

- Mufaddal b. Ebü'l-
Fezâil

Kortantamer, Samira: *Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaddal b. Abi 'l-Fadā'il*. Freiburg/Br.: Schwarz 1973. 430 S. (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen. 23.) Diss. Freiburg.

Rez. U. Haarmann in: *Der Islam* 51.1974. S. 319-320; B. Schäfer in: *ZDMG* 127.1977. S. 138-139.

Derpi No: 271

2 SUPAT 1993

131648 MUFADDAL B. EBÜ'L-FEZÂIL

1

24009 78.

MUFADDAL ibn ABĪ al-FADĀ'IL. فضل بن ابي الفضائل

- النهج السديد والدر الفريد فيما بعد تاريخ ابن الحديد :
حوادث الفترة بين سنتي ٧٧٧ و٧٤١ هجرية / فضل بن ابي
الفضائل

= Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in
der Chronik des Mufaddal b. Abi l-Fadā'il / von
Samira Kortantamer . - Freiburg im Breisgau :
K. Schwarz , 1973 . - [4] - 340 - 114p. : fac-
sim. ; 21cm. -(Islamkundliche Untersuchungen ;23)

"Nahğ (al-) al Sadīd...

[89 G.19788(23)

2

24010 78.

MUFADDAL ibn ABĪ al-FADĀ'IL. فضل بن ابي الفضائل

- النهج السديد

[89 G.19788(23)

[89 G. 19788(23)

.. " Nahğ (Al-) al-sadīd wa al-durr al-farīd fī mā
ba'ada tāriḥ ibn al-'Amīd..." . - Bibliogr.282-
298 .- Index .- Acq.4955-74 .- ISBN 3-87997-023
-8 .

Egypte.1317-1341.
Historien arabe.Texte.

-Syrie.1317-1341.
Historien arabe. Texte.

C. A. A. A. A.

CS
BRF

Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il

von
Samira Kortantamer

80007

95604

MUF. N



KLAUS SCHWARZ VERLAG · FREIBURG IM BREISGAU

KLAUS SCHWARZ VERLAG · FREIBURG IM BREISGAU

1973

- 2 -

erwähnt, daß die benutzte Handschrift, anscheinend das Autograph, zahlreiche Besonderheiten aufweist, die sowohl für die Zeit als auch für den Autor charakteristisch sind. Sie ist daher auch ein wertvolles sprachliches Dokument. Mit der Erschließung des Schlußstücks von Mufaḍḍals "an-Nahḡ as-saḍīd" soll für die Erforschung der mamlukischen Geschichte sowie für die arabische Historiographie neues Material geliefert werden.

I. Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il

Über das Leben des Kopten¹ Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il ist uns nur sehr wenig bekannt. Weder Geburts- noch Todesdatum sind uns überliefert worden. Blochet vertritt die folgende Auffassung: Da Mufaḍḍals Tod weder bei al-Maqrīzī, in "Kitāb as-Sulūk li-ma'rifat duwal al-mulūk", noch bei Ibn Taḡrībīrdī, in "an-Nuḡūm az-zāhira" und "al-Manhal aṣ-ṣāfi", in den Jahren 759/1358 bis 783/1382 Eingang gefunden hat und er, als er 759/1358 seine Chronik beendete, vermutlich nicht mehr jung gewesen ist, denn sonst hätte er sie weitergeführt, ist es augenscheinlich, daß seine sterblichen Überreste im Jahre 783/1382 schon in einem von Kairos Friedhöfen geruht haben². Nau, der davon ausgeht, daß die Handschrift kein Autograph sei, glaubt, daß man Mufaḍḍals Tod auf die Zeit zwischen 742/1342 und 750/1350 setzen muß³. Das einzige Datum, das wir kennen, steht im Kolophon seines Werkes⁴: Im Jahre 759/1358 hat er seine Chronik beendet⁵. Leider kann man dem

Werk sonst keine biographischen Hinweise über den Autor entnehmen. Ebenso sucht man in den einschlägigen biographischen und historischen Werken, wie etwa aṣ-Ṣafadī, al-Maqrīzī und Ibn Taḡrībīrdī, vergeblich nach Auskünften über ihn¹. Auch in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī's "ad-Durar al-kāmina fī a'yan al-mi'a at-tāmina" wird er nicht aufgeführt.

