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Abstract

The Mamluks of Egypt and Syria excelled in most arts, especially architecture and Qurʾān manuscript production. While their architecture is heavily studied, very little in depth research has been done on their Qurʾān manuscripts, especially the collection kept at the National Library of Egypt (Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya). This dissertation examines and analyzes the illumination and calligraphy of the Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts produced after the death of the Mamluk sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (d. 741/1341) until the death of the second Circassian Mamluk sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (d. 815/1412), that are kept in Dār al-Kutub. This period in Mamluk history was a turbulent one with socio-political calamities, yet Qurʾān manuscript production was not affected.

Illumination and calligraphy workshops have been identified using stylistic similarities in conjunction with the information found in the rich chronicles and biographical dictionaries of the Mamluk period. Biographies of artists, mostly calligraphers, were reconstructed and their modes of learning were investigated to shed light on their training process depending primarily
on the calligraphy treatises of the period. Patrons, especially in their capacity as supporters of workshops, were also studied in light of the primary sources and to a lesser extent through their architecture.
Calligraphy and Illumination are as it were compensations for such contingencies as ink and paper, a ‘set up’ which makes it possible, in a flash of wonderment, to approach more nearly and penetrate more deeply the Divine Substance of the Quranic text, and thus to receive a ‘taste’, each soul according to its capacity, of the Infinite and the Eternal.
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Note on Transliteration, Style and Plates

In the transliteration of Arabic and Persian words, I have adopted the system of the International Journal of Middle East Studies with a few changes. The double letter ya’ (with a shadda) is transliterated by an ‘i’ followed by two ‘y’s. The ta’ marbūṭa is transliterated with a single ‘a’ at the end of the word instead of ‘ah’. However, words that are part of an Arabic grammatical construction and end in ta’ marbūṭa, end in a ‘t’ instead of the ‘a’.

Unless otherwise noted I have made all the translations myself. I have used the most common ways for spelling names of the mamlūks unless I have found a different vocalization in one of the colophons I have.
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<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 150, c.1356-58, for Shīrghītmish al-Nāṣīrī, juz’ 20, opening pages, f. 2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 64</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 150, c.1356-58, for Shīrghītmish al-Nāṣīrī, juz’ 10, opening pages, f. 1b, detail © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 68</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 704, 634/1236, by Qutlug ibn ‘Abdallāh, ff. 1b-2a (James, Master Scribes, 54-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 70</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 538, 707/1307, by Muḥammad ibn Aybak, for Sultan Uljaytū, f. 17b (Lings, Splendours, pl. 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 72</td>
<td>Coptic alphabet (Azevedo, <em>Coptic Dictionary</em>, xiii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 73</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 61, c.1356-58, for Şirghītmish al-Nāṣīrī, *juz’*1, opening pages, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 77</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c. 1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*1, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 78</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c. 1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*20, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 79</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c.1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*1, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 80</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c.1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*20, finispage, ff. 56b-57a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 85</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 59, c.1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*1, f. 1b, detail © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 89</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 59, c.1356-61, for Sultan Hasan, *juz’*1, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xviii
| Pl. 93 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 59, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, *juz’*1, ff. 52b-53a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 94 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 82, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, frontispiece, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 95 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 82, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, f. 35a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 96 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 82, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, last page © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 97 | Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 450, 713/1313 by Shādhī ibn Muḥammad ibn Shādhī ibn Dāwūd ibn ʿĪsā ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb, Aydughdī ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Bakrī and ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Rassām al-Aʿṣar, for Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, finispiece, f. 302b (Lings, *Splendours*, pl. 43) |
| Pl. 99 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 5, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, opening pages, f. 2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 100 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 5, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, opening pages, f. 1b © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt) |
| Pl. 101 | Four stages for preparing the reed pen |
| Pl. 107 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 70, 757/1356, by Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ṭahmād al-
| Pl. 110 | Chester Beatty Library, Is 1464, *juz’* 4, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin |
| Pl. 111 | Chester Beatty Library, Is 1465, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin |
| Pl. 112 | The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 29, 681/1282, by Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī, frontispiece, f. 1a (James, *Master Scribes*, 61) |
| Pl. 122 | The British Library, Or 848, *juz’* 9, frontispiece, f. 1b (James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūk*, 211) |
| Pl. 123 | Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 70, 757/1356, by Yāḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 125</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 24, Uljāyṭu Baghḍad Qur‘ān manuscript, <em>juz‘</em> 20, frontispiece, f. 2a (James, <em>Qur‘āns of the Mamluks</em>, 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 130</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 250, The anonymous Baghḍad Qur‘ān, 702/1303, by Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī and Muḥammad ibn Aybak, <em>juz‘</em> 2, frontispiece, f. 1b (James, <em>Qur‘āns of the Mamluks</em>, 211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 131</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1463, 14th century, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 140</td>
<td>The British Library, Add 22406, 704-5/1304-6, by Ibn al-Waḥīd, Sandal and his workshop, for Baybars al-Jāshnakīr, juz’ 7, colophon, f. 166b (James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 141</td>
<td>The British Library, Add 22406, 704-5/1304-6, by Ibn al-Waḥīd, Sandal and his workshop, for Baybars al-Jāshnakīr, juz’ 5, f. 2b (James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 142</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1479, c. 705-15/1306-15, by Sandal, closing pages, f. 235b © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 143</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1479, c. 705-15/1306-15, by Sandal, opening pages, signature, ff. 2b-3a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 144</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1469a, 734/1334, juz’ 8, opening pages, ff. 1b-2a (Wright, Look of the Book, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 145</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 450, 713/1313 by Shādhī ibn Muḥammad ibn Shādhī ibn Dāwūd ibn ‘Īsā ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb, Aydughdī ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakrī and ‘Āfī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Rassām al-A’sar, for Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, opening, f. 2b (James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 146</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’ 3, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 147</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’ 9, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 148</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 58, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’ 10, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 152</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 59, c.1356-61, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’ 27, f. 6a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 155</td>
<td>Iran-Bastan Museum, 2061, 739/1339, by Ahmad ibn Baylîk al-Muhsînî, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a (James, <em>Qur’âns of the Mamlûks</em>, 247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 157</td>
<td>Marginal medallions: Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59 © Dâr al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 165</td>
<td>Dâr al-Kutub, Raṣīd 62, c.1356-61, by Sawunju al-Rasûlî, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’1, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dâr al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 166</td>
<td>Dâr al-Kutub, Raṣīd 62, c.1356-61, by Sawunju al-Rasûlî, for Sultan Ḥasan, juz’1, f. 1a © Dâr al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 167</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 541, Ulijāytû’s Mosul Qur’ân manuscript, 1304-16, by ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad ibn Zayd, for Sultan Ulijāytû, juz’21, f. 9a (James, <em>Qur’âns of the Mamlûks</em>, 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 170</td>
<td>Dâr al-Kutub, Raṣīd 62, c.1356-61, by Sawunju al-Rasûlî, for Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Kutub al-Misriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 204</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 71, 757/1356, most probably by Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ahmad al-Qādī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī, juz’6, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 210</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 6041, 506/1112, f. 1 <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8433296d.r=arabe%206041">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8433296d.r=arabe%206041</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 211</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 1610, 607-22/1210-25, f. 72b (Splendeur et majesté, 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 212</td>
<td>Tehran Bastan Museum, 4277, 685/1286, by Yaḥyā al-Mustaṣimī, f. 598a (Lings, Splendours, pl. 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 213</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 6716, 686/1287, ff. 1b-2a (Splendeur et majesté, 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 214</td>
<td>Iran Bastan Museum, 3548, 704/1304, by Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī and Muḥammad ibn Aybak, juz’10, f. 48b (Lings, Splendours, pl. 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 215</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France Arabe 2324, Majmūʿa al-Rashidiyya, 707-10/1307-10, frontispiece, ff. 3b-4a (Verany-Nouri and Berthier, Eluminures, 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), K. 430, 739/1339, Yahyā al-Jamālī al-Ṣūfī, opening pages, f. 2a (Lings, <em>Splendours</em>, pl. 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, K.3, 709/1309, frontispiece, f. 1b (James, <em>Qur’āns of the Mamlūks</em>, 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 452, 741/1340, by Muḥammad ibn Sayf al-Dīn al-Naqqāsh, frontispiece, f. 1b (James, <em>Qur’āns of the Mamlūks</em>, 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Art and History Trust, c. 1330, text page (Soudavar, Art of the <em>Persian Courts</em>, 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 452, 741/1340, by Arghūn al-Kāmilī and Muḥammad ibn Sayf al-Dīn al-Naqqāsh, opening pages, f. 3a (Lings, <em>Splendours</em>, pl. 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>John Rylands University Library, 760-773, c. 1335 (James, <em>Qur’āns of the Mamlūks</em>, 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 236</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, frontispiece, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 238</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 239</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 33b-34a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 243</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 7b-8a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 244</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 4b-5a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 245</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 6b-7a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 246</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 80, 770/1369, for Khawand Baraka, *juz’*1, ff. 10b-11a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 248</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 6, 769/1368, for Khawand Baraka, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 249</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 243, 707/1307, by Muḥammad ibn Aybak, for Sultan Uljaytū, *juz’*7, f. 2a (Lings, <em>Splendours</em>, pl. 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 250</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, E.H. 247, by Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī and Muḥammad ibn Aybak, ff. 40b-41a (Lings, <em>Splendours</em>, pl. 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 251</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 6, 769/1368, for Khawand Baraka, opening pages, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 253</td>
<td>Mural on the north wall of a tomb in Dongercun, Pucheng County, Shaanxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 2, waqf statement, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 2, ff. 4b-5a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 1, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 2, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 1, opening pages, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 1, ff. 3b-4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 1, ff. 37b-38a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 249, the anonymous Baghdad Qur‘ān, 705/1305, by Ahmad al-Suhrawardi and Muḥammad ibn Aybak, juz’13, frontispiece, ff. 2b-3a (James, Qur‘āns of the Mamluks, 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 1, f. 380b © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 9, 770/1369, for Sultan Sha‘bān, volume 2, opening pages, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 245, Uljaytu Baghdad Qur‘ān, 1307-1313, by Muḥammad ibn Aybak ibn ‘Abdallāh, for Sultan Uljaytu, juz’20, f. 2b (James, Qur‘āns of the Mamluks, 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 238, 710/1311, by Sulaymān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Persian Supplement 205, Tārikh-i jahān-gushā, 689/1290, Baghdad, f. 2a. (Kadoi, ‘Cloud Patterns,’ 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 500, Manafi‘ al-ḥayawān, c. 1300, f. 31 (Kadoi, Islamic Chinoserie, 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Lala Ismail Efendi 565, Kashf al-asrār, 14th c, Egypt, (Haldane, Mamluk Painting, 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, EH 248, 715/1315, by ‘Abdallāh ibn Abū al-Qāsim al-Tūvī al-Rūdāvārī, for Rashīd al-Dīn, ff. 2b-3a © Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>The British Library, Or. 3623, Athār al-bīlād, 729/1329, ff. 2b-3a, (Wright, Look of the Book, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>The British Library, Or. 2676, Jawāmi‘ al-ḥikayāt, 732/1332, (Wright, Look of the Book, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 312</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 141, 776/1374 by Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṭūrī al-Tunūkhī al-Malākī al-Aṣḥāfī, most probably for Sultan Shaʿbān, frontispiece, f. 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 313</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1521, c. 1430, (Wright, <em>Islam</em>, 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 317</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 14, c. 1350s, opening pages, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 318</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 14, c. 1350s, opening pages, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 319</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 14, c. 1350s, opening pages, ff. 7b-8a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 320</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 321</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 322</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, opening pages, ff. 2b-3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 323</td>
<td>Iran-Bastan Museum, 3548, 704/1304, <em>juz‘</em> 10, f. 2a (Lings and Safadī, <em>The Qur‘ān</em>, 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 324</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 538, 707/1307, by Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Image Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 325</td>
<td>Marble panel from the madrasa of Şirghitmish, now in the Museum of Islamic Art, courtesy of the American University in Cairo Press © Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 326</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, text page © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 327</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, text page © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 328</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, text page © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 329</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 12, c. 1380s, for Sultan Barqūq, closing pages, 254b-255a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 330</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 595, 784/1382-3, by Aḥmad ibn ʿAḥmad al-ʿAjami al-Mudḥahhib, frontispiece, f. 2a (James, Master Scribes, 191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 332</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 595, 784/1382-3, by Ahmad ibn ʿAḥmad al-ʿAjami al-Mudḥahhib, ff. 333b-334a (Rogers, The Arts of Islam, 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 334</td>
<td>The British Library, Add 22406, 704-5/1304-6, by Ibn al-Waḥid, Şandal and his workshop, for Baybars al-Jāshnakir, juz′ 2, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a <a href="http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa00-a67a-11db-87d3-0050c2490048&amp;c=book">http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa00-a67a-11db-87d3-0050c2490048&amp;c=book</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 335</td>
<td>The British Library, Add 22406, 704-5/1304-6, by Ibn al-Waḥid, Şandal and his workshop, for Baybars al-Jāshnakir, juz′ 6, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a <a href="http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa00-a67a-11db-87d3-0050c2490048&amp;c=book">http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa00-a67a-11db-87d3-0050c2490048&amp;c=book</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 343</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 14, c. 1350s, f. 4a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 351</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 445, c. 1380s, frontispiece, f. 1b, (Tanindi, Anniversary of the Qur’ān, 259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 365</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 450, 713/1313 by Shādhi ibn Muḥammad ibn Shādhī ibn Dāwūd ibn ‘Īsā ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayūb, Ḥaydūḏī ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakrī and ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Rassām al-Aʿṣar, for Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, closing pages (James, <em>Qur’āns of the Mamluks</em>, 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 372</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 187, c. 1380s-1410, ff. 1b-2a (Rogers, <em>The Arts of Islam</em>, 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 125, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 27, ff. 30b-31a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 1, ff. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 1, f. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, f. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 1, ff. 25b-26a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 120, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, ff. 17b-18a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 121, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 121, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, f. 1b-2a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 121, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 24, ff. 11b-12a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 124, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 20, ff. 15b-16a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 124, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, juz’ 20, ff. 25b-26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, H. 231, Taṛjuma-i ḥiyyā’t- ’ulūm al-dīn, 745/1344, f. 1a © Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Rašīd 13, c. 786-801/1384-1399, for Sultan Barquq, f. 3a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 405</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 182, c. 1340s, medallion on f. 41a (Wright, <em>Look of the Book</em>, 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 406</td>
<td>The Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 242, c. 1340s, medallion on f. 30a (Wright, <em>Look of the Book</em>, 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 111, 74x/134x, by ʿAbdallāh al-Shāfīʿī, ff. 8b-9a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 111, 74x/134x, by ʿAbdallāh al-Shāfīʿī, frontispiece, f. 1a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 430</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, view from Maydān al-Rumayla, facing west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 431</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, map and plan (Herz, Sultan Hassan, Pl. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 432</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 433</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, portal, west end of north façade, west side of portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 434</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, portal, left jamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 435</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, portal, left jamb, chamfering above plinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 436</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, Ḥanafi madrasa, inscription band around courtyard, Muḥammad ibn Baylīk al-Muḥsīnī’s name on south wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 437</td>
<td>Floral bands from the frontispieces of Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7 and Raṣīd 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 438</td>
<td>The bimaristan of al-Mū`ayyad Shaykh, 821/1418, façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 439</td>
<td>Bayn al-Qasrayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 440</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Barquq, 786/1384, qibla iwan, ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 441</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Barquq, 786/1384, court, northwest door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 442</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Barquq, 786/1384, portal, marble panel above door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 443</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, vestibule, marble panel on south wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 444</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Barquq, 786/1384, qibla iwan showing tripartite division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 445</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Qalāwūn, 683/1284, qibla iwan showing tripartite division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 446</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Barquq, 786/1384, portal, inscription band around jambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 447</td>
<td>The khānqāh of Faraj ibn Barquq, 803/1400, view from the roof of the southern riwāq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 448</td>
<td>The khānqāh of Faraj ibn Barquq, 803/1400, plan (Mustafa, al-Turāth al-mi’mārī, 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 449</td>
<td>The khānqāh of Faraj ibn Barquq, 803/1400, northern mausoleum, miḥrāb wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 450</td>
<td>The madrasa of Tatar al-Hijāziyya, 748/1347, plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 451</td>
<td>The madrasa of Tatar al-Hijāziyya, 748/1347, inscription band around sahn and qibla iwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 452</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 6, 769/1368, for Khawand Baraka, waqf statement, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 454</td>
<td>The madrasa of Khawand Baraka, 770/1368, plan (<em>Mamluk Art</em>, 123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 455</td>
<td>The madrasa of Khawand Baraka, 770/1368, upper part of court © Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation (<a href="http://www.islamic-art.org">www.islamic-art.org</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 456</td>
<td>The madrasa of Khawand Baraka, 770/1368, façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 457</td>
<td>The madrasa of Khawand Baraka, 770/1368, portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 458</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 459</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, plan (<em>Mamluk Art</em>, 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 460</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, inscription around jambs of portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 461</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, dome above mīhrāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 462</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, mausoleum dome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 463</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, qibla iwān, marble panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 464</td>
<td>The madrasa of Sīrghitmish, 757/1356, plan (<em>Mamluk Art</em>, 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 465</td>
<td>The complex of Sultan Ḥasan, 757-764/1356-1362, inscription band around court, southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 466</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1503, 813/1411, for Fāris al-Khāzindār, ff. 59b-60a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 467</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1503, 813/1411, for Fāris al-Khāzindār, ff. 269b-270a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 468</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1503, 813/1411, for Fāris al-Khāzindār, ff. 299b-300a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 470</td>
<td>Al-Azhar Library, 7982/177, f. 1a, by Ḥanim ibn ‘Abdallāh, signature of calligrapher, f. 1a © Al-Azhar Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 472</td>
<td>Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 122, c. 1380s-1411, <em>juz’</em> 2, ff. 7b-8a © Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 5848, early 15th century, <em>juz’</em> 29, text page <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419232s/f1.image.r=arabe%205848">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419232s/f1.image.r=arabe%205848</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Oriental Institute of Chicago, OIM A12029A, early 15th century, fragment from <em>juz’</em> 19 (Cosmopolitan City, 130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Al-Azhar Library, 767/17, 826/1423, by ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣayīḥ, f. 31a © Al-Azhar Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, 5846, late 14th century, for Sultan Barquq, text page <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419231c.r=arabe%205846">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419231c.r=arabe%205846</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>The British Library, Add 22406, 704-5/1304-6, by Ibn al-Wāḥīd, Ṣandal and his workshop, for Baybars al-Jashnakīr, all frontispieces <a href="http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa0-a67a-11db-87d3-0050e2490048&amp;atype=book">http://www.bl.uk/turning-the-pages/?id=0354fa0-a67a-11db-87d3-0050e2490048&amp;atype=book</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Marginal medallions to the Star Polygon workshop: Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 59, Raṣīd 54, Raṣīd 7 and Raṣīd 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Marginal medallions to al-Amīdī workshop: Raṣīd 9, Raṣīd 10, and Raṣīd 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, Y 365, 744/1343, by Mubārah Shāh al-Suyūfī, opening pages, ff. 115b-116a © Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, Y 365, 744/1343, by Mubārah Shāh al-Suyūfī, opening pages, f. 129a © Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Topkapi Sarayi Library, K.3, 709/1309, f. 1a © Topkapi Sarayi Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, 5844, late 14th century, for Sultan Barquq, opening pages, f. 1b <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84192299.r=arabe%205844">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84192299.r=arabe%205844</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, 5845, late 14th century, for Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 495</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, 5846, late 14th century, for Sultan Barquq, opening pages, f. 1b <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419230z.r=arabe%205845">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419230z.r=arabe%205845</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 496</td>
<td>Special Collections Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Isl. Ms. 228, <em>takhmiṣ</em> of the <em>Burda</em> of Imam al-Busiri, 783/1381, by Shams al-Din al-Ziftawi, f. 1a © Special Collections Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor <a href="http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419231c.r=arabe%205846">http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8419231c.r=arabe%205846</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 498</td>
<td>Various Openings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 500</td>
<td><em>Sūra</em> titles © Dar al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 503</td>
<td>Special Collections Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Isl. Ms. 228, <em>takhmiṣ</em> of the <em>Burda</em> of Imam al-Busiri, 783/1381, by Shams al-Din al-Ziftawi, inner page © Special Collections Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 514</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 393, late 14th century, ff. 1b-2a <em>(Splendeur et majesté, 51)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 520</td>
<td>The <em>madrasa</em> of Ṣirghītmish, 757/1356, marble panel to the right of the <em>miḥrāb</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 521</td>
<td>The <em>madrasa</em> of Ṣirghītmish, 757/1356, mausoleum, lid of cenotaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 522</td>
<td>The <em>madrasa</em> of Ṣirghītmish, 757/1356, mausoleum, lid of cenotaph, detail of the floral frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 523</td>
<td>The <em>madrasa</em> of Ṣirghītmish, 757/1356, mausoleum, lid of cenotaph, detail of the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 524</td>
<td>The <em>madrasa</em> of Ṣirghītmish, 757/1356, mausoleum, south side of cenotaph, detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 526</td>
<td>Central Library for Islamic Manuscripts of the Ministry of Awqāf in Cairo, 2254, 693/1294, by Maṣḥūr ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Maṣḥūr ibn Ḥabīb al-Ṭayf al-Akhḍar al-Ḫalībi known as ibn al-Sammāk al-Nassākh al-Muqrī al-Shāfī al-Dumyāṭī, frontispiece, ff. 1b-2a © Ministry of Awqāf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 529</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1457, by Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Ḥamīd al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī and Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, c. 1306-10, frontispiece, f. 1a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 530</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Is 1457, by Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Ḥamīd al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī and Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, c. 1306-10, finispiece, f. 293a © The Trustees of the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 532</td>
<td>Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM), 447, 714/1314, by ʿAlī ibn Abī Sālim and ʿAbdallāh al-Ṣafawī al-Ḥalabī, frontispiece, for Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, frontispiece, f. 1a, detail (James, <em>Qurʾāns of the Mamlūkṣ</em>, 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajlab</td>
<td>Also called julbân, refers to mamlûks acquired by the Sultan and raised and freed by him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al al-bayt</td>
<td>Family of the Prophet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alif mufrâda</td>
<td>The letter “alif” when nothing comes before it and so it is not attached to anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amîr akhûr</td>
<td>Amîr of the royal stables. The amîr in charge of the royal horses and livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amîr kabîr</td>
<td>Grand amîr, the highest position an amîr can assume and it also gives the highest iqta’. It is usually assumed by an amîr of a thousand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amîr majlis</td>
<td>Amîr of the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amîr tablakhâna</td>
<td>An amîr of forty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansa</td>
<td>A roundel or medallion in the margin next usually placed next to a chapter heading emphasizing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ashara</td>
<td>The marker connoting every ten verses of the Qur’ân.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashraâf</td>
<td>Descendants of the Prophet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atâbak</td>
<td>Commander in chief of the armies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awlâd al-nâs</td>
<td>Children of mamlûk amîrs – descendants of the mamlûks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>Verse of the Qur’ân.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinoiserie</td>
<td>Motifs of Chinese origins; lotuses, peonies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmân al-aghâni</td>
<td>Prostitution or singing tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmân al-maghâni</td>
<td>Property sales tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâsâtir</td>
<td>Written royal commands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîwân</td>
<td>Department or administration – Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîwân al-âhbas</td>
<td>Bureau in control of waqf/revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîwân al-mawârîth</td>
<td>Bureau for inheritances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîwan insha’</td>
<td>Bureau of the state chancery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fath</td>
<td>Opening the reed pen at its thin end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadra</td>
<td>Sufi gatherings for the remembrance of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâjîb</td>
<td>Chamberlain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâkk</td>
<td>Removing ink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hizb</td>
<td>Eighth of a Qur’ân volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijâza</td>
<td>Proof a scholar receives that he is authorized to transmit his knowledge and that he has studied with a certain master(s). In other words it is the permission given from master to disciple to transmit a body of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juz’</td>
<td>A volume of the Qur’ân.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasht</td>
<td>Removing ink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kâtib al-sîr</td>
<td>Confidential secretary to the Sultan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamsa</td>
<td>The marker connoting every five verses of the Qur’ân.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaṣṣakiyya</td>
<td>Mamluks of the Sultan, his private retinue. See ajlāb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāṭima</td>
<td>All the volumes of the Qurʾān and also the end of the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāzin al-kutub</td>
<td>Keeper of the books or librarian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khushdāshiyya</td>
<td>Mamluks owned by the same master, who usually develop a brotherly bond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lālā</td>
<td>Tutor for royal children who is usually a eunuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majlis al-mashūrā</td>
<td>Advisory council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Maqat</td>
<td>A tool used by calligraphers to cut the nib of the reed pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mażālim</td>
<td>The implementation of unjust action. Since the 2/8th century the shariʿa instituted a qāḍī to possess the legal authority to reside over cases dealing with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mināwil</td>
<td>Also called khādim al-rabʿa al-sharifā or hāmil al-mushaf. He is responsible for handing over and distributing the different volumes of the Qurʾān to the Sufis for recitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudawwar</td>
<td>A way to cut the nib of the reed pen: the cut is almost straight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥarrraf</td>
<td>A way to cut the nib of the reed pen: angled cut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhtasib</td>
<td>Market inspector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munḥani</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: tilted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkab</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: thrown to a side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsāṭiḥ</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: extends vertically from the calligrapher’s right to his left or left to right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntasib</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: vertical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṣawwab</td>
<td>A way to cut the nib of the reed pen: the left side is higher than the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musḥir al-dawla</td>
<td>Counselor of the financial affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustadrīr</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustalqī</td>
<td>One of the letter forms: lies on or above the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustawī</td>
<td>See muḥarraf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwaqqāʾ al-darj</td>
<td>Scribe of the scroll. He is the employee responsible for letters of appointment, iqṭāʿ grants and the like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwaqqāʾ al-dast</td>
<td>Scribe of the royal bench. He is the employee responsible for responding to petitions and this reports directly to the head of the Diwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḥt</td>
<td>Carving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naʿʾib</td>
<td>Deputy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naẓīr</td>
<td>Administrator of a waqf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niṣṭ hīzib</td>
<td>One sixteenth of a juzʿ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāʿim</td>
<td>A way to cut the nib of the reed pen: an intermediate angle, the right side being a bit higher than the left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaṭ</td>
<td>Cutting the nib of the reed pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaṣṣariyya</td>
<td>Caravanserai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabʿa</td>
<td>All the volumes of the Qurʾān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubʿ ḥīzib</td>
<td>1/32 of a volume of the Qurʾān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رَئِسُ الْنَّاءِ (Ra’s al-nawba)</td>
<td>Head of the guards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شَدَّدُ الْآمَّرِيَّةِ (Shadd al-‘amā’ir al-sultāniyya)</td>
<td>Supervisor of royal constructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شَأْق (Shaq)</td>
<td>Splitting the nib of the reed pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شَادِدُ الْقَوارِيْنِ (Shadd al-dawāwīn)</td>
<td>Superintendent of the bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شُرُوعُ المَنْسَبِ (Shurūṭ manuals)</td>
<td>Treatises written by religious scholars on the rules of drafting up legal documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سُوْرَةُ (Sūra)</td>
<td>Chapter in the Qur’ān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَذْهِيْب (Tadhhiḇ)</td>
<td>To make golden or to illuminate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَمُشِّيْ (Tams)</td>
<td>When the letters are filled in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طَارِس (Tarwīs)</td>
<td>Serif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَماْشَىْ (Tawāshī)</td>
<td>Eunuch or horseman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَزَمِّك (Tazmik)</td>
<td>To encrust, to illuminate, to paint or to outline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عُمَارَةُ الْوَلِيدِ (Umara’ al-ulūf)</td>
<td>Plural of امیر alf, rank of an امیر of one thousand or an امیر who is in a charge of a thousand مماليک.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عَسْتَادَار (Ustadār)</td>
<td>Majordomo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَالِيُّ (Wālī)</td>
<td>Governor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

*God is Beautiful and He loves Beauty*

The patronage of the Mamluk rulers (648–922 A.H./1250–1517 A.D.) produced one of the greatest artistic traditions within Islamic art, a tradition so powerful that it left a perpetual stamp on Cairo. Cairo as we know it today is Mamluk in all aspects of its material culture. They excelled in most arts, especially architecture and Qurʾān manuscript production. The art of producing the Qurʾān, the Word of God, “reading” par excellence, in a visual format is the most important art of Islam and the source of all other arts in the Islamic world. The Qurʾān is the revelation that descended on the heart of the Prophet of Islam, and as such its art is intimately and directly related to the Word itself. Thus the Word had to be manifested in the most appropriate and beautiful fashion. The Mamluk artist understood this and, as will shortly be seen, produced manuscripts of the Word that reflect both majesty (jalāl) and beauty (jamāl).

Research Goals and Focus

For this reason I chose to examine and analyze this sacred art of Islam as produced by the Mamluks with the aim of understanding who the producers of these Qurʾān manuscripts were and how they worked. The primary goal of this dissertation is to identify the workshops producing Qurʾān manuscripts operating at the time, using stylistic similarities as the core of the analysis in conjunction with the valuable

---

1 *Hadīth* number 101 in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.
information from the rich chronicles and biographical dictionaries of the period, and to identify, elaborate on and connect the masters and disciples. A secondary goal is to identify the patrons who sponsored these workshops and how they were connected to the artists involved.

This research will focus on Qurʾān manuscripts produced after the death of the Mamluk sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (d. 741/1341) until the death of the second Circassian Mamluk sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (d. 815/1412), that are kept in Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (The National Library of Egypt). This period is particularly interesting for three main reasons. First, in spite of the political turbulence of the last sixty years of the fourteenth century, the two monumental arts of this time, Qurʾān manuscript production and architecture, continued to prosper and flourish. The examples we have of both arts are proof that the puppet rulers, the declining economic situation, and the Black Death did not have major effects on them. Thus, the plethora and quality of these manuscripts cannot be explained simply by the socio-political transformations of the period.

Second, the period from 741–815/1341–1412 coincides with the end of the Bahri Mamluk rule, the termination of the Qalawunid line, and the rise of a new regime, that of the Circassian Mamluks. Its significance is twofold. On the one hand it is important to study a material culture and its sacred art after the death of one of the greatest patrons of art Egypt has ever seen, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. How the entourage and descendants of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad followed his lead in what supposedly
was a chaotic scene that also included the Black Death is important to address.\(^3\) These amīrs and descendants can be looked upon as the supporters and maintainers of ‘workshops.’ In addition it is also important to examine the continuation and flowering of this sacred art of Qur’ān production, and how it changed during the early days of a new regime.

Third, the chronological spread of over sixty years allows thorough research into the establishment of workshops. Calligraphers and illuminators needed decades to establish themselves as masters. Since a workshop is the backbone of artistic production, it is very important to clarify that in the context of this research the reference to a “workshop” will always mean “a small group of men working under a master craftsman.”\(^4\) It can also refer to a specific physical working place, but for our purposes here, it is used to designate a working relationship between master and disciple.\(^5\) This is a traditional understanding of the word and not a modern one. The aim is to identify calligraphers and illuminators, date their work, assign works to individual artists and their disciples whenever possible, establish links and thus identify workshops. Millard Meiss’ work has been very important in the field of Parisian bookmaking of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. His view is that actual

\(^3\) During this period twelve descendants of al-Nāṣir Muhammad were to rule. Only two appear to be almost successful as sultans, al-Nāṣir Hasan and al-Ashraf Sha‘bān. An interesting and important book dealing with the political environment of this period is Jo Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos: Patronage, Conflict and Mamluk Socio-Political Culture, 1341–1382 (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

\(^4\) Max E. Mallowan and Georgina Hermann, Furniture from SW 7 Fort Shalmeneser, Ivories from Nimrud (1949–1963), fasc. III (London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1974), 35. For more work on the concept of workshops see also Debra Foran, “The Identification of a Mosaic Workshop in Madaba, Jordan” (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 2003).

bookmaking workshops existed, which he describes as different artists working together under a master craftsman. The same approach will be taken here. It is also important to stress that implicit in the word ‘master’, as used throughout the research, is ‘master and his workshop’.

