816/1413) dated 810/1407-8 [fig. 20].

Figure 17

al-Ṣafadī’s consultation note in Ibn Saʿīd’s al-Muġrib.
(Courtesy Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms 103 Tārīḫ mīm, f. 132a)

Figure 18

Ibn Duqmāq’s consultation note in Ibn Saʿīd’s al-Muġrib.
(Courtesy Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣriyya, ms 103 Tārīḫ mīm, f. 132a)

The contents of this volume were published: Ibn Saʿīd 1970.

\textsuperscript{14} The contents of this volume were published: Ibn Saʿīd 1970.

\textsuperscript{15} استفاد منه داعيا لمالكه / أحمد بن علي المغريزي / سنة 803.

See chap. 3 in this volume, by Élise Franssen.
11 Sūhāǧ, Maʿhad Balaṣfūra al-Dīnī, shelf number unknown


Description As no. 9.


Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 6a, in the middle of the outer margin)

استفاد منه داعيا مالكه / أحمد بن علي المقرزي / سنة ٨٠٣.
History of the Manuscript  As no. 9. In addition, there is an undated consultation note by Ḫalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī in which he states that he owned this volume (f. 6a) [fig. 22]; there is an undated consultation note by Ibn Duqmāq [fig. 23]; and there is a dated (802/1399-1400) consultation note by Ahmad ibn Abdallāh al-Awḥādī (f. 6a) [fig. 24].

12 Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphane Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 2832


Description  This four-volume work, composed by Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Aydamur al-ʿAlāʾī, known as Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407), consists of a biographical dictionary of Hanafī scholars. The entries are organised by generations (*ṭabaqāt*), starting from the founder, Abū Ḥanīfa, and then alphabetically in each section. 23

Bibliography  Karatay 1962-9, 3: 556 (no. 6454).
History of the Manuscript This volume is a holograph dated 794/1392; there is a consultation note by ʿAbdallāh ibn Ahmad al-Bišbīšī dated 803/1400-1 (f. 1a) [fig. 26]; there is an undated ownership statement by Ali ibn al-Adamī al-Ḥanafī (f. 1a) [fig. 27]; and there is an undated consultation note by Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Saḫāwī (f. 1a) [fig. 28]. In 825/1422, it was endowed by Fāris al-Âṣrāfī to al-Azhar mosque (f. 1a).24

Figure 26
al-Bišbīšī’s consultation note in Ibn Duqmāq’s Naẓm al-ǧumān.
(Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 2832, f. 1a)26

Figure 27
al-Adamī’s ownership statement in Ibn Duqmāq’s Naẓm al-ǧumān.
(Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 2832, f. 1a)25

Figure 28
al-Saḫāwī’s consultation note in Ibn Duqmāq’s Naẓm al-ǧumān.
(Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 2832, f. 1a)27

24 Fāris al-Ḥāzīndār al-Ṭawāšī (death date unknown but the endowment note shows that he died sometime after 825/1422).


27 This is the famous traditionist and historian al-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1497). On him, see Petry 1995.
13 London, British Library, ms Or. 8050

**Manuscript**  Same as no. 12 above. Volume 3 covers generations 5-7. Part of the same set including no. 12.

**Description**  Same as no. 12 above.

**Bibliography**  Stocks 2001, 227.

![Figure 29](image)

**Figure 29**

al-Maqrizí’s consultation note in Ibn Duqmâq’s *Naẓm al-ǧumān*.
(Courtesy British Library, ms Or. 8050, f. 2a)

**Al-Maqrizí’s consultation note** (f. 2a, in the middle of the outer margin)

![Figure 30](image)

**Figure 30**

al-Bišbīšī’s consultation note in Ibn Duqmâq’s *Naẓm al-ǧumān*.
(Courtesy British Library, ms Or. 8050, f. 2a)

![Figure 31](image)

**Figure 31**

al-Saḫāwī’s consultation note in Ibn Duqmâq’s *Naẓm al-ǧumān*.
(Courtesy British Library, ms Or. 8050, f. 2a)