Durch einen unerwarteten Zufall kennen wir aber vier Mitglieder der Familie von Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā'il, die drei verschiedenen aufeinander folgenden Generationen angehören²: Seinen Vater, Abū l-Faḍā'il b. Abī l-Mufaḍḍal aṣ-Ṣafī, der eine, offenbar nicht erhaltene Abhandlung mit dem Namen "Firdaus" geschrieben hat, welche eine Sammlung erbaulicher Geschichten enthält³; seinen Onkel, Ğirġis (Georg) b. Abī l-Mufaḍḍal b. Amīn al-Mulḡ, der im Jahre 754/1353 eine Kopie des Pentateuch "Ḥamsat asfār at-taurāt al-muqaddasa al-munzala ʿalā Mūsā an-nabī" angefertigt hat⁴; den Priester Abū l-Mufaḍḍal, den Vater von Abū l-Faḍā'il aṣ-Ṣafī und von Ğirġis; Amīn al-Mulḡ, den Vater von Abū l-Mufaḍḍal⁵.

1) Über Mufaḍḍals Konfession vgl. Blochet, Histoire, S. [13]-[19].

2) Siehe Blochet, Histoire, S. [9] Anm. 1.

3) Siehe Nau, "Sur al-Makin et Ibn Abi-l-Faza'il", Revue de l'Orient Chrétien 26 (1927/8), S. 210-211.

4) Hs Paris Ar. 4525, fol. 270b.

5) Über die Frage, ob die Handschrift ein Autograph darstellt oder nicht, siehe ausführlich unten S. 13-15. Das im Kolophon verzeichnete Jahr, nämlich 759/1358, wird manchmal versehentlich als Mufaḍḍals Todesdatum angegeben, siehe z.B. Schäfer, Beiträge, S. 9; Kaḡḡāla, Mu'gam al-mu'allifin, XII, S. 315.

1) Wir stützen uns hierbei auf die Angaben bei Blochet, Histoire, S. [8]-[11], der aṣ-Ṣafadī's "al-Wāfi bil-wafayāt", al-Maqrīzī's "Kitāb as-Sulūk li-ma'rifat duwal al-mulūk" und Ibn Taḡrībīrdī's "an-Nuḡūm az-zāhira" und "al-Manhal aṣ-ṣāfi" daraufhin untersucht hat.

2) Die folgenden Angaben entnehmen wir Blochet, Histoire, S. [11]-[12].

3) Dieses Werk wird als die Hauptquelle einer heiligen Mönchen gewidmeten Sammlung von Anekdoten und erbaulichen Erzählungen, deren Verfasser unbekannt ist, angegeben.

4) Ğirġis, der Sohn des Priesters Abū l-Mufaḍḍal b. Amīn al-Mulḡ, der wahrscheinlich zur Geistlichkeit gehörte, scheint ein Gelehrter gewesen zu sein. Er kannte die griechische, hebräische, koptische und arabische Sprache; vgl. ausführlich darüber Blochet, Histoire, S. [11] Anm. 2; Graf, Geschichte, I, S. 131.

5) Der Priester Abū l-Mufaḍḍal und Amīn al-Mulḡ sind uns nur durch den Kolophon des Pentateuchs bekannt. Wie es bereits sein Titel andeutet, bekleidete Amīn al-Mulḡ wahrscheinlich ein Amt in der Finanzverwaltung Ägyptens.

التاريخ العربي والمؤرخون

دراسة في تطور علم التاريخ
ومعرفة رجاله في الإسلام

Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi Kütüphanesi	
Dem. No:	65016
Tas. No:	929 MUS. T

الجزء الثالث

Beirut - 1990

دار العالم للملايين

Muhammad b. Ebu'l-Ferail

وقد جاء بعد ابن العميد مؤرخ قبلي ذيل عليه هو:

٣ - المفضل بن أبي الفضائل

(المتوفى بعد سنة ٧٤١هـ/١٣٤١م). فكتب ذيلاً باسم: «النهج السديد والدر الفريد فيما بعد تاريخ ابن العميد» وفيه تراجم بعض السلاطين العماليك و«تاريخ البطارقة اليعاقبة» و«تاريخ المسلمين في اليمن والهند والتتر» وسوف تأتي على ذكره. ومن هذا الذيل نسخة مخطوطة في باريس رقم ٤٥٢٥.

٤ - ابن ميسر

تاج الدين محمد علي بن يوسف بن جلب راغب المعروف بابن الميسر القاضي الفاضل^(١): توفي سنة ٦٧٧هـ/١٢٧٨م. والمعلومات عن هذا المؤرخ قليلة جداً، ولا تجاوز عدة أسطر في ترجمته، متشابهة في النص والمعنى، وهي تذكر مع نسبه أنه «مؤرخ» وأنه كان فاضلاً بارعاً، وله تصانيف مفيدة، وأنه «دفن في المقطم».