These thesis goals are reached by the thorough examination of the collection at Dār al-Kutub, which is the focus of this research. Every single Qurʾān manuscript from the period in Dār al-Kutub will be analyzed and discussed extensively. While the research also includes other Qurʾān manuscripts from the same period that are kept in other collections, they are introduced for comparative purposes and are not the focus. In an ideal situation all Mamluk Qurʾān manuscript from this period found in every single collection in the world, would be analyzed and integrated. However, such a task would have taken decades and vast resources to realize, and is thus beyond the scope of this research. I have chosen to focus on Dār al-Kutub’s collection, first because of its wealth of with regards to Mamluk material, much of which has never been researched and remains unpublished. Second, it is normally very difficult to access their collection, but I was fortunate to have had consistent access over a period of two years. Subsequently, Dr. Saber Arab, Director of Dār al-Kutub, allowed me to research and use the images of the Qurʾān manuscripts my team and I had photographed for a joint conservation project.

---


7 Catherine Reynolds, “The Workshops of the Master of the Duke of Bedford,” in Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris around 1400, ed. Godfried Croenen and Peter Ainsworth (Paris: Peeters, 2006), 449. Tracing the repetition of motifs and designs will be a key element throughout the analysis to aid in establishing illumination workshops.
in which I was involved in connection with my professional work. I was able to access the collection a few years later as a PhD student, and the photography team of Dār al-Kutub, under the directorship of Dr. Abd al-Nasser Hassan, photographed several manuscripts for me. No other library or collection in the world has as much Mamluk material, which is understandable given that the library is located in the capital of the Mamluk empire and most of the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts in the collection came from the buildings in Cairo to which these manuscripts were originally endowed. I also visited and examined Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts in the collections of the Chester Beatty Library, the Topkapi Sarayi Library, al-Azhar Library and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

It will be noticed that the manuscript numbers of the Dār al-Kutub collection are preceded by the word ‘Raṣīd,’ which is the designation under which the Qur’ān manuscripts are kept. It connotes that they constitute the body of the manuscripts collected from the different mosques, madrasas and khānqāhs of Cairo, with the exception of al-Azhar, following the orders for the establishment of Dār al-Kutub in the middle of the nineteenth century.

**Literature Review**

Very little in depth research has been done on the Qur’ān manuscript collection in Dār al-Kutub. While some research has been carried out on Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts housed in other libraries and collections, only a few of the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts preserved in Dār al-Kutub have been studied and published. Some of the latter were

---

8 I was the director of the *Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation-Dār al-Kutub Manuscript Conservation Project* from the beginning of 2005 to the middle of 2006.
illustrated in early nineteenth and twentieth century catalogues. The earliest mention of Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts is chapter twelve, on illuminated manuscripts, in Stanley Lane-Poole’s book *The Art of the Saracens of Egypt* (1886).\(^9\) Drawings of Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts are found in Émile Prisse d’Avenne’s *Art arabe*, first published in 1877, and in J. Bourgoin’s *Précis de l’Art arabe* first published in 1892.\(^10\) Arabic *Paleography* is the earliest work to show many dated examples from Dār al-Kutub. It is a catalogue published in 1905 and prepared by Bernhard Moritz, head of Dār al-Kutub from 1896 to 1911. However, this work did not discuss or analyze the Qur’ān manuscripts, but only photographically reproduced them.\(^11\)

Another work on the Dār al-Kutub collection is Ahmed Mousa’s *Zur Geschichte der islāmischen Buchmalerei in Ägypten*, published in 1931.\(^12\) This is another general study of manuscripts in the Dār al-Kutub collection, not solely Qur’ān manuscripts. A general work on Qur’ān manuscripts is the published PhD dissertation of Muḥammad bin Saʿīd Shārīfī, who in 1976 studied several Qur’ān manuscripts from Morocco to Iran and covering the period from the 7th to the 16th century A.D. His work included five of the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts from the Dār al-Kutub collection and is entitled *Khūṭūṭ al-mašāḥif ‘īn ḍ al-maşāḥira qa wa-al-maghāriba min al-qarn al-rābī‘ īlā al-‘aḥšir al-hijrī*.


\(^13\) Muḥammad bin Saʿīd Shārīfī, “*Khūṭūṭ al-mašāḥif ‘īn ḍ al-maşāḥira qa wa-al-maghāriba min al-qarn al-rābī‘ īlā al-‘aḥšir al-hijrī*” (PhD dissertation, University of Algiers, 1976), later published as
Serious work on Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts developed in the 1970s, when Martin Lings brought attention to the manuscripts through *The World of Islam Festival* exhibition in London in 1976; with Yasin Safadi he published a catalogue of the exhibition, entitled *The Qurʾān: Catalogue of an exhibition of Qurʾān manuscripts at the British Library*.14 In 1980, following the World of Islam Festival, Lings was inspired to produce his book *The Qurʾānic Art of Calligraphy and Illumination*.15 A newer edition of this work was published in 2005 under the title *Splendours of Qurʾān Calligraphy and Illumination*.16 It is by far the most extensive display of Qurʾān manuscripts from the various periods ever published.

Subsequently, in 1987, David James’ *Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks* appeared, which was republished in 1999 as *Manuscripts of the Holy Qurʾān from the Mamlūk Era*. It provides excellent coverage and analysis, although only of the Bahri Mamluk period, and opens up many questions for further research.17 James established the existence of a functioning workshop headed by the illuminator Ṣandal in the early fourteenth century.18 He also studied the style of al-ʿAmidī in the second part of the fourteenth century.19 His validation of workshops along with details of their work and the survival of their legacies, as well as the identification of workshops not to mention his pointing

---

19 James, *Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks*, 197–214.
to an Ilkhanid connection, are important concerns in my research.\textsuperscript{20} The fact that more manuscripts are available for examination from the Dār al-Kutub collection than were available to James will yield to more concrete conclusions. No research has been carried out after the period that James covered.

In addition to \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamluks} James has published several catalogues with some limited analysis. These include \textit{The Master Scribes: Qur’āns of the 10\textsuperscript{th} to 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD}, dealing with the Khalili collection,\textsuperscript{21} and \textit{Qur’āns and Bindings from the Chester Beatty Library},\textsuperscript{22} which is a supplement to the catalogue at the end of \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamluks}. In 2007 James published a short article entitled “More Qur’āns of the Mamluks” in \textit{Manuscripta Orientalia}.\textsuperscript{23} The article deals primarily with Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts in auction houses. While this publication is very useful for cataloguing purposes, art historical analysis is still required. Unfortunately the article does not reproduce any of the Qur’āns. It also features a few manuscripts that are not Qur’ān manuscripts, because according to James they provide relevant illumination details.

Both \textit{Splendours of Qur’an Calligraphy and Illumination} and \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamluks} address some of the Mamluk masterpieces of the Dār al-Kutub, but not all.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item David James, \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamluks}, chapters four, five and seven
\item David James, \textit{The Master Scribes: Qur’āns of the 10\textsuperscript{th} to 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD} (New York: Nour Foundation/Azimuth Editions/Oxford University Press, 1992).
\item David James, \textit{Qur’āns and Bindings from the Chester Beatty Library} (London: World of Islam Festival Trust, 1980).
\item Other publications that include Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts are catalogues rather than studies. These include: \textit{The Koran Illuminated: A Handlist of Korans in the Chester Beatty Library} by Arthur J. Arberry (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1967); \textit{Ink and Gold: Islamic Calligraphy} by Marcus Fraser and Will Kwiatkowski (London: Paul Holberton, 2006); \textit{The Qur’an Manuscripts in the al-Haram al-Sharif Islamic Museum, Jerusalem} by Khader Salameh (Paris:
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The most recent study of Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts is an unpublished PhD dissertation submitted in 2012 at Helwan University in Egypt entitled “The Mamluk Muṣḥaf: Its Influence and Impact on Contemporary Arts, A Case Study of Mamluk Maṣāḥif from Dar al-Kutub, Cairo” by Shereen Mohamed Rashad El-Mitainy. The dissertation focuses on the Dār al-Kutub collection but refers to some, not all, of the Qur’ān manuscripts because it covers a rather long period of time, from 1250–1517 A.D. and it lacks the necessary analysis to make comparisons between the centuries covered.

El-Mitainy introduces some of the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts in Dār al-Kutub and provides a very brief description of each. She ties the Qur’ān manuscripts to the buildings by placing the Qur’ān manuscript in the building to which it was endowed. Metal and wooden objects and fittings are also mentioned. She did not examine the chronicles and biographical dictionaries of the period for information concerning the people involved in the production. El-Mitainy lists the names of patrons, calligraphers, and illuminators, but no further details or information. The lists are, however, useful for they provide us with some names.

More research and methodical analysis of the Qur’ān manuscripts are needed to establish workshops, developments and influences. More in depth comparisons of a repertory of motifs, calligraphic hands and patronage are required. The research undertaken here will expand on the workshops and the artists involved in them, and

UNESCO, 2001); and Writing the Word of God: Calligraphy and the Qur’ān by David J. Roxburgh (Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2007).

highlight the intellectual and cultural environment of the Bahri Mamluks and the early years of the Circassian Mamluk period.

**Qur’ān Manuscript Production Pre-741/1341: A Brief Look**

The earliest surviving Mamluk Qur’ān manuscript is most probably manuscript OP 2708 in the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia (Pl. 525). It was calligraphed in *muhāqqaq* in 669/1271 by a calligrapher called Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. It is missing the first few pages, and contains other dates indicating later restorations 699/1299, 835/1431–32, 1158/1748, and 1292/1875.26

The second earliest Qur’ān manuscript of the period is found at the Central Library for Islamic Manuscripts of the Ministry of Awqāf in Cairo (Pl. 526).27 It was calligraphed in *muhāqqaq* in 693/1293 by a Sufi, Mašūr ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mašūr ibn Abī al-Maʿāfī al-Ṭayr al-Akhḍar al-Ḥalabī, known as Ibn al-Sammāk al-Nassākh (calligrapher-copier) al-Muqriʿ (the reciter) al-Shāfiʿī al-Dumyiṭī by orders of his shaykh the Damietta ascetic Fāṭiḥ al-Takrūrī (Pl. 527).28 The calligrapher was most probably the illuminator as well, because his shaykh has ordered him to produce a codex.

---

27 I am very grateful to Khalid Youssef for bringing this manuscript to my attention. Its colophon starts in *muhāqqaq* in the same ink as the rest of the manuscript and then continues in *naskh* in a different ink. I believe that someone retracted this part during the Mamluk period because they wanted to keep the names and date after some wear and tear occurred.
28 This manuscript was most probably produced in Damietta, where the calligrapher/illuminator was living as we can tell from his colophon. His shaykh, Fāṭiḥ al-Takrūrī (d. 695/1296), was an ascetic who came from Marrakesh and settled in Damietta in the thirteenth century. Al-Maqrīzī describes this man as a saint whose sole occupation was servitude to God. He cleaned and fixed mosques for prayers, taught Qur’ān recitation, and instituted the reading of *awrād*. All his services were provided for free and without much socializing with people, as he chose to abide only in the inward. See Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAḥf al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-mawāʾīz wa-al-ʾitibār*
The third earliest surviving whole Mamluk Qur’ān manuscript known is also located in the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia (Pls. 23–25). It was produced in 701/1302 in the Mosque of Sūq al-Ṣāgha in Cairo by the ḥadīth scholar Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Qāsim al-Maydūmī. He penned it in a thick muḥaqqaq that is distinct from the muḥaqqaq we will see in later examples. The illumination is unlike what follows later and is also different from the styles of the period, such as those of Şandal and his disciples discussed below.

A Qur’ān manuscript written in 703/1303 and auctioned at Bonhams in 2002 is allegedly the work of the famous calligrapher Ibn al-Wahīd (Pl. 528). The attribution is based on the testimony of the twentieth century Ottoman calligrapher Ḥāmid al-Āmidī (Hamid Aytaç) (d. 1982), who restored the codex and gave his details on folio 1b. He also informed us that the last page carried the signature of Ibn al-Wahīd and the date 703/1303, but he could not redeem that folio since it was too damaged from humidity. David James has already argued, but not in detail, that the design of the frontispiece fits the 1350s and not earlier.

In 704–705/1304–1306 we have the Qur’ān manuscript of Sultan Baybars al-Jāshnakīr, which he commissioned when he was still an amīr. Its magnificence cannot be overstated. This manuscript is a true masterpiece of sacred art. It is also a delight to

---

30 Stoivola and Ivanova, The Holy Qur’ān through the Centuries, 50. There the script is wrongly identified as thuluth. David James in “More Qur’āns of the Mamluks” correctly identifies the script as muḥaqqaq.
31 The same as the calligrapher of the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript, mentioned below.
33 James, “More Qur’āns,” 5.
34 The British Library, Add. 22406. James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, catalogue 1.
art historians and codicologists, because it contains all the information they need. It was copied by Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shariʿf ibn Yūsuf al-Kātib,35 known as Ibn al-Wahīd. He was born in Damascus in 647/1249 and died in Cairo in the Bīmāristān of Qalāwūn in 711/1311. This great calligrapher might have been a student of yet another master, Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī, whom he met and trained under in Baghdad. He was fluent in languages and had mastered muḥaqqaq, rayḥān and naskh. Al-Ṣafadī testifies that he has never seen anyone write these three scripts in such an excellent way as Ibn al-Wahīd. Al-Ṣafadī also tells us that Ibn al-Wahīd sold the Qurʾān manuscripts for one thousand dirhams each, without binding or illumination. He apparently reached such fame that he had his imitators. A certain Ibn Tammām, whose biography has not been found, would copy Qurʾān manuscripts in the same hand and take them to Ibn al-Wahīd, who would check them, sign them, pay four hundred dirhams and then re-sell the same codex for a thousand dirhams because it carried his name.36 What is important to mention about Ibn al-Wahīd is that, because of his hand, Baybars al-Jāshnakīr employed him in the diwān al-inshaʿ, where he was unfortunately not very good at diplomatic correspondence or political discourse.37

The fourteenth century historian al-Ṣafadī saw a Qurʾān manuscript in the Mosque of al-Ḥākim, which he described in his biographical dictionary ‘Ayān al-ʿaṣr wa aʿwān al-naṣr. His description fits the Baybars Qurʾān manuscript now in the British

---

35 In David James’ Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks his name has been mis-written as Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Sharaif al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Kātib. The mistake is in his father’s name which is Shariʿf and not Sharaf al-Dīn. All the primary sources corroborate his father’s name as Shariʿf.
Library. It comprises seven volumes, penned in the script *ash’ār* script, and was illuminated by Șandal. Ibn al-Wahīd was paid 1600 dinars for this superb accomplishment. The script used in this manuscript does not feature much in surviving Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts. It is a script that is in between *thuluth* and *muḥaqqaq*, but closer to *thuluth, thuluth ash’ār*. Also unusual is the fact that the Qur’ān manuscript is composed of seven parts rather than the more typical thirty. A third unusual element is that each page contains six lines. None of these elements were to influence the later Qur’ān manuscripts that have come down to us.

The illumination is superb as well. It is the result of the collaboration of three illuminators, the head of whom was named Șandal. Șandal as the master seems to have designed the seven parts and led both Muḥammad ibn Mubādir and Aydughdī ibn Abdallāh. Aydughdī seems to have been the lower ranking apprentice who was responsible for the *tazmīk*, since this is the word he used in his signature, and not *tadhhiḥ*.

The illumination program of the seven volumes can be surmised from the seven frontispieces. The central field of each of the frontispieces always has a central star surrounded by geometric shapes that often give the feel of a jigsaw puzzle, each of which is filled with an arabesque. A very broad arabesque frame borders the central field.

---

38 Master illuminator of the early fourteenth century identified in chapter five.
40 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 38.
41 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 40. The root Z-M-K (*zammak*) means ‘to encrust.’ The word could mean ‘to outline,’ mainly the *sūra* titles and the various designs in the manuscript. See Adam Gacek, *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 63. On the other hand *zammak* can also mean ‘to illuminate’ or ‘paint.’ See Nasser Rabbat, “Architects and Artists in Mamluk Society: the Perspective of the Sources,” *Journal of Architectural Education* 52, no. 1 (1998): 31 and James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 40, 67. James argues that the word can only be interpreted as ‘to paint.’ *Tadhhiḥ* is ‘to make golden’ or ‘to illuminate.’
on three sides (Pls. 55, 334, 335, 485, and 492). This school of design which was originated by Şandal and on the basis of which he can be considered the head of the workshop, produced other Qur’ān manuscripts where the similarities in illumination with the Baybars Qur’ān are uncanny. Şandal’s signature can also be found on a Qur’ān manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library, which was dated by David James between 1306 and 1315 (Pls. 56 and 142). The Şandal workshop influenced the use of color on glass as well. Faded shades of the same colors used in his floral elements to give depth can be seen on later mosque lamps dating between 730/1330 and 740/1340.

A Qur’ān manuscript dated to 713/1313 and commissioned by al-Nāşir Muḥammad was illuminated by Aydughdī, Şandal’s apprentice, aided by ‘Afī ibn Muḥammad al-Rassām al-Aʿsar, and written by the Ayyubid prince Shādī ibn Muḥammad. It is now kept in the Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM: Türk ve İslam Eserleri Muzesi) in Istanbul (Pls. 57, 97, 145, and 365). The main text was written in naskh (we have not reached the age of the majestic muḥaqqaq yet). As was noted by David James, the hierarchy of the illuminators can be determined from the signatures. Şandal is referred to as muʿallim (teacher-mentor) in the Istanbul Qur’ān manuscript, and even earlier as mudhahhib (illuminator). In the Baybars Qur’ān

42 James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, 66.
43 Chester Beatty Library, 1479. Juz’ 23 of another Qur’ān manuscript was ascribed by David James to Şandal and Ibn al-Wahīd. This juz’ was auctioned by Christie’s in October 2002. According to James it was written in fāṭr or muḥaqqaq, he also believes that other parts from the same Qur’ān have been in western collections. James, “More Qur’āns of the Mamluks,” 6.
45 This is made clear in his signature, which he accompanies with the phrase “taught by the master Şandal.”
46 TIEM 450. Other pages from this manuscript are preserved in other libraries; see James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, 222 (catalogue 6).
manuscript Aydughdi was referred to as *muzammik* (encruster, illuminator, or outliner) but ten years later he is *mudhhahhib* in the Istanbul Qur’ān manuscript, while al-A‘sar is referred to as a *rassām* (painter). Accordingly we can establish a hierarchy of the artists: “The mu‘allim was the master, below him came the *mudhhahhib*, and then perhaps came the *muzammik* and the *rassām*.” The influence of the illumination of the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript is very clear here. The design of the frontispiece maintains the big arabesque border around the whole design, the central star polygon, and the four half star-polygons at the corners. This Şandal workshop style continued to be used for decades. The Qur’ān manuscript commissioned by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and penned by *shādd al-‘amā‘ir* (supervisor of constructions) Muḥammad ibn Baylīk al-Muḥṣinī, now kept in the Keir Collection in London, looks as though it was produced by one of Şandal’s students. Another one, also a commission of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, produced in 720/1320 and kept in the Chester Beatty Library (1481), harks back to the Şandal style, but in a larger size.

The other participant in the illumination of the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript, Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, produced another extraordinary codex (Pls. 233, 529 and

---

47 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 69.
48 *Shādd al-‘amā‘ir* is the title given to the head of the royal constructions. Muḥammad ibn Baylīk al-Muḥṣinī signed at the end of the elaborate stucco inscription band in the Ḥanafī madrasa in the complex of Sultan Ḥasan (Pl. 436). He was *shādd al-‘amā‘ir* and in this capacity was a designer/architect. That calligraphers produced works in different genres has been attested to in fourteenth century Iran by the students of the great Yaqt al-Musta‘simī and noted by Sheila Blair in her book *Islamic Calligraphy*. See Sheila Blair, *Islamic Calligraphy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), chapter seven. Yaqt’s student ‘Abdallāh al-Ṣayrafi has been identified as the calligrapher responsible for the first volume of the Great Mongol Shahnāmah. His other student Haydar, who instructed the Ilkhanid wāzīṣ Tāj al-Dīn ‘Aʿī Shāh and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad in calligraphy, is responsible for the inscription around the mihrāb commissioned by Sultan Uljäytū in 1310 in the Great Mosque of Isfahan and the inscription band in the mausoleum of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ṣamad in Nataz.
49 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 75
His vision for his frontispiece is different from his master Şandal, but his finispiece (Pl. 530) is similar to his own work in the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript. As James points out, this finispiece is almost identical to the frontispiece of volume six of the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript.\textsuperscript{51} The script used in this manuscript was 
\textit{naskh}. Once again these were still the decades of the supremacy of \textit{naskh} before \textit{muḥaqqaq} took over.

Other Qur’ān manuscripts from the period include Dār al-Kutub, Rasīd 4 (Pl. 531). Also a commission by the great patron al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, this manuscript lacks a frontispiece and interior illumination, but was written in golden \textit{muḥaqqaq} outlined in red. It was penned in 723/1323 and this might explain the use of \textit{muḥaqqaq} rather than \textit{naskh}.

Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad commissioned other Qur’ān manuscripts, including another one that is now in the TIEM.\textsuperscript{52} It was written in 714/1314 in \textit{naskh} by ‘Alī ibn Abī Sālim and illuminated and bound by ‘Abdallāh al-Şafawī al-Ḥalabī (Pl. 532).\textsuperscript{53} This manuscript shows that al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was a patron of varied taste. As James has already shown, it is not produced in a Mamluk style. Had it not been for the colophon, it might have been ascribed a different provenance. James argues that it was most probably produced in Mamluk Syria, not Egypt, given the \textit{nisba} of the illuminator/binder “al-Ḥalabī” and the similarities between it and another in CBL Is 1473 produced in 723/1323 in Tripoli.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{50} CBL Is 1457.
\textsuperscript{51} James, \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamlūks}, 54.
\textsuperscript{52} TIEM 447.
\textsuperscript{53} James, \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamlūks}, 73.
\textsuperscript{54} James, \textit{Qur’āns of the Mamlūks}, 74.
The most impressive output is that of the Şandal workshop, whose influence continued to be felt in the following years, but there are also divergent strains, probably pointing to regional diversity, Ilkhanid connections, and interconnections between the artists. This will be taken up in the coming chapters and examined in detail.

**Scripts of the Period: Naskh and Muḥaqqaq**

The two main scripts used for writing the Qurʾān in this period were *naskh* and *muḥaqqaq*. Incidental in *thuluth*, *tawqīʿ*; and *kūfi* were also used, primarily for *sūra* titles. *Naskh*, which literally means ‘transcription,’ is exceptional for its clarity which makes it very fitting as a Qurʾān script; it makes the revelation clear. The classical tradition, that of the ninth century A.D., led to the filtering-out of many scripts and to the development in the tenth century of the six main scripts: *thuluth*, *naskh*, *muḥaqqaq*, *rayḥān*, *riqʿa*, and *tawqīʿ*. The work of the tenth century Abbasid wazīr Ibn Muqla (d. 329/940), who was credited with the creation of the cursive script *al-mansūb* (‘proportioned’), where each letter was formed in proportion to the height of the letter *alif*, led to the development of the aforementioned six scripts. It was his genius and knowledge of geometry that enabled him to do this. What supposedly set him to this task was the abundance of scripts that did not match the elegance of *kufī*. It was Ibn Muqla who elevated *naskh* to the level of a major script. On the basis of his work later

---

58 Lings, *Quranic Art*, 53; and Safadi, *Islamic Calligraphy*, 17.
calligraphers excelled especially in *naskh*, which is one of the cursive scripts he developed. Ibn al-Bawwāb was considered the best of these calligraphers (d. 413/1022), while others argue that the thirteenth century Yāqūt al-Musta'ṣīmī (d. 698/1298) was the master and was rightfully named “the Sultan of Calligraphers.”  

Yāqūt, the *mamlūk* of al-Musta'ṣīm the last Abbasid caliph to rule from Baghdad, improved the six scripts by devising a new way to sharpen his reed pen by cutting it in an oblique manner (*tahrīf al-qalam*), which resulted in a new and more elegant twist or sharpness to all the scripts. To this day the six scripts have consistently maintained their elegance. Between Ibn al-Bawwāb and Yāqūt there is a gap, where there are no calligraphers whose work we can analyze with regard to script development. The differences between their hands were analyzed by Nassar Mansour who summarizes them as follows:

The general appearance of Yāqūt’s writing has more flow and life than Ibn al-Bawwāb’s. Yāqūt shows the great benefit he had from studying Ibn al-Bawwāb and other earlier masters’ works in al-Musta’ṣīm Billah’s treasury. The high patronage he acquired from the Caliph al-Musta’ṣīm Billah and the Mongol’s governor, Jūwaynī, allowed him to dedicate most of his life to writing, without being worried about his livelihood. In comparison to the patronage enjoyed by the Muqallad brothers, the scripts produced by Yāqūt were more refined, and the rules on which the scripts are based.

---

60 Lings, *Quranic Art*, p. 54. Named “The King of Scribes” by the scholar al-Dhahabi (d.1347) and “The pen of God on earth” by Ibn al-Fuṭī, ‘Alī ibn Hilāl ibn al-Bawwāb lived most of his life in Baghdad. He was a preacher and an interpreter of dreams and the librarian of the Buwayhid ‘Aṣūd al-Dawla in Shiraz. He was a house decorator, an illuminator of manuscripts and eventually a master calligrapher. Qur’ān manuscript K.16 in the Chester Beatty Library is entirely his work; he produced the whole codex. Ibn al-Bawwāb is credited with the refinement of the scripts, making them more round since the time of the Muqallad brothers, and the refining of the rules on which the scripts are based. According to the fifteenth-sixteenth century Egyptian calligrapher al-Ṭayyibī, Egyptian calligraphers followed Ibn al-Bawwāb. Nassar Mansour, *Sacred Script: Muḥaqqaq in Islamic Calligraphy* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 49–51. Ibn al-Bawwāb’s other surviving work is the Diwān of Salāh ibn Jandal in *muḥaqqaq*. This manuscript lacks his signature but Ugur Derman, Şalāh al-Din al-Munajjid, Nassar Mansour and Sheila Blair all agree that it is in his hand. See Mansour, *Sacred Script*, p. 60.


63 Mansour, *Sacred Script*, p. 75.
by Yaʿqūb, Ibn al-Bawwāb was so hard up that he was once reported to have written a letter, seventy lines long, claiming repayment of a loan of two dinars!64

In the fourteenth century the two Egyptian scribes/chroniclers al-Nuwayrī (d. 734/1333) and al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418) list five principal scripts within the Mamluk context from which others are derived. These are muḥaqqaq, naskh, thuluth, riqʿa and tawqī.65 They group the scripts into two different categories: raṭib and yābis (curvilinear and rectilinear). Both muḥaqqaq and naskh are rectilinear, while thuluth and its two derivatives tawqī and riqʿa are curvilinear.66 The late fifteenth century/early sixteenth century Egyptian calligrapher Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Tayyibī mentions seventeen in his book Kitāb jāmiʿ maḥāsin kitābat al-kuttāb wa nuzhat ʿullī al-baṣāʿir wa-al-albāb, which is an album of the different scripts that he compiled for the Circassian Mamluk sultan al-Ghūrī (r. 906–922/1501–16).67

Naskh is grouped with the rectilinear scripts primarily because of its shape. The early Bahri Mamluks, as we have just seen, preferred using naskh for their Qurʿān. This would change with later Bahri Mamluks who preferred the more majestic muḥaqqaq. Naskh regained its place under the Circassian Mamluks in the fifteenth century and of

---

64 Mansour, Sacred Script, 81.
65 Blair, Islamic Calligraphy, 318.
course reached its ultimate usage in the Qur’ān manuscripts of the Ottomans: it was called “Khādim al-Qur’ān” (servant/server of the Qur’ān).\(^6\)

_Muḥaqqaq_ truly crowns the production of Qur’ān manuscripts in the fourteenth century in Egypt. The earliest mention of _muḥaqqaq_ in the sources is found in _Adab al-Kuttāb_ by al-Ṣūfī (d. 335/946).\(^6\) In 400/1010 Abū Ḥayān al-Tawḥīdī defines it in his treatise on penmanship as a word relating to calligraphy but not as a calligraphic style. He explains the word by saying that it means “making all letters clear, those that are independent, separated or joined, elongated or shortened, straight or curved.”\(^7\) This definition tells us that this term was used during the early centuries to connote a perfect script.

The fourteenth-century scholar Ḥusayn ibn Yāsīn ibn Muḥammad al-Kāṭib wrote that the letters in _muḥaqqaq_ had to be clear, especially the _mīm_, _wāw_, ‘_ayn_, _qāf_ and _fā_’, which cannot be penned with ‘blind eyes’ ( _tams_). Also, two different pens were needed to scribe _muḥaqqaq_, one for the text and another for its vocalization.\(^7\) Unlike _nastḥ_ it uses _tarwīs_ (serif), but like _nastkh_ it uses the _al-lām alif al-warrāqiyya_.\(^2\)

To make the difference somewhat clearer, here are a few examples of words in both _nastkh_ and _muḥaqqaq_, for comparison. All of them are from fourteenth century Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts.

---

\(^6\) Mansour, _Sacred Script_, 31.


\(^7\) Gacek, “Arabic Scripts,” 146. This _lām alif_ is used by the professional calligraphers and has a triangular base. See Adam Gacek, _Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers_ (Brill: Leiden, 2012), 140.
Plan of Chapters

This dissertation comprises seven chapters. The first chapter sets the historical scene during the period from 1341 to 1412. It discusses the political, economic and intellectual environment of the period to contextualize the manuscripts. We will encounter some of the events and persons of this period again in chapter six where the patrons will be discussed. The next three chapters (two, three and four) examine the Qur’ān manuscripts and study them primarily from an art historical perspective. Each manuscript is described and analyzed. It is necessary to construct a periodization that
divides the years under study into coherent and balanced periods. Hence, each of the three chapters concentrates on a specific period:

- Chapter two deals with Qur’ān manuscripts from 741/1340 to 764/1363. The Qur’ān manuscripts discussed here are primarily the ones belonging to Sultan Ḥasan, amīr Ṣirghitmish, and Princess Tatar al-Hijāziyya (daughter of al-Nāṣir).
- Chapter three deals with Qur’ān manuscripts from 764/1363 to 784/1382. The manuscripts discussed here are primarily the ones belonging to Sultan Sha‘bān, his mother Khawand Baraka and his entourage.
- Chapter four deals with Qur’ān manuscripts from 784/1382 to 815/1412. The manuscripts discussed here are primarily the ones belonging to the new Circassian regime, Sultan Barqūq and his son Sultan Faraj.

Chapter five is dedicated to the artists discussed in the previous chapters who signed their Qur’ān manuscripts, in light of the reports found in the chronicles and biographical dictionaries. This chapter will include calligraphers from the period under study as well as from earlier periods. Following their biographies, a discussion of their learning process through Mamluk calligraphic treatises and sources will ensue. Chapter six discusses the patrons in light of their Qur’ān manuscripts and architectural masterpieces, according to reports found in the chronicles and biographical dictionaries. Chapter seven will group the manuscripts and the artists according to the workshops that have been identified for them as a result of the analysis presented in chapters two, three and four.
The appendix that follows the chapters is the catalogue of all the Dār al-Kutub Qurʾān manuscripts mentioned in the dissertation.\textsuperscript{73} Arranged in order of registry number, it is meant to be of aid to the reader to locate a manuscript and basic information about it quickly.