---

28 Ms Pet. II.24 (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek) is another holograph copy of this volume with the same contents. It seems that ms Or. 8050 corresponds to the first version and ms Pet. II.24 to the second. The latter was owned by Ibn al-Adamî as no. 12, as well as by Fath Allâh (on him, see no. 10). Ms Arabe 2096 (Paris, BnF), a holograph copy of the first volume, confirms that Ibn Duqmâq prepared a fair copy: in the colophon (f. 154a) he states that he completed the process (*bayyaḍtu hāḏihi al-nusḫa min al-musawwada*) in 795/1393.

29 لناظمه عبد الله بن أحمد البشبيشي

30 محمد بن السخاوي غفر الله له
14 Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi Kütüphane Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 1822

**Description**  This is a work composed by Sulaymān ibn ʿAbd al-Qawī al-Ṭūfī (d. 716/1316) as an apology of Islam and written in close connection with his refutation of Christianism.\(^{31}\)

**Bibliography** Karatay 1962-69, 3: 61 (no. 4863).

---

**Figure 32**

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in al-Ṭūfī’s *al-Intiṣārāt al-islāmiyya*.
(Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 1822, f. 1a)

---

**Figure 33**

Ibn al-Ṣāʾiġ’s note in al-Ṭūfī’s *al-Intiṣārāt al-islāmiyya*.
(Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 1822, f. 1a)\(^ {32}\)

---

**Figure 34**

al-Diǧwī’s ownership statement in al-Ṭūfī’s *al-Intiṣārāt al-islāmiyya*. (Courtesy Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Müzesi, ms Ahmet III 1822, f. 1a)\(^ {33}\)

---

**History of the Manuscript**  This copy is an apograph dated 711/1311, i.e., three years after the completion of the work; there is an undated note (of ownership?) by Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣāʾiġ (f. 1a) [fig. 33]; there is an undated ownership statement by Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥaydara (f. 1a, in the middle of the outer margin) [fig. 34].

---

\(^{31}\) On al-Ṭūfī and his work, see Demiri 2013. The work has been published: al-Ṭūfī 1992.

\(^{32}\) He is probably Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī al-Suʾūdī al-Ḥanafī, known as Ibn al-Ṣāʾiġ (d. 776/1375), al-Maqrīzī’s maternal grandfather. See al-Maqrīzī 2002, 3: 255-60 (no. 1157).

Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Reisülküttab 157

**Manuscript**  

**Description**  
This is the famous collection of prophetic traditions collected by ʿAlī ibn ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī (385/995).³⁴

**Bibliography**  
Nil.

---

**Al-Maqrizī’s consultation note** (f. 1a, in the middle of the upper half of the outer margin)

٥٠٨ 
١٤٥٨  
سنة القعدة 
ذي في المقرئي 
علي بن أحمد بن علي \/ المقرئي في ذي القعدة سنة ٥٠٨.

**History of the Manuscript**  
This copy is dated 511/1117 and was made by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Laylā; the copy was read aloud by the copyist to Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣadafī (d. 514/1120)³⁵ during the same month the copy was completed (f. 1a); a certificate of audition witnesses that the text was read in the presence of three masters in 753/1352 in Cairo; there is a (consultation?) note by Ibrāhīm al-Biqāʿī (d. 885/1480)³⁶ dated 862/1458 [fig. 36].