ألف ابن ميسر كتابين في التاريخ:

١ - أحدهما كتاب في قضاة مصر لا نعلم شيئاً عن مصيره سوى أنه كان بين مصادر ابن حجر العسقلاني في رفع الإصر.

٢ - والثاني كتاب تاريخ مصر أو أخبار مصر. وهو تاريخ على السنين في مجلدين ذيل به ابن ميسر على تاريخ المسيحي (عز الملك محمد بن أبي القاسم عبيد الله بن أحمد الحراني كاتب الخليفة الحاكم بأمر الله والمتوفى سنة ٤٢٠هـ/١٠٢٩م). وكان هذا التاريخ في اثني عشر مجلداً^(٢).

وقد ضمت المكتبة الوطنية في باريس مخطوطة باسم «أخبار مصر» لابن ميسر (رقم ١٦٨٨) تتضمن الحوادث ما بين سنتي ٤٣٩ - ٥٥٣هـ/١٠٤٧ - ١١٥٨م، نشرها

= ومقالة Plessner في الموسوعة الإسلامية ج ٣ ص ١٨٣.

وانظر كذلك جرجي زيدان - «آداب اللغة العربية» ج ٣ ص ١٩٤. وكحالة - «معجم المؤلفين» ج ٣ ص ١٢٢. والزركلي - «الأعلام» (الطبعة الجديدة) ج ٢ ص ١١٦. و«هدية العارفين» ج ١ ص ٢٥٠. و«فهرس معهد المخطوطات العربية» (التاريخ) ج ٣ ص ٥٩ - ٦٠.

(١) يذكر الصفيدي («الوافي بالوفيات» ج ٤ ص ١٨٦) وابن تغري بردي في مخطوط «المنهل الصافي» أنه ابن علي بن يوسف بن شاهنشاه المصري. وقد اتبعنا النسب الذي أثبت له المقرئ في «المقفى» (مخطوط ليدن ورقة ١٤٧) وذكره ناشره Massé في القطعة المنشورة من تاريخه.

(٢) من قطعة باقية في الأسكوريال تضم السنوات ٤١٤ - ٤١٥ هـ (وقد طبعت مؤخراً في مصر) وقد ذكر عليها أنها المجلد الأربعون، وما ذكرناه تابعنا فيه كشف الظنون ٣٠٤/١.

١31648

الأول - من الخليفة إلى ظهور الإسلام، اختصر فيه التواريخ وذكر ما حدث للأمم، أمة بعد أخرى، وذكر قصص الأنبياء، ولا سيما موسى والمسيح (حيث أفاض الحديث)، وذكر ملوك النصراني (الروم) إلى ظهور الإسلام.

الثاني - من ظهور الإسلام إلى سنة ٦٥٨هـ. وسماه «تاريخ المسلمين».

وقد اقتبس في هذا القسم الثاني الكثير من تاريخ الطبري، وأورد تراجم الشخصيات البارزة في كل فترة ولكل ترجمة رقمها.

وللقسم الأول مخطوطات عديدة، منها مخطوطة غوطا ١٥٥٧، وليدن ٨٣٦ و ١٢٥ (في ٢١٢ ورقة)، وباريس ٢٩٤ و ٢٩٥ (في ٢٥٨ ورقة)، وفيينا ٨٨٤، وميونخ أول ٣٦٧، ولينغراد ١٦١ و ١٩١.

وللقسم الثاني أيضاً مخطوطات عدة منها: باريس ٤٥٢٤ و ٤٧٢٩، وبرلين ٩٤٤٣، وليدن ٨٣٧، وبودليانا ٤٧/٢.

ونجد المجموع المبارك كله مخطوطاً في المتحف البريطاني ٧٥٦٤ ومانشستر رقم ٢٣٨ ولبزيغ أول ٦٤٣.

وقد ترجم تاريخ ابن العميد إلى اللاتينية ونشر بقلم توماس أرنبيوس بعنوان «تاريخ

العرب»: Th. Erpenius: Historia Sarcenica, Leyde 1625. وسرعان ما ترجم الكتاب إلى الإنكليزية في السنة التالية (سنة ١٦٢٦)، وطبع في أكسفورد بقلم S. Purchas، ثم إلى الفرنسية (سنة ١٦٥٧) في باريس بقلم P. Vattier.

ومضت بعد ذلك فترة تزيد على ثلاثة قرون صار فيها تاريخ المكيين أحد المصادر الاستشراقية الأساسية. ولما كان المترجم الأول قد توقف عند سنة ٥١٢هـ/١١١٧م. من الكتاب، فقد استقر في الأذهان أن هذا التاريخ يقف عند هذه السنة، ولم يهتم أحد بنشر قسمه الباقي الممتد ما بين سنة ٥١٢ و سنة ٦٥٨هـ/١٢٦٠م.