\textsuperscript{73} This database is part of a larger database I made of all the Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts during my PhD research.
Chapter One:
History of the Period (741–815/1341–1412)

Pre-741/1341: Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn, the mutajammiḥ

The year 741/1341 marks the death of the great Mamluk sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (r. 693–94/1293–94, 698–708/1299–1309 and 709–41/1310–41). While he predates the period on which this research focuses, it is imperative to shed light on him and his reign so that we have a better understanding of the events following his death. This is especially important since al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s third reign was a very stable and flourishing one, in contrast to our period of study, which was very unstable.75

Scholars have studied al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and his reign quite thoroughly.76 Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was the tenth Mamluk sultan to rule Egypt. His father was the great Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn, a pillar of the dynasty, and his mother, Ashlūn Khāṭūn, was the daughter of a Mongolian notable. He was born in 684/1285 and enthroned for the

---


first time in 693/1293 at the age of eight upon the murder of his brother al-Ashraf Khafîl, at which time he received the title al-Malik al-Nâşir. The circumstances in which he was enthroned were typical of Mamluk politics where veteran _amīn_, in this case the Manṣūrī _amīn_, and the household of the late ruler were at odds and a compromise had to be reached.\(^{77}\) His throne was usurped by his _nāʾib al-saltana_ (deputy to the sultan) al-ʿĀdil Kitbughā al-Manṣūrī (r. 694–95/1294–95) in 694/1294,\(^{78}\) and he was imprisoned in the Citadel until he was put on the throne again in 698/1298–99.\(^{79}\) Things did not change for him much because he was merely a figurehead while the empire was run by two powerful _amīns_ at odds with each other, the _nāʾib al-saltana_ Salâr al-Manṣūrī and the _ustādar_ Baybars al-Jâshnakîr al-Manṣūrî.\(^{80}\) In spite of being a puppet al-Nāšir had learned his lesson and started concentrating on building his own household, the Nâṣirîyya Mamluks. He attempted to use them in asserting his power, but this attempt was premature and the two magnates foiled his efforts. Over time al-Nâšir refined his political shrewdness and in 708/1309 he abdicated his throne, to give himself time and resources to plan winning it back, while on the way from the fortress of al-Karak to an alleged pilgrimage.\(^{81}\)


\(^{78}\) Al-Ṣafadî, _Aʿyân_, 5: 78; Irwin, _The Middle East in the Middle Ages_, 85; _Encyclopaedia of Islam_, s.v. "Al- Nâšir" (by Peter M. Holt). Kitbughā was one of the veteran _amīn_ belonging to al-Nâšir Muḥammad’s father, hence the _nisba_ al-Manṣūrī.

\(^{79}\) Holt, _Age of the Crusades_, 108.


\(^{81}\) Al-Ṣafadî, _Aʿyân_, 5: 90; Holt, _Age of the Crusades_, 111; _Encyclopaedia of Islam_, s.v. "Al-Nâšir" (by Peter M. Holt).
Now that the throne was empty Baybars al-Jāshnakīr was enthroned as al-Malik al-Muẓaffar (r. 708-9/1309-10) while Salār remained as nāʿīb al-saltāna. Sharpening his political acumen throughout his stay at al-Karak, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad used al-Karak as a base to plot a very successful plan to regain his throne. To his advantage were the bad circumstances of Baybars’ rule. Whether Baybars was in reality a good ruler or a bad one many factors were against him. He was a Circassian ruling a primarily Turkish military elite; it was still not the time for Circassians to be the rulers. The Nile was low throughout his reign and “dearth and pestilence had inauspiciously characterized” it. Baybars was in a situation where a large part of the military and ruling elite did not want him as ruler, including his nāʿīb al-saltāna, Salār, nor did a suffering populace. Most people hated him.

Once al-Nāṣir Muḥammad regained his throne in 709/1310, his third and successful reign began. Almost immediately he got rid of his enemies, the first of these were Salār and Baybars, who were both murdered. He then eliminated the senior amīrs of his father who were looked upon as his peers. He also worked more on increasing the numbers of his own mamlūks and on building his “affectional ties” to them through his generosity, promotions and marriage.

---

82 Holt, *Age of the Crusades*, 111.
83 Circassian rule in Egypt started in 784/1382 with Sultan Barqūq.
84 Holt, *Age of the Crusades*, 112.
86 His third reign lasted for thirty-one years and ended in June 1341.
88 Van Steenbergen, “Military Patronage State,” 200; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. "Al- Nāṣir" (by Peter M. Holt). Al-Ṣafadī comments on how generous he was in giving to those close to him.
Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s third reign is considered the zenith of Mamluk rule of Egypt.\textsuperscript{89} His character and management of matters helped.

He was majestic and solemn; intelligent and knowledgeable; well versed in the politics of rulership, had a strong will, his opinions and actions were in place, he loved horses, slaves, and buildings; his reign was long and glorious; his entourage, \textit{mamlūks}, and servants were many; kings and rulers of nations sought his peace and sent him gifts; he destroyed the Mongol army and conquered many countries.\textsuperscript{90}

This is how the Mamluk historian Ibn Ḥābib (d. 779/1377), in his dynastic history dedicated to the Qalawunids, described al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Ibn Ḥābib was not following a \textit{topos} here; the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad was characterized by political stability and economic prosperity. Previous Mamluk rulers had been preoccupied with repelling the Crusaders and the Mongols, especially the Mongol Ilkhanids.\textsuperscript{91} During his reign the Ilkhanids were nearing the end of their days and not to be feared, and the Crusader states no longer existed.\textsuperscript{92} He concentrated on the infrastructure of Egypt, and that he has seen no other sultan do the same. See al-Ṣafādī, \textit{Aʿyān}, 5: 75. Also see in this regard Shams al-Dīn al-Shuʿāʾī, \textit{Tārīkh al-malīk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn al-Ṣālihi wa awlādīhi}, ed. Barbara Schaefer (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978), 1:112.


\textsuperscript{90} Ibn Ḥābib, \textit{Tadhkira al-nabīh}, 2:325.

\textsuperscript{91} Northrup, “Bahri Sultanate,” 251.

\textsuperscript{92} Holt, \textit{Age of the Crusades}, 114. Like many other rulers before him he abolished many taxes that were unlawful, which was an act that gained him a lot of popularity with the people. He also cleverly and successfully re instituted the \textit{rawk}, a redistribution of land control after a cadastral survey, a policy already tried by his predecessor Ḥusām al-Dīn Lājin in 697/1298, which was a failure. Al-Nāṣir’s personality and authority allowed him to carry it out successfully, because he was able to strip the powerful \textit{amīrīn} of their lands and thus their power and authority and at the same time increase the amount of arable royal land (\textit{khaṣṣ al-sultān}). The royal land increased from one-sixth of the land of Egypt to half of it. This increased his authority and power as well, as this was one of the ways to control the economy of an agriculturally based society. \textit{Encyclopaedia of Islam}, s.v. “Rawk.” (by Heinz Halm), \textit{Encyclopaedia of Islam}, s.v. “Mamluks” (by Peter M. Holt); Nasser Rabbat, \textit{The Citadel of Cairo: A New Interpretation of Royal Mamluk Architecture} (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 186.
especially the agricultural, and on the urban development of Cairo. As Ibn Ḥabīb mentioned, his love of building embellished Cairo with some of the most majestic examples of Islamic architecture in the Muslim world. He was not only interested in building but had an opinion, and he closely supervised building projects. “Kān lahu naẓar ‘ażīm fī al-handasa” (‘he possessed a great vision in engineering’), and is reported to have even designed the palace of one of his amīrs. He built his amīrs, or helped them in building, palaces and mosques, which was part of his plan to urbanize and beautify his capital. Thus, his amīrs followed in his footsteps and left us important landmarks in the architectural history of Cairo. The interest in building activity continued after his death and the Qurʿān manuscripts under study were commissioned for and donated to the various religious institutions. We have already seen some of the Qurʿān manuscripts produced for al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and how magnificent they are. Their stylistic importance and place in the art historical narrative will become clearer in the next chapters. During his third

---

94 Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 117.
95 Al-Shujāʿī, Tārīkh, 47 and 25; Behrens-Abouseif, “al-Naṣir,” 271; Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 117.
96 The issue of al-Nāṣir’s patronage of his amīrs is discussed thoroughly in the unpublished MA thesis of Diana Bakhoum, with the case in point being the Mosque of amīr Altunbughā al-Maridānī.
reign “…certain archetypical and official features took shape in the visual arts.” It was his patronage of the arts and of his amīrs that produced a magnificent artistic language identified with the elite.

Notwithstanding the success of his rule, some modern studies have blamed the bad state of affairs after the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad on al-Nāṣir Muḥammad himself and how he managed his state. While it is difficult to assert that it was al-Nāṣir Muḥammad who planted the seed of the chaos that followed his death, his centralized rule contributed to the leadership problem and political turmoil that ensued for a few decades afterward. The abuse he suffered from the magnates and veteran amīrs of his father before ascending the throne for the third time in 709/1310 created political cunningness and distrustfulness in him. He constantly felt that his government was being undermined. The Mamluk historian Shams al-Dīn al-Shujāʿī (d. 745/1344) describes this fear of deposition and mentions his paranoid behavior. According to

---

101 Al-Shujāʿī says the following of al-Nāṣir: “It was commonplace of him [al-Nāṣir] that if an amīr in his service became too powerful/prominent, he would rid himself of him and confiscate all his possessions. He would then appoint a younger man in his place and make him grand till he became even more powerful than the one dispensed of. He would then arrest him and elevate yet
another Mamluk period historian al-Yūsufi (d. 759/1358), al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s cunningness and craftiness were unprecedented. This fear translated itself into his actions against his closest amīrs, which were on occasion unfounded. He arrested and killed some of them. This same fear also made him elevate his own mamlūks on the promotional ladder quickly and guarantee their loyalty with “flattery and gold.” Besides the flattery and the gold he used marriage ties as another prize or medium to guarantee loyalty. He married his daughters to his amīrs, married daughters of amīrs himself, and married the daughters of amīrs to his sons. He also attempted to win their loyalty via patronage, which coincided with the marriages he planned.

another in order to protect himself from his [the amīr’s] cunning and ill-will. He was paranoid.”
See al-Shujā’ī, Tārikh, 1:113.
103 Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 107.
104 A case in point is Qawsūn al-Nāṣirī, who came to Egypt as an adult and did not go through the typical necessary mamlūk training. Nor was he a soldier before he was given a fief and a military title. Another is Aqsunqur al-Rūmī who was a merchant and became an amīr. See Levanoni, Turning Point, chapter 2. For specifics on Qawsūn see Levanoni, Turning Point, 34–6 and also Jo Van Steenbergen, “Caught Between Heredity and Merit: the Amir Qusīn and the Legacy of al-Naṣir Muhammad b. Qalāwūn (d.1341),” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 78, no. 3 (2015): 429–50.
106 Al-Naṣir had fourteen or seventeen sons and eleven daughters. Twelve sons were alive when he was on his deathbed. Among his sons-in-law were Qawsūn, al-Maʿrīdānī, Taghatmur, ʿUmar ibn al-Nāʾib and Aqsunqur; his children’s fathers in law included Baktimur al-Sāqī and Arghūn; and his own fathers in law was Tankiz al-Ḥusānī. Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 108; Levanoni, Turning Point, 41; Northrup, “Bahri Mamluk Sultanate,” 262, ʿAḥmad ʿAbd al-Rāziq, al-Marʾa fī maṣr al-mamlūkiyya (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣiriyya al-ʿĀmma li-al-Kitāb, 1999), 69; Frédéric Bauden, “The Sons of al-Naṣir Muḥammad and the Politics of Puppets: Where Did it all Start?” Mamluk Studies Review 13, no. 1 (2009): 60–1 and 61nn25–26.
Political and Economic History

The period under study represents an era of turbulence with many rulers and political plots that should have caused a completely dysfunctional state of affairs on all levels.\textsuperscript{108} Mostly young and incapable sultans were ruling during the 1340s and most of the 1350s. They were sons and grandsons of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, who were, for the most part, young and weak leaders. His strong amīrs, who were integrated into his family through marital ties, vied against each other as they were left in charge of his politically weak offspring.\textsuperscript{109} Real power was in the hands of these amīrs, who had accumulated immense amounts of riches when al-Nāṣir was still alive.\textsuperscript{110} The rule of his offspring in principle was not contested, however, because a Qalawunid right to rule was by this time established.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{108} Humphreys, “Egypt in the World System,” 456.
\textsuperscript{111} Studies discussing and debating the Qalawunid lineage’s right to rule are Van Steenbergen, “Military Patronage State,” 189–217; Bauden, “The Sons of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad,” 53–81; Amalia Levanoni, “The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate,” \textit{International Journal of Middle East Studies} 26 (1994): 373–92; Jo Van Steenbergen, “Is Anyone My Guardian…? Mamluk Under-age Rule and the Later Qalawūnids,” \textit{al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean} 19, no. 1 (2007): 55–65. There is an interesting panegyric written for Sultan al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā’il (r. 743–46/1342–45) by the scribe Ibrāhīm ibn al-Qaysarānī, which stresses the Qalawunid authenticity and right to rule by divine sanction. For further details see Jo Van Steenbergen, “Qalawunid Discourse, Elite Communication and the Mamluk Cultural Matrix: Interpreting a 14th-Century Panegyric,” \textit{Journal of Arabic Literature} 43 (2012): 1–28. Also, the fact that in 801/1398–99 the Qalawunid descendants, through al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, were living in the Citadel, and were given a stipend by Barquq because of their lineage, shows how the Qalawunid line was perceived even by the one who ended their rule. It was under Barsbāy’s rule...
The remaining years of the fourteenth century after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s death, 741–815/1341–1412, can be divided into three periods: 741/1340 to 764/1363, during which al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s son al-Nāṣir Ḥasan (Qumārī) dominated the last six years; 764/1363 to 784/1382 which saw the success of his grandson al-Ashraf Sha‘bān; and lastly 784/1382 to 815/1412 which witnessed the demise of the Qalawunid line and the change of the ruling elite with the usurpation of the throne by the Circassian al-Zāhir Barqūq and the consolidation of his power, succeeded by the reign of his son Faraj, who tried to follow in his father’s footsteps. With Barqūq, Turkish rule waned and was replaced by Circassian rule. Internal strife and economic decline characterized all of these decades, but what was the extent of these troubles?

741/1341 to 764/1363

The first decade following al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s death, the 1340s, was the most dysfunctional and witnessed the most sparring between the magnates. These magnate amīrs were instrumental in the enthronement of the sultans and their subsequent deposition without the need to consult with either the ‘ulamā’ or the Abbasid Caliph.112

---

112 Abdullah Kahil, *The Sultan Hasan Complex in Cairo, 1357–1364: A Case Study in the Formation of Mamluk Style* (Beirut: Orient Institute, 2008), 8; Ḥayat Nāṣir al-Ḥajjī, “al-Aḥwāl al-dākijilīya fī saḥlanat al-Ashraf Sha’bān ibn Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn, 764–778 AH/1362–1376 AD,” *‘Alam al-Fikr* 3, no. 3 (1983): 762. The amīrs conceded that the sultan had to be from the Qalawunid line to avoid major power struggles and to share authority while a legitimate figurehead was ruling, even though they could have nominated someone from among themselves. Ḥayat Nāṣir al-Ḥajjī also makes an interesting point in saying that these amīrs cared...
Some of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s sons, good examples being al-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl (r. 743-46/1342-45) and al-Muẓaffar Ḥājjī (r. 747–48/1346–47), devoted themselves mostly to entertainment and a life of debauchery while empowering eunuchs and slave girls. For a few years, this power might have made eunuchs and slave girls increasingly wealthy, because of the bribes they were given to assure *mamlūks* of posts and appointments.\(^{113}\)

A few coups took place in Syria by *nāʿībs* between 742/1342 and 744/1344 and expeditions had to be organized to suppress them. We have to keep in mind that these expeditions had a significant impact. Such expeditions were also necessary to curtail disobedient Arab tribes in both Egypt and Syria in 747/1347, 754/1353–54, 760/1359–60 and 766/1365–66. Lesser Armenia was also troublesome, since Cyprus competed for suzerainty there.\(^{114}\) In spite of all these calamities, the economic life of the 1340s was somewhat sustained, since trade with European cities was reestablished in 745/1345.\(^{115}\) This must have been of great help to the state.

The Black Death also plagued the region in the late 1340s.\(^{116}\) This outbreak first came to Egypt while the country was suffering from famine and it was followed by

---

\(^{113}\) Ayalon, “The Eunuchs,” 283, 287–88; Levanoni, “The Mamlūks in Egypt and Syria,” 255–56; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Sulūk*, 2:627. Jo Van Steenbergen has studied a few *waqf* documents from the 1340s, in which eunuchs were either *wāqif* or *nāẓūr*. Through the endowments and the titles of those involved he concluded that the eunuchs were indeed accumulating wealth from public assets. For details see Jo Van Steenbergen, “Mamluk Eunuchs, Ḥabashis and Waqf in the 1340s,” *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 169 (2007): 539–52.


\(^{115}\) Levanoni, “The Mamlūks in Egypt and Syria,” 255.

regular bouts of the pneumonic plague.\footnote{Northrup, “Baḥrī Mamlūk Sultanate,” 287; Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 227. The pneumonic plague, which was very infectious, claimed a large number of lives every time it hit. Fifty-five bouts of pneumonic plague struck Egypt between 1347 and 1517. Irwin, \textit{The Middle East in the Middle Ages}, 136.} It hit Alexandria in the autumn of 748/1347 and spread through the Delta, escalated in January 750/1349, and subsided in February of the same year.\footnote{Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 154–55.} The population drastically decreased and entire villages were left deserted. No muezzins were around to call to prayers, and the crops were left in the fields, because there were not enough peasants to harvest them, and so agricultural work was abandoned.\footnote{Ibn Taghri Birdi, \textit{al-Nuṣr}, 10:160; William F. Tucker, “Natural Disasters and the Peasantry in Mamluk Egypt,” \textit{Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient} 24, no. 2 (May 1981): 219; Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 160.} Michael Dols has shown that around 20 percent of Egyptian villages had a much lower tax assessment and 2 percent were left abandoned.\footnote{Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 167. This decrease in population came after a dramatic increase in the previous century. The prosperity of Egypt under the late Ayyubids and the early Mamluks led to an increase in population from an estimated 2.4 million during the time of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn to around 4 million right before the Black Death first struck. See Josiah C. Russell, “The Population of Medieval Egypt,” \textit{Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt} 5 (1966), 76 and Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 149.} 

The Black Death claimed a large number of Cairo’s population, but left many of the remaining individuals with religious zeal.\footnote{At least a third of the population of Egypt died. Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 172–200; Borsch, \textit{Black Death}, 24 and Humphreys, “Egypt in the World System,” 457.} Areas in Fustat were completely abandoned and the area around the Mosque of ‘Amr was heavily populated again only in 776/1374–75.\footnote{Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 172.} The prosperous al-Tabbāna, al-Darb al-Aḥmar area, fell into ruins during the attack of the plague, and Ḥusayniyya was deserted. The effects of the plague and its aftermath could still be felt in Cairo in the fifteenth century. By that time, Cairo
had undergone a major urban and commercial setback.\textsuperscript{123} It was not just Egyptians who died; the *mamlūks* suffered greatly, especially those in the barracks. Many deaths have been recorded among them and among the *amīrs*, many of whom would not leave the city because they did not want to leave their properties.\textsuperscript{124}

The substantial decline in population could not help but influence the social and economic life of Egypt and Syria. The Black Death and the recurrent plague epidemics had both immediate and protracted consequences. The numerous facets of the periodic disasters are not easily separable, nor is it always easy to distinguish between what may properly be considered direct and indirect consequences of depopulation. Yet the careful marshaling of the plague epidemics’ social and economic effects give credibility to the historical event.\textsuperscript{125}

Other natural calamities played a role in the troubled situation. Egypt’s strength is in its agriculture and disturbances to crop yields have a very negative influence on the economy. This can still be seen today in the relation between the agricultural sector and Egyptian economy. Immediately before the Black Death in 744/1343 the Nile flooded; in 745/1344 severe rain caused major crop damage; and in 748/1347 the Nile level fluctuated.\textsuperscript{126} A year later the Black Death struck such that the agricultural sector had no respite. Lives and crops lost meant money lost. In the years following the Black Death, the government needed to make up for the loss; the resulting greedy tax collection did not make things better for the people, but certainly enabled the state to


\textsuperscript{125} Dols, *Black Death*, 255.

accrue a relatively high revenue.\textsuperscript{127} Further effects of the repeated natural disasters were unemployment, inflation, and the recurring plague.

The Black Death and the weakening of Egypt’s position in international trade escalated the economic problems of the period.\textsuperscript{128} International trade decreased in volume towards the end of the fourteenth century, although the reasons for it were not the fault of the Mamluks and their policies. Depopulation caused by the plague lowered demand. The blocking of land routes due to the dissolution of the Mongol states and the rise of the Ming Dynasty in China were some of the causes behind reduced trade volumes.\textsuperscript{129} Prices within the Mamluk realm increased and there were shortages in many commodities. The cost of labor increased significantly and was often unaffordable. Al-Maqrizi (d. 845/1442) mentions that the gold dinar lost value \textit{vis-à-vis} the silver dirham and prices increased dramatically.\textsuperscript{130} The artisans — those who remained — flourished and became wealthier.\textsuperscript{131}

It has been stated that Egyptian products lost their quality, possibly due to the plague claiming craftsmen’s lives.\textsuperscript{132} However, this is contradicted by the fact that building activity continued forcefully and Qur’ān manuscript production did not cease. As a matter of fact there was a rise in the endowment of religious buildings of all types. People were asked to meet in mosques and to say certain prayers. They recited the

\textsuperscript{127} Tucker, “Natural Disasters,” 221.  
\textsuperscript{128} Northrup, “Bahri Mamluk Sultanate,” 253.  
\textsuperscript{129} Humphreys, “Egypt in the World System,” 459.  
\textsuperscript{132} Humphreys, “Egypt in the World System, 458.
Qur’an and read the Šahīḥ of al-Bukhārī.\textsuperscript{133} The decrease in land value, the increase in government revenue from death taxation (dīwān al-\\mawārīth al-\\hashriyya), and the reclamation of plague victims’ properties, led to the availability of the money for an active building program especially in the 1350s.\textsuperscript{134} An important example is the greatest Mamluk construction of this decade, the mosque-

madrasa of Sultan Hasan, built between 757/1356 and 762/1361.

Building activity should not be viewed only as a drain on funds. The constructed buildings, especially those with an educational purpose, participated in the economic environment of the city by providing jobs of various sorts. Large numbers of people were directly employed in these institutions, hundreds of students were paid stipends by the endowments to the religious establishments, and a vibrant service industry catering to the students existed.\textsuperscript{135} Waqf deeds of buildings and shurūṭ manuals enumerate and often describe these jobs and sometimes specify the salaries paid.\textsuperscript{136}

Teachers/jurists/qādīs, their assistants, supervisors, Qur’ān reciters, guards, cleaners, doormen, all participated in this economic cycle. The money they were paid was pumped back into the economy as they spent it. Specialized products, such as paper, reed-pens, ink, and all the necessary items for book production used by this class of teachers/‘ulamā’ and students also contributed to the economic activity of the time.

Perhaps this money available to the state—namely, to the sultan and the important amīrs—is what supported the patronage. In an economy that is based on

\textsuperscript{133} Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 246–47.
\textsuperscript{134} Dols, \textit{Black Death}, 269–70.
agriculture and grain, the state benefited from being the intermediary between the grains produced on the endowed lands and the beneficiaries. The state received the revenue in the form of grain through diwan al-aḥbās and paid the beneficiaries of waqf in cash. Together these various elements may explain the existence of great buildings from this period.

There is, however, more than just the money. The patron had to have the intent. Sultan al-Nāṣir Ḥasan, son of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, is one of two dominating rulers after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s death, the other being Sultan al-Ashraf Sha’bān. They actually ruled and raised themselves above the position of figurehead by standing up to the amīrs. Ḥasan ascended the throne twice: in 748–52/1347–51 and in 756–62/1355–61. He succeeded his brother, Sultan al-Muẓaffar Ḥājji, who was deposed and killed by a group of amīrs headed by Shujāʿ al-Dīn Aghrū who was shādd al-dawāwīn (superintendent of the bureaus). Ḥasan is well portrayed in the sources, who give us the image of an intelligent and well behaved teenager when he first ruled. It seems that they admired him for curtailing the power of strong amīrs and for strongly promoting awlād al-nās (sons of mamlūk) and other factions, many of whom occupied positions in the diwan. He also made various military positions available for them. By the time of

138 Northrup, “Bahri Mamluk Sultanate,” 253 and 257. Both were children upon enthronement, gained power in their late teens and are considered successful rulers. This is interesting because the rest of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s sons and grandsons, who became sultans, were adolescents and young adults and failed miserably. See Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 102. They both will be studied in more detail in chapter six.
139 As sons of mamlūk, Muslims at birth, they were free born not slaves. The sultans of the 1310–1382 all fall into the category of awlād al-nās.
140 Al-Ṣafadī, Aṭyān, 2:247-50; Levanoni, Turning Point, 49 and 86; Ulrich Haarman, “The Sons of Mamluks as Fief-holders in Late Medieval Egypt,” in Land Tenure and Social Transformation in the Middle East, ed. Tarif Khalidi (Beirut, 1984), 162; Northrup, “Bahri Mamluk Sultanate,”
 Hasan’s death we find that two of his sons and other sons of his mamlūks, held the highest military positions of the state. This was possibly the result of his suffering from the amīrs’ political schemes and fiscal control during his first reign. When he first ruled, Hasan was allotted only a small amount per day by the amīrs as his stipend.

However, his period was also one marked with incessant struggles amongst the amīrs and between himself and the amīrs. When he first reigned he was around eleven years of age and so these amīrs formed a body of nine amīrs to rule called majlis al-mashūrā (Consultative Council). This body was subsequently dissolved because the amīrs would not stop scheming against each other. Strong amīrs who were in control during his reign and whose power he attempted to curtail include Shaykhū al-Nāṣirī and Širghitmish al-Nāṣirī. Shaykhū, who was in essence the real ruler, was arrested, released, promoted and later killed in 758/1357, while Širghitmish was killed in his prison cell in Alexandria some time afterwards. These two amīrs continue an old

262; Kahil, Sultan Hasan Complex, 5-6; Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 143; and Van Steenbergen, “Military Patronage State,” 207.


142 Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 33.

143 Kahil, Sultan Hasan Complex, 8.


146 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manḥal, 6: 343; Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 115. Sayf al-Dīn Širghitmish al-Nāṣirī is one of our very important patrons, who will be discussed in detail in chapter six. He was a mamlūk of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and became very powerful under Sultan Hasan, when he shared the de facto rulership with Shaykhū in the early days of Sultan Ḥasan. He played an important part in the cultural and intellectual life of the 1350s.
tradition going back to the reign of al-Nāṣir Muhammad, when such amīrs played an indispensable role in the political and cultural life of the era.147

764/1363 to 784/1382

The next two decades, the 1360s and 1370s, witnessed the rule of the second successful monarch Sultan al-Ashraf Sha‘bān (r. 764–78/1363–77) during the second period 741/1341 and 784/1382.148 He ruled from the age of 10 to the age of 24 (d. 778/1377). He is described as being brave, majestic, generous, and lenient with his subjects, mamlūks and relatives. He was trying to be a good ruler and on many fronts it was showing. In 766/1365 the Cypriot Peter I of Lusignan launched an attack on Alexandria for commercial reasons disguised as religiously motivated.149 This attack led Sha‘bān, to provide more protection for both Alexandria and Damietta.150 In 776/1374 prices were so exorbitant to the extent that Sha‘bān ordered amīr Manjak, his nā‘ib at the time, to gather the poor and destitute and give each of the umarā’ al-ulu‘f one hundred persons each to feed. He also assigned the merchants and elites of the bureaucracy a number of people to feed and take care of. He then forbade the poor to beg in the streets to limit the spread of contagious diseases.151

Sha‘bān enjoyed the people’s support for him until he died, especially when they fought for him between in 767/1366–67 when the Yalbughāwīyya mamlūks (mamlūks of

148 Another great patron of architecture and Qur’ān manuscripts.
The positive views of the sources were also due to his cancellation of the taxes on prostitution (ḍamān al-aghānī) and the property sales tax (ḍamān al-qarārīt). A few strong amīrs of the time, an example being Ibn Aqbugha Āš, fought to bring these taxes back, especially the one on prostitution, but failed. All of this scheming led to his untimely death. Like Ḥasan, he was brutally murdered by the amīrs when he was only 24 years of age. A few of his amīrs, the amīrs of Uljāy al-Yūsufi, who wanted revenge for the death of their master, and other older amīrs planned his death. In the year 778/1376, after a long series of events, they beat and strangled him. He was succeeded by two insignificant minors, his sons al-Manṣūr ‘Afi (778–83/1377–81) and al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī (783–84/1381–82 and 791–92/1389–90).

The Qur‘ān manuscripts Sha‘bān commissioned, his no longer extant madrasa at the foot of the Citadel in Cairo, and his mother’s madrasa in al-Ṭabbān tell of a

---

152 Van Steenbergen, *Order out of Chaos*, 17n4; al-Nuwayri, *Kitāb al-ilmān*, 6:18; al-Ḥajjī, “al-Ḥwāl,” 785. The most important amīr in control in the early days of Sha‘bān was the amīr Yalbughā al-‘Umari who was the sultan’s atābak and was the real ruler as long as Sha‘bān was a child. Sha‘bān eventually removed Yalbughā. The post of atābak under Sha‘bān’s rule was more important than that of nā‘ib al-saltana. Al-Ḥajjī, “al-Ḥwāl,” 793. The term ajlāb or julbān refers to mamlūk acquired by the sultan and raised and freed by him.

153 His grandfather al-Naṣīr Muḥammad had cancelled this tax before him, but it was later revived.


155 He was Sha‘bān’s stepfather and an important patron of the arts. He was one of the mamlūks of Sultan Ḥasan and only became an important figure when he married Khawand Baraka, Sha‘bān’s mother. He had good relations with his step-son the sultan until the death of Khawand Baraka. Upon her death a huge conflict arose between them over the inheritance that she left, which ended with Uljāy fleeing and drowning in the Nile. Sha‘bān ordered divers to bring his body out of the Nile and buried him in Uljāy’s madrasa in Suq al-Silāḥ. See Al-Maqrizī, *al-Sulūk*, 3:230; Ibn Ṭaghrī Birdī, *al-Manhal*, 3: 42–44, 3:356; Ibn Ṭaghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm*, 11:47–50.

resourceful sultan. His madrasa is described as the best in Cairo by al-Maqriżi, even grander and more ostentatious than that of his uncle Ḥasan. The number of madrasas during this period increased considerably, which also means that the money was available to some in spite of the economic decline of the country.\textsuperscript{157} This was caused in part by a rise in prices due to the low Nile especially in 776/1374,\textsuperscript{158} and perhaps the loss of the emerald mine in Upper Egypt, which stopped producing emeralds in 767/1365.\textsuperscript{159} So how did the sultan do it?

Tax registers for the year 777/1375–76 found in Ibn al-Jiān’s (d. 885/1480) Kītab al-tuḥfa al-sanīyya bi ḍarna’ al-bilād al-miṣriyya show that Sha‘bān manipulated some resources and managed to collect more than sixteen percent of the income of the state.\textsuperscript{160} Jo Van Steenbergen points out that his grandfather al-Nāṣir Muḥammad had received double this amount and via legitimate means, which tells us that sultans following al-Nāṣir Muḥammad did not have as much monetary or political authority as he did.\textsuperscript{161}

This additional money for Sha‘bān and his family, in addition to a possibly heightened instinct for good investments may have yielded good profits. His mother, Khawand Baraka, who was a great patron of Qur’ān manuscripts and architecture, had

\textsuperscript{157} Al-Hajjī, “al-Ahwāl,” 764.
\textsuperscript{158} Al-Maqrīzī, Ighāthat al-umma, 40. Al-Maqrīzī explains that it is normal in Egypt that if the Nile is delayed in its flooding, prices rise until the Nile rises and then they start dropping again. However, this process takes a couple of years and thus its effect can be negative. See al-Maqrīzī, Ighāthat al-umma, 41–3.
\textsuperscript{160} Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 31. The asyād (descendants of Qalāwūn) were given large iqṭā’s, especially in Upper Egypt and Cairo, when Sha‘bān redistributed the land. This left the army very unhappy and might have caused the eventual murder of Sha‘bān. See Levanoni, “The Mamluks in Egypt and Syria,” 255.
\textsuperscript{161} Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 32.
good economic sense too. Analysis of her waqf shows that she was an astute investor who also possessed financial acumen. She owned properties spread widely around Cairo and in prime locations. Her income from them must have been large. Sha’bān was very close to her and consulted her in ruling matters as described by Ibn al-Shihna (d. 815/1412) in his al-Dhayl min kitāb al-manhal fī al-tawārikh.