---

³⁴ On the author and his work, see Sezgin 1967, 206-9.
³⁵ He is probably al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Firruh al-Ṣadafī (d. 514/1120). On him, see de la Puente 2012.
³⁶ Al-Biqāʿī is the famous scholar who authored a chronicle and used the Bible in his exegesis of the Qurʾān. On him and his work, see Thomas 2013.
³⁷ إبرهيم البقاعي في رمضان سنة ٤٠٢.
Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Fatih 3612


**Description**  The work, written by Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Qays al-Kasdānī, known as Ibn Waḥšiyya (d. 318/930-1), corresponds to an agricultural treatise mixing botanical and astrological information as well as ancient stories. 38

**Bibliography**  Nil.

---

**Figure 37**

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Waḥšiyya’s *al-Filāḥa al-nabaṭiyya* (vol. 1). (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Fatih 3612, f. 1a)

---

**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a, in the upper left corner)

في الله فتح الملكه / فتنهذ داعياً مالكها بالبقاء / والعز المديد أحمد بن علي / المقريزي نطف الله به في شهر ربيع / الآخر سنة ست وثمان مائة.

---

**History of the Manuscript**  Though undated, this volume was written before 640/1242-43 as it belonged to a set in five volumes of which volumes 4 and 5 have been preserved and volume 4 includes a colophon added by a later hand dated from that year; 39 there is an undated ownership statement by Fatḥ Allāh (f. 1a) [fig. 38]; and there is a dated note of acquisition by Ahmad ibn Mubārakšāh al-Ḥanafi (d. 862/1458) who owned the whole set in five volumes (f. 1a) [fig. 39].

---

**Figure 38**

Fatḥ Allāh’s ownership statement in Ibn Waḥšiyya’s *al-Filāḥa al-nabaṭiyya* (vol. 1). (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Fatih 3612, f. 1a)

---

38 On the author and his work, see Hämeen-Anttila 2006. The work was published: Ibn Waḥšiyya 1993-98.

39 See no. 17. The manuscript is more likely from the sixth/twelfth century.

40 ملكه / فتح الله.
17 Rome, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, ms Arabo 904

Manuscript  Same as no. 16 above. This is vol. 4. 253 ff. Part of a set in five volumes.
Description  Same as no. 16 above.
Bibliography  Levi della Vida 1935, 86.

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the upper left corner)

History of the Manuscript  This is a copy made before 640/1242-43, which corresponds to the date added by a later hand; there is an undated ownership statement by Fath Allāh (f. 1a) [fig. 41]; and there is a dated ownership statement by Aḥmad ibn Mubārakšāh al-Ḥanafī (f. 1a) [fig. 42].
18 Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms Huntington 326

**Manuscript** Same as no. 16 above. This is vol. 5. 190 ff. Part of a set in five volumes.

**Description** Same as no. 16 above.

**Bibliography** Uri 1787, 118 (no. CCCCLXIII).

---

42 Frédéric Bauden

---

43 I am grateful to Umberto Bongianino for kindly sending pictures of this manuscript.

---

The year is pretty clear but does not agree with the date provided by the same owner on vol. 1 (see no. 16).
Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the upper left corner)

Figure 43
al-Maqrizi’s consultation note in Ibn Wahšiyya’s al-Filāḥa al-nabaṭiyya (vol. 4). (Courtesy Bodleian Library, ms Huntington, f. 1a)

History of the Manuscript  There is an undated ownership statement by Fatḥ Allāh (f. 1a) [fig. 44], and an ownership statement by Aḥmad ibn Mubārakšāh (f. 1a) [fig. 45].

Figure 44
Fatḥ Allāh’s ownership statement in Ibn Wahšiyya’s al-Filāḥa al-nabaṭiyya (vol. 4). (Courtesy Bodleian Library, ms Huntington, f. 1a)
San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de El Escorial, ms Árabe 534, ff. 132a-289b


Description  This history of Egypt from the Muslim conquest to the author's life-time was written by Muḥammad ibn ʿUbayd Allāh al-Musabbiḥī (d. 420/1029). Only one volume, covering part of the year 414/1023-24 and most of the year 415/1024-25, has been preserved. 47

Bibliography  Derenbourg 1884, 362-3 (no. 534).
History of the Manuscript  This fortieth volume of the work was bound at a later date with another unrelated text; though undated, this copy seems to be from the sixth/twelfth century; there is a consultation note (f. 132a) by ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Awḥadī dated 803/1400-01 in Cairo [fig. 47].