وجاء المستشرق كلود كاهن الفرنسي فنه إلى هذا النقص، ونشر القسم الأخير من هذا التاريخ (ما بين سنة ٦٠٢ و سنة ٦٥٨هـ). بعنوان أخبار الأيوبيين مع مقدمة حولها، وذلك في نشرة الدراسات الشرقية B.E.O. (العدد XV لسنة ١٩٥٥ - ١٩٥٧) التي ينشرها المعهد الفرنسي بدمشق^(١).

(١) انظر حول المكيين ابن العميد:

- بروكلمان (بالألمانية) ج ١ ص ٣٤٨ وبالترجمة العربية ج ٦ ص ١٤٤، ١٤٥.

- وأبليسيف Elisséfe، نور الدين ج ١ ص ٥٧ - ٥٨.

- وكلود كاهن مقدمة أخبار الأيوبيين في B.E.O. العدد ١٥ لسنة ١٩٥٥ - ١٩٥٧ (ص ١١٩ - ١٢٥).

02 KASIM 1981

sources used by them, one of which was al-Ġazārī. It might not be unfair, in fact, to characterize the section of *Nihāyat al-arab* which we have studied as a combination of materials borrowed from *Zubdat al-fikra* and the Syrian sources with relatively little original information. Such a characterization of course needs qualification, for an-Nuwairī does modify and amplify statements made by Baibars al-Manṣūrī and omits information on such areas as the Spanish and Golden Horde states. This same willingness to add and subtract from other authors we have seen illustrated most vividly in an-Nuwairī's treatment of the Ibn Taimiyya affair, in which he not only balances written sources against oral but also makes an innovation of sorts by violating the annalistic pattern. In sum, we can see at times in an-Nuwairī a glimmer of independence in his manipulation of source material, more independence, at any rate, than that evident in his contemporaries. In this connection we might bring up the verdicts rendered by various scholars for and against an-Nuwairī as a historian, one of whom – E. ASHTOR – faults him for his misuse of the topical as opposed to chronological treatment and concludes that "An-Nuwairī often repeats himself, is inaccurate, transmits his sources inexactly, and is decidedly less informative than Ibn al-Furāt"¹. Of these charges, the only one that can be verified from our analysis is repetition; separate treatment of the Mamlūks and Mongols did result in some duplication, probably inevitable in an encyclopedia. Otherwise, ASHTOR must have based his judgments on years other than these here analyzed. Another scholar – GUSTAV WEIL – lodges an even more serious complaint, accusing an-Nuwairī of being unreliable for events which occurred within his lifetime and especially those which reflected upon the glory of the sultan². But against such adverse judgments stands the favorable one of E. BLOCHET: "The chronicle of an-Nuwairī . . . is an excellent one, a pleasure to read; its author did not try to dazzle his readers with elegance, gaudy or in bad taste: it is one of the models of the Muslim historical genre for precision and clarity. It is well known that for the first Mamlūk sultans, it served as the basis for the later chronicles of al-Maqrizī and Abū l-Maḥāsin"³. Although BLOCHET was referring mainly to language and style, he was obviously implying some judgment as to an-Nuwairī as an historian as well. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that an-Nuwairī does not enjoy the complete confidence of modern scholars but that a great deal of work remains to be done – not the least of which is a full edition of the vast encyclopedia in which his history is embedded – before his contribution to Muslim historiography can be judged.

5. *Mufaḍḍal ibn abī l-Faḍā'il*

If an-Nuwairī cannot be trusted as a historian, what can be said of Mufaḍḍal ibn abī l-Faḍā'il, whose *an-Nahḡ as-sadiid wad-durr al-farid fi mā ba'd tāriḥ Ibn al-'Amīd* represents – according to BLOCHET, who edited it – nothing but a careless abridgement of *Nihāyat al-arab*?⁴ In all fairness to Mufaḍḍal it should be pointed out that BLOCHET's pronouncements are not always valid, often being colored, as we have just seen, by stylistic considerations: an-Nuwairī wrote clearly and precisely; he was, therefore, a good historian. Mufaḍḍal wrote awkwardly and crudely; consequently he was a poor historian. Furthermore, according to BLOCHET, Mufaḍḍal could not possibly have excelled as a historian because he was a Copt, and no Copt has ever mastered

¹ *Studies*, p. 15.

² *Geschichte des Abbasiden Chalifats in Egypten*, I, 269, note 1.