784/1382 to 815/1412

With the demise of Sha’bān’s two sons a new regime evolved, a regime whose beginnings have been blamed for further economic decline. The initiator and leader of change was one of the amīrs who aided in the killing of Sha’bān, the Cirassian Barquq, who was not a royal mamlūk since he belonged to amīr Yalughā al-‘Umarī al-Khāṣṣakī and not to the sultan. In less than twenty years after Barquq’s appearance on the

---

162 “Baraka Khatūn bint ‘Abdallāh and mother of Sultan Sha’bān ibn Ḥusayn” is how the sources refer to her. She was al-miwwallida, that is, of mixed ethnic origin. For this term see Ayalon, “The Eunuchs,” 289. All our sources mention that Khawand Baraka married the atābak Uljāy al-Yūsufi after the death of Ḥusayn (a son of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad who was never enthroned), that she died in 774/1372, and that she was buried in her madrasa in al-Ṭabbānā. She was also considered one of the greatest women of her time. She was pious, generous, and known for her good deeds. She is best known for both her madrasa and her pilgrimage caravan. See al-Maqrizī, al-Khiṭṭat, 4:2:626; Aḥmad ibn ‘Afi ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, al-Durar al-kāmina fī a’yān al-mī’ā al-thāmina, ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Jad al-Haqq (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥaditha, 1966–67), 2:7; Ibn Ṭagrī Birdī, al-Manhal, 3:355–56; Ibn Ṭagrī Birdī, al-Nujum, 11:48; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, ‘Inbā’, 1:41; Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Iyās, Badā’i’i’ al-zuhūr fī waqā’i’ al-duhūr, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1960-3), 1:2:87.

163 Waqf document 47/7 kept in Dār al-wathā’iq al-qawmiyya (The National Archives of Egypt). [The conclusions are based on an unpublished paper I wrote analyzing the waqf for Prof. Northrup’s class NMC2119H entitled “The Meticulous Mothers of the Mamluk Sultans: The Waqf of Khawand Baraka – Umm al-Sulṭān Sha’bān”].

164 His work is still in manuscript form and has not been thoroughly studied. See Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Ḥāṭib, La Femme au temps du Mamloukes en Égypte (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, 1973), 30.

165 Allouche, Mamluk Economics, 3, and 15–16.
political scene, and with the aid of some of his khushdāshiyya, Barqūq was able to usurp the throne of Egypt, and thus begins the rise of an ethnically different elite, the Circassians. He was part of the large Circassian corps belonging to the amīr Yalbughā al-ʿUmarī al-Khāṣṣākī. Barqūq managed to attain the rank of atābak (commander in chief of the armies), become the step-father of both of Shaʿbān’s sons, al-Manṣūr ‘Alī and al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī, and then attain the sultanate very quickly. He was enthroned as Al-Malik al-Ẓāhir. The speed at which he rose to power is a good reflection of how powerful amīrs continued to have authority and ruling privileges under the young sultans. Barqūq faced resistance from several amīrs, who were primarily upset about a Circassian ruling instead of a Turk. Many of the amīrs in Syria also gave him trouble, and he had to give up his throne for a brief period of time in 791/1389 when al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī was reinstated.

Throughout his rule he was very busy fighting all the opposing factions. When one considers that after seven years of rule he still had to abdicate for almost a year because of his Circassian origins, it seems clear that he was constantly engaged in political maneuvers. To protect himself Barqūq had to rid himself of the Turkic Ashrafi amīrs, who had belonged to the previous and effective Sultan al-Ashraf Shaʿbān,

166 Mamlūks owned by the same master; they develop a brotherly bond.
170 Garcin, “Circassian Mamlūks,” 290 and 299.
and the *yalbughāwiyya* who did not support him. He then bought many Circassians, who bolstered his corps of royal *mamlūks.*

Barquq also faced several other problems besides the constant conflicts with the Turkic *amārs.* The populace grew restive with all the strife and the constantly changing laws. In 791/1389 he ordered some taxes to be abolished, only to retract his decision. The *ʿamma* were going around the streets saying “*al-sultān min ʿaksuh ʿād fi muksuh*” (‘because of his contrary nature the sultan changed his taxes’). The people were also aggravated because Barquq was preoccupied with supplying his own *mamlūks* with all they needed to fight the opposing factions. The conflicts were dragged to the streets of Cairo and so disturbed the people’s lives. Added to this was a bout of pneumonic plague, which of course made everything worse.

During his second reign (792–801/1390–99) Barquq concentrated his efforts on internal reform. He managed to control the unruly Bedouin/Arab tribes, especially the Hawāras, who were creating havoc in the Egyptian countryside. He abolished a few taxes and attended a bi-weekly session to listen to people’s *maẓālim.* He also fixed

---


174 Shukri, *al-Sultān Barquq,* 76.

175 Shukri, *al-Sultān Barquq,* 89–90. *Maẓālim* (sing. *mazālim*) literally means ‘unjust actions.’ In early Muslim Egypt the governor appointed the person responsible for *maẓālim.* By the ninth century it seems that in Egypt this functionary was connected to *qādā*’. See Jorgen Nielsen, *Secular Justice in an Islamic State: Mazālim under the Bahri Mamluks,* 662/1264–789/1387 (Istanbul: The Nederlands Historisch-Archaelogisch Instituut, 1985), 8. During the Fatimid period the sources paint a picture of an administrative procedure for the *maẓālim* more than a judicial one. See Nielsen, *Secular Justice,* 9–11. Developments in the procedures took place under the Ayyubids when, in emulation of Nūr al-Dīn Zangi regular, public *maẓālim* took place in Dār al-ʿAdl. *Qādis* and jurists most probably attended these sessions. Nielsen, *Secular Justice,* 45
the infrastructure of the country. He built bridges and city walls for towns to protect
themselves against Bedouin attacks. 176 He embellished Cairo with one of its greatest
buildings, his mosque-*madrasa-khanqah* in Bayn al-Qaṣrāyn and endowed it with many
Qurʾān manuscripts. The intellectual life of the city continued to flourish under his rule.

On the external front he had to deal with many challenges, chief among which
was Timūr Lang (Tamerlane), who faced Barquq on the Euphrates but withdrew and the
Ottomans whose forces had occupied Mamluk territory in Anatolia. 177 With all the
internal and external conflicts he had to confront and while trying to consolidate his
efforts, he nevertheless left us many Qurʾān manuscripts, some commissioned by
himself and some reendowed. 178 Barquq’s artistic program, which is discussed later,
reflects his intent to connect himself to the Qalawunids, who monopolized the socio-
political environment for most of the fourteenth century. 179

After his death and the enthronement of his son Faraj (801–815/1399–1412),
another patron of Cairo, a bloody war among the Mamluk factions ensued. Barquq’s
*amīrs* did not want his son on the throne; they wanted a *mamlūk*, not an *awlād al-nāṣ.*

13, 49. With the Bahri Mamluks, the Dār al-ʿAdl was built in the Citadel, which became al Iwān
al-Kabīr where the *maẓālim* were heard until Barquq moved the *maẓālim* to the royal stables in
789/1387. See Nielsen, *Secular Justice,* 51–52. For more details on *maẓālim* see Nielsen, *Secular
justice;* Albrecht Fuess, “Zulm by Mazālim? The Political Implications of the Use of Mazālim
Rabbat, “The Ideological Significance of the Dār al-Adl in the Medieval Islamic Orient,”

176 Shukri, *al-Sultan Barquaq,* 90-1.
178 Chapter four discusses his Qurʾān manuscripts.
179 See chapter six for the details on how this was achieved, especially on the artistic front. For
more on the “socio-political monopoly” of the house of Qalāwūn see Jo Van Steenbergen,
“Ritual, Politics and the city in Mamluk Cairo: The Bayna L-Qaṣrāyn as a Dynamic ‘lieu de
Mémoire,’” in *Court Ceremonies and Rituals of Power in Byzantium and the Medieval
Mediterranean,* ed. Alexander Beijammer, Stavroula Constantinou and Maria Parani (Leiden:
Faraj killed hundreds of these Circassian amīrs. Major economic decline was attributed to the reign of Faraj. Corruption and heavy taxation were among its causes for such a decline. Escalating the situation were the invasions of Timūr Lang in Syria and the low level of the Nile, starting in 806/1403 and lasting for years. It is thus not surprising that al-Maqūrī (d. 845/1442) refers to Faraj as “ash’ām mulūk al-Islām” (‘the most ill-fortuned/ill-omened of Muslim rulers’).

Intellectual life

Life in Egypt and Syria in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries under Mamluk rule was intellectually very active. The upsurge of writings in religious studies, prosopography and history is unmatched in other periods of Egyptian history. A quick look at Donald Little’s An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography and Sami Massoud’s The Chronicles and Annalistic Sources of the Early Mamluk Circassian Period shows that many scholars of various backgrounds thrived during both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This educated class was mostly composed of the ‘ulamā’ or ‘the men of the turbans.’ This class was not exclusive to the ‘ulamā’, since we have Mamluks and sons of Mamluks occupying this class as well. It has been argued that one of the reasons this class flourished was the rule and patronage of the Mamluks. There are many reasons behind the complex relationship between the Mamluk ruling elite and this class.

180 Ayalon, “Circassians,” 141.
184 Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Nujum, 13:108 was quoting al-Maqūrī.
185 Berkey, “Mamluks as Muslims,” 163.
The ruling elite needed the spiritual and political support of the religious figures. For this reason, they became great patrons of religious architecture, which provided the ‘ulama’ with the necessary means to transmit knowledge, and also with jobs by way of the endowments that were made. It has also been argued that the Mamluk ruling elite needed to endow institutions such as madrasas and khānqāhs in order to make their progeny, who would be appointed as administrators of the waqt, beneficiaries of the proceeds of the endowed properties. Otherwise after a patron’s death it was always possible that the dīwān al-mawārith (bureau for inheritances) would confiscate the properties.

Therefore we owe the Mamluk elite the commissioning of the institutions of learning. In this way they participated in making the intellectual life possible, since they had the intention and were in positions of power and money to build. All of the above-mentioned reasons had a bearing on the motivation of our patrons, but one of the main reasons they participated in the patronage of the intellectual environment and endowment of institutions of learning and worship was their belief as pious Muslims in their religious and intellectual importance. Their patronage was also often due to their piety; many of them believed in and were committed to their religion. Their mission of

---


jihād against the enemies of Islam, namely the Crusaders and the Mongols, can be seen
to have extended to the intellectual realm as well in the form of patronage.189

Some of the sultans and amīrs took part in the intellectual environment by
engaging in discussion or by producing works themselves. An early example is the
veteran amīr Baybars al-Manṣūrī (d. 725/1325), who was nā‘ib al-saltana in 711/311 and
a historian who left us two very important works.190 Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn’s son al-
Ashraf Khalīl (r. 689–93/1290–93) was interested in literature and intelligently
discussed literary issues.191 Along with Sultans Lajīn (696–98/1296–99) and Baybars al-
Jāshnakīr (708-9/1309-10), Sultan Ḥasan is another example of a Bahri Mamluk sultan
who searched for knowledge and the company of the learned. Ḥasan is noted to have
busied himself studying when the amīr kept him imprisoned in the Citadel during his
first reign.192 The amīr ʿSirghitmish studied Arabic, jurisprudence, and other disciplines
and frequented the ‘ulamā’; while supporting the Persians who came to study at his
madrasa next to the mosque of Ahmad ibn Ṭūlūn.193 More examples exist for the
fifteenth century.

Many of the buildings they commissioned were for the dissemination of
knowledge as well as for worship.194 Throughout Mamluk rule from the thirteenth to the

189 Inspired by Prof. Linda Northrup’s discussion of Qalāwūn’s intent in building his Bīmāristān.
191 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 1:791.
Islamic Education,” in Modes de transmission de la culture religieuse en Islam, ed. Hassan
Elboudrari (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, 1993), 103.
194 Throughout Islamic history the mosque served as an educational institution as well as a place
of worship. However, under the Mamluks the endowment of lessons and the assignment of
scholars to buildings increased. This of course was in addition to the madrasas and khānqāhs. On
the various institutions of learning in Mamluk Cairo see Jonathan Berkey, The Transmission of
Knowledge in Medieval Cairo (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), chapter three;
fifteenth century more than one hundred educational institutes were constructed.\footnote{Berkey, “Mamluks and Islamic Education,” 95.}

Specific to the fourteenth century is the building activity under al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, which made possible thirty-one different Friday sermons across the city.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 2:544.} These mosques had dedicated teachers who gave lessons on the various religious sciences and who discussed them.\footnote{Al-Ḥajjī, “Aḍwā‘ ‘alā al-ta’lim,” 66-7. An interesting example is that of the \textit{amīr} Yalbughā al-ʿUmarī, who in 767/1366 endowed to the mosque of Aḥmad ibn Ṭūlūn (876) seven teachers to teach Hanafi jurisprudence. See al-Ḥajjī, “Aḍwā‘ ‘alā al-ta’lim,” 71; al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Khiṭāt}, 4:1:71.} After the death of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad many buildings were also commissioned. Sixty-eight buildings still remain standing in Cairo from the period 1341-1412, eleven of which are \textit{madrasas}.\footnote{Madrasas of Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya, al-Ghannāmiyya, Ināl al-Atābakī, Khawand Baraka, Uljāy al-Ŷūṣufī, Sultan Ḥasan, Sultan Barqūq, Șīrghītmish, Bishr Aghā al-Jamdār, Qūṭulbūghā al-Dhahābi and al-Kharūbiyya. Data from the Islamic Art Network (\texttt{www.islamic-art.org}), which I developed for the Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation in 2002.} Prominent examples include the mosque-\textit{madrasa} of Sultan Ḥasan (757-62/1356-62), the \textit{khānqāh-madrasa} of Shaykhū (756/1357), the \textit{madrasa} of Șīrghītmish (756/1357), the \textit{madrasa} of Umm al-Sultan Sha'bān (770/1368), and the \textit{khānqāh-mosque-madrasa} of Barqūq (786/1384). The line between the functions of a mosque, a \textit{madrasa} and a \textit{khānqāh} started to dissolve by the 1330s.\footnote{Berkey, \textit{Transmission of Knowledge}, 48-9.} This merging of functions was formalized when Hasan commissioned his great \textit{madrasa} in 757/1357 as a Friday mosque. The \textit{madrasa/mosque/khānqāh} of Sultan Barqūq built in 786/1384 can be seen as the flowering of such a merger.


\footnote{195}{Berkey, “Mamluks and Islamic Education,” 95.}
\footnote{196}{Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 2:544.}
\footnote{198}{Madrasas of Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya, al-Ghannāmiyya, Ināl al-Atābakī, Khawand Baraka, Uljāy al-Ŷūṣufī, Sultan Ḥasan, Sultan Barqūq, Șīrghītmish, Bishr Aghā al-Jamdār, Qūṭulbūghā al-Dhahābi and al-Kharūbiyya. Data from the Islamic Art Network (\texttt{www.islamic-art.org}), which I developed for the Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation in 2002.}
\footnote{199}{Berkey, \textit{Transmission of Knowledge}, 48-9.}
\footnote{200}{\textquoteleft}{\textquoteleft}Abd al-ʿĀṭī, \textit{al-Taʿlīm fi miṣr}, 139.}
The madrasa and other institutions of learning flourished under the rule of the Mamluks and most of the manuscripts under study were endowed to these madrasas. They thrived due to the abundant presence of the scholars in the various religious sciences, and in turn the madrasas produced many more. The presence of the scholars was an incentive to the patrons to provide for them the necessary means to educate.\(^2\) It is very possible that, after the destruction of Baghdad by the Mongols in 656/1258 and the Reconquista of al-Andalus, many scholars fled from these regions and ended up in Cairo and Damascus, where Mamluk patronage of Islam, its arts, and its culture made it possible for intellectual figures to thrive.\(^2\) The chancery scribe and encyclopedist al-Qalqashandî (d. 821/1418) reports on the abundance of scholars specializing in exegesis, ḥadīth, recitation, Sufism, grammar, literature, kalām, medicine, and other fields.\(^3\)

In a few cases students vied to go to the madrasas since the madrasas offered housing and stipends.\(^4\) The madrasa built by Baybars al-Bunduqdārī in 662/1263 in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn apparently had excellent accommodation, and so students competed strongly to study there.\(^5\) Khānqāhs were built for Sufis to have the necessary space for seclusion. They were introduced to Egypt by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 569/1174 when he built the

\(^{201}\) Al-Hajjī, “Adwā’ ʿalā al-taʿlīm,” 70.
\(^{204}\) Berkey, Transmission of Knowledge, 45. We need to keep in mind that this was not the rule, because students were primarily interested in studying with certain scholars and so joined them wherever they were. This will be further discussed in chapter five. For medieval Damascus Michael Chamberlain explains that there is no proof in the sources that students sought out specific madrasas. See Michael Chamberlain, Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 76.
\(^{205}\) Al-Ḥajjī, “Adwā’ ʿalā al-taʿlīm,” 70.
They eventually became institutions for the dissemination of knowledge. By the fourteenth century the various patrons endowed khānqāhs with teaching positions. Shaykhū endowed his khānqāh in 756/1355 with teachers teaching the four schools of jurisprudence, ḥadīth and Qurʾān recitation.

Many disciplines were taught in these institutions, the most important of which was the recitation and exegesis of the Qurʾān and for this purpose Qurʾān manuscripts were of crucial importance. This partly explains the abundance of Qurʾān manuscripts that remain from this period. Following in importance were ḥadīth studies, jurisprudence, and the four schools of law. Attendance was in a few cases not optional. A committed student had to attend regularly as in the case of the madrasa of amīr Ṣirghitmish. Its waqf stipulates that two people are in charge of listing attendees, and distributing volumes of the Qurʾān at the beginning of lessons for students to read. They were also responsible for collecting and returning the codices.

Libraries in mosques, madrasas and khānqāhs were an important part of the endowment to the buildings. The disciplines covered by endowed works included jurisprudence, ḥadīth, grammar, Qurʾān manuscripts, and other subjects. A librarian, khāzin al-kutub, was in charge of the books. His responsibilities included taking care of the collection in the endowed buildings, conserving the codices and repairing them in

---

206 Little, “Nature of Khānqāhs,” 93.
207 Courses in religious sciences were offered in khānqāhs from the early fourteenth century. See Little, “Nature of Khānqāhs,” 94.
addition to observing the \textit{waqf} rules regarding the lending of the manuscripts.\footnote{211 Tāj al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Subkī, \textit{Muʿīd al-nīʿam wa mubīd al-niqām} (Beirut, Muʿassasat al-Kutub al-Thaqāfīyya, 1986), 87.} He was the equivalent of the modern-day librarian and manuscript conservator/restorer.\footnote{212 The \textit{amīr} ʿīṣālāshīmīsh’s \textit{waqf} for his \textit{madrasa} details the contents of the library and the duties of the librarian. See Ibrāhim,”Naṣṣān jadīdān (Part I),” 152.} Such libraries with their great collections were essential for the dissemination and transmission of knowledge and art. Without them, the incessant demand for the books to fill them, or the educated class who produced and demanded the books, not many manuscripts would have remained for us. Copiers, calligraphers, and illuminators would not have thrived.

The ‘ulāma’, the product of the religious/educational institutions, were not an isolated class but one that was deeply rooted in the society and highly interactive with the ruling elite.\footnote{213 Al-Ḥājī, “ʿAḍwāʿ al-ṣalātīya,” 85.} They often served as the link between the rulers and the ruled.\footnote{214 Lapidus, \textit{Muslim Cities}, 130.} They were the educators and the scholars responsible for the active intellectual life. Such opportunities available under Mamluk rule in Egypt and Syria gave rise to great personas such as the jurist and Sufi Aḥmad ibn ʿAṭāʾ Allah al-Iskandarī (d. 709/1309), whose intellectual presence is still visible in Cairo especially through his writings, and who fervently stood up to Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328). It gave rise to scholars like Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khāfi Ḥaybāk al-Ṣafāḍī (d. 764/1362-3),\footnote{215 Donald Little, \textit{An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annualistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāʾūn} (Montreal, McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1970), 102.} whose valuable historical writings were indispensable to the present research, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Dhahābī (d. 748/1348),\footnote{216 Little, \textit{Mamluk Historiography}, 61–2.} Muḥammad ibn Shākir al-Kutubī (d. 764/1362-3),\footnote{217 Little, \textit{Mamluk Historiography}, 61–2.} al-Ḥafīẓ Yusūf al-

212 The \textit{amīr} ʿīṣālāshīmīsh’s \textit{waqf} for his \textit{madrasa} details the contents of the library and the duties of the librarian. See Ibrāhim,”Naṣṣān jadīdān (Part I),” 152.
214 Lapidus, \textit{Muslim Cities}, 130.
Mizzî (d. 742/1342), ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Subkī (d. 771/1369), ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Bulqīnî (d. 824/1421), and many others, who wrote on hadīth, prosopography and literature. The list is very long. Perhaps, they thrived in reaction to the political instability of the period. These scholars participated not only in the intellectual life of their own century, but ours as well. Without their works our understanding of the Mamluk era would definitely be flawed.

217 Little, Mamluk Historiography, 67.
Chapter Two:
Qur’ān Manuscripts from 741/1341 to 764/1363

The group of Qur’ān manuscripts discussed in this chapter comprises fifteen manuscripts, most of which consist of several volumes. The focus in this chapter and the next two is on the manuscripts in Dār al-Kutub. The manuscripts considered here differ in size. The largest is Raṣīd 5, in one codex, measuring 77x45 cm, and the smallest is Raṣīd 150, a multi-volume rab‘a, measuring 18x13 cm. Each of the Qur’ān manuscripts will be described and their illumination will be analyzed individually, in order to make preliminary suggestions regarding provenances and workshops, as well as a summary at the end of the chapter with the aim of tying the Qur’ān manuscripts to each other and to the suggested workshops. The calligraphy of each individual Qur’ān manuscript will be discussed briefly at the end of the section on each manuscript. The analysis of each and its potential positioning within workshops will take place at the end of the chapter as well. The two scripts we are dealing with are naskh and muḥaqqaq. Since the discussion of the persons involved in the production of the manuscripts will be carried out in chapters five and six, no biographical details will be dealt with here.

The Qur’ān manuscripts have been divided according to their waqf. Thus we have the Șirghitmish subgroup, which contains six Qur’ān manuscripts endowed by the amīr to his madrasa, and the Sultan Ḥasan subgroup, which contains nine Qur’ān manuscripts endowed by the sultan, most probably to his mosque-madrasa. Three more Qur’ān manuscripts stand alone: one is Raṣīd 162, the earliest dated post—al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Qur’ān manuscript (743/1343); another (Raṣīd 56) is a waqf created by al-
Nāṣir’s daughter Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya; and the last (Raṣīd 70) is a Qur’ān manuscript that was produced for a Mamluk military official in 757/1356, and later, in the fifteenth century, made a waqf to the madrasa of amīr Qijmās al-Iṣḥāqī.

Before surveying the manuscripts we need to keep in mind two things about our artists. The illuminator, not the calligrapher, was responsible for the sūra titles. At the same time, however, it frequently happens that the illuminator and the calligrapher are one and the same person. In any case, if only the date of copying is mentioned in the colophon, it is accepted as pertaining to the illumination as well.

A Unique Qur’ān Manuscript

Raṣīd 162

A special and unique example, Raṣīd 162, produced in 743/1342, features important and distinct traits that will be examined shortly. It is a single codex made of 249 folios of polished cream paper. It measures 51.8x34.5 cm, while the text block itself is 40.5x24 cm. The text is written in muḥaqqaq with a thick black pen and, except for the opening pages and the pages with sūra titles, there are seventeen lines to a page (Pl. 1). The frontispiece, sūra titles, and colophon are executed, however, in thulūth. The calligrapher gave us only the date of completion but neither his name (Pl. 2) nor that of the illuminator.218

218 The codex is not well preserved and wormholes fill all the pages. The leather binding is loose and its spine is dilapidated. The codex looks to have been restored at some stage, and this is why the frontispiece, the opening pages, and the colophon have been remargined using a different kind of paper (Pl. 3). This restoration possibly occurred in 1266/1849 when the codex was made an endowment by a certain Muhammad al-Garāna. Min fihrist al-kutub al-’Arabiyya al-maḥfüza bi-al-kutubkhāna al-khidwiyya (Cairo, 1892), 7.
God the Great spoke the Truth, and His Generous Prophet spoke the Truth, and the nearest of His Angels spoke the Truth, and we are witnesses to this. Its copying was completed on Friday 20th of Safar the year 743. May his prayers and peace be on the best of His creation, Muhammad the Prophet, and his pure kin and his chosen companions.

The frontispiece is spread over two pages (folios 1b–2a) and is heavily soiled (Pl. 3). Each side of the frontispiece has a full-page illumination containing an almond shape taking up around two-thirds of the illuminated space of the frontispiece, and painted in several concentric patterns. The innermost pattern has a golden background and a black border. On the golden background an arabesque sprouts from a diamond-shaped motif. The arabesque forms a mirror image with the diamond-shaped motif as the vertical axis of the reflection. Some of the half palmettes and trefoils are filled in with ultramarine. The border of this innermost almond shape is a solid golden one with two black lines, a pearl band, and a thin golden line framing it. The almond shape surrounding all of this has an ultramarine background and contains thuluth inscribed in gold over an undulating arabesque scroll. The same thin golden line with the black outlining and the pearl band surround the blue area. The full-page rectangle, in which the almond shape is centered, is gold. The spandrels are treated like an architectural ornament. They are outlined in a double black frame and filled with an arabesque carrying palmettes and half palmettes, often adorned with ultramarine to reflect the innermost arabesque in the middle. The pearl band is repeated for a third time around the large outermost rectangle and surmounted by small petals, one next to the other, filled with ultramarine, a half-tone of that same blue, and gold. Using half-tones for a color gradation effect can already be seen in earlier Qur’ān manuscripts, and by the 1330s the art of the Qur’ān influenced its
appearance on other media, such as glass.\textsuperscript{219} Tassels top this border. The vertical margin contains a rosette of a diameter of about 4 centimeters but which is mostly cut off from the left-hand frontispiece (Pl. 4).

The two sides of the frontispiece are identical except for the inscription filling the blue part of the almond shape. The text is a \textit{hadith}, which is revealed as a guide to understand the laws in the Qur'\textacutecn and to aid with jurisprudence.\textsuperscript{220} It commences on the top left of the right side of the frontispiece.

On the verso of the left side of the frontispiece (folio 1b) we find the right side of the opening page containing Fātihat al-Kitāb, while the recto to its left (folio 2a) contains the beginning of \textit{sūrat} al-Baqara (Pls. 5 and 6). As is usual in Mamluk Qur'\textacuten manuscripts the opening pages consist of two large rectangles with a central field in the middle and two horizontal panels above and below. Each of the four panels contains a cartouche framed with the same pearl band encountered in the frontispiece. Both upper panels are used for the \textit{sūra} titles while the lower panels contain a Qur'\textacuten quotation (Q 56:77–78).\textsuperscript{221} The golden \textit{thuluth} script in the cartouches is embedded in a “cloud” outlined in gold on the paper ground and is surrounded by a golden arabesque on an ultramarine background.\textsuperscript{222} The arabesque’s half palmettes are filled with two-toned blue to create a gradation effect. The lighter blue is also used in the inscription carrying the title “\textit{sūrat} al-Fātiḥa” in the diacritical marks, and as a filler of some letters like the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{219} Ward, “Mosque Lamps and Enamelled Glass,” 63–64.
\item \textsuperscript{221} This verse is frequently used to adorn the beginnings of Mamluk Qur'\textacuten manuscripts.
\item \textsuperscript{222} The gold here is most probably gold shell. Gold leaf was used extensively in illumination when the area covered was large.
\end{itemize}
The darker blue used in the sūra title of al-Baqara is also used as filler for the wāw, qāf, and tā’ marbūta (a fāms variation). The corners around the cartouche are filled with a golden arabesque outlined in black and formed on a golden background. The central fields of the rectangles contain the text of the first and the beginning of the second sūras, respectively. The thick black muḥaqqaq is in clouds placed on a pink background, which was created by small semicircles surrounding one another, and adorned with rows of three black dots in the shape of a triangle. The central field of the opening pages is bordered, only on the right and on the left, with a braided scroll carrying half palmettes. In the margin to the right on folio 2b we find two rosettes.

Folio 249a, which carries the colophon, has above the colophon the last verses in the Qurʾān, Q 114:4–6 (Pl. 2). The texts of these āyās are treated like those in the opening—that is in a cloud, the background of which is the paper color, on top of the pink semicircles. This narrow rectangle is bordered with the pearl band.

The colophon appears on the last folio in a rectangle with the horizontal bottom side as an arched semicircle. The frame of this shape is the same as the frontispiece, made of petals of two tones of blue and the gold, which has now disappeared. The background is made up of the semicircles encountered earlier.

This Qurʾān manuscript is unique in many respects. No direct parallels for the overall design survive from earlier Qurʾān manuscripts, whether from the Mamluk or the

---

223 The one on the left of the sūrat al-Fātiḥa is unfortunately non-extant now.
224 The one at the top is in better condition than the one at the bottom and gives us a better idea of how the ones adorning the frontispiece looked. Unfortunately the ones by sūrat al-Baqara are no longer extant because the original page was cut by the edge of the frame and is now remargined. The full-page illuminations of the two opening pages are topped with a scroll band that was clearly added much later than the original date of the manuscript—possibly in the nineteenth century with the new waqf (Pls. 5 and 6).
Ilkhanid realms, and this makes it all the more difficult to integrate within the current illumination workshops, but also more intriguing and interesting. Where then can we find compositions with similar elements, and what are the origins of the motifs used? Let us place this in the context of other Qurʾān manuscripts and begin with the motival details of the illuminated elements, starting with the frontispiece.

The motif that has been used abundantly before is the pearl band found on the frontispiece and the colophon page. This band was used in many Mamluk and Ilkhanid Qurʾān manuscripts with different provenances: Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Iran.225

The multi-toned petals surrounding the frontispiece, the colophon’s polygonal rectangle, and the marginal rosettes were not as popular, but direct us to a potential source of influence. They are found in two shades of blue and brown in a framing band of a Qurʾān manuscript that David James dates to 1330–40 and whose production he places in Cairo (Pl. 7).226 These petals can be also seen in a rosette denoting the khamsa in a Qurʾān produced in Shiraz between 1336 and 1357 for Fars Malik Khāṭūn, the sister of the Injuid ruler at the time (Pl. 8).227 The petals in the Shiraz manuscript differ in that the degradation of the color to its lighter tone is far more pronounced, as a result of which it does not convey depth as the Mamluk examples do. Rather, one feels that the colors are completely different and not just different tones. Given the good condition of the Shirazi manuscript, the thin golden border of each petal is clear, whereas it is unfortunately barely visible in Raṣîd 162. Another Qurʾān in the Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 228 (Pl. 9), displays the same petals, also in a rosette, rather than in a

225 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamluks, cat. 6, 39, 40, 20, 67; James, The Master Scribes, cat. 43.
226 James, Master Scribes, 152. Raṣîd 162 can be used to back up the dating ascribed by James.
227 QUR 181 in the Nasser Khalili Collection. James, Master Scribes, 130.
band as the Mamluk examples do. It was dated by J.M. Rogers to 1280–1320 and attributed to Iran or Anatolia.\textsuperscript{228} Whereas the Mamluks, it seems, preferred to use this petal to form bands, in the Eastern realm it was mostly used for rosettes.\textsuperscript{229}

The arabesque bands in the frontispiece are features of both Cairo and Damascus production, and in spite of the dilapidated condition of the frontispiece, the scroll is more akin to the Cairo examples (compare Pls. 3 and 9 to Pl. 10).