Figure 47  al-Awḥadī’s consultation note in al-Musabbiḥī’s Aḥbār Miṣr. (Courtesy Real Biblioteca de El Escorial, ms Árabe 634, f. 132a)

20 Lost?

Manuscript  Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb, al-Iḥāṭa bi-tārīḫ Ġarnāṭa, vol. 4.
Description  This is a history of Granada in eight volumes composed by the polymath and head of the chancellery in the same city, Lisān al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Ḥaṭīb (d. 776/1374).  
Bibliography  de Castro León 2021, 180-1.

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note:

انتهى منه داعياً لمؤلفه أحمد بن علي المقرزي في شهر ربيع سنة سبع وثمانمائة.

History of the Manuscript  This fourth volume was part of a full set in eight holograph volumes sent by the author to Cairo as an endowment to the Saʿīd al-Suʿadāʾ convent; this volume could still be consulted by the historian from Tlemcen al-Maqqarī (d. 1041/1632) during his stay in Cairo and he registered some of the notes that were left by scholars from various periods; these included, beside al-Maqrīzī’s note, notes by Ibn Duqmāq, Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449), and al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), among others.

21 Tübingen, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek, ms Ma. VI.18


48  قال له أحمد بن عبد الله بن أحمد بن الجليل: سنة 832 / بالقاهرة سنة 1052.
50  There is a lacuna in the text as the number of the month is not provided.
51  This set is considered lost, though some 170 scattered folios were retrieved in al-Azhar mosque in the last century; their fate is currently unknown.
52  Al-Maqqarī 1988, 7: 105-6.
53  He is the chief magistrate who was also a colleague and a friend of al-Maqrīzī. On him, see Van Arendonk, Schacht 1986.
54  الحمد لله وحده قائله على طبقات النحاة واللغويين وكتبه عبد الرحمن بن أبي بكر السيوطي سنة ثمان وستين ومائتين. He is the famous polymath. On him, see Ghersetti 2017.
This concerns the life of the Damascene traditionist Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Nawawī (d. 676/1278) narrated by his student, ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār al-Šāfiʿī (d. 724/1324), who completed the fair copy in 708/1309.

**Bibliography**
Seybold 1907, 36.

---

*Figure 48*

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār’s *Tuḥfat al-ṭālibīn*. (Courtesy Universitätssbibliothek, ms Ma. VI. 18, f. 1a)

**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a, in the upper right corner, parallel to the spine)

ابتنافا داعيا للملكها / أحمد بن علي المفريزي في ذي القعدة سنة 810.

**History of the Manuscript**
This copy appears to be a *unicum*; moreover it was copied by the author’s brother in 744/1343 and collated with the author’s holograph (f. 47a).

---

22 Rabat, al-Maktaba al-Wataniyya, ms 241 qāf

**Manuscript**

**Description**
This work is a multi-volume history of Islam with a major focus on Egypt and Syria up to the author’s own time and preceded by several volumes on the prophets who preceded Muḥammad; it was composed by Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Ibn al-Furāt al-Hanafī (d. 807/1405).

**Bibliography**

---

*Figure 49*


**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a, in the middle of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

استفاد منه داعيا للملكه / أحمد بن علي المفريزي في محرم / سنة 818.

**History of the Manuscript**
This volume is an undated holograph; there is an undated ownership statement by Muḥammad al-Abšādī al-Mālikī (d. aft. 898/1493) (f. 1a) [fig. 50]; there is an undated ownership statement by Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-

---


56 On him and his work, see Bora 2019. The Rabat ms remains unpublished.
ibn [Ināl al-ʿAlāʾī] (d. 902/1497) (f. 1a) [fig. 51]; and there is an undated ownership statement by ʿĀḥmad ibn Fath al-Dīn al-Ẓāʾir (d. bef. 931/1525) (f. 1a) [fig. 52].