³ BLOCHET, E., (ed. and trans.), *Histoire des sultans mamlouks* by Mufaḍḍal ibn abī l-Faḍā'il ("Patrologia orientalis," Vols. XII, XIV, XX, 1919–28), p. 10, note 2. All page citations refer to the compiled one-volume edition of this work, these page numbers appearing in brackets both in this single volume and in the original installments.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.

Arabic!¹ If such indeed were the case one cannot help wondering why BLOCHET should have wasted so much energy on editing an unrewarding history, especially when the model for it which he so greatly admired was also unedited. Be that as it may, *an-Nahḡ as-sadiid* is interesting for present purposes since its author, as a Copt, affords – potentially at least – yet another approach to events already narrated by Muslims of varied qualifications and backgrounds.

Unfortunately, it is Mufaḍḍal's fate to be labelled as the Copt, for other than the fact of his religion few facts are known. Ignored by historians and biographers alike, too insignificant a personage, apparently, to figure even in his own narrative, he is the first author so far studied not even remotely involved – to our knowledge – in the events which he described. In fact, if we can take a marginal note to *an-Nahḡ as-sadiid* seriously, he wrote the history for his own use, not for general consumption, in order to fix in his mind those events which he had witnessed or heard of and which had occurred after the end of the Copt Ibn al-'Amīd's history². Completed in 759/1357–58, *an-Nahḡ as-sadiid* begins with the accession of Baibars I, al-Malik az-Zāhir, in 658/1259–60 and ends with the death of al-Malik an-Nāṣir in 741/1341, a part of which, up to 717/1317–18 has been edited and translated into French by BLOCHET³.

Table 14

694/1294–95

Sultans

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Royal Mamlūk uprising (419–21) | 4. Kitbugā's appointees (423–24) |
| 2. Death of patriarch Theodosius (422) | 5. Arrival of Oirats (424–25) |
| 3. Accession of Kitbugā (422–23) | 6. Famine and high prices (427–28) |

It should be noted in the beginning that Mufaḍḍal did not consistently arrange his narrative strictly as an annal, that is, with yearly chronological divisions and headings; but he did follow in the main a rough chronological sequence, justifying our inclusion of the last two items in the table for this year. To the arrival of the Oirats he assigns no date whatever, and for the incidence of high prices he merely states, correctly, that the inflation occurred and lasted during both 694/1294–95 and 695/1295–96. Obviously, then, events which took place around the end of 694 and the beginning of 695 he allowed to run together in his narrative. Although from one point of view such a practice might indicate carelessness and result in some confusion, from another standpoint it reflects a deliberate deviation from a rigid form, further evidence of which we shall see elsewhere.

As authority for the Mamlūk uprising Mufaḍḍal cites Baibars al-Manṣūrī, but it is certain that neither of that author's works served as the sole source for this incident, for Mufaḍḍal presents information not recorded by Baibars al-Manṣūrī, namely, a numerical estimate of the Mamlūks involved in the insurrection⁴. And since this bit of information is also lacking in *Nihāyat al-arab*, the alleged master source for *an-Nahḡ as-sadiid*, it is obvious that Mufaḍḍal used still another source. Obvious too that Mufaḍḍal relied on his own judgment in organizing his account, by far the most coherent studied so far. Coherence he achieves simply by culling the significant facts of the episodes, combining them with what led to and resulted from the event, and stating all in terse, concrete detail. Such seems to us a routine procedure and yet

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³ The complete text of this work, covering the years 658–741/1259–1340–41, exists in manuscript: Bibliothèque Nationale Arabic MS, 4525, hereafter referred to as *Nahḡ* MS. The portion edited by BLOCHET, from the beginning through 716/1316–17, is hereafter referred to as *Sultans*.

⁴ *Sultans*, pp. 417–29.

Samira Kortantamer, *Aegypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaddal b. Abî l-Fada'il*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1973, s. 2-11.

Tercüme: Hilal Görgün

(Sayfa 2) Mufaddal b. Ebi'l-Fedail

Kıpti Mufaddal b. Ebi'l-Fedail'in hayatı hakkında çok az şey bilinmektedir. Doğum ve ölüm tarihleri bize ulaşmamıştır. Blochet aşağıdaki fikirleri savunmaktadır: Mufaddal'ın ölümü ne Makrizi'nin *Kitabu's-Sülûk*'unda ne de İbn Tagribirdi'nin *en-Nücumu'z-zahire* ve *el-Menhelü's-sâfi* adlı eserlerinde¹ 759/1358-783/1382 arasında zikredilmemiştir. Mufaddal 759/1358'de tarihini bitirdiğinde muhtemelen genç değildi, zira aksi takdirde devam ederdi. Görünüşe göre cesedinden kalanlar 783/1382'de Kahire'nin mezarlıklarında bulunuyordu². Yazmanın müellif nüshası olmadığına inanan Nau'a göre Mufaddal'ın ölüm tarihi 742/1342-750/1350 arasında olmalıdır³. Bildiğimiz tek tarih eserin arkasındadır⁴: 759/1358'de tarihini bitirdi⁵. (Sayfa 3) Ne yazık ki eserden yazarı hakkında başka bir bilgi edinemiyoruz. Aynı şekilde Safedi, Makrizi ve İbn Tagribirdi gibi tabakat ve tarih kitaplarında da onun hakkında bilgi yoktur⁶. İbn Hacer el-Askalani'nin *ed-Dürer*'inde de adı geçmez.