We now turn to the main shape employed in the frontispiece, the almond shape inscribed with the \textit{hadith}. No other example of a Qur\textsuperscript{ā}n manuscript exhibits this same exact design. Perhaps it is the remnant of a school of illumination, one that possibly did not flourish as much as the star polygon type seen in earlier decades and reappearing in later decades. We need to look at other Qur\textsuperscript{ā}n manuscripts, or manuscripts in general, for the source of this design. Almond shapes are found in many Qur\textsuperscript{ā}n manuscripts adorning margins, \textit{sūra} titles, and occasionally frontispieces as central motifs, but rarely do we see them on such a large scale during this time.\textsuperscript{230} One of the earliest examples of an almond shape in a frontispiece is found in an Iraqi Qur\textsuperscript{ā}n dated to the first half of the eleventh century in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 11).\textsuperscript{231} The frontispiece is mostly gold with some blue, but the almond shape is gold and brown and is laid horizontally rather than vertically as seen in Raṣīd 162. It is however bordered by the pearl band as in Raṣīd 162. Could this have been an inspiration, or was it an illuminator who was

\textsuperscript{228} J. M. Rogers, \textit{The Arts of Islam: Treasures from the Khalili Collection} (New York: The Overlook Press, 2010), 142.
\textsuperscript{229} More is said about the petal border in chapter three.
\textsuperscript{230} Almond shapes in marginal medallions or even in \textit{sūra} titles are irrelevant to the comparative purposes here since their usage and proportions are completely different from the frontispiece of Raṣīd 162.
\textsuperscript{231} QUR 284 in the Nasser Khalili Collection. James, \textit{Master Scribes}, 24–25.
reviving an old style, especially since the fourteenth-century Qur‘ān manuscripts produced in Iraq show no resemblance to this style whatsoever?

In the Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 497, which is juz‘28 of a thirty-volume Qur‘ān, shows the use of the almond shape in gold and ultramarine (Pl. 12). It was produced for the Zanjid ruler of northern Mesopotamia, Quṭb al-Dīn Abū al-Muẓaffar Muḥammad, and was therefore attributed to Sinjar or Nusaybin sometime between 1198 and 1219.232

Another manuscript, not a Qur‘ān, that used an almond shape, though less narrow as in Raṣīd 62, is the manuscript of the Mathnavī of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī, kept in the Mevlana Museum in Konya (MS number 51). It was produced in 677/1278 by the illuminator Mukhlīṣ ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Hīndī. In this case the almond shape is found in the frontispiece of a chapter in the Mathnavī, not the frontispiece for the whole book.233

It seems that an illuminator working under Mamluk rule might have been reviving a two-centuries old Mesopotamian tradition, potenitally passed down through artists or manuscripts kept the different libraries, while portraying it in a Mamluk manner. The use of thuluth for the hadith surrounding the arabesque background and the arabesque in the spandrels are characteristically Mamluk. This points to an illuminator who might have been trained in the Mesopotamian/Iraqi tradition.

---

In Raṣīd 162 the opening pages are the only pages with elaborate sūra titles (Pls. 5 and 6). Each title written in golden thuluth is enclosed in a cartouche taking the full area allotted at the top of the central field, leaving four small triangles, one at each corner, filled with two half-palmettes and a trefoil each. The whole composition for the sūra titles at the openings seem to be Cairene. Other similar examples include QUR 317, produced in 729/1329 and ascribed to Cairo (Pl. 13); and QUR 580 (Pl. 14), dated to 1330–50 and also ascribed to Cairo by David James.

The text of the sūras in muḥaqqaq is also contained in clouds, this time surrounded by the semicircular hatchings as described above. Typical of Mamluk Qur’āns of the period are the clouds in which the script lies. The background, however, is particular and may be one of the clues directing us to Cairo production. Another surviving example with this kind of background is a Qur’ān manuscript in the Topkapi Sarayi Library (Pl. 15). The Topkapi manuscript was produced in 744/1343 and copied in Cairo by Mubārak Shāh al-Suyūfī. A second example with a similar hatching can be seen in a Shiraz Injuid production. The Qur’ān manuscript in thirty volumes was calligraphed by Yāqūt’s student Yaḥyā al-Jamāli al-Ṣūfī in 744–46/1343–45 and illuminated by Ḥamza ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī (Pl. 16). The Shirazi example is, however, quite different from the Cairene one, with its smaller semicircles executed in

234 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 247, cat. 67. Manuscript number Y 365.
235 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, cat. 69, fig. 115 and p. 168. Manuscript number 456 in the Pars Museum in Shiraz.
brown. Bigger pink-colored semicircles will be seen again later in the Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts produced in the 1360s and 1370s.\textsuperscript{236}

**Calligraphy**

Raṣīd 162 was penned in a sure hand (Pl. 1). It is most unfortunate that we do not have the name of the calligrapher. His pen is steady and does not thin at any point. He opts to leave extra space rather than to break the word or to place it in the margins. However, there are a few instances in which he extends the line in the margins. In spite of the wear and tear on the opening pages and the outrageously placed modern white tape, it is obvious that his two basmalas are symmetrical and proportionate. The spacing between the words does not vary much. He uses the Persian ʰāʾ in the beginning of some words, and adorns the ˢîn with the three dots beneath it to verify it is a ˢîn. The muḥaqqaq he uses combines features from both the Egyptian/Mamluk and Iraqi/Ilkhanid worlds.\textsuperscript{237} The script here has the curved nature of Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq. The Mamluk one is more rigid. However, the lines in the codex are straight and flat, exhibiting an important Mamluk characteristic.\textsuperscript{238}

As will be clearly seen at the end of this chapter, this manuscript stands as a testament that endless possibilities existed in Mamluk arts of the book. It might have impacted a later production (Raṣīd 62) and was itself inspired by the earlier Iraqi school,

\textsuperscript{236} Other illuminated elements are fragmentary and include the marginal rosettes (Pl. 17) and the colophon. The colophon, which, as described earlier, is contained in an atypical shape, includes motifs we have already covered.

\textsuperscript{237} Whereas the Egyptian muḥaqqaq is more influenced by Ibn al-Bawwāb, the Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq relies most on the style of Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī; see Mansour, *Sacred Script*, 102.

\textsuperscript{238} Mansour, *Sacred Script*, 106.
but it is still very interesting and represents an atypical trend of illumination in the period.

A Qurʾān Manuscript for a Princess

Rasīd 56

We have no date for this codex, but there is a waqf dedication in the name of Princess Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya (d. 778/1376), daughter of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. She built a madrasa in al-Jamāliyya right next to her palace there in 761/1359. This manuscript was dedicated to her madrasa and so can be given a potential date of c. 1359. Rasīd 56 is unfortunately in an extremely bad condition. It comprises 291 folios of cream paper that were cut and stuck on new paper, and wormholes fill most of the pages. The leaves are mostly detached from the binding, which is not original. This Qurʾān manuscript comprises one codex only but not a complete one. The damage has apparently taken away the last few folios, as it stops with the basmala of sūra 97 (sūrat al-Qadr) on folio 291b (Pl. 18). The codex measures 51.8x34.5 cm while the text block is 40.5x24 cm. It is written in naskh that has some of the characteristics of muḥaqqaq and in thirteen lines to a page, which is one of the standard arrangements used in this period (Pl. 19). Thuluth is encountered only in the titles of the first two sūras (Pls. 20 and 21), while the other sūra titles are in the same script as the main text (Pl. 22). Beginning with the opening sūras and continuing throughout the verses is an interlinear smaller naskh text in red (Pl. 22). This text is in

---

239 Min fiḥrist al-kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 6.
Arabic and thus not a translation, but rather a lexicon and exegesis at the same time. We unfortunately do not have the name of either the calligrapher or the illuminator.

No frontispiece survives and the opening pages (Pls. 20 and 21), folios 1b–2a, are in bad condition, but there is enough to inform us about the illumination program of the anonymous illuminator. The layout of all four horizontal panels on the two opening pages is the same. The suṣra title is in a multi-lobed cartouche with an ultramarine background and a golden arabesque scroll surrounding the thuluth inscription, which is in gold. This multi-lobed cartouche is encased in a rectangular panel with a faded orange background and a golden arabesque scroll.241 The central field of the full-page illumination is bordered at the right and left only by a dotted interlaced/plaited band.

The background of the text is the typical arabesque that characterized the Şandal workshop and was used to adorn the backgrounds of opening pages.242 The scroll and the half palmettes appear to be in brown, but it seems that they were executed in black, which tarnished with time.

Each margin in the opening pages contains three elements adjacent to the rectangular frame surrounding the text (Pls. 20 and 21). We find a golden medallion within a blue border of a blossom. There is such a decoration at the bottom as well.243 In between the two medallions is a semicircle, decorated with gold and a delicate arabesque scroll, which encases two semicircles of blue on the diameter resting on the frame, each adorned with a golden half palmette. At the top and in between the two blue semicircles the remains of another golden scroll on blue appear.

---

241 The panel at the bottom of folio 1b is partially there, while the one at the bottom of folio 2a is non-extant.
242 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 34–72.
243 Only a tiny part of its border is visible at the bottom of folio 1b.
The āya markers in the opening pages are rayed rosettes of gold. No other illuminated elements are found throughout the codex. The sūra titles throughout the codex are in blue with nothing adorning them, while the āya markers consist of three blue dots forming a pyramid.

Since the only illuminations encountered are those in the opening pages, this will be the only bi-folio to be analyzed here (Pls. 20 and 21). Most important are the two panels carrying the sūra titles. A Qur’ān manuscript dated to 701/1302 and kept in the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia (Pl. 23) has somewhat similarly structured panels. Folio 1b with the opening sūra, surāt al-Fātiḥa, exhibits the sūra title in a teardrop–oval–teardrop shape flanked by two rosettes, with an ultramarine background and the sūra title in gold. Raṣīd 56 has a more complex shape but the connection is obvious. The Sofia manuscript has a full colophon giving us the calligrapher’s and the illuminator’s (harrar marsūmuḥ) name as Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Abī al-Qāsim al-Maydūmī, who produced the codex in the Mosque of the Gold Market in Fatimid Cairo (bi-al-Qāhira al-Muʿizziyya bi-masjid Sūq al-Ṣāgha) (Pl. 24). He will be discussed further in chapter five, but we can for now conclude that there is a possibility that the same workshop, or a disciple of al-Maydūmī produced Raṣīd 56 for the princess. Al-Maydūmī, who was one of Egypt’s greatest

---

244 Manuscript number OP2707. Stoivola and Ivanova, The Holy Qur’ān through the Centuries, 49–50.
245 Al-Maydūmī uses three words in the colophon to describe the work he did: katabahu (wrote it), ḍabatahu (added the vocalization), and harrar marsūmuḥ. The last task can be understood in many ways, one of which is ‘to write.’ This does not seem applicable here because he already said he wrote it using katabahu. Adam Gacek, in The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography, Supplement under the entry ‘ḥār’ (p. 15), gives as one of the meanings of muḥarrir ‘to illuminate, paint in ink, and outline.’
hadith scholars and teachers, died at the age of ninety in 754/1354 and so had an opportunity to train many students.246

The arabesque scroll in the central field (Pls. 20–21) possibly stems from the Şandal workshop.247 The text is placed in a cloud band, but it is not as wide as Raşid 162 (compare with Pls. 140–145). Thus this codex is proof that after three decades the style of Şandal and his disciple Aydughdî was still being used.248 Together with the design of the sūra titles discussed above, this affiliation to the Şandal workshop points to a Cairene origin. There is also a resemblance between the marginal medallions here on the opening pages and those adorning various pages in TIEM 450 (compare marginal medallions on Pls. 20, 21, and 145).249

**Calligraphy**

The calligrapher had a steady hand and his naskh is peculiar in adopting some of the features of muhões. The muhões features include the extension of the stroke of such final letters as the nūn, wāw, and yā’ (Pl. 19). The text of the opening pages has been centered within the text block dedicated to the opening sūras. This is probably to avoid having a bigger space beneath the sūrat al-Fātiha than that beneath sūrat al-Baqara. Thus it was done for the sake of symmetry.

---

247 James, *Master Scribes*, 152.
248 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 72.
249 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 60–62.
Endowments by amīr Ṣirghitmish al-Nāširi

No informative colophons survive from the manuscripts in this section, but we have waqf statements in all five cases. Thus, the attribution to a terminus ad quem of 757/1356 (date of the building of the madrasa) or 759/1358 (the amīr’s death date) has been made based on these waqf statements.

Raṣīd 149

This multi-volume Qur’ān manuscript, a rabʿa, is the first on our list that is attributed to the great patron amīr Ṣirghitmish al-Nāširi. A long tradition of thirty-volume Qur’āns would blossom throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Only two volumes remain of this set, the seventh and the thirteenth. Neither carries a date with the Ṣirghitmish waqf statement in the manuscript but the terminus ad quem would be 759/1358, which is the date of his death. The construction date of his madrasa, to which the manuscript was endowed, is 757/1356, which gives us 757/1356–759/1358 as a date for the manuscript. Both measure 26x19 cm and so they are not monumental in size.

They are penned in a good naskh, similar to that in Raṣīd 56 in having some characteristics of muḥaqqaq (Pl. 27). They are both in a relatively good condition and the text block in each case is still attached to the binding. The binding is the original one and is decorated in the style of the period, that is, it is tooled with the knotted band seen in frontispieces and has a rosette, also tooled, in the middle and adorned with a geometric pattern. Both juz’s have the same kind of binding and same interior illumination. The paper is thick polished cream paper with five lines to a page. This Qurʾān manuscript was endowed to the Ṣirghitmish madrasa. No information is present
on the calligrapher’s or illuminator’s names. The waqf dedication is found in both cases at the top of the left side of the frontispiece (folio 2a). The text of the endowment reads (Pl. 28):

Şirghitmish, the poor slave of God Almighty, endowed (awqafâ), bequeathed (habasa), dedicated to charitable purposes (sabbala), and gave as alms (tasaddaqâ) all this blessed volume to those working on noble scholarship and those living in the Ḥanafi madrasa next to the mosque of Ibn Ṭuļūn to benefit from it in work and writing day and night. It is not to leave the above-mentioned madrasa, is not to be sold, not to be mortgaged, and not to be given as a gift. The rightful legal waqf should not be exchanged, as the endower intended this a waqf for the sake of God the Great; may God accept it from him. Whosoever changes it after listening to it, then its sin is on those who change it. God is the All-Listener and All-Knower.

To avoid redundancy juz’ 7 will be described, and any variations in volume thirteen will be noted. Juz’ 7 begins with a double page carrying the frontispiece (Pl. 29). The full-page illuminations on folios 1b and 2a are each framed by a wide gold band and a thick blue line. Four panels with text in kūfi (Q 56:77–80) are found above and below the central field. The writing appears layered over an arabesque scroll in gold with the palmettes filled in with orange on an ultramarine background.

The geometric design of the central field of each side of the frontispiece consists of four eight-pointed stars around a concaved octagon containing the word al-juz’ on folio 1b and the word al-sâbi‘ on folio 2a. Accordingly, in juz’ 13 the words are al-juz’ and al-thâlith ‘ashr (Pl. 30). The eight-pointed stars each carry a large lotus flower in gold and orange on an ultramarine background. Each star is surrounded by another eight-pointed star with edges in orange, each with a trefoil in gold. In both frontispieces, remains of the color green can be found in the octagon carrying the volume number on
both sides of each frontispiece, in the corner shapes formed by the extension of the stars, and at the end of the two axes of the rectangle.

Each side of the frontispiece has a medallion in the middle of the margin: a thick blue line that surrounds a golden border, which in turn surrounds a circle of blue with a golden blossom in volume seven and a circle of orange with a golden blossom in volume thirteen.

The interior of each juz’ has no illumination except for the āya markers, which are golden-rayed rosettes with alternating red and blue dots on the perimeter and a blue dot in the middle of each rosette.

The kūfī panels of the frontispiece bring to mind once again QUR 349 in the Nasser Khalili Collection, dated by David James to 1330–40 (Pl. 7). The panels in the frontispiece and on the opening pages in QUR 349 display kūfī over a golden arabesque on a blue background. However, the orange is missing from QUR 349. The other example is also in the Khalili Collection, QUR 470, and dated by James to 1350–1450 (Pl. 31). QUR 470 is strongly related to Raṣīd 149 and will be discussed again shortly.

Earlier Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts with kūfī titles include works from Qurʾān of Baybars al-Jāshnakīr, which belongs to the Șandal workshop. From then on the kūfī inscribed panel was occasionally used, most notably by the calligrapher/illuminator ʿ Ḥmad ibn Kamāl ibn Yaḥyā al-Anṣārī al-Mutaṭṭabbib. His works were primarily commissioned by the great patron al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. Examples of his

250 James, Master Scribes, 152.
251 James, Master Scribes, 186.
252 They can be seen in the first and second sevenths. British Library, Add. 22406. James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, cat. 1.
work with *kūfī* on scroll titles include Raṣīd 184/714, dated 732/1332\(^{253}\) (Pls. 32 and 33), and Qur’ān manuscript 1476 in the Chester Beatty Library (CBL) (Pl. 129).\(^{254}\) Both date to the 1330s. This can be considered the apex decade of the artistic productions of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. Such *kūfī sūra* titles, which would become more popular two decades later with works commissioned by Sultan Sha‘bān, are not an invention of the Mamluk artistic milieu. They have existed since the early *kūfī* Qur’ān manuscripts. More related to their revival in the Mamluk tradition are the Eastern *kūfī* Qur’ān manuscripts in which plant motifs, primarily palmettes, are used as a background for the *sūra* title.\(^{255}\)

A similar combination of the four eight-pointed stars in the central field of the frontispiece can be seen in the Khalili Collection QUR 470 (Pl. 31). Even the color usage is almost the same, using primarily blue, gold, and orange. Details such as the use of text instead of the lotus flower and a larger octagon in the middle set them apart. But the same illuminator or disciples of the same workshop may have designed both.

Another Qur’ān manuscript that is useful for comparison is manuscript 138.M5 in the Topkapi Sarayi Library (Pl. 34). It was completed in 741/1341 in one volume.\(^{256}\) The frontispiece displays four eight-pointed stars in blue and gold in the central field. The calligrapher, who was assumed by David James to be also the illuminator, is Aḥmad

---

\(^{253}\) The registry number is now 184 in the registry books of Dār al-Kutub. However, it was referred to as 714 until recently. The reason for this change is not known. Here it will be referred to as Raṣīd 184 from now on.

\(^{254}\) From here onwards it will be referred to as CBL. James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 141–43.


\(^{256}\) James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 143, cat. 21.
ibn Abī lbrāhīm Muḥammad al-Shāfīʿī al-Qurashī al-Kātib al-Dimashqī.²⁵⁷ His nisba, al-Dimashqī (the Damascene), probably led James to suggest a Damascus origin. James also points to the quality of the illumination as the reason for his attribution, stating, “the quality of illumination is certainly much better than contemporary Cairo work.”²⁵⁸ This would also put Raṣīd 149 in the Cairo workshop, because the quality of its scrolls and fineness of line are different from those of the Topkapi manuscript.²⁵⁹

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy exhibits similarities with Raṣīd 56, a naskh which retains some of the characteristics of muhaqqaq. The strokes used for the final nūn, yāʾ, or sīn are the same (Pl. 27). It may have been produced by the same workshop. In any case it is an excellent naskh in a master’s hand. The calligrapher’s pen is more sure, which is clear from letters like rāʾ, dāl, and sīn.

To conclude our discussion of this manuscript, it has to be said that an accomplished artist produced it, it was written in an excellent naskh and illuminated in a good hand consistent with productions of the 750s/1350s.

²⁵⁷ James, Qur’ans of the Mamlūks, 227, cat. 21.
²⁵⁸ James, Qur’ans of the Mamlūks, 143.
²⁵⁹ We still cannot conclusively say that the Topkapi manuscript was produced in Damascus. The artist could have been operating from Cairo and thus his nisba was important to keep, indicating that he is from Damascus but living elsewhere.
Raṣīd 148

Raṣīd 148 is another rabʿa or thirty-volume set that belongs to the amīr Șirghitmish; there will be more to come from the same amīr. The terminus ad quem for this set would again be 759/1358, which is the date of his death. The construction date of his madrasa, to which the manuscript was endowed, is 757/1356, which gives us 757/1356–759/1358 as a date for the manuscript. Only eleven volumes among the thirty survive, with no names given for the calligrapher or the illuminator. Three volumes will be discussed: 4, 14, and 28.260 They measure 27x19 cm each and are made of cream polished paper. Each folio contains six lines to a page. The text is in black muḥaqqaq, with juzʿ titles in kūfī, and sūra titles, verse count, and other features in tawqīṭ. Each volume still possesses its original binding in stable condition.

Each of the volumes begins on folio 1a with an isolated rectangular panel, similar to sūra titles and inscription panels in frontispieces in various Qurʿān manuscripts previously seen (Pls. 35, 36, and 37). There is a medallion on the left margin of the rectangle bulging from its middle, also resembling those adorning the interior of Qurʿān manuscripts. The medallion consists of concentric rings of blue, gold, and orange containing a golden blossom with a bit of blue.

While the horizontal panel is the same in all the volumes, the central part, carrying the script in kūfī that denotes the volume number, varies. The rectangle of the panel is framed with a golden band and a thick blue line and encloses differently shaped medallions or cartouches with the text. The spandrels created around them are painted orange and adorned with golden blossoms.

260 These volumes were examined more closely than the rest of the volumes.
Beginning with juz’4 (Pl. 35), there are two big circles and another smaller one resting on the circumference of each of the bigger circles. They have a border of gold that engulfs a pearl band. Inside the circle to the right is the word al-juz’, and in the one to the left is al-rābi‘ appearing in cream/white, because of the paper’s color, on a blue background with a golden spiral finishing in a palmette.

Juz’14 (Pl. 36) has a cartouche in the center of its panel, bordered with the pearl band. The inscription al-juz’ al-rābi‘ ‘ashr appears on a blue background on which is an arabesque undulating scroll carrying palmettes and half palmettes in gold filled with red and brown.

Interestingly, juz’14 has the sūra title of the first sūra of this juz’ on the same folio beneath the rectangle holding the juz’ number. As with all the sūra titles in all these volumes, the rectangle is bordered with blue and gold and has no illumination or special background. The text is in golden tawqī‘. It contains the sūra name, āya count, word count, and letter count in each rectangle carrying a sūra title.

Juz’28 (Pl. 37) is similar in conception to the fourth. The center of the panel consists of two parts as in juz’4. The two parts are identical. Two equal-sized circles intersect to form a shape bordered with the pearl band and filled with blue, with an undulating arabesque scroll carrying palmettes and half palmettes in gold filled with red and brown. Inscribed in the right circular composition is ‘al-juz’ al-thāmin,’ while the left has ‘wa-al-‘ashrūn’ inscribed in it.

On folio 1a in each of the volumes and above the volume title there is an endowment dedication that contains the same text as in Rasīd 149 with the addition of “and He is [. . .] and the Best Deputy” at the end.
The only illumination elements to be analyzed here are the *juz’* titles. They are very interesting because they open up the question of artistic relations between the Mamluk milieu at the time and that of Anatolia or Central Asia. Of many available Qur’an manuscripts examined, the only ones that showed a resemblance to Rašīd 148, in terms of the varied circular constructions holding the numbers of the volumes, was a group of Qur’an manuscripts that David James entitled “A Turkish Group.” This Turkish group contains three manuscripts that exhibit interesting connections. The overall look of CBL 1458, and of the other two as well, is completely different from Rašīd 148. Thus their provenance cannot be the same. The question is the source of inspiration. David James was unsure about the provenance himself and opted, with respect to the CBL 1458 manuscript, to give it either an Anatolian or Central Asian origin since it includes an interlinear Persian translation, and he dates it to circa 1335–37. If we look at a folio from *juz’*21 carrying a *sūra* title (Pl. 40), we can clearly see that *juz’*28 of Rašīd 148 exhibits the same intersecting two circles to contain text. Circles inscribed with the *sūra* name can be seen in a *sūra* title in a Qur’an manuscript in the Astān-i Quds, Mashhad, 293 (Pl. 38). The Mashhad manuscript bears the date 737/1337 and has an interlinear Chagatay commentary. The Cairo manuscript, Rašīd 148, combines foreign influences and portrays them in a Mamluk garb.

Similarities can be detected in the Qur’an manuscript produced in the Great Mosque of Damascus and dated by David James to 1330–40 (Pl. 41). Part of the *sūra*

---

261 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 173.
262 The three are shown in *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, catalogue nos. 58, 59, and 60. Catalogue 60, CBL 1458, in *Qur’āns of the Mamluks* is now distributed among a few collections around the world. James, *Qur’āns of the Mamluks*, 168–77.
title is in a circle in the midst of two almond shapes. The Anatolian/Central Asian examples are closer to the Cairo example, Raṣīd 148. It is very possible that the inspiration arrived through Syria, as was the case with architecture.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is a good *muḥaqqaq* hand but not that of a master (Pl. 45). This shows in the extension of the letters; the pen seems to be hesitant in the calligrapher’s hand. However, the improvement over the course of the volumes is noticeable. *Juz’* 28 (Pl. 46) features a much steadier hand than that of *juz’* 4 (Pl. 47). This difference is not due to different hands working on the manuscript, but rather to a calligrapher who has become much better as he gained experience throughout his work on the manuscript.

What is most interesting is that certain key words are highlighted in the text by being inscribed in gold rather than black. These include *kun fayakūn* (Q 16:40) and *rabbihim yatawakkalūn* (Q 16:42) in *juz’* 14 (Pl. 48), and *yā ayuḥā al-ladhina amānū* (Q 66:8) and *yā ayuḥā al-nabī* (Q 66:9) in *juz’* 28 (Pl. 49). The long-voweled *alif* are depicted in red in their respective places.

**Raṣīd 147**

Şirghitmish was not only interested in small multi-volume Qur’ān manuscripts but in single codices as well. Another Qur’ān manuscript attributed to him is Raṣīd 147, a single-volume Qur’ān with his *waqf* dedication to his *madrasa* at the bottom of the left side of the frontispiece (Pl. 50). The Şirghitmish *waqf* statement bears no date but the *terminus ad quem* is 759/1358, which is the date of his death. The construction date of
his madrasa, to which the manuscript was endowed, is 757/1356, which gives us 757/1356–759/1358 as a date for the manuscript. The polished cream paper of the codex is heavily restored. It consists of 351 folios measuring 58x42 cm in a new binding. The script is an excellent muḥaqqaq hand with incidentals in thuluth, eleven lines to a page. No colophon survives to give us the names of the calligrapher or the illuminator.

The illuminated elements of the codex begin with an elaborate frontispiece on folios 1b and 2a (Pl. 51). The right-hand side shows the first part of āya Q 56:77–80 and continues on the left side with ‘īlā al-muṭḥabharūn.’ The central field contains a geometric pattern while each of the horizontal panels encloses a cartouche carrying the thuluth text in blue on a golden background. At the edges of the panels a golden blossom appears on blue background. The central field and panels are surrounded by a golden band, a thick blue line, and ultimately a wide arabesque border. The arabesque, composed of half palmettes and trefoils, is gold with brown filling on the cream background. Large blossomed trefoils are also decorated in blue.

The central field is composed of an eight-fold rosette that expands from a central star (Pl. 51). Each of the elements of the geometric puzzle has a blossom in gold; these negative spaces are emphasized by their blue backgrounds. The elements created by the expansion of the eight-fold rosette are small octagons and irregular hexagons. In between them we find five-pointed stars and other shapes harmoniously blending in gold.  

---

The second illuminations we encounter are the full-page illuminations of the opening pages, which are perfectly proportioned (Pl. 52). The *sūra* titles appear in panels similar to those containing the āyas inscribed on the frontispiece, the difference being the color combinations. They are still blue and gold, but the *thuluth* is in black, now faded, enveloped in a cloud band, and surrounded by blue with a simple scroll going around the panels. The edges of the horizontal panels, in orange, display a golden scroll with a blue detail. The text of the *sūras* is the black *muḥaqqaq* in cloud bands placed on a hatched background (thin parallel red lines), topped with an undulating arabesque outlined in black.

The margins contain two medallions with a hasp motif in the middle. The medallions are orange and gold with a blue border, while the hasp motif is blue with a golden border. The blue is adorned with a golden/orange blossom surrounded by a thin scroll in gold in response to the one around the *sūra* titles.

The inner pages of the codex are adorned with āya markers, rayed rosettes of gold with the blue dot center, and the *sūra* titles in golden *thuluth* with no extra decoration (Pl. 53). The exceptions to this simplicity are the closing pages, which are exactly like the opening pages in decoration and placement of text, except for the color scheme of the medallions and the hasp in the margin (Pl. 54). Here the colors are the reverse of those on the opening pages. The hasp motif is mostly in orange, not blue, with a blue detail in the middle and a golden border. The two medallions are blue with a golden border. But here the blue allows the golden/orange flower in the middle to show much more clearly than the medallions at the beginning of the codex. The bottom left
corner has the remains of an inscription of an endowment that is partially legible and reads similarly to the endowment statement in the Raṣīd 148 and Raṣīd 149.

Are there any similarities in this work to those produced by the Şandāl workshop? This codex might have been produced by an illuminator who was a disciple of the Şandāl workshop or who was very familiar with it. He did not reproduce the style exactly but arrives at a very similar one, as comparison with the frontispiece of the seventh juz’ of the British Library Baybars al-Jāshnakīr’s Qurʾān manuscript proves (Pl. 55). The central field in the Baybars Qurʾān manuscript is based on a ten-fold star and its expansion, rather than an eight-fold star. Particularly important is the elaborate outer border with alternating palmettes in the Baybars Qurʾān manuscript and CBL 1479 (Pls. 55 and 56), as compared to the alternating trefoil blossoms in Raṣīd 147. The three manuscripts have an outer border on three sides like the one characterizing the Şandāl workshop.  

The blue background of the trefoil blossoms in Raṣīd 147 is more successful than those in the Baybars Qurʾān manuscript simply because the blue surrounds a blossom and not just a tendril. Another frequent element in the Şandāl workshop is the red hatching or the parallel lines in red serving as a background to this border, and seen as a background to the opening and closing pages of Raṣīd 147. A similar frontispiece is also found in Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum (TIEM) 450, which was illuminated by Şandāl’s disciple Aydughḏī ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakrī and his student ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Rassām al-Aʿsar in 713/1313 (Pl. 57).  

---

265 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 48.
266 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 48.
267 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 59.
The red hatching of the opening and closing pages with the undulating arabesque scroll appearing in cream/white, because of the paper’s color, is also a Şandal trademark. CBL 1479, produced by Şandal, clearly shows the uncanny resemblance (Pl. 56).²⁶⁸ These stylistic elements were continuously employed by Aydughdî and can be seen in TIEM 450 (Pl. 57). More than a decade later a manuscript attributed to the powerful amîr Qawsûn al-Nâşirî in 729/1329 and calligraphed by al-Maydûmî (Pl. 13),²⁶⁹ the same artist operating in the mosque of Sûq al-Šâgha in Cairo and responsible for OP2707 in the National Library in Sofia, shows that this tradition was still thriving (Pl. 23). We have already hypothesized that a disciple of al-Maydûmî might have been responsible for the Raşîd 56, the manuscript produced for Princess Tatar al-Ḥijâziyya.