| Figure 50 | al-Abšādī’s ownership statement in Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Ṭarīq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk. (Courtesy al-Maktaba al-Wataniyya, ms 241 qāf, f. 1a)57 |
| Figure 51 | al-ʿAlāʾī’s ownership statement in Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Ṭarīq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk. (Courtesy al-Maktaba al-Wataniyya, ms 241 qāf, f. 1a)58 |
| Figure 52 | al-Ẓāʾir’s ownership statement in Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Ṭarīq al-wāḍiḥ al-maslūk. (Courtesy al-Maktaba al-Wataniyya, ms 241 qāf, f. 1a)59 |

23 Rome, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, ms Arabo 726

Manuscript Same as no. 22 above. This volume covers the years 639-58.
Description Same as no. 22 above.60
Figure 53
al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Tariq al-wādh al-maslūk. (Courtesy Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, ms Arabo 726, f. 291b)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 291b, on the left, below the end of the text)

History of the Manuscript 
This is an undated holograph volume.

24 Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms AF 123

Manuscript Same as no. 22 above. This volume covers the years 672-82.
Description Same as no. 22 above.64

Figure 54
al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn al-Furāt’s al-Tariq al-wādh al-maslūk. (Courtesy Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms AF 123, f. 95b)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 95b, in the lower left corner, written vertically)

History of the Manuscript
Another holograph volume.

61 The note is barely legible now, but it was read almost a century ago by Tisserant 1914, xxxiii; however, he was unable to read the second and the third words.
62 The contents of this volume have been published: Ibn al-Furāt 1942.
Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, ms Arabic 3315

**Manuscript**  
al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, vol. 1.63

**Description**  
This catalog of works available in Arabic and composed by Arabs and non-Arabs from Antiquity to the fourth/tenth century was compiled by Muḥammad ibn Išāq al-Nadīm (d. 385/995).64

**Bibliography**  

---

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the upper half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

اِنَتَفَقَ مِنْهُ دَعْوَةً دَاوِعَةً لِّيَوْمَ الْيَوْمِ ۖ [..] ۖ أَحْمَّدُ بْنُ عُلْيَاءُ المَقْرِيْزِيُّ سَنَة٤۸۴١٩٨٩

Al-Maqrīzī also added a biography of al-Nadīm on the title page.65

**History of the Manuscript**  
This is an undated apograph copy datable to the early fifth/eleventh century, an ownership statement (f. 1a) by a certain Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī dated 825/1422 in Damascus [fig. 56]; and there is an ownership statement (f. 1a) by Yaḥyā ibn Ḥiǧǧī al-Šāfiʿī dated 885/1480-81 [fig. 57].

---

63 The second volume is now in Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Şehid Ali Paşa 1934. The text was originally in one volume, and was later separated into two.

64 On the author and his work, see Fleishhammer 1996. The work is published: al-Nadīm 2009.

65 This was edited in al-Nadīm 2009, 1/1: 13 (of the introduction).

66 Arberry 1955-69, 2: 31, wrongly attributes this mark to al-Maqrīzī. This attribution can be dismissed, as demonstrated in this study (see above).

Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3416


**Description**  This is a 27-volume encyclopedic work composed by the chancery secretary Ahmad ibn Yahyā Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī al-Šāfiʿī (d. 749/1349).

**Bibliography**  Defter 1887, 205.

---

**Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note** (f. 1a, in the lower right corner, parallel to the spine)

انتقاف دعاء ملتح / أحمد بن علي الإفريزي / سنة 831.

Three excerpts selected in this multi-volume work are extant in al-Maqrīzī’s note-book held in Liège (ms 2232).

**History of the Manuscript**  This is a copy datable to the eighth/fourteenth century; there is an ownership statement by Ibn al-Bārizī (d. 856/1452) [fig. 59]; and there is an ownership statement by Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Īnāl al-ʿAlāʾī al-Dawādār al-Ḥanafī [fig. 60].

---

68 On him and his work, see Krafūlskī 1990. The work has recently been completely published several times, the last time by Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī 2010, but no real critical edition of the whole is available.