Beklenmedik bir tesadüfle Mufaddal b. Ebi'l-Fedail'in ailesinden dört kişiyi tanıyoruz ki bunlar ard arda gelen üç nesle aittirler⁷: Babası Ebu'l-Fedail b. Ebi'l-Mufaddal es-Safi, ki bu halihazırda mevcut olmayan *Firdevs* başlıklı bir eser yazmıştır. Bu eser bazı dini hikayeleri içermektedir⁸. ~~Amcası~~ ^{Diyisi} Circis (Georg) b. Ebi'l-Mufaddal b. Eminü'l-Mülk, ki bu da 754/1353'te Hamsetü esfar et-Tevrat el-mukaddese el-münzele ala Musa en-nebi'yi istinsah

¹ Mufaddal'ın dini hakkında krş. Blochet, *Histoire*, s. 13-19

² Bk. Blochet, *Histoire*, s. 9, dipnot 1.

³ Bk. Nau, *Sur al Makin*, 210-211

⁴ Paris el yazması, Ar. 4525, vr. 270b.

⁵ Bu yazmanın müellif nüshası olup olmadığı hakkındaki tartışmalar için aşağıya bakınız. Eserin sonunda verilen 759/1358 tarihi bazen yanlışlıkla Mufaddal'ın ölüm yılı olarak verilmektedir. Mesela bk. Schaefer, *Beitraege*, s. 9; Kehhale, *Mu'cem*, XII, s. 315.

⁶ Bu konuda Blochet, *Histoire*, s. 8-11'deki bilgileri esas alıyoruz. O burada Safedi'nin *el-Vafi'sini*, Makrizi'nin *Kitabu's-süluk'unu* ve İbn Tagribirdi'nin *en-Nücumu'z-zahire* ve *el-Menhelü's-safi'sini* incelemiştir.

⁷ Aşağıdaki bilgileri Blochet, *Histoire*, s. 11-12'den alıyoruz.

⁸ Bu eser bir din adamına ithaf edilen bazı anekdotlar ve dini hikayeleri ihtiva eden yazarı belirsiz bir kitabın ana kaynağı olarak geçer.

by implication, according to the terminology of Western grammar.

Sībawayhi distinguishes between two types of implicit words: those of which the manifestation (*izhār*) is utilised (*mustaʿmal*) and those of which the manifestation is laid aside (*matrūk*).

The implicit word can be a verb or a particle, the existence of which, implied in the conversation, justifies the rection observed in the governed word.

Bibliography: Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. Derenbourg, i, 329-50; Mubarrad, *K. al-Muktaḍab*, ed. ʿUḡayma, iii, 186; Ibn al-Sarrādj, *K. al-Uṣūl fi ʿl-naḥw*, ed. al-Fatī, ii, 115-26; Ibn Yaʿīsh, *Sharḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, ed. Cairo, iii, 84-125; G. Troupeau, *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sibawayhi*, Paris 1976, 132.

(G. TROUPEAU)

MUDROS [see MONDROS].

MUEZZIN [see MUʿADHDHIN].

MUFADDAL B. ABI ʿL-FADĀʾIL, Coptic historian who lived in the 8th/14th century. His only known work, *al-Nahḍj al-sadīd wa ʿl-durr al-farīd fīmā baʿd Taʾrīkh Ibn al-ʿAmīd*, is an account of the Bahrī Mamlūk period from 658/1260 until 741/1340.

Nothing more is known about al-Mufaḍḍal's life than his Coptic confession and the year in which he completed his *Nahḍj*, 759/1358. A passage in Ghāzī al-Wāsiṭ's *Radd ʿalā Ahl al-Dhīmīma wa-man tabiʿahum* (ed. and tr. R. Gottheil, in *JAOS* [1921], 338-457), in which a certain Abu ʿl-Fadāʾil figures as the nephew (*ibn ukht*) of the Coptic historian al-Makīn b. al-ʿAmīd [*q.v.*], has led modern scholars to affirm that al-Mufaḍḍal was the great-nephew of his more famous predecessor, whose world history *al-Maḍjūʿ al-mubārak* he sought to continue.