Calligraphy

The hand of our calligrapher is very steady. Once again it seems that Şirghitmish was interested in varied styles, as we have seen in his Qur’ân manuscripts so far. The Egyptian Mamluk style can be identified easily by the very straight lines and the rigidity of the letters. The rigidity adds to the revered and solemn nature of the word.

Raşîd 150

Another rab’a for the amîr shows the diversity of his taste. Only five volumes (10, 12, 18, 20, 28) from the thirty in Raşîd 150 survive. Again we have only a terminus ad quem for the set, namely 759/1358, which is the date of his death. The construction date of his

²⁶⁸ James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, 58.
²⁶⁹ James, Master Scribes, 162. Nasser Khalili Collection QUR 317. David James assumes he might have been the illuminator as well. See James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, cat. 13, 225.
*madrasa*, to which the manuscript was endowed, is 757/1356, giving us 757/1356–759/1358 as a date for the manuscript.

This is the smallest *rab’a* produced for the *amīr*. Each volume measures 18x13 cm, which is very small for the Mamluk Qur’an manuscript tradition and reveals how varied their artistic milieu was. The text is in good *naskh* in black, while the *sūra* titles are in *thuluth*. The lines per page differ; standard pages have five lines of text, but those with headings have only three (Pls. 60 and 61). The bindings are original and in a stable state. The volumes (except *juz’* 28, the opening pages of which are heavily restored) begin on folio 1a with the *waqf* dedication, much the same as his previous endowment statements, with, in this case, the addition of the prayer for the Prophet (Pl. 62).270

Neither the calligrapher nor the illuminator are identified.

In *juz’* 10, following the *waqf* dedication on folio 1a, which is transcribed in a chancery script, we have on folio 1b the opening lines of the *juz’*(the beginning of Q 8:41) (Pl. 63) which does not continue on folio 2a. The other side of the opening, which must have been as elaborately illuminated, is missing. Thus there is a lacuna from the middle of *āya* 41 to the end of *āya* 42 along with the first word of *āya* 43. It seems that a folio (two pages) was damaged or torn out at some stage. Folio 1b is heavily illuminated but does not indicate the number of the *juz’* anywhere. The text of the *āya* on folio 1b is contained in the central field, as is typical of opening pages. The *naskh* is surrounded by a cloud band, beneath which is a white arabesque scroll with blue dots over a red hatching, seen earlier and associated with the Şandal workshop. To the right and left is a golden braided frame. Since this *juz’* does not begin with a *sūra* title, in its place is part

270 “May God pray for and provide peace for Muhammad and on his family and companions (peace and blessings be upon Muḥammad, his family, and companions).”
of the popular āya Q 33:56, which fills the two horizontal panels, above and below the text box. Interestingly, the scripts in which the words are inscribed vary. Thus the upper panel carries ‘inna Allah wa’ in grey kūfī on a blue background, ‘malā’katahu’ in light blue thuluth on an orange background, and ‘yuṣalūna’ in a light blue kūfī on a blue background. The word in the middle has two curved lines surrounding and separating it from the right and left. This arrangement differs from that in juz’ 12, where the juz’ coincides with the beginning of the sūra and so the sūra title there is in tawqī‘ inside the panel (Pl. 43). Beneath the inscription in both juz’ 10 and juz’ 12 is a golden arabesque scroll. The lower panel in juz’ 10 carries ‘alā in grey thuluth on a blue background, al-nabī yā ayuhā in light blue kūfī on an orange background, and al-ladhīna in light blue on a blue background. The golden arabesque scroll is also present beneath the script. Two medallions in gold and orange protrude from the two panels carrying the script.271

The page opposite this one, folio 2a, consists of five lines and is illuminated by a khamsa marker in the margin, contained in a medallion like those in the margins of folio 1b (Pl. 63). The juz’ does not continue as five lines to a page but rather as three lines to a page, contained in a thick gold border from the middle of which protrudes the same medallion as those on folio 1b.

All the other remaining ajzā’, 12, 18, and 28, open with a two-page opening spreading on folios 1b–2a (Pls. 43, 65, and 69). The same illumination program is used for all of them, the difference being the text. If it starts at the beginning of a sūra, it has its sūra title inscribed in the horizontal panel surmounting the sūra text on folio 1b. In juz’ 28 the panel on folio 2a carries āya Q 10:62, another popular and important one. In

271 There is an āya marker on top of the word al-yatāma in the text, which should not be there (Pl. 64).
this volume, too, we find pages with five lines to a page and no border and others with
only three lines to a page with the thick golden frame.

The unknown illuminator, who might have been the calligrapher as well, seems
to have wanted to show off the various techniques that he knew. The distribution of kūfi
and thuluth is reversed in the decorative panels in juz’ 10. This technique was rather
unsuccessful aesthetically. However, the illumination elements fit well within the
Cairene tradition. The hatching and arabesque scroll used in the decoration of the
opening pages of the different volumes and the marginal elements are all typical of a
Cairo production. The overall planning of the volumes is an innovative experiment. The
sizes of the codices, the alternation of kūfi and thuluth for sūra titles, the varying
number of lines, and the framing are all new, but did not carry over into later
production. Also peculiar is the exaggerated size of the juz’ and sūra titles in proportion
to the naskh of the text of the sūras.

**Calligraphy**

The script here is an excellent naskh in a steady hand where the ink does not thin at any
point. The quality of this hand is far superior to the hand that inscribed the sūra titles,
where the mixing of different scripts in the same line may have had an adverse effect,
such as in juz’ 28.
Exceptional in quality and craftsmanship, Raṣīd 60 is another rābʿa dedicated to Șirghitmish’s madrasa. Twenty-nine volumes of the thirty survive and were studied, but not in full, by David James in his Qurʾāns of the Mamluks. The volumes are in a stable condition, each measuring 39.2x 27.1 cm, with a text block of 23.9x14.7 cm. The folios are polished cream with five black muḥaqqaq lines to a page. Kūfī and thuluth are used for the sūra titles. There is a colophon with the calligrapher’s name at the end of juz’ 1 on folios 46–47a and at the end of juz’ 30 on folio 54a. The calligrapher was Mubārak Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh (Pl. 66). The bindings of the twenty-nine volumes are all original, some in better condition than others. Folio 1a of each volume contains the waqf dedications (Pl. 67), which is identical in all volumes and uses the same wording as seen earlier in the patron’s other manuscripts.

None of the volumes has a frontispiece, but the opening pages of each juz’ almost function as one, because of the elaborate illumination. We have seen nothing like this, in the group we are discussing, in terms of illumination. This is why David James infers that it is an Ilkhanid Qurʾān rather than a Mamluk one. Although he does not clearly state this, he points out all the Ilkhanid features of the manuscript. The provenance he seems to be arguing for is Iran rather than Iraq. Indeed, the details

---

272 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 153–55, cat. 72. The missing juz’ is number fourteen.  
273 James identifies the sūra titles as penned in tawqīṭ. Throughout the text they are not adorned, but the sūra titles that are found as opening pages are inscribed in heavily decorated panels and are sometimes kūfī and sometimes thuluth.  
274 He is not to be confused with Mubārak Shāh Qutb (zarīn qalam) who was one of the six students of Yaqūt. However, his pen is very close to that of Ahmad ibn al-Suhrawardi, who was one of the six, and the similarities and mastery of the pen would indicate that if he were not a student of Yaqūt, he might have been a disciple of one of them. Of all the manuscripts discussed so far, his hand is by far the best.  
275 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 153–54.
show an uncanny resemblance to Ilkhanid Qurʾān manuscripts. The question is whether this is an Ilkhanid gift to the Mamluk court or to the amīr, who, as will be seen in chapter six, was fond of Persian culture and Persians and dedicated his madrasa to Persian Sufis. We cannot exclude the employment of Persians in Cairo to produce such a manuscript. Širghitmish had many Persians in his service, who were almost all expelled after his death in 759/1359. There is also the possibility that it is an earlier production; it has been dated to 1320–30 by Martin Lings, in Cairo or possibly Iran. The Ilkhanid Qurʾān manuscript CBL Is 1469a, produced in 734/1334, is very similar in illumination to Raṣīd 60 and so might suggest an earlier date (compare Pl. 98 and Pl. 144).276 An attempt to answer this riddle will be made as we describe and analyze the manuscript.

Each juz’ has a different double page spread for its opening pages (Pls. 504–513). Juz’ 1, the fanciest of them all, and the most Ilkhanid-looking, has surat al-Fāṭiḥa spread on both central fields (folios 1b and 2a). The rectangle of the full-page illumination is bordered with a golden-knotted frame containing gold-encrusted blue squares. The panels carrying the sura titles encase cartouches with bulbous ends, creating spandrels at both ends. The arabesque contained in the cartouches is extremely fine, allowing for several clearly depicted spirals, and appears in gold on a blue background. The spandrels hold two half palmettes in gold and a green scroll but on black background, a color combination we have not encountered in the previous examples. The lack of orange is to be noted. The text displayed is surat al-Fāṭiḥa on the top right (folio 1b), sabʾ āyāt makkīyya on the top left (folio 2a). Qurʾān 85:22 is on the two bottom panels. The sura titles are written in a fine kūfī, which in other volumes is knotted or floriated itself. The

margin of each folio is adorned with a teardrop rosette bordered with the petals we have seen in Raṣīd 162, but here they are in gold and very fine, not colored and overstated. The inner surface is rendered in the same way as the sūra title, a very fine gold arabesque on a blue background. The āya markers are also very special, small medallions with blue-rayed borders and concentric golden circles around the word āya.

*Sūrat* al-Baqara begins on folio 2b and is adorned with a sūra title in a panel at the top. In this case it is not part of the opening pages. Two parallel blue lines and a golden knotted border with orange squares frame the panel. The kūfī in gold is on a blue background with a green arabesque scroll. Each of the corners is adorned with a crownlike palmette combination on black not seen before, and used again in the openings of *juz*’30.

Similarities can be seen with the work of Muḥammad ibn Aybak displayed in TIEM Qur’ān manuscript 538, where the scroll is similarly executed (Pl. 70). The TIEM Qur’ān was produced in Baghdad, thus supporting an association of Raṣīd 60 with Baghdad.

The medallions marking the khamsa and ‘ashara throughout *juz*’1 (Pl. 139) are spectacular, each featuring a different design with varied techniques. This does not continue throughout the manuscript, as will be seen starting with *juz*’2, where the illumination program seems to have changed. One possibility is that the master illuminator produced the first *juz*’ while the rest were produced by his disciples. However, the style is completely different, making this less likely. Another possibility is that *juz*’1 was produced in Baghdad but found its way to Egypt, where the amīr was

---

277 Lings, *Splendours*, pl. 75.
inspired to commission a continuation. The calligraphy, however, continues in the same excellent and sure hand, featuring similarities with the work of Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī, while the illumination varies. In addition, we have the signature of Mubārk Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh in the first and last juz’. Was Mubārk Shāh in Cairo finishing a manuscript he brought with him and working with Cairene illuminators?

To discuss the rest of the illumination program in the remaining volumes, it is best to group the decorative elements to be able to see the differences between them. The teardrop medallion in the middle of each margin in the opening pages of all of the volumes seems to differ in color scheme or in the details of the motifs employed. Three similar groups can be identified and two individual designs stand on their own. We need to bear in mind that not a single design repeats itself. The illuminator, or group of illuminators, has really outdone himself. The first group has a mostly blue background with golden palmettes, sometimes reflecting on one axis or two axes. The tip of the teardrop has the same motif in all of them. The second group has a golden background and with a border of golden petals/squares. Orange is also used in most of them; blue is used more heavily in only one (juz’21). Group three has a blue background but the tip is orange. In a way it combines the first and second groups. Group four, which can be found in two opening pages only, juz’13 and juz’4, share the repeated swirling leaf but differ in color combination. Juz’4 is the only one of all the twenty-nine which has a knot in its tip, as opposed to the half-palmette combination. The last is not a group but rather a single juz’ which differs from the rest in that it is not based on a palmette.

278 Yaʿqūb’s student.
279 The volumes are: 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, and 24.
280 The volumes are: 7, 8, 9, 21, 27, 28, and 29.
281 The volumes are: 11, 16, 19, 20, and 25.
derivative. It is a six-petaled rosette with degraded colors of pink and purple. *Juz’*30 does not have the marginal medallion, but only because it has an extra floral border with tassels around three sides of each rectangle that does not exist in any other opening.

Different groups of opening pages feature different backgrounds to the text. There are five main groups of the backgrounds to the opening pages. Group one\textsuperscript{282} has arabesque scrolls outlined in a black pen and interspersed with the pyramidal three-dot combination. The arabesque is very similar in all, in as much as it uses the palmette and half palmette, except for *juz’*10 where a lotus is the main element on the scroll. The lotus had already been in use for decorative purposes in the arts of the Mamluk realm since the 1320s.\textsuperscript{283} It appeared later in architecture on the marble jambs of the mosque-madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan (757–62/1356–61). It does not look as if the same hand produced all the backgrounds. The text is invariably placed in a cloud against the paper background, except in *juz’*30 and *juz’*1, where the cloud remains without an outline. Some of the backgrounds are left in the paper’s color, while others are washed with pink. Group two\textsuperscript{284} has rows of blue dots. The clouds containing the text are not all done with the same care. An example of a hasty execution of a cloud can be seen in *juz’*22. The third group\textsuperscript{285} is one with the pyramidal three blue dots in rows on a pink background surrounding the cloud around the text. Whenever there is a *bism*, a blossom

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[282]{The volumes are: 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 25, and 30.}
\footnotetext[283]{Rachel Ward refers to it as chinoiserie’ and states that it was used on Mamluk lamps since the 1320s. See Ward, “Mosque Lamps and Enamelled Glass,” 71. The earliest use of these elements on metalwork can be seen in a kursî dated 728/1328. See Rachel Ward, “Brass, Gold and Silver from Mamluk Egypt: Metal Vessels Made for Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. A Memorial Lecture for Mark Zebrowski,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Third Series, 14, no. 1 (2004): 66. Its first appearance on architecture is on the mosque-madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan in 1356.}
\footnotetext[284]{The volumes are: 1, 3, 13, 17, 18, 22, and 26.}
\footnotetext[285]{The volumes are: 7, 8, 9, 21, 27, 28, and 29.}
\end{footnotes}
will be decorating its top, but none that are as fancy as the one in *juz’*30. Group four, *juz’*5 and *juz’*19, features a chevron done in a crude manner Qur’ān of Baybars al-Jāshnakīr; one wonders how it came to be part of such an elaborate illumination program. The last one, *juz’*24, features dots alternating with Xs.

The script in the horizontal panels at the top and bottom of these opening pages gives the *juz’* number out of thirty, and so it spreads over the four panels. Not all seem to have been written by the same hand. This is not because some are in *kūfī*286 while others are in *thuluth*,287 but rather because the *kūfī* examples display differences in letter thickness and execution. The scroll beneath the text is in most cases the golden arabesque, but a less sophisticated one than on *juz’*1, which features a scroll spiraling several times.

In the cases where the *juz’*’s beginning coincides with the beginning of a *sūra*, the *sūra* title is added to the *juz’*’title in the horizontal panels of the opening pages. The *thuluth* titles are not as successful as the *kūfī* ones; they lack the majesty and, surprisingly, the clarity as well. The lack of clarity is due to the thinness of the golden letters in relation to the arabesque, which in the case of the *thuluth* titles is wider with large leaves. The exception is *juz’*21, where the program for the title illumination is very different. The white *thuluth* in this *juz’* is large and encased in a cloud of gold, while the arabesque scroll is relatively small and does not overpower the script as in the other *thuluth* examples. The ends of the rectangle are divided into small squares, each with a tiny floral motif in gold on blue.

286 The volumes are: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 30.
287 The volumes are: 8, 9, 21, 27, 28, and 29.
Āya markers are only special in juz’1 and juz’30. The other volumes utilize the typical rayed rosette which is seen often. Marginal decoration varies significantly between the first volume and the rest of the volumes, which suggests a difference in illuminators and provenance. In juz’1, marginal elements correspond well with the illumination of early fourteenth-century Ilkhanid Baghdad. The rest of the volumes, however, do not show the same intricate scrolls, finesse of brush, or attention to detail. They are still of very good quality, but rather different from the first juz’. The circles making up part of the teardrops are pronounced in all the volumes except for the first. The arabesque scrolls used in the marginal elements of juz’1 are thinner and have more undulations. Another difference is the petals with degraded, faded hues of the same color special only in juz’1. Less orange is used in juz’1 than in the other volumes.

A group of marginal medallions is very peculiar and warrants a more in-depth look. The medallions in this group are regular circles and circles with a small triangular tip. They use gold as the primary color with orange and blue for the border, tassels, and symbols. What is peculiar about them is the symbols. The word in Arabic is in golden kūfi on an orange background encircled with alternating “w”s and “crosses” (cross-shaped elements) in blue contained in golden panels (Pl. 71). Such a choice for decoration is odd. Nothing like this has been seen in Qur’an manuscripts before these, and the closest motifs to them are found in the Coptic alphabet, which is based on the Greek alphabet. Indeed, they do look like letters rather than decorative items. There is no relation between the numerical value of these letters and the words they are

288 Looks exactly like the shadda.
decorating. The “w” symbol is pronounced as “o” or “ou,” while the cross symbol is a “t” (Pl. 72). The “w” sign also looks like the *tashdid* marker, the *shadda*, which might have been an inspiration to a decorative utilization.

More comparative material needs to be looked at to establish where the team was working. The assumption for now is that the first *juz*’ belongs to an earlier Ilkhanid workshop while the rest was produced later, either in Cairo or in Damascus.

Whether produced in Cairo or Iraq, its presence in Cairo during that time helped in creating the style to be seen in Qur’ān manuscripts of later decades. This manuscript, especially *juz*’ 1, will, as we shall see, have a huge influence on Cairo production. The finesse of the arabesque in gold and the *kūfī* will become a standard feature in later Qur’ān manuscripts produced in Cairo.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy by Mubārak Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh is very similar to that of Aḥmad ibn al-Suhrawardī. The calligraphy is definitely from the Yāqūt al-Mustaṣimī style, so perhaps we are not wrong to assume that this Mubārak Shāh was one of the disciples of Yāqūt, possibly one of his younger disciples. Raṣīd 60 is calligraphed in a master’s hand and Mubarak Shāh may have produced it after years of training and production.

---

Lastly, we have another rab‘a from Şirghitmish that survives in full, but without a colophon that would reveal the names of the calligrapher or the illuminator. It was planned without frontispieces, but the opening pages are elaborate. The text in black and golden thuluth testifies to a very good hand. Each juz‘ measures 38.4x29.3 cm, with a text block measuring 27x 18.6 cm. It has seven lines to a page (Pl. 25). The bindings are original and each juz‘ is still in good condition. On folio 1a of each juz‘ the waqt statement reads the same as in Şirghitmish’s previously mentioned manuscripts. The terminus ad quem for this set would again be 759/1358.

Each juz‘ begins in the same manner with an opening page, not seen before anywhere, that is very distinct yet simple (Pls. 73–76). We have no juz‘ titles inscribed in openings; neither do we have sūra titles of the juz‘ when the beginning happens to coincide with the beginning of a sūra. The only exception is juz’1, which carries the sūra title in white thuluth in a teardrop that is part of and at the same time crowns the upper border. The description here, which applies to all volumes, is quite simple. The opening spread on two pages, folios 1b–2a, consists of a full-page illumination of a large rectangle framed in a double blue line and golden knotted frame on each folio (Pl. 73). The text is in golden thuluth on top of a very finely drawn arabesque in black, gold, blue, and orange. The arabesque consists of one huge spiral starting in the middle, revolving around itself in concentric circles, and creating four smaller spirals in the four corners of the rectangle. The arabesque is quite serene in that it is the circles that stand out more than the floral elements that they carry. On other opening pages it is usually the floral elements that are more visible. Some volumes differ from others. For example,
in juz’ 18 the plant motifs are more overwhelming and are definitely the precursor to what will be seen two decades later.

The text of the opening pages in juz’s 1–17 (Pls. 73 and 74) is written in gold, but in juz’ 18 the text is black. In juz’s 19–29 black and gold lines alternate (Pl. 75), while in juz’ 30 it is entirely in gold (Pl. 76). Some of the letters of the text are filled with blue. The upper frames of the opening pages each have a teardrop in the middle of the frame, as in juz’ 1 (Pl. 73), which carry the sūra titles, while the margins have a gold and orange teardrop, with a golden floral element on the orange. The remaining volumes feature the same concept but in a circle with a triangular extension, as in Rašîd 60, to look like a teardrop.

The āya markers throughout are the typical rayed rosettes, while the ‘ashara and khamsa markers differ in shape. The ‘ashara is carried in a medallion bordered in blue and gold with an orange background, the sub’ and khamsa in a medallion with a triangular tip forming a teardrop-like ornament in the opening.

This manuscript finds affinities in the Ilkhanid world of the early fourteenth century, although this does not mean that this manuscript is Ilkhanid. The manner in which the marginal elements have been drawn is certainly Cairene and places Rašîd 61 in the second half of the fourteenth century. The Ilkhanid production that seems to have been an inspiration is TIEM 538, a manuscript in thirty volumes, which was illuminated by Muḥammad ibn Aybak in 707/1307 and most probably written by Aḥmad ibn al-Suhrawardī (Pl. 70). The alternating black and gold, an Ilkhanid characteristic, is consistent in that manuscript. In Rašîd 61 it is not uniform; the Mamluk artist was

---

291 Lings, Splendours, 69, figs. 75–79.
obviously experimenting. The opening pages in the Ilkhanid manuscript with the undulating scroll background beneath the script look similar, but close examination shows that the Mamluk artist was deviating from the model by creating the large spiral in the middle and putting an end to the undulations by containing them. At the same time he also avoided the use of the clouds for the text, which resulted in a text that is harder to read.

To summarize our findings with regard the endowments of the amīr Şirghitmish, the Şandal workshop had a major impact on Rašīd 149 and Rašīd 147. Ilkhanid influences were another major feature of this group, especially seen in Rašīd 61 and Rašīd 148. There is also a connection between Şirghitmish’s manuscripts and those endowed by Sultan Ḥasan; it is probable that the same calligraphers and illuminators were working for both men.

**Endowments by Sultan Ḥasan**

It is my belief that all the manuscripts in this group belong to Sultan Ḥasan, even if the *waqf* statement is incomplete and only mentions the name of the sultan. They all have this short statement and were found in his complex. Most importantly, the methodology used to substantiate their attribution to Sultan Ḥasan depends on the stylistic comparison to dated manuscripts in other collections, which minimizes the danger of a mis-attribution. Rašīd 8 is a special case because it does bear the date 757/1356 in its colophon, while its *waqf* is a later one. The later *waqf* of 769/1367 is important, as it

---

292 The few sentences at the beginning of the manuscript naming the endower and the stipulations he made. They sometimes include the date as well.
connects this manuscript to another group that will be discussed in chapter three, where Raṣīd 8 is shown to represent an earlier production of the same workshop, which continued to operate in the 1360s and 1370s.

Raṣīd 8

This is a magnificent manuscript, which was endowed to the madrasa of Umm al-Sultan Sha'bān in al-Tabbāna several years after its production. While the endowment was made in 769/1367, the production date, which was not effaced by the endower, was 757/1356. Given its opulence, it is fit for royalty, and so must have been produced for Sultan Ḥasan, who was the reigning monarch at the time. It is in one codex of 410 folios, measuring 73x51 cm. The script used is a beautiful muḥaqqaq, eleven lines to a page, with occasional thuluth for the suṣra titles and the frontispiece panels (Pl. 153). The calligrapher was Yaʿqūb ibn Khalīl ibn Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭim al-Ḥanafi, who signs at the end and gives us the production date of 757/1356 (Pl. 272).

God Almighty spoke the Truth and His Generous Prophet spoke the Truth. Yaʿqūb ibn Khalīl ibn Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭim al-Ḥanafi has written this magnificent volume with the aid of God Almighty and His Care in the months of the year 757. Thanks are to the Lord of the worlds.

Folio 1a carries the new waqf statement, which is not discussed here because it is not relevant to the decades on which we will focus in this chapter. The frontispiece follows, on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 154). The first impression is of an overabundance of

---

293 Raṣīd 8 will be contextualized in chapter three.
294 More on this sultan, his mother, and the madrasa are found in chapter six. His other endowments of Qurʾān manuscripts are discussed in chapter three.
295 See appendix.
gold. No other manuscript utilizes as much gold. The central field is a square, a major transition from the rectangular central fields which characterized the first half of the fourteenth century. A twelve-pointed star with a golden frit surrounding a six-petaled rosette in the center forms a wreath, from which small five-petaled tendrils emerge and settle in the arms of the star. This central star radiates from the middle of the central field into petals made of pentagon-based hexagons. These pentagon-based hexagons have a blue background and each is filled with a full golden palmette. Each of the palmettes is split and has in the middle a five-petaled tendril with a blue notch. Most of the puzzle pieces of the star pattern have a blue background except four pieces, forming half of an octagon, positioned in the middle of each side of the square of the central field. Only four lotuses are used as fillers on each side of the frontispiece, which makes them stand out. Each is placed in an eight-sided polygon positioned next to each end of the horizontal and vertical centers of the circle which makes up the star polygon, the centerpiece of the whole composition. It is the star polygon in the square shape as a design conception that makes this manuscript crucial to our discussion; the Star Polygon Group workshop will be further investigated in the next chapter. While it is not the first manuscript to show this design, it is the fundamental link to the workshop, and the base on which the 1360s–1370s workshop operated, as will be seen in detail in chapter three. The first frontispiece in a Qurʾān manuscript to exhibit a star polygon in a square is the Iran Bastan Museum manuscript 2061 produced by Aḥmad ibn Baylīḵ al-Muḥṣīnī in

---

296 The gold used here was gold leaf.
297 This is the term used to describe this shape, which looks like a pentagon but has six sides. See Sutton, *Islamic Design*, 38.
naskh in 739/1339 (Pl. 155). The Iran Bastan manuscript is much smaller, measuring 39x29 cm, and its star polygon takes up most of the space in the central field. Its lotuses, four of them, one at each corner, stand out distinctly because of their relative size and their light blue toning.

In Raṣīd 8 and in both folios of the frontispiece is a rectangular cartouche with rounded ends flanking the upper and lower sides of the central field. These cartouches have a blue background and carry Q 56:77–78 in white thuluth outlined in a golden cloud. The letters are surrounded by small golden leaves and half palmettes. Whereas the cartouches are in golden rectangular panels, the spandrels are filled with lotuses, carnations, and half palmettes in gold outlined in black and on a golden background. The rendering of these floral elements in this way will be seen again in the 1370s. They will be discussed in chapter three in detail, where their Chinese origin will also be traced.

Bordering the central fields on folios 1b–2a and the rectangular panels is the dotted interlaced band, appearing as a grid of dots, alternating with small, solid gold squares. Around the entire composition is a rectangular frame with the same floral filling as the cartouches. The final frame is a narrow plait which then leads to the outermost border of the stylized arabesque.

This outermost border has a blue background and its stylized arabesque scroll utilizes the most colors in the frontispiece: green, pink, white, red, gold, and black are used to fill the half palmettes, floral buds, and tendrils. The same colors are also used in the marginal medallions of the frontispiece, one large medallion in the middle of the

---

298 This manuscript will be discussed further in chapter three in conjunction with the Star Polygon Group workshop, where it will be analyzed and compared to the other manuscripts. The calligrapher Aḥmad al-Muḥṣini will be discussed in chapter five.
right margin of folio 1b and another in the middle of the left margin of folio 2a. Along the horizontal centerline of the medallion is a knot in black with a trefoil tying the arabesque together, surmounted by a closed bud in pink and white with a green notch, and another larger knot in black, topped with half palmettes in gold arranged in a teardrop filled with green. Around that centerline are golden scrolls and half palmettes making up the arabesque. The medallion is similar to the Iran Bastan Museum manuscript but is much closer to the Star Polygon Group workshop, to be discussed in chapter three. 299

The opening pages are yet another masterpiece and their illuminated parts are also filled with an overabundance of gold (Pl. 156). They occupy folios 2b–3a and their rectangular central fields carry the text. Folio 2b carries sūrat al-Fatiḥa in five lines including the basmala. Folio 3a carries the first three or four ʾāyas of sūrat al-Baqara. The script is elegant muḥaqqaq: three lines in black, and two in gold, one at the top and another at the bottom. There is nothing that surrounds or adorns the script, which stands magnificently alone with no background decoration or even enclosing clouds.

Rectangular panels above and below the central fields are exactly like those seen in the frontispiece. The cartouches with the rounded ends carry the sūra name, place of revelation, and ʾāya count in white thuluth, also outlined in a golden cloud and surrounded by tendrils and half palmettes on a blue background. The spandrels resulting from the placement of the cartouche in a rectangular panel have the same Chinese floral elements, to be discussed and traced in chapter three, as in the frontispiece. The difference here is in the background color, which is orange and not gold. A band of

299 All these details will be analyzed and collated in chapter three, where later manuscripts of the workshop will be discussed and compared to Raṣid 8, since they were based on it.
interlaced dots in the form of a grid borders the entire composition. The small alternating squares are orange, rather than gold as in the frontispiece. The colors are beautifully contrasted and all the elements stand out.

Marginal medallions, to be discussed in detail in the context of the Star Polygon Group workshop in chapter three, are like those in Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 157). There are two medallions in the right margin of folio 2b and two more in the left margin of folio 3a. The lotus flower, which is a trademark in the works belonging to Sultan Ḥasan, is used in the middle of the medallion. It is in gold, surrounded by golden tendrils and placed on an orange background.

The closing pages of the manuscript, folios 411b–412a (Pl. 158), are almost identical to the opening pages (Pl. 156), with a few variations that might make them seem more glamorous. The overall design and details used are the same, the differences being that the text of the closing sūras in the central fields is entirely in gold, there is a floral background to this text, and the marginal medallions have a blue background, not an orange one. While black text is better for prominence and legibility, the background in the closing pages is spectacular. It has the same floral pattern that is found in the spandrels of the sūra titles (to be discussed extensively in chapter three), but here it is on a red hatching and executed in a red pen. It appears pink and is very soft, and does not take away from the text. The marginal medallions stand out because of the way their blue background contrasts with the gold. This is a much better combination than the gold on orange.

The inner pages of the manuscript (Pl. 159), which are all framed in blue and gold, are masterpieces of muḥaqqaq, and the details of their illumination in the form of
Sūra titles and marginal medallions are as exquisite as those in the frontispiece, opening, and closing pages. All sūra titles are in white thuluth enveloped in a golden cloud, which is used as a thick outline. The background varies from orange to blue, just like the marginal medallions. The tendrils and small half palmettes used to adorn the rectangular panels that carry the sūra titles are all in gold. The gold on blue works better aesthetically than the gold on orange. There is also the occurrence of the last word of the sūra continuing into the sūra title.