69 See Bauden 2003, 63-4; 2006, 135.

27 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3418


**Description**  Same as no. 26 above.

**Bibliography**  *Defter* 1887, 205.

---

Figure 60

al-ʿAlāʾī’s ownership statement in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3416, f. 1a)

Figure 61

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3418, f. 1a)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

[...] ١٣٨ / أحمد بن علي المغرزي / سنة ٨٣١.

**History of the Manuscript**  Same as no. 26 above.
28 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Laleli 2037
Manuscript   Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 6.
Description   Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  Nil.

Figure 62
al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Laleli 2037, f. 1a)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript   Same as no. 26 above.

29 London, British Library, ms Add. 9589
Manuscript   Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 14.
Description   Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  Stocks 2001, 386.

Figure 63
al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Masālik al-abṣār. (Courtesy British Library, ms Add. 9589, f. 1a)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript   Same as no. 26 above.
30 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3428

Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 15.
Description  Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  Defer 1887, 205.

Figure 64
al-Maqrizi’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Mosālik al-ʿabṣār. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3428, f. 1a)

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above.

31 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms Arabe 2327

Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 17.
Description  Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  de Slane 1883-95, 408.

Figure 65
al-Maqrizi’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s Mosālik al-ʿabṣār. (Courtesy Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms Arabe 2327, f. 3a)

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 3a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above.
32 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3432

**Manuscript** Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 19.

**Description** Same as no. 26 above.

**Bibliography** Defter 1887, 205.

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

**History of the Manuscript** Same as no. 26 above; in addition, there is a consultation note by Umar ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Yahyā ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī al-ʿAdawi al-Qurašī in Cairo dated 793/1391 [fig. 67].

33 Manchester, John Rylands Research Institute and Library, ms Arabic 16

**Manuscript** Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 20.

**Description** Same as no. 26 above.

**Bibliography** Mingana 1934, 532-4.

Figure 66

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3432, f. 1a)

Figure 67

ʿUmar Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3432, f. 1a)

Figure 68

al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī’s *Masālik al-abṣār*. (Courtesy John Rylands Research Institute and Library, ms Arabic 16, f. 3a)

He is the great-great-grandchild of the author of the book.
History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 32 above.

34 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3437

Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 25.
Description  Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  Defter 1887, 205.

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above.

35 Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Yazma Bağışlar 1917

Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above. This is vol. 26.
Description  Same as no. 26 above.
Bibliography  Nil.

Al-Maqrizi’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript  Same as no. 26 above.
36  Istanbul, Millet Genel Kütüphanesi, ms Feyzullah 549


**Description**  A collection of prophetic traditions extracted from Ibn Ḥibbān’s (d. 354/965) *Ṣaḥīḥ*, the selection is limited to the traditions that were not quoted by al-Buḥārī and Muslim, and was organised into chapters by ʿAlī ibn Abī Bakr ibn Sulaymān al-Hayṭami al-Qāhirī al-Šāfiʿī (d. 807/1405).\(^{73}\)

**Bibliography**  Nil.

-Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the upper right corner, parallel to the spine) -

٢٤٨ 
سنة المقريزي علي بن أحمد / [...]

842 / أحمد بن علي المقرزي (سنة) 842.

**History of the Manuscript**  This is a holograph copy.

37  Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 3116

**Manuscript**  Ibn Miskawayh, *Taǧārib al-umam wa-ʿawārif al-humam*, vol. 1. Part of a set in six volumes.\(^{74}\)

**Description**  This is a universal history from the pre-Islamic Persian dynasties until the beginning of Islam down to the author’s lifetime written by the Buyid secretary Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb Ibn Miskawayh (d. 932/1030).\(^{75}\)

**Bibliography**  Defter 1887, 187.

-Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note (f. 1a, in the middle of the upper half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine) -

انتقاء داعيا [ذكیر] / أحمد بن علي المقرزي سنة 844.