In his *Nahḍj*, a necrological chronicle with a basically annalistic structure, al-Mufaḍḍal concentrates on political history in Egypt and Syria, but also sheds some light on events in other parts of the Muslim world, particularly those pertaining to the Mongol empire in Persia.

The intricate problem of al-Mufaḍḍal's sources has been studied mainly by D.P. Little, U. Haarmann and S. Kortantamer in the framework of Mamlūk historiography and cannot be dealt with here. Suffice it to say that the *Nahḍj* is not a servile copy of al-Nuwayrī's [*q.v.*] *Nihāyat al-arab* as Blochet contended; several texts have been shown to share enough features with the *Nahḍj* to be regarded as its direct or indirect *Vorlage* or as deriving from a common source. Besides the *Nihāya*, this goes for Shams al-Dīn al-Djazarī's [*q.v.*] *Hawādīth al-zamān*, Ibn al-Dawādārī's [*q.v.*] *Kanz al-durar*, Baybars al-Manṣūrī's [*q.v.*] *Zubdat al-fikra* and other texts.

Information of specifically Coptic interest in the *Nahḍj* is limited to a few notes on the Coptic patriarchs of the period and a small number of other times. In most cases, an implicitly Christian attitude may only be detected where comparison with other (Muslim) texts points towards al-Mufaḍḍal's omission of details which discredited his coreligionists (for this method, see Haarmann, *Quellenstudien*, 142-4, and Kortantamer, *Mufaḍḍal*, 38-40).

Although the *Nahḍj* does not appear to have had any direct influence on later Mamlūk historians, the passages where al-Mufaḍḍal writes as a contemporary observer of events make it a valuable document of central importance to the period which it describes. In those parts where he draws upon older texts, moreover, al-Mufaḍḍal displays an undeniable originality in his ability to organise his sources in a coherent and meaningful manner.

Bibliography: The unique ms. (probably al-

Mufaḍḍal's autograph), of the *Nahḍj*, Paris ar. 4345, was ed. and tr. by E. Blochet, *Moufazzal ibn Abi l-Fazāil, Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks. Texte arabe publié et traduit en français*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, xii (1919), 345-550, xiv (1920), 375-672, and xx (1929), 3-270. This edition contains the text of the *Nahḍj* up to the year 716/1316. The remaining part was edited and translated by S. Kortantamer, *Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaḍḍal b. Abi l-Fadāʾil* (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 23), Freiburg im Breisgau 1973, whose introduction includes a limited but valuable study of the problem of sources, continuing the research carried out by D.P. Little, *An introduction to Mamlūk historiography. An analysis of Arabic annalistic and biographical sources for the reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāʾūn* (Freiburger Islamstudien 2), Wiesbaden 1970, and U. Haarmann, *Quellenstudien zur frühen Mamlukenzeit* (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 1), Freiburg im Breisgau 1970. See also the reviews of Kortantamer's book by U. Haarmann in *Isl.*, li (1974), 319-20, and by B. Schäfer in *ZDMG*, cxxvii (1977), 138 (with further suggestions for parallels with al-Shuḍjāʿī and al-Makrīzī). On al-Mufaḍḍal's family link with al-Makīn, see F. Nau, *Sur al-Makin et Ibn Abi-l-Fazāil*, in *ROC*, xxvi (1927-8), 208-11. For all other works incidentally dealing with al-Mufaḍḍal, see Kortantamer's extensive bibliography.

(J. DEN HEIJER)

AL-MUFADDAL B. MUḤAMMAD B. YAʿLĀ b. ʿAmīr b. Sālīm b. al-Rammāl AL-DABBĪ, an Arabic philologist of the Kufan school. By birth he was a free-born Arab; the date of his birth is not known. His father was a recognised authority on the events in the wars of the Arabs on the frontiers of *Khurāsān* in 30-90/651-709 (quoted in al-Ṭabarī, *Annales*). It is possible that his son was born in this region. As a partisan of the house of ʿAlī he took part in the rising against the ʿAbbāsīd caliph al-Manṣūr led by Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd Allāh [*q.v.*], brother of *al-Nafs al-zakiyya*. The rising was put down and Ibrāhīm killed; al-Mufaḍḍal was taken prisoner but pardoned by the caliph and appointed tutor to his son, the future caliph al-Mahdī, in whose train he visited *Khurāsān*. He then worked in Kūfa as a philologist and teacher; among his pupils was his son-in-law Ibn al-Aʿrābī [*q.v.*]. The date of his death is variously given; the *Fihrist* does not give it at all while others give 164, 168 or 170/781, 784-5 or 786-7.

Al-Mufaḍḍal, like his contemporary Ḥammād [*q.v.*] bore the epithet and title of honour al-Rāwiya, and was regarded as an authority on the poetry of the *Djāhiliyya*. In contrast to Ḥammād, he is celebrated for the reliability of his transmission. In the *Kitāb al-Aghānī* there are several stories illustrating this fact. While Ḥammād was accused of having inserted into poems of the *Djāhiliyya* verses which he had himself composed, al-Mufaḍḍal is praised for handing down the old poetry pure and unfalsified. There was, of course, a great rivalry between the two *rāwīs* which also finds expression in the stories of the *Aghānī*. Al-Mufaḍḍal is reported to have said that the influence of Ḥammād on Arabic poetry had been most disastrous, to a degree which could never be corrected. To the question what this meant and whether Ḥammād had made mistakes in the attribution of the poems or linguistic errors, he replied that if that were all, it could be corrected, but he had done worse than this. Since he was such an authority on the old poets, he was able to write verses in their style and he had inserted such verses of his own composition into genuine old *kaṣīdas* so that now only very good critics of the

ذخائر التراث العربية الإسلامية, مج. الأول, ١٩٨١/١٤٠١.

ISAM 95809.

38

[y.y : y.y.] ص.

ابن أبي الفضائل *Mufaddal b. Ebū' Fozail*
مفضل ، القبطي المصري (بعد ٧٥٩ هـ)

١ - النهج السديد والدر الفريد فيما بعد تاريخ ابن العميد •

- تحقيق : اي • بلوشيه E. Bloché

باريس ، ١٩١١ - ١٩٣٢ م ، مع ترجمة الى الفرنسية

[يشتمل على تاريخ الفترة من أواخر سنة ٦٥٨ هـ (ابتداء الدولة الظاهرية

الى شوال سنة ٧٥٩ هـ] •

7 AGUSTOS 2005

Coptic historian writing in Arabic (fl. at least until 1358).

780
Mufaddal wrote a historical chronicle of the Bahri Mamlūk dynasty in Egypt from 1260 to 1349, i.e., from Baibars (ruled 1260-77) to al-Nāṣir Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ḥasan (first rule 1347-51). It was meant as a sequel to the Kitāb al-majmū' al-mubārak of al-Makīn Ibn al-'Amīd (XIII-2), according to a statement in his own preface and to the title Kitāb al-naḥj al-sadīd wal-durr al-farīd fī mā ba'd ta'rīkh Ibn al-'Amīd, but its fortune was very different. Al-Makīn was very well known in the East and was one of the earliest Arabic chroniclers to be known in the West, whereas Mufaddal remained practically unknown. The latter's work was represented by a single MS (Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, MS arabe 4525), apparently the very MS prepared under his own direction. It was ignored by later Arabic historians such as Yūsuf ibn Taghrībīrdī (d. 1412) and al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442).

According to its own explicit, the MS was completed on September 16, 1358. We may assume that the author was then an old man; the date of his death is unknown, but was certainly anterior to 1381/82. He says that he wrote the chronicle for himself, narrating events which he had witnessed or which had been told to him by witnesses.

He quotes a number of sources, such as Baibars al-Manṣūrī (XIV-1), but he does not quote by name the main one, al-Nuwairī (XIV-1). His abundant summaries extracted from al-Nuwairī always begin "Qāla-l-mu'arrikh" (Said the historian), which may be construed as a very fine tribute to the author of the Nihāyat al-arab.

Though the circumstances of Mufaddal's life are unknown, the names of four members of his family have come down to us, to wit his father, an uncle, a grandfather, a great-grandfather. The name of the last mentioned, Amīn al-mulk, suggests that he was employed in the Mamlūk treasury (a traditional office for Copts).

There is no doubt that Mufaddal was a Copt, but the strange mixture of Christian and Muslim formulas in his chronicle is perplexing. It expresses a kind of dual personality.

Mufaddal's chronicle is of value not only for Mamlūk history, but also for the history of the Coptic patriarchate, the Muslims of Arabia and India, and the Tatars.

Text. Text edited and translated into French with notes by Edgar Blochet: Histoire des sultans mamlouks (Patrologia orientalis 12, 345-550, 1919; 14, 375-672, 1920; 20, 1-270, 1928; in all, 776 p.), this includes the chronicle to 1316; to be completed.

Criticism. Brockelmann (1, 348, 1898; suppt. 1, 590, 1937). G. W. (EI 2, 1002, 1927).

(Mufaddal b. Abi-l-
Said al-Mu'arrikh)