Ya’qūb ibn Khālid ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafī was indeed a master calligrapher (Pls. 153 and 159). His muhaqqaq combines features from both the school of Egyptian muḥaqqaq and the school of Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq. The stress on the sweeping motion of the descending letters is most certainly Egyptian, while the execution of some letters, like the ya‘, lām, and ʿayn, is more Ilkhanid. His signature, which includes the nisba al-Ḥanafī during a time where some amīrs, especially Sirghitmish, were trying to support the Ḥanafī madhhab over the predominant Shafi‘ī one, tells us that Ya’qūb ibn Khālid might have been a member of the entourage of this important amīr.300

An Addendum

The waqf statement on folio 1a reads:

Our lord, of the greatest, noble, lofty, lordly, sultanic dignity, the imām, the universal, the just, the holy fighter, the murābiḥ, the muthāghir, the fortified, the needed, the kingly, the royal, al-Ashraf al-Nāṣirī, victor of the world and of religion, sultan of Islam and of

300 Sirghitmish tried to make the Ḥanafī chief qāḍī superior to the Shafi‘ī one, an attempt that ultimately failed. Irwin, The Middle East in the Middle Ages, 144. Sirghitmish will be thoroughly discussed as one of our patrons in chapter six.
Muslims, the slayer of the unbelievers and polytheists, the supporter of those against whom injustice was inflicted by the unjust, oppressor of the *khawārij* and the atheists, Abū al-Muṣaffār Shaʿbān—may God make his dominion and rule eternal and make his justice and goodness overwhelm all his subjects and renew for him a victory every day and make him possess all the land and sea—son of our lord, the mighty, the noble, the glorious al-Jamālī Husayn, son of our lord the sultan, the happy, the martyr al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, son of the martyr Sultan al-malik al-Mansūr Qalāwūn al-Salihī, may God have mercy on all of them—he has made all of this noble *muṣḥaf* a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. He has made a stipulation that its place is the madrasa known in the street of al-Tabbāna in Cairo the protected... and that it may not leave the aforementioned place unless a collateral of a stated value is placed. He has made a stipulation that he is the administrator of this waqf throughout his life, and after his death whoever he has stipulated will be the administrator in his waqf. All of this was witnessed on the blessed day, Monday 3rd of the month of Dhi al-Qaʿda the sanctified in the year 769 of the Prophetic migration, may God’s peace and blessings be upon him.

This *waqf* statement belongs to Ḥasan’s nephew Shaʿbān, whose manuscripts are discussed in the next chapter. The presence of this manuscript in Shaʿbān’s possession is not surprising, since Ḥasan was his uncle. The original date of the manuscript was left untouched and this statement was simply added at the beginning of the manuscript. Shaʿbān is intentionally preserving the link to his Qalawunid lineage and to the workshop which was operating during the reign of Ḥasan. To intentionally leave in the date underlines its Qalawunid origin and suggests that it was possibly considered an heirloom. As will be seen from the forthcoming discussion in chapter three, Raṣīd 8 is the inspiration for many details in the group of manuscripts produced for Shaʿbān. They were all produced by the same workshop, and Shaʿbān had their works in his possession.
Sultan Hasan never ceases to surprise us with his adoration of the arts. This manuscript is truly incommensurable with all others. The illumination program is spectacular and of a higher quality than the calligraphy. We are assuming that in this case the calligrapher might have been the illuminator as well. It is a *rab’a* of thirty volumes\(^{301}\) all in a relatively good condition, measuring 52.6x36.2 cm with a text block of 36.5x27.5 cm. The script is black *muḥaqqaq* penned in seven lines to a page on thick paper by the *amīr* Sawunju al-Rasūlī al-Silāhdār al-Malākī al-Nāṣirī\(^{302}\) and his son Muḥammad ibn Sawunju, who produced *juz’* 11. We know he penned it for Hasan because he sometimes writes “al-Nāṣir Hasan” above his name, as in *juz’* 1 and *juz’* 2 (Pls. 160 and 161), and sometimes adds “al-malākī al-Nāṣirī,” as in *juz’* 4 and *juz’* 18 (Pls. 162 and 163), or “al-malākī Ḥasan al-Nāṣirī,” as in *juz’* 8 (Pl. 164), to his *nisba*. While he does not leave a date, he must have completed it to be used in the grandiose mosque-madrassa of the sultan below the Citadel. This gives us a *terminus ad quem* of 1356–61.

Each of the thirty volumes had a *juz’*’s title page and elaborate opening pages. The only one with a frontispiece as well is *juz’* 1 (Pl. 165). *Juz’* 14 is missing the decorative roundel on the title page, which was completely cut out at some stage. *Juz’* 30, which is heavily restored, is missing its title page. In fifteen of the thirty volumes we have a colophon, each with its own beautiful design. *Juz’* 27 contains an unfinished

---

\(^{301}\) *Juz’* 26 is entirely Ottoman. At some stage this *juz’* went missing or was destroyed, and so a new one was ordered to be made and placed as a *waqf* by *amīr* Ismā’īl Bāsh Jāwīsh in 1176/1762. This *amīr* was among the Circassians in the madrasa of Uljāy al-Yūsfī. The calligrapher signs himself as ‘Umar Darwish Bak and gives the date 1174/1760 for this *juz’*.\(^{302}\) Unfortunately there is no biographical notice or mention of this *amīr* in any of the sources. From his signature we can tell he was one of the *mamlūks* of Sultan Hasan, his *khāṣṣaktīyya*, who became a master of the arms (*silāḥdār*—the person who carried the sultan’s weaponry and was in charge of the arsenal).
colophon at its end, consisting only of a golden outline of a circle. It seems that Sawunju was telling us that he was the illuminator as well. He was showing off his talent as an illuminator by the varied styles and colors he used throughout the manuscript. There is a striking difference between his colophons and the colophon of his son Muḥammad, who signs at the end of juz’ 11.

**Juz’ Title Pages**

Every juz’ starts with a title page featuring a frame of varied complexity with a medallion in the middle. The medallion in most cases is a circle, but we also have the almond shape which we saw earlier in Raṣīd 162. Each medallion has a different design, expressing the ingenious possibilities that our illuminator devised. The title page of juz’ 1 (Pl. 166) is the most elaborate. Its rectangular frame encompasses a flamboyant tripartite arch, almost like that of the portals to mosques and madrasas. It is also reminiscent of Ilkhanid productions, as in Uljäytū’s Mosul Qurʾān manuscript, which exhibits a commissioning statement at the beginning of each juz’ contained in an arched design, Chinese in its inspiration (Pl. 167). The spandrels resulting between the rectangular frame and the tripartite arch have an orange background, displaying golden carnations with green notching. The title of the juz’ is in golden tawqī’ī written within the curves of the tripartite arch on the paper background. Beneath the title the medallion shines through, radiating colors at its edge. The heart of it is a detailed arabesque surmounted by the four trefoil chalices on the cross-axis. The background is blue,

---

303 This manuscript is spread over many libraries. Check the commissioning statement of Juz’ 21 in the TIEM bound with juz’ 2 and kept under the number 541. Published in James, *Qurʾāns of the Mamluks*, fig. 72.
although it is mostly effaced now. The arabesque itself is gold, black, green, and orange. The frame is a plaited grid of dots in gold. The outermost border glows like the rays of a sun. He uses the different shades of red to construct small triangles that appear multidimensional and almost alive. He then contains them by drawing a circumference made of small tassels of black.\footnote{304 At the bottom of this title page we have the \textit{waqf} statement placing this manuscript in the \textit{madrasa} of \textit{amīr} Uljāy al-Yūsufī.}

To make the task of surveying somewhat easier, the medallions on the title pages will be grouped according to shape. This organization will allow us to examine and compare the ones that have an almond shape in the centerpiece. These are three: \textit{juz’}2, \textit{juz’}12, and \textit{juz’}13 (Pls. 168, 169, and 170); all the rest are decorated with a circular medallion. Each page has a rectangular frame with a rectangular panel in the uppermost part, containing a cartouche with rounded ends that is interlocked with the next cartouche at each end. These three \textit{ajza}‘ differ greatly in the details within each almond shape. The cartouche carries the \textit{juz’} number in the same format as the rest of the titles (the \textit{juz’} number is given out of a division of thirty). The script is \textit{thuluth} in gold or blue and the backgrounds vary considerably. \textit{Juz’}12 (Pl. 169) and \textit{juz’}2 (Pl. 168) share the arabesque which is executed in concentric circular scrolls. \textit{Juz’}13 (Pl. 170) has one scroll bordering the frame of the cartouche in green on a red hatched background. The almond shape in each case has a completely different design. \textit{Juz’}2 (Pl. 168) has a \textit{thuluth} script denoting the \textit{juz’} number in gold and surrounded by a cloud of the paper background. The cloud is placed on a red hatching adorned with a few half palmettes. The plaited border around the inner almond contains blue squares; it is further bordered by the small triangles seen in the border of \textit{juz’}1 (Pl. 166), although in blue and grey
rather than red, before leading into the tasseled frame. \textit{Juz’} 12 (Pl. 169) features a heavily golden almond. The innermost almond shape holds a structured scroll of half palmettes and elaborate trefoils in blue and green surrounding a red, eight-petaled rosette as a nucleus on a gold background, surrounded by a golden frame bordered with black, and then a golden plaited frame containing small blue squares with red notches.

The thirteenth \textit{juz’} (Pl. 170) features a honeycomb design formed of red hexagons outlined in blue, alternating with golden hexagons. The outermost frame of this almond is composed of semicircles rather than triangles, of varying hues of blue leading into grey, which gives a flowing feel like the sea and not a radiating, firelike one like the sun seen in the first \textit{juz’}. The most similar to the frontispiece in Raṣīd 162 (Pl. 3) is the frontispiece of \textit{juz’} 12 (Pl. 169). Its scroll center is the most similar element.

The remaining twenty-four title pages feature medallions, each with a different design. Most of them have a geometric center: \textit{juz’} 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 29 (Pls. 171–187). The eighth \textit{juz’} (Pl. 188) is peculiar, because the title page does not have the cartouche in the rectangular panel at the top. Instead, it has a \textit{thuluth} script on the paper background reading “\textit{al-juz’ al-thāmin},” and then a roundel with Sawunju’s signature, constituting a colophon. Other volumes have a medallion with floral center, for example \textit{juz’} 17 (Pl. 189), and to a lesser extent \textit{juz’} 7 (Pl. 190).

\textit{Juz’} 11 (Pl. 176), which is the production of the son and not the \textit{amīr} himself, is mistakenly entitled “\textit{al-juz’ al-‘āshir min ajzā’ thalāthīn}” (“the tenth volume from thirty volumes’). Was it his mistake, assuming that he is indeed our illuminator as well as the calligrapher?
The only frontispiece is in *juz’* 1. It is a two-page spread occupying folios 1b–2a.  

Elaborate and fancy, it foreshadows what we will see from the workshop of Ibrâhîm al-Āmîdî in chapter three, especially Raṣîd 9 (Pl. 277), where the frontispiece to the first part depends on multi-lobed rosettes like the one here. This frontispiece is not as geometric as others we have seen, and in this respect it is similar to al-Āmîdî’s work.

Once again Uljâytû’s Mosul Qur’ân manuscript comes to mind. The multi-lobed rosettes are used to adorn the frontispiece of *juz’* 21 (Pl. 191). There they stand out because of the color contrasts used. The central field, on each folio, is a rectangle which displays one full twelve-lobed rosette surrounded by parts of rosettes. Flanking the central rosette on the top, bottom, right, and left is half a rosette. Next to the central rosette on the diagonal axis is a quarter rosette (four in total). The central rosettes, the half rosettes, and the quarter rosettes that surround it are decorated with fine arabesques carrying half palmettes, trefoils, and three sepal floral elements. The stems interlace and hold six blue trefoils facing the nucleus of the rosette, which is made of a six-pointed star. The trefoils are on an orange background, which makes them stand out; especially since the background color of the entire central field is blue. The main color of the scroll is gold but other colors are also there: green, white, and black (for small backgrounds) are also used. In between the central rosette and the half and quarter rosettes, the cross-like shape, formed by the petals of the rosettes, has a similar arabesque that is not free flowing, but instead contained in a cross shape. It is predominately green and gold.

---

305 There might have been one for *juz’* 30 as well but we cannot tell, because the *juz’* is restored and its opening pages are pasted on new paper.
While the central field of this frontispiece foreshadows Raṣīd 9 (chapter three), its floral utilization is more complex, since it features an intertwined arabesque that supports all the elements, not a simple scroll or the flowers by themselves. Did Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī work with this amīr at some point? Or was he inspired by the manuscript which was in the possession of Sha‘bān’s family or entourage in the 1360s and 1370s? The manuscript was deposited in the madrasa of Ulijāy al-Yusūfī, who was married to Khawand Baraka and thus was Sha‘bān’s stepfather.306

Flanking the central field from above and below, a rectangular panel has two cartouches at each side, eight in total on both sides of the frontispiece, bearing the verses Q 56:77–80. A plaitted border around the central field and the rectangular panel contains small blue squares with red dots in their middle. This shows how precise the illuminator is. The outermost border also prefigures productions of the coming two decades; the solid blue background and the colorful and multilayered stylized arabesque are important features originating in al-Āmidī’s workshop.

Opening pages

An outermost arabesque page border and medallions in the margins adorn the opening pages. The background to the outermost border in all the volumes is blue and the stylized arabesque is gold. The golden arabesque is highlighted by using other colors as well, and each juz‘ has its own flavor, produced by manipulating the colors and the width of the border. Some are more complicated than others, but all are a precursor to the borders we will see in the next chapter. The finest of all of them is found in juz‘1,

306 More about them is found in chapter six, since Sha‘bān and Khawand Baraka are two of our very important patrons.
where the arabesque is rendered meticulously and with minute details (Pl. 192). Half palmettes are relegated to the base of the scroll and are all in gold, so small they almost don’t show. The three sepal floral elements and the palmette trefoils have greater focus, especially with the blue filling and the alternating green and orange notching. The second most elaborate opening page is that of juz’ 30 (Pl. 193), but unfortunately it was remargined and the details were cut off when the restoration of the volume required repasting its folios on new paper. Another volume in which the restoration was not done well is juz’ 18 (Pl. 194). The left side of the frontispiece is non-extant and in its place a b (verso) folio is pasted; thus 2b is now 2a and so the marginal medallion appears in the wrong place, because of the misplacement of the pasted folio.

Most of these borders are similar to each other, but the illuminator shows us his excellence in the opening of juz’ 22 (Pl. 195), where the arabesque of half palmettes has alternating orange and blue carnations in orange and blue on black backgrounds. The effect is of an orange flame and a blue flame lighting up the whole composition.

The central fields of all the opening pages of all the ajzā’, carrying the text of the various sūras, have a lavish background of whirling arabesque scrolls in concentric circles, which are rather heavy. The arabesques are all on a hatched background, some in red and others in black. The text itself is in clouds where the hatching does not extend.

The āya markers, which are the standard whirling rosettes or the roundels carrying ‘Allah’ in kūfī, are also played with by means of the occasional insertion of one very different and very beautiful one among them. The opening of juz’ 27 āya 34 (Pl. 196) is marked by a whirling rosette of various colors and shades of these colors (reminiscent of an Ilkhanid petal border). The Ilkhanid petal border, which will be
analyzed in chapter three, had a very important role to play in the coming decades. In this manuscript it is not just used in the occasional āya marker; it also surrounds some of the marginal medallions.

**Colophons**

The colophons are yet another *tour-de-force*. The details of each of them are different from the others. Not all survived, but many did. Most, but not all, are contained in roundels. In *Juz’* 6 (Pl. 197), *Juz’* 11 (by the son—Pl. 198), *Juz’* 12 (Pl. 199), and *Juz’* 13 (Pl. 200) the signature is displayed in a rectangular panel akin to sūra titles. The roundels are sometimes filled with geometric patterns, like the squares in *juz’* 1, but are often filled with floral patterns, arabesques, or flower blossoms. While most of them are very impressive, the one by the son, Muḥammad, is not. A rectangle holds his name, which is placed in a cloud from which and around which half palmettes and trefoils sprout. There is no illumination. It is very possible, but purely speculative, that the manuscript was being produced in 762/1361, but when the sultan was killed, certain details, like the rest of the colophons, were not completed. After all, Sawunju was Ḥasan’s *silāhdār*, as his signature in *juz’* 19 (Pl. 201) explains.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is not as impressive as the illumination. It is all in black muḥaqqaq except for the occasional *thuluth* and kūfī in sūra titles and *juz’* titles. His muḥaqqaq is

---

307 Colophons are found in the following ajza’: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19. In *juz’* 27 the golden outline of the circle is there but nothing else, which suggests it is incomplete.
somewhat special, as it is definitely an offshoot from the Egyptian school, though not as
elegant. It is somewhat thin and focuses on verticality. He was definitely well trained,
probably by one of the master calligraphers of the time. Was Sawunju a master
calligrapher? In terms of the quality of his \textit{muh\'aqqaq}, it does not seem so, but he did
have a disciple, his son Mu\'ammad, whose \textit{muh\'aqqaq} is almost identical to that of his
father but with more of an emphasis on horizontality. No other manuscript survives with
a \textit{muh\'aqqaq} that resembles theirs, and so one wonders whether he taught someone else
besides his son Mu\'ammad.

\textbf{Rasid 58}

This \textit{rab\'a} has survived in full. The division here was not a thirty-part Qur\’\text{\`a}n, but
twenty-part.\textsuperscript{308} It was found in the \textit{madrasa} of the sultan and moved to the collection of
D\=ar al-Kutub in the nineteenth century. The average measurement of the volumes is
56.2x20.2 cm; the text block measures 44x27 cm. The text is in black \textit{muh\'aqqaq} and the
incidentals in \textit{thuluth} are found in the \textit{juz\'} and \textit{s\=ura} titles. Each is in the original binding,
which are magnificent pieces. We unfortunately do not have the names of the
calligrapher or the illuminator.

All volumes feature the same \textit{juz\'} title page with the same design. Only one
volume has a frontispiece, \textit{juz\'} 1 (Pl. 79), and one has a finispiece, \textit{juz\'} 20 (Pl. 80). The

\textsuperscript{308} This is very unusual and unprecedented in the extant manuscripts. Each \textit{juz\'} here is composed
of three \textit{ah\j{z}\=a}\textsubscript{\textit{b}}, thus each \textit{juz\'} corresponds to one and a half \textit{juz\'} from the thirty-part
manuscripts. I have not encountered an explanation to this in any of the sources. I speculate that it
had to do with a specific w\=ird, possibly for a specific \textit{uj\=ari\textsubscript{\textit{q}}a}. It might have been used to finish
reading the Qur\’\text{\`a}n \textit{(full kha\textsuperscript{\textit{tima})} the first twenty days of Ramadan and then do another full
\textit{kha\textsuperscript{\textit{tima}} the last ten days of the month (deemed the most blessed days of the month and when
the Qur\’\text{\`a}n was revealed to the Prophet).
design for the title page in all of them (Pls. 77, 78, 146, 147, and 148) begins on folio 1a with a rectangular panel in the upper half of the folio, similar in concept and placement to Raṣīd 148 (Pls. 35–37). The panel is enclosed in a golden knotted border with blue dots, which frames an interior panel containing a shape constructed of an oval with a semi-circle at each of its ends. The shape contains the juz’ title, which mentions that it is the first of a twenty-part Qur’ān. The thuluth is outlined in black, on an orange background with a golden arabesque. The spandrels display a golden arabesque on blue. At the outer margin a medallion in gold and orange, bordered with blue, is attached. The same decoration is found on folio 1a in juz’20, with different text.

Folios 1b–2a in juz’1 carry the two-full-page illuminated frontispiece (Pl. 79). The frontispiece in juz’1 is close to the Șandal workshop style and also similar to Raṣīd 147. The geometric pattern making up the central field is based on a prevalent technique in geometric patterns in Islamic art. It builds upon an eight-fold rosette, with its petals arranged around a sixteen-sided star. It is based on a square grid with a central large octagon divided into the petals of the rosette. The octagon repeats in full four times across the vertical and horizontal axes of the rectangle. The four repetitions are what are encased here, but in reality the repetition is eternal, and this is why we have parts of other octagons cut off by the frame. The finispiece in juz’20 (Pl. 80), which is based on the same eight-fold rosette, is different from the frontispiece in juz’1 in that the main central octagon is larger and therefore not repeated in full. The fillers are the same in both volumes, depending mostly on orange as a background, but also utilizing blue.

The horizontal panels above the central field in the juz’1 frontispiece carry cartouches inscribed with the āya Q 56:76–80. The thuluth is executed in white on
orange, while the spandrels are blue with a golden arabesque. The same is the case in juz’20 but the spandrels feature orange only in the flower, which makes the scroll appear to be displaying half a blossom at the bottom of each spandrel. The margins contain different ornament in each of the volumes, both still akin to Rašīd 147.

Even though the frontispiece and the finispiece are based on the same geometric composition, they are still different. In juz’1 (Pl. 79) we have five big full octagons, while in juz’20 only one large full central octagon (Pl. 80) is evident. It is as if in juz’20 a zoom-in was made on one of the octagons in juz’1, so that it appears enlarged. Also, the small octagons that seem to be acting as fillers are arranged differently. In juz’1 they are on the vertical and horizontal axes of the rectangle, while in juz’20 they are on the diagonal axes.

The interior illumination consists mainly of medallions with triangular tops as seen in both Rašīd 60 and 61, featuring sūra titles (Pl. 81). This is an interesting treatment of a sūra title, which in function leads into Rašīd 147. The hizb markers are in medallions in the form of perfect circles. The color scheme remains the same for all: orange, gold, and blue (Pl. 82).

The illuminator working in the 1330s on Qur‘ān manuscripts Rašīd 81 (Pl. 83) and Rašīd 184 (Pl. 33), but especially Rašīd 184,⁵⁰⁹ might be from the same workshop as the illuminator of Rašīd 58. The central field of the finispiece in Rašīd 184 (Pl. 84) is the same as the finispiece in juz’20 here. The difference is the color scheme. David James has tied QUR 317 in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 13), produced in 729/1329, to the
workshop of both Raṣīd 81 and Raṣīd 184. Marginal medallions carrying *khamsa*, as seen on folios 148b–149a in QUR 317, look exactly like the marginal medallion carrying the *sūra* title in Raṣīd 58 (*sūrat al-Wahīy in juz’ 20). Both Aḥmad ibn Kamāl al-Mutāṭabbīb, who was responsible for Raṣīd 81 and Raṣīd 184, and al-Maydūmī, who was responsible for QUR 317, worked in Cairo, as their colophons state. Probably Raṣīd 58 was produced in Cairo as well.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is not as good as al-Mutāṭabbīb’s but it is very similar to that of al-Maydūmī, who might have been the master of the calligrapher who produced Raṣīd 58.

**Raṣīd 59**

Of another thirty-volume *rab’a*, Raṣīd 59, twenty-nine volumes are preserved; missing is *juz’* 12. This manuscript was found in the *madrasa* of Sultan Ḥasan and also bears his name on folio 1b below the illuminated opening (Pl. 85). But it does not contain the names of the calligrapher or the illuminator. Each *juz’* measures 46.2x34.2 cm with a text block of 26.1x18.8 cm. The text is in black *muhaqqaq* except for *sūra* and *juz’* titles, which are in *thuluth*.

*Juz’* 1 begins on folio 1b with the illuminated opening pages (Pl. 86). *Juz’* 30 seems to have been produced with better care than the rest of the volumes (Pl. 87). All volumes exhibit the same design, but in *juz’* 30 details are executed in a more refined manner and the background to the text is illuminated (Pls. 86, 87, 88, 149, 150, and

---

310 James, *Master Scribes*, 162.
311 This manuscript does not have any frontispieces.
The openings of all volumes are framed with the golden knotted border, and their titles, together with the āya, are written in white thuluth on a blue background and golden arabesque, contained in a cartouche in a panel, the spandrels of which are filled with a golden arabesque (Pls. 86–88, 149–150). Only in juz’ 1 are the spandrels in gold; in the other volumes they have orange as a background. They both also use orange squares in the knotted border. Volumes 1 and 11 have two medallions in the margin of folios 1b and 2a around the opening, while juz’ 30 has one teardrop medallion in the middle with a lotus in gold on an orange background also seen in juz’ 11. The lotus flowers in the marginal medallion in juz’ 1 appear in gold on gold.

The background of the text in the opening pages is hatched with red parallel lines, with lotuses and tendrils filled with blue detailing superimposed. The lotus is used heavily in this manuscript, even in the doublures of the bindings. The hatching on juz’ 15 and juz’ 27 is bold and is not in the same direction, which has a negative effect on the overall design.

Throughout the codices the sūra titles are in gold, outlined in black, and rendered in thuluth. An additional detail not encountered previously is a medallion in gold and orange with a lotus to the right near the sūra titles on ‘b’ folios, and to the left near the sūra titles on ‘a’ folios (Pls. 89 and 90). Perhaps this is a substitute for fully decorated sūra title panels—something we have not seen a lot in this decade. The medallions carrying ḥizb, ‘ashara, and khamsa are simple spiked circles with the word inscribed in gold on an orange background and surrounded with gold in a blue outline (Pl. 92).

The style of illumination is definitely from the workshop of this time. The lotus in the marginal medallions in the different volumes is almost a trademark of the Sultan
Hasan group. Text in illuminated rectangular panels of *juz’* beginnings resemble the ones on the frontispieces of Raṣīd 58.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy in Raṣīd 59 is in a good hand, better than in Raṣīd 58 (Pl. 93). Small interlinear letters in red are used for *qirāʿat* and *tajwīd* purposes.\(^{312}\) Thus Raṣīd 58 was apparently used for educational purposes.

**Raṣīd 82**

This manuscript is the only volume surviving from a set of thirty. It is also the most unattractive we have so far surveyed. It is *juz’* 9, bound in a new cloth binding that measures 30.2x20.8 cm with a text block of 20.2x13.9 cm. The text is in thick black *muhāqqaq*, except for the āya on the frontispiece and the last page, where we encounter golden *thuluth* and *muhāqqaq*. The only textual evidence connecting this codex to Sultan Hasan is the note beneath the frontispiece that it was found in his madrasa in the nineteenth century when Dar al-Kutub was founded and was added to the collection then.\(^{313}\) This volume does not supply the names of the calligrapher or the illuminator.

Of the frontispiece only the left side has survived (Pl. 94). The central field is an eight-pointed star, filled with blossoms and half palmettes which are not delicately executed. The rectangular panels above and below the central field are inscribed in a crude white *thuluth* verging more on *tawqī‘*. The text (āya Q 26:194–95) is flanked with

---

\(^{312}\) Qurʾān reading in accordance with pronunciation and intonation rules.

\(^{313}\) Current unpublished registry books of Dār al-Kutub record that there is a *waqf* by Sultan Hasan.
a palmette combination that is asymmetrical because of the varying sizes of the palmettes. The margin on the left contains a hasp which takes up one-third of the length of the rectangle. The hasp is filled with two intersecting circles and large, crude palmettes in gold and orange. The hasp is flanked by the two medallions.

The āya markers are the typical rayed rosettes and the medallions in the margin of the volume are blue circles with a gold border (Pl. 95). The lower half of folio 35b, the end of the codex, is adorned with a rectangle framed with a golden band and a narrow pearl band. It contains the text “God the Great spoke the Truth and His benevolent Prophet spoke the Truth.” The writing appears in a cloud and is surrounded by an arabesque in the paper color with orange, brown, blue, red, and green highlights (Pl. 96).

The illumination workshop was inspired by the designs used for the central field of frontispieces by the Şandal workshop but produced a much simplified version. The eight-fold rosettes are surrounded by pentagon-based hexagons filled with blossoms and arabesque scrolls. There are no arabesque scrolls in the frontispiece. The finispiece of TIEM 450 is an elaborate version of the design we have in Rażid 82. TIEM 450 was illuminated by the famous Aydughdī and his assistant Muḥammad al-Rassām al-Aʿsar in 713/1313 (Pl. 97). While there does seem to be some connection between Rażid 82 and TIEM 450, the quality of Rażid 82 is lower.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is of fine quality but not the best, and is most likely the work of a disciple and not a master. The ink has faded and time has not been kind to it. The


*muhāqqaq* is rough and more angular. It is interesting in that it has colored interlinear letters connoting the *qira‘āt* system and *tajwīd*. The last *juz‘* possibly had a folio explaining the meaning of the letters used. This tells us that this manuscript was also used for educational purposes.

**Rasīd 5**

The last of the Sultan Ḥasan group is a Qur‘ān manuscript in one codex. It is a large volume measuring 77x45 cm; the text block is 47x33 cm. It consists of 374 folios of thick cream polished paper, inscribed in thick black *muhāqqaq*, five lines to a page, while the *sūra* titles are in golden *thuluth*. The folios of this codex have been trimmed and remargined, so the page measurement should not be regarded as the original size. It was a large codex nonetheless, which unfortunately did not leave us the names of the calligrapher or the illuminator.

It lacks a frontispiece, but the illumination is encountered in the opening pages and some of the marginal medallions (Pl. 99). The first folio contains a full-page illumination carrying upper and lower panels with an arabesque scroll and a lotus blossom in each of the flanking circles. The central field was left empty for the text of al-Fāṭiḥa. The upper and lower cartouches in the panels might have been intended to carry text, or perhaps a title, over the undulating arabesque, but it was never inserted. It seems that this unfinished page was added at the time of the restoration of the codex. Each page in the Qur‘ān manuscript has been cut around the text and pasted on paper that is of the same material as the illuminated opening that contains no text (Pl. 100).

---

314 The *waqf* of the sultan is mentioned in the khedivial catalogue. *Min fihrist al-kutub al-‘Arabiyya*, 5.
The quality of the illumination on that folio, and the paper itself, testify to a possibly Mamluk restoration project, not a modern one. It is very possible that Sultan Hasan donated a dilapidated codex to his complex, and that it was being prepared to be reused, but the new additions were never finished, as was also the case with his mosque, which suggests that he died while it was being prepared.

The opposite folio, carrying *sūrat* al-Baqara (Pl. 99), focuses on the lotus, as does his mosque, but here the lotus bud is sprouting from a base. The lotuses are rendered in gold on a blue background, each in a circular medallion. The spandrels of the medallion and the cartouche are orange with golden leaves. The composition as it is does relate to the production from the 1360s through the 1380s, and so Raṣīd 5 is a precursor to them. It should be compared with the frontispiece of QUR 595, produced in 784/1382–83 (Pl. 330).³¹⁵

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is rough and thus is not in the hand of a great master. It is very thick and the lines are too close together for the size of the letters (Pl. 152). The long strokes characteristic of *muḥaqqaq* are too straight and the letters are not proportional. It is also similar to the calligraphy seen in Raṣīd 82, where the same rendition of *muḥaqqaq* is actually better.

---

Rasíd 111

This Qur’ān manuscript is an example of the continuation of the work from the previous decades and proves the survival of the Şandal workshop in the 1340s. It is in one codex of 248 folios of polished cream paper and measures 59x43 cm. The script is elegant black muḥaqqaq, with thirteen lines to a page except for the opening pages and those with sūra titles. Kūfī is used for the sūra titles of the opening pages, while tawqī‘ is used for the rest of the sūra titles throughout the manuscript. The calligrapher left his name in black tawqī‘ in a rectangle on folio 248a (Pl. 515):

The poor slave in need of God Almighty, ‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī‘ī, the one who seeks the forgiveness of his Lord, has written it.

He left the date in golden tawqī‘; now partly eroded, in a line beneath the rectangle that bears his name:

And its finishing was in the month of Shawwāl the year 74 . . .

This Qur’ān manuscript was revised and corrected (taṣḥīhan) at a later date, and possibly repossessed by a sultan. A roundel with pointed ends on folio 248b contains text that reads (Pl. 516):

Was done through the Grace of God Almighty . . . correction . . . the noble, the lordly, the sultāniyya (‘of the sultan’), the royal, the ashrafi. . . lines through God in the months of the year 760.

The year when the revisions were made and the volume was made part of the royal library, 760/1358, makes it a possession of Sultan ハウス. He must have purchased it, or more probably inherited it, and made it part of his library. This manuscript should not be entirely thought of as part of the Sultan ハウス group because it was finished in
the 1340s and not in 1358, but it is placed here nonetheless because of the revision date, which might have also included some work on the illumination.

Only part of the frontispiece survives. The left side still remains on folio 1a but in bad condition. The central field contains a large rectangle with a ten-pointed star as its center. This ten-pointed star is filled with an arabesque in gold on blue. Only the pentagons in the composition are highlighted with a blue background. The rest of the geometric puzzle is in gold. Each blue pentagon has a small bud in gold and brown. Flanking the geometric central field at the top and at the bottom are rectangular cartouches with rounded ends. The cartouches enclose Q 56:79–80 (Q 56:77–78 must have been in the cartouches in the now missing right side of the frontispiece on folio 1b) in golden kūfī surrounded with a golden arabesque and placed on a blue background. The outermost border around the central field resembles the Şandal workshop and is comparable to juz’ 4 and juz’ 6 from the Baybars al-Jāshnakīr Qur’ān manuscript in the British Library (compare Pls. 422, 325, and 492). It borders the central field on four sides and its arabesque is on a hatched background, with gold being the primary color.

The opening pages (Pl. 517), also in bad condition, are spread over folios 1b–2a. The central fields carry the text in clouds on paper ground, surrounded by an arabesque on hatching. The arabesque’s leaves, the half palmettes, and the tendrils are filled in with brown and blue notching. Flanking the top and bottom of each central field is a rectangular panel containing a cartouche with rounded edges and a trefoil at each end. As with the frontispiece, the text inside the rectangular panels is kūfī on a blue background. But here the kūfī is white outlined in gold, and the arabesque scroll has
brown and blue notching in its half palmettes. Marginalia still include the middle triangular hasp, which will disappear in later decades.

Folios 2b–3a (Pl. 518), carrying part of surat al-Baqara, are the only pages with text, apart from the opening pages, that are framed. The frame consists of a grid of dots: thin black lines with green dots are superimposed on a golden background. Surat titles on other pages consist of simple rectangular panels with tawqī’ used in gold or white on a blue or orange background (Pls. 515, 420, and 519).

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy reveals a master calligrapher, ‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī’ī, who must have been trained with Ibn al-‘Affī or one of his disciples. His hand elegantly follows the methods of the Egyptian school.

**Raṣīd 14**

Even though the old khedivial catalogue mentions that Raṣīd 14 was brought from the madrasa of Uljāy al-Ŷūsufī, this manuscript fits best within the Sultan Ḥasan group.\(^{316}\)

We have no waqf or colophon for it, unfortunately. Stylistically, it can be shown that it must have been produced in the later years of the 1350s. This Qur’ān manuscript is in 260 folios of thick polished paper in one codex, measuring 55x36 cm with a text block of 42x23 cm. It is written in a small naskh and a large muḥaqqaq. Each page has large muḥaqqaq and small naskh alternating, but incidentals in thuluth are also present.

---

\(^{316}\) Uljāy must have acquired some of Ḥasan’s endowments, through his familial relations.
Rašīd 14 lacks a frontispiece, but its opening pages are quite idiosyncratic and are the only fully illuminated pages in the codex. Folios 1b–2a (Pl. 317) have the *basmala* on folio 1b and the first *āya* of *sūrat* al-Fātiḥa on folio 2a in huge black *thuluth* on a rectangular central field. The script in clouds on a hatched red background, bearing a scroll outlined in red and displaying half palmettes with blue detailing, resembles the script in Rašīd 82 (Pl. 96). Surmounting the word *Allāh* in the *basmala* and within it in the first *āya* is a circular medallion with a triangular top made of petals. The medallion’s border and triangular top are gold; its center is blue, with a golden composite blossom of half palmettes intertwining with an orange center. The word ‘al-Raḥmān’ on folio 1b has a similar medallion on top of it, but this medallion lacks the triangular top.

The four rectangular panels flanking the central fields on the two pages carry the *sūra* title and verse count on folio 1b, and Q 56:80 in the upper cartouche and Q 85:21–22 on the lower cartouche on folio 2a. These cartouches are like those in Rašīd 59 (Pl. 86) and Rašīd 8 (Pl. 156). Each rectangular panel contains a cartouche with round ends in gold and orange while the *thuluth* is in blue. The spandrels are blue with a golden arabesque scroll displaying large half palmettes. The thin and delicate scrolling seen in the other Qur’ān manuscripts from the 1360s and 1370s was not utilized much in the 1350s, so this Qur’ān manuscript should perhaps be placed with the Sultan Ḥasan subgroup. Each rectangular panel has a circular medallion bordering it in the margin. The medallions are mostly gold and orange with a blue border. A hasp decorates the margins bordering the central field. The hasp is tripartite with blue background and golden scroll with an orange center.
Folios 2b–3a (Pl. 318) carry the rest of the first sūra, with three lines to a page in large muḥaqqaq and not thuluth as in folios 1b–2a. The design is similar, the difference being that the scroll in the background has some half palmettes in brown and yellow. There are only two rectangular panels, one at the top of each page, carrying the sūra title and verse count in cartouches with a blue background, not an orange one, with golden thuluth and golden spandrels. One medallion borders each rectangular panel. The background is blue and the scroll and border are gold. The hasp here is different (folio 2b–3a).

Each of the inner folios displays different scripts (Pl. 319). We see muḥaqqaq alternating with naskh and thuluth on every page. Varying scripts on one page became popular in the Iranian and Turkish lands in later centuries. It can already be found in Iranian Qur‘ān manuscripts of the twelfth century, but only became widespread under the Timurids. This seems to be an attempt by our calligrapher to use the different scripts on one page, which was not well received and thus not encouraged in the Mamluk world at the time. This technique is “a sacrifice of the Arabic text for the sake of what was evidently thought to be a good artistic effect . . . sometimes with incongruous results,” which is quite clear in our example here.

The endowments of Sultan Ḥasan are seen to have had commonalities with Širghitmish’s endowments. The use of chinoiserie (floral details of Chinese origin, such as the lotus and peony) is yet to attain its full importance, as will be seen in the next

---

317 Lings, Splendours, 50.
318 Lings, Splendours, 49–50.
chapter, but it started here. In this group we have seen a diversity that will open up new possibilities in later years, which we will examine in the next chapter.

A Qur’ān Manuscript from al-Khizāna al-‘Ādiliyya

Rāṣīd 70
A fine find in the collection of Dār al-Kutub is a Qur’ān manuscript where the name of the patron partially remains and is semi-legible. Originally Rāṣīd 70 was a thirty-volume rab'a, but only twenty-two volumes have survived. They are in relatively good condition, each in its original leather binding, and each measuring 37.2x26.5 cm, with a text block of 26.5x18.3 cm. The text is in black muḥaqqaq, five lines to a page, with the sūra titles and some of the volume titles in kūfī. The manuscript was brought to the library from the madrasa of amīr Qijmas al-Ishāqī (built in 1481) and bears a dedication to his madrasa on the left side of every single frontispiece (Pl. 102).319 The colophon, which is written in a simple naskh, mentions the date of completion as 757/1356 and the calligrapher as Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Āḥmad al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī. The text of the colophon reads (Pl. 103):

The completion of the writing (tahrīr) and lineation/illumination (tastīr)320 of this noble mushaf, with the aid of God Almighty and His

319 A brief note should be given here on the amīr Qijmās al-Ishāqī (d. 1487), since he will not be discussed as one of our major patrons. He was one of the important amīrs of Sultan al-Ashraf Qāytbāy (r. 1468–96). Like Qāytbāy, Qijmas was a patron of the arts. His madrasa still stands in the area of al-Darb al-Āḥmar in Cairo and is a manifestation of the genius of the Mamluk architect of the period. Qijmas was trained in calligraphy when he was still in the service of Sultan al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq (r. 1438–53). See al-Sakhāwī, al-Daw', 6:213–14.
320 The word used is tastīr, which has several meanings, according to Adam Gacek. It means ‘ruling,’ ‘writing,’ and the execution of geometrical as opposed to arabesque designs. We can
beatific facilitation, was by the hands of the slave who admits to his shortcomings, Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-Qādī al-Qumshī al-ʻIrāqī—may God absolve him from his crimes, purify him, and appoint him and strengthen him and make him among the closest of His slaves—in the beginning of the holy month of God Rajab the murājjab in the year 757, by the orders of the thriving amirial, worldly, al-ʻAdiliyya (‘of al-ʻAdil’), al-Sayfiyya (‘of Sayf al-Dīn’) Library (al-khizāna) of the master of princes in the world, the sword of the prince of the believers ‘Alī [ . . . ], may God make the days of his domain eternal through the chosen one (al-Muṣṭafā, the Prophet) and his companions; may he be perfumed[?]; and thanks be to God, Lord of the worlds.

Two possibilities so far exist for the patron, as gleaned from the colophon. The first and most probable one is that this ‘Alī was a military official. The titulature used could point to a high military figure in the Mamluk world. The dignitary is referred to as sayf amīr al-mūʾminīn (‘sword of the prince of the believers’), which has been recorded by al-Qalqashandī as one of the titles of the military officials.321 The dignitary is also described as sayyid al-umārā’ fī al-‘ālamīn (‘the master of the princes in the two worlds’), which is a title used for Mamluk amīrs.322 The title ‘al-ʻĀdiliyya’ given to the library of the dignitary could be referring to a nāʾīb (deputy), since al-Qalqashandī mentions that ‘al-ʻĀdilī’ was used by heads of the military in the Mamluk system.323 ‘Alī was a nāʾīb, or high commander, in the army in 757/1356.324 There is a strong possibility that he was the nāʾīb al-shām during the reign of Sultan Ḥasan’s amīr ‘Alī

thus take it to mean ‘to illuminate,’ since he has already mentioned tahrīr to indicate writing the codex.

321 Al-Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ al-ʿashā, 6:108.
323 Al-Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ al-ʿashā, 6:19.
324 He could not have been nāʾīb al-saltāna in Cairo because by that time Sultan Ḥasan had abolished the post. Thus he must have been a military dignitary who was not a nāʾīb, or a nāʾīb somewhere in Greater Syria.
ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Māridīnī (al-Mārdānī), but because his name is so illegible, we cannot be certain.\textsuperscript{325}

The second and weaker possibility is that the manuscript is Rasūlid. Three correlated facts in the text of the colophon might lead to this conclusion. First, the name of the ruling regent in 757/1356 in Yemen is al-Mujāhid ‘Ālī.\textsuperscript{326} If we take ‘‘Ālī‘ in the colophon to be the name of the \textit{amīr al-mu’āminīn}, then this assumption might be justified. Second, the library to which this manuscript was commissioned is called ‘al-‘Ādiliyya,’ as seen in the text above. One of the sons of al-Mujāhid ‘Ālī was al-‘Ādil.\textsuperscript{327} Third, given the two aforementioned facts in addition to the similarity in style, motival repertoire, and titulature used in the colophon to the Mamluk material culture, the Rasūlid world might be a possible candidate. They are known to have employed Mamluk artisans and to have copied Mamluk art.\textsuperscript{328} In the year 755/1355 one of the sons of al-Mujāhid ‘Ali, al-Nāṣir, was in Cairo for four months and went back to Yemen accompanied by craftsmen (\textit{ṣu‘ā‘}), workers in the entertainment business, and luxurious gifts sent by the \textit{amīrs} of Egypt. Al-Maqrīzī stresses that the \textit{amīrs} were especially

\textsuperscript{325} ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn ‘Ālī al-Māridīnī belonged to the ruler of Mardin and was given as a gift to Sultan Ḥasan in Cairo when Sultan Ḥasan showed interest in the \textit{amīr}‘s amazing lute playing. He became very close to Sultan Ḥasan and gave up playing the lute when the sultan died. He was known for his generosity, piety, and interest in studying jurisprudence, as he was a dedicated student of the Hanafī \textit{madhab}. His reputation reveals an \textit{amīr} who was highly respected for his religiosity and manners. For his biography see Ṣalāh al-Dīn Khalīl ibn ‘Ayyb al-Ṣafādī, \textit{al-Wāfi bi-al-wafayāt} (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, in Kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus, 1931), 22:367; Ibn Ṭaghrī Birdī, \textit{al-Nu‘um}, 11:116; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Aṣqalānī, \textit{al-Durar}, 3:149.


\textsuperscript{327} Noha Sadek, “Patronage and Architecture in Rasūlid Yemen, 626–858 AH/1229–1454 AD” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1990), 58.

generous in their gifts. Could it be that this manuscript was commissioned then and finished two years later, but that it never left Cairo? Or might it be that al-ʿĀdil, al-Nāṣir’s brother, saw what al-Nāṣir had brought and decided to employ some of the Mamluk artists who had accompanied his brother to produce the manuscript for him, which at some point was given as a gift to Egypt and so ended up with the late fifteenth-century amīr Qijmas al-Ishāqī? In her dissertation on Rasūlid architecture, Noha Sadek, in light of the similarities between Rasūlid architectural decoration and manuscript decoration, poses the questions “Could the artists in Rasūlid Yemen have been illuminators and calligraphers of Qurans? Or were they inspired by Quranic illuminations and other precious objects, such as the inlaid metalwares and enameled glass produced for the Rasūlid sultans in Mamluk workshops?”

The Frontispieces

The illumination of this magnificent manuscript is mostly contained in the frontispieces adorning each of the surviving volumes, except for juz’ 15 and 30. These two lost their frontispieces to damage at some point. This leaves us twenty different frontispieces, which can be placed in five different groups based on their general geometric composition in the central fields of the full-page illuminations. In the first group of six frontispieces, all share a simplicity in the basic geometric pattern of the central field (Pls. 104–109). They are all based on the intersection of a number of circles.
of different sizes on the horizontal and vertical axis of the central field. The color repertoire in this group uses not only gold, blue, orange, green, and black, but also pink, as in the central quatrefoil in \textit{juz'} 12. This group is also characterized by the use of more naturalistic plant elements, dominated by variants of the lotus flower.

The first group relates to a manuscript dated by David James to c. 1370–75. This was also a thirty-volume Qur’ān manuscript, whose surviving volumes are spread over many collections.\footnote{Juz’ 4 and juz’ 12 are in the Chester Beatty, 1464 and 1465 respectively; juz’ 8 and juz’ 14 were at Sotheby’s; juz’ 9 is in the British Library, Or 848. James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 233, cat. 35.} These volumes have five lines to a page as well, but the work is almost ten centimeters smaller than Raṣīd 70, measuring 27x19.7 cm. The two volumes relating to this group are 4 and 12 (both in the CBL, MSS 1464 and 1465) (Pls 110 and 111), in which the geometric compositions of the frontispieces are very similar. The floral details filling the pieces vary.

There is a possible inspiration for this kind of geometric pattern. Building the design upon intersecting circles can already be observed in the great Qur’ān manuscript copied by Ibn al-Bawwāb in 1001, in the double-page illuminations on ff. 8b–9a and ff. 284b–28a.\footnote{CBL Is 1431. See Elaine Wright, Islam: Faith, Art and Culture: Manuscripts of the Chester Beatty Library (London: Scala, 2009), 126–27.} QUR 29 in the Nasser Khalili Collection also shows a connection (Pl. 112).\footnote{This manuscript is another Baghdad production, but closer in date and context to Raṣīd 70.} In this case the calligrapher is the great Yāqūt al-Musta’s̱imi, who calligraphed his several-volume Qur’ān in \textit{muhāqqaq}. Only four volumes of this Qur’ān survive, one of which is this one in the Khalili Collection. This is the only one with the original decoration, and David James reiterates that it “is perhaps the only extant example which has calligraphic, decorative and codicological features that can unquestionably be
associated with Baghdad in the late thirteenth century.”

The frontispiece in the Khalili volume on folio 1a shows a similar geometric composition, with the intersecting circles and arcs.

The second group of frontispieces consists of juz’9 and juz’7 (Pls. 113 and 114). In these two, the central field is in a square also decorated by intersecting circles. However, a central circle overlaps with eight more circles and so the pattern continues in juz’9, while in juz’7 the repeat pattern is based on the intersection of four circles. These two volumes also have a border which makes them stand out, as in juz’22 (Pl. 120), although the borders here are different. In juz’7 two flower forms alternate to form a band above and below the horizontal borders of the central field; in juz’9 this band is composed of a knotted series of half palmettes. The medallions adorning the margins also differ from each other. Juz’7 has the same medallion seen in the first group, while juz’9 has a seven-petaled flower medallion, delicately rendered.

The third group features the traditional geometric central field inspired by the Sandal workshop (Pls. 115–121). The design is based on a ten-fold rosette, which extends into a ten-fold symmetry where the arcs intersect the invisible radii to form the petals of the rosette. This results in a myriad of five-pointed stars and pentagon-based hexagons that stand out with their varying colors. Color combinations vary among the frontispieces, but the combinations are always chosen from blue, gold, orange, green, and a little black. The geometric central field is framed with the same frames in all the frontispieces in this group, except juz’22 (Pl. 120), where a golden frame around the

---

337 This feature would influence Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī’s work in later decades.
338 Volumes 2, 4, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.
geometric piece has, above and below it, a horizontal band of blossoms alternating with circles. The marginal medallions in the frontispieces of this group repeat the design of the medallions in the band in this $juz'$.\textsuperscript{339}

As closely as this group is connected to the Şandal workshop, it also relates to a manuscript mentioned above in connection with the first group, cat. 35 in James’ *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks* (Pls. 110–111). The frontispiece of $juz’$ 9 (Pl. 122), now in the British Library, Or 848, is also based on a ten-fold rosette/star. James connects it to the Şandal workshop, but he assigns it a different illuminator from al-Āmidī. In his opinion, “it is one of the old patterns used by Şandal and his associates at the beginning of the century.”\textsuperscript{340}

Group four comprises two volumes, 16 and 17, where the frontispieces are identical except for the color combinations (Pls. 123–124). Here too we see pink and a very light orange. The central field has an eight-fold rosette, the petals of which are small circles enclosing a radiating eight-fold medallion, included in a double square octagram, producing a diamond shape. Here, the plant motifs are more naturalistic, with little use of palmette scrolls. Below and above the central field extends a panel with a kūfī inscription in the middle of two quatrefoils. In $juz’$ 17 (Pl. 124) the script is white on a golden background, while in $juz’$ 16 (Pl. 123) it is gold on a blue background. It possibly reads *al-ḥamd li-Allāh* (‘thanks be to God’) mirrored on the vertical axis and very stylized. What is interesting and inexplicable is that on the right side of the frontispiece in $juz’$ 16 (Pl. 123) this inscription is not just mirrored but rendered upside-

\textsuperscript{339} Palmettes dominate the lotus flowers.  
\textsuperscript{340} James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 211.
Could it have been a mistake? Whether the script reads *al-ḥamd li-Allāh* or not, the upside-down rendering connotes a textual or a design error. If it is a design error, then the illuminator thought that this side was the left one, not realizing he already had a left side ready, and so he inverted the leaf when the codex was being bound to resolve the problem. The medallions in the margins are the standard ones seen in most of the frontispieces of Raṣīd 70. The broad arabesque band at the outer frame differs from the rest of the corners, where three of the palmette elements merge together to form a crown.

The inspiration for the basic geometric composition in this group, apart from the floral details, must have been the frontispiece of the Topkapi Sarayi Baghdad manuscript EH245, *juz’* 20 (Pl. 125).[342] This manuscript was also in thirty volumes and was illuminated in Baghdad in 710/1310 by Muḥammad ibn Aybak, who was mentioned earlier in connection with Raṣīd 60.[343] The frontispiece of *juz’* 20 of Raṣīd 70 (Pl. 118)[344] has the same composition as the frontispieces in group four in Raṣīd 70. This kind of composition was described by David James as “quite different in conception from the composition based on infinite pattern, so typical of most Islamic surface decoration.”[345] This is true inasmuch as the composition does not replicate and expand into the unseen surroundings of the rectangular frame always enclosing the frontispiece. Al-Qūmshī, who might have been the illuminator, also carries the *nisba* ‘al-‘Irāqi.’ Thus he might have been very familiar with the production style in Baghdad. He added his

---

341 Mirror images of script are common in Islamic art.
343 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 236. James called this manuscript ‘the anonymous Baghdad Qur’ān.’
344 Topkapi Sarayi, MS EH 245.
345 James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, 89.
own touch by varying the interior of the composition and the floral elements. The finesse of the illumination lines in Raṣīd 70 is not of the same quality as the earlier Baghdad production, which is more refined.

The fifth and last group includes volumes 27, 28, and 29 (Pls. 126–128). It is very possible that it included juzʿ 30 as well. Unfortunately, thanks to the loss of the first few pages of juzʿ 30, we will never know. The three are identical, except for the color variations. The central field in each of the sides of the frontispieces is organized around a large octagon carrying the title of the juzʿ in white, outlined in both black and gold, on a blue background, surrounded by isolated vegetal elements. The juzʿ names are not rendered the same way. The clearest is in juzʿ 29 (Pl. 128) where it also carries Q 45:29 in kūfī in the upper and lower panels. The text reads: right: “volume twenty-nine,” left: “of thirty volumes.” The other two panels are odd and seem to have mistakes in the writing. There are extra mīns and one mīn is written with a kāf instead of a mīm. The medallions in the margin and the outer border are standard, similar to those we have so far seen in the manuscript.

A frontispiece similar to this group can be seen in a slightly earlier Cairo production. Juzʿ 27 of a Qurʿān manuscript in the CBL, 1476, penned by Aḥmad ibn Kamāl al-Mutaṭabbib, who worked in Cairo in the 1330s, has a frontispiece with a very similar composition (Pl. 129). It goes back to the Şandal workshop, as comparison with the frontispiece of juzʿ 2 of the Baybars Qurʿān by Muḥammad ibn Mubādir shows. There, the overall composition is even more similar to a Baghdad production,
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346 James, Qurʿāns of the Mamlūks, cat. 18.
347 James, Qurʿāns of the Mamlūks, 226.
348 Figure 22 in Qurʿāns of the Mamlūks.
such as the anonymous Baghdad Qurʼān frontispiece, illuminated in 1303 by Muhammad ibn Aybak (Pl. 130). An almost identical geometric composition can be seen in another Qurʼān manuscript which is unfortunately undated. It is in the CBL, Is 1463 (Pl. 131), and has been attributed by Elaine Wright to fourteenth-century Egypt. It was also in thirty volumes and heavily illuminated. Even though the geometry of the central field is identical to Raṣīd 70, the execution of all other details seems more refined.349

As a matter of fact, this group in Raṣīd 70 and the frontispiece in CBL Is 1463 (Pl. 131) are also very similar to the frontispieces in group four. The octagram of one square flipped diagonally into another is present. The differences between the five groups of frontispiece designs should not be overstated. There is immense variability in the frontispieces, and the artist(s) must have used many resources for such an impressive decorative program.

The aesthetic appeal of the interior of all the volumes relies on the beauty of the script, which is majestic and imposing, as well as on the marginal medallions carrying the khamsa, ʿashra, and ḥizb, which are consistent throughout (Pl. 132). There are also the āya markers depicted in the typical rayed rosette form. Besides this the sūra titles are also highly illuminated. Each appears in white kūfī, outlined and then bordered in gold on a blue background in a cartouche. The horizontal panels are framed by a golden knotted band with blue dots and orange fillers. Each of the spandrels of the cartouche carrying the text contains a gold blossom on orange.

The closing pages of some of the volumes display the words “ṣadaq Allah al-Aẓīm wa ṣadaq rasūluhu al-kařīm” (‘God Spoke the Truth and His generous Prophet

---

349 Wright, Islam: Faith, Art and Culture, 75, fig. 47.
spoke the Truth’) (Pls. 133–135). On the top and at the bottom they are decorated with narrow horizontal panels framed by golden knotted bands. The enclosed cartouche contains a golden tendril on blue ground; thus the structure of the panel is the same as those used in the sūra titles.\(^{350}\)

**Calligraphy**

Al-Qūmshī’s hand is sure and the muḥaqqaq he renders is large. He occasionally inserts letters in the margins in order to remain faithful to the script’s size rather than squeeze them into the rectangular frame; sometimes he also finishes them off on top of the border of the page (Pls. 59 and 91). A master’s hand is at work. An occasional but important characteristic of muḥaqqaq is the presence of a gap between the ascenders and descenders of joined upright letters like the dāl, kāf, lām, or lāmālīf.\(^{351}\) Of all our examples of muḥaqqaq this Qur’ān manuscript displays this particular characteristic the most (Pls. 42, 58, and 59). Al-Qūmshī also made a few mistakes and forgot words, letters, or parts of āyas, which he then inserted in a small script in the margins (Pls. 91 and 137). We can see this to a lesser extent in Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 90).

**Addendum**

Another manuscript that exists in Dār al-Kutub, but has no date or signature, was most certainly produced by the same workshop as Raṣīd 70. This manuscript is Raṣīd 71, a ḥabīb from which only three volumes survive: the first, the fifth, and the sixth. There is a

---

\(^{350}\) The manuscript was unfinished because the end of juzʾ 2 and juzʾ 15 do not contain any text in the frames prepared for them (Pls. 136 and 137).

\(^{351}\) Mansour, *Sacred Script*, 142–44.
waqf statement in the name of Qijmas al-Ishāqī, the same statement and madrasa of endowment as Rašīd 70.

The three surviving volumes of Rašīd 71 are all designed with the same underlying concept behind the design of the frontispiece (Pls. 202–204), and they tie in well with the first group of frontispieces (Pls. 104–109) discussed in Rašīd 70. They are all based on the intersection of a number of circles of different sizes on the horizontal and vertical axes of the central field. Very important in this connection is the fact that the color repertoire in this group not only use gold, blue, orange, green, and black, but also pink, as in the central quatrefoil in juz’12 in Rašīd 70 and juz’1 and juz’6 in Rašīd 71. The use of more naturalistic plant elements, dominated by variants of the lotus flower, is another connection between the frontispieces of these two manuscripts. The calligraphy is most certainly that of al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī as well. The same letter formations can be seen in both (compare Pls. 205 and 206), and he even finishes off some letters on top of the frame as he does in Rašīd 70.

**Preliminary Conclusions**

The general problem encountered for these two decades was the rarity of signatures of calligraphers and illuminators in colophons.

**Illumination**

Not surprisingly, the Şandal workshop, the most important of the early fourteenth century, continued to influence the production of later decades. The arabesque scroll beneath the text of the opening page, the star pattern (jigsaw puzzle) for the central
panel of the frontispieces, and the arabesque frame on three sides of the frontispiece are all features that started with Şandal and his disciples and continued. The Şirghitmish group shows the connection most clearly; Raşîd 149 and Raşîd 147 are important examples. Raşîd 58 and Raşîd 82 show influences from the work of al-Maydûmî. Even though the works we have from Dâr al-Kutub do not bear his signature, the surviving examples with his signature closely resemble Raşîd 56, Raşîd 147, and Raşîd 58.

Connections to Ilkhanid Iraq and Anatolia can be detected in Raşîd 148 and Raşîd 61. It is most surprising that the great Hamadan Qur’ân manuscript (Raşîd 72), produced in 713/1313 for the Ilkhanid wâzîr Rashîd al-Dîn,352 had no influence on compositions produced for the Mamluks, although it has been in Cairo since 726/1326.353

Raşîd 70 is crucial for understanding the production of the 1350s. It was indeed a magnificent project on a very high level. The facts that it preserved for us the name of the calligrapher, and that most of its volumes survive in good condition, allows concrete comparisons to be made.

A Cairo provenance has been ascribed to almost all of the manuscripts studied in this chapter. In spite of the impressive nature of these manuscripts, the variable quality
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353 James, Qur’ans of the Mamlûks, 111–26. The amîr who made it a waqf in Cairo in 1326 is Baktîmûr al-Sâqî. He was one of the favorite and closest amîrs to al-Nâşîr Muḥammad, who received many gifts from the sultan. Sources mention various items including Qur’ân manuscripts. This manuscript was probably sent to al-Nâşîr Muḥammad by the Ilkhanid Abû Sa’îd, and was then given to the amîr, who endowed it to his khânqâh. Conclusions about the importance of Baktîmûr were reached in an unpublished paper I wrote for Prof. Northrup’s class NMC 2117 “Al-Nâşîr Muḥammad ibn Qâlâwûn’s Favorite Amir: Baktîmûr al-Sâqî (d. 733/1333–4) in Light of Fourteenth- and Fifteenth Century Mamlûk Sources,” analyzing and comparing what the chronicles and biographical dictionaries wrote about him.
of some of the details is indicative of the economic and political circumstances in Cairo in that era.

The marginal decoration of the decorative medallions of various forms are very similar. Raṣīd 5, Raṣīd 56, Raṣīd 58, Raṣīd 59, Raṣīd 147, Raṣīd 148, Raṣīd 149, and to a lesser extent some of the volumes of Raṣīd 61, show stylistic similarities (Pl. 138). The inscription denoting ẖamsa, ‘ashara, or ḥizb is in kūfī or tawqī‘; inside a circle within one or more other circles, and bordered in blue. All may have been produced by the same workshop or by disciples of the same workshop. Both Șirghtimish and the sultan used the same group to produce Qur’ān manuscripts, which makes sense given the fact that the two of them, together with Shaykhū, were the most powerful men of their decade, with the most important artistic and building programs.

In juz‘1 of Raṣīd 60 the marginal elements are very important, as they set it apart from the rest of the volumes (Pl. 139). They are conceptually and technically very different from the rest of the volumes. The resemblance between the marginal elements in juz‘30 of Raṣīd 60 and Raṣīd 58 (volumes 1 and 28), together with the presence of Coptic symbols, confirms a Mamluk provenance for the rest of the volumes of Raṣīd 60.

Calligraphy

Two types of writing were popular: naskh and muḥaqqaq. Naskh was still commonly used to scribe Qur’āns at this time, but muḥaqqaq had definitely achieved its supremacy. Over the next two decades, naskh will disappear and muḥaqqaq will completely take over. The naskh of the period has characteristics that it shares with muḥaqqaq, especially in final letters.
Thus the manuscripts studied in this chapter fall within two main categories: *naskh* codices (Raṣīd 56, 149, and 150) and *muḥaqqaq* codices (Raṣīd 5, 58, 82, 147, 148, 162, 59, 60, 61, and 70). The *naskh* in Raṣīd 149 and Raṣīd 150 is very similar. They feature the same ك and the same final ن. Raṣīd 56 is different from both, possibly because it was produced a decade earlier. It does however share the final ن with Raṣīd 149 and Raṣīd 150.

The *muḥaqqaq* codices fall within two main groups. One of them follows the style of Yaḥyā al-Mustaʿsimī (Raṣīd 5, 59, 60, 61, and 70). The other is more closely related to the Egyptian school, which is considered to have originated with Yaḥyā al-Mawṣūlī al-Nūrī, and been perfected by Ibn al-ʿAfīf (Raṣīd 58, 82, 147, 148, and 162). The primary difference between them is the angle at which the nib of the pen was cut or at which it was laid on the paper. Yaḥyā al-Mustaʿsimī’s hand and workshop are characterized by an increased angle, one that is closer to 90 degrees. This would result in slimmer vertical letters and thicker horizontal ones. This can be seen clearly when the edges of *alif* and *lām* in our manuscripts are compared. This group shows close affinities to the works of Ibn al-Mutaṭabbib, who must have had many disciples. He was, after all, the calligrapher for al Nāṣir Muḥammad and his important retinue.

Raṣīd 82 and Raṣīd 148 show close affinities to each other, especially in the letters *ṣīn* and *shīn* (Pls. 46 and 95). Raṣīd 147 is very close to Raṣīd 148, and most letters are done in almost the same manner. Thus Raṣīd 82 could also be the work of the same calligrapher(s). The *ṣīn* and *shīn* in Raṣīd 58 have particularly sharp teeth (Pl. 81),
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not encountered in any of the earlier \textit{muḥaqqaq} examples. This is sufficient to assign it potentially to a different workshop.

The more Iraqi-inclined group features strong resemblances between al-Qūmshī’s work in Raṣīd 70 and that of Mūbārak Shāh ibn ʿAbdallāh in Raṣīd 60 \textit{juz’} 1 (Pls. 42 and 68). However, Mūbārak Shāh’s hand is better than that of al-Qūmshī, and his pen is thicker. Raṣīd 59 is also close to Mūbārak Shāh’s hand, but much closer to al-Qūmshī’s hand in Raṣīd 70. This is probably because Raṣīd 59 is also from the late 1350s, while Mūbārak Shāh’s is earlier. A hand that closely resembles both Raṣīd 70 and Raṣīd 59 is Raṣīd 61.
Chapter Three:
Qur’ān Manuscripts from 764/1363 to 784/1382

This chapter deals primarily with ten manuscripts from the 1360s and 1370s. A continuation of styles from the past two decades will be noted and analyzed in addition to the novelties introduced. Even though Ilkhanid elements appeared