---


74  The six volumes are together (mss Ayasofya 3116-21).

75  On the author and his work, see Arkoun 1970. The work is published: Ibn Miskawayh 2001-02.
History of the Manuscript  This is a copy dated 505/1111; it has a dated (797/1395) note of endowment of the whole set by Maḥmūd al-Ustādār (d. 799/1396) to his madrasa in Cairo.  

Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 2577M

Manuscript  Al-Balḫī, Aqālīm al-buldān wa-ṣūrat ǧamīʿ al-ard.

Description  This is an abridgement of Ibn Ḥawqal’s (d. after 368/978) Ṣūrat al-ard, a description of the earth with maps attributed to Abū Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Balḥī.  

Bibliography  Defter 1887, 154.

Figure 73  al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in al-Balḫī’s Aqālīm al-buldān. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 2577M, f. 1a)

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note  (f. 1a, in the middle of the lower half of the inner margin, parallel to the spine)

History of the Manuscript  This was commissioned by ʿAlam al-Dīn Sanǧar al-Ǧāwalī (d. 745/1345) (f. 1a); there is an ownership statement (f. 1a) by Fatḥ Allāh [fig. 74]; and there is a note of endowment by sultan Ḫušqadam (d. 872/1467) to his mosque located in the desert outside Cairo in 871/1466.

Figure 74  Fatḥ Allāh’s ownership statement in al-Balḫī’s Aqālīm al-buldān. (Courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, ms Ayasofya 2577M, f. 1a)

[...] أحمد بن علي المقرزي / سنة ٤٤٨

76 On this person and his library, see Behrens-Abouseif 2018, 25.
78 On him, see al-Ṣafadī 1931-2010, 15: 482-4 (no. 645).
79 ملكه لله
Authors as Readers in the Mamlūk Period and Beyond, 195-266

Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms Marsh 424


Description This is a biography of the Mamlūk sultan al-Mansūr Qalāwūn (r. 678-89/1279-90) composed by the chancery secretary Šāfiʿ ibn ʿAlī ibn Abbās al-Kīnānī al-ʿĀṣqalānī (d. 730/1330). 80

Bibliography Uri 1787, 169 (no. DCCLXVI).

---

**Figure 75**

Al-Maqrīzī’s consultation note in Šāfiʿ ibn ʿAlī’s al-Faḍl al-maʾṭūr. (Courtesy Bodleian Library, ms Marsh. 424, f. 1a)

---

**Figure 76**

Ibn al-Mulūk’s ownership statement in Šāfiʿ ibn ʿAlī’s al-Faḍl al-Maʾṭūr. (Courtesy Bodleian Library, ms Marsh. 424, f. 1a) 82

---

**History of the Manuscript** This is an undated copy possibly made at the author’s request for the library of a certain Šihāb al-Dīn (f. 1 a); 81 there is a dated ownership statement by ‘Uṯmān ibn al-Mulūk in Cairo (f. 1a, in the upper left corner) [fig. 76].

---

80 On him and his work, see Van Den Bossche 2018. The work is published: Šāfiʿ ibn ʿAlī 1998.

81 This Šihāb al-Dīn can be tentatively identified as Šihāb al-Dīn Mahmūd ibn Salmān ibn Fahd al-Ḥalabī (d. 725/1325), a famous chancery secretary and bellettrist celebrated for his prose and poetry. On him, see al-Ṣafadī 1931-2010, 25: 301-61 (no. 196). Another hand added the name Mahmūd below the inscription giving some weight to this identification.

82 He is probably Fahr al-Dīn ‘Uṯmān ibn Muhammad al-Ayyūbī al-Qāhirī, known as Ibn al-Mulūk due to his pedigree, according to which he was a descendent of the Ayubids. He died in 884/1470. On him, see al-Saḥawī 1934-36, 5: 143 (no. 485). The number preceding the year is illegible because the border was damaged. Given the space occupied by the word and taking into account the date of his death (he was more than seventy years old), it must correspond to one of the tens, more probably 40 given that it starts with an alif.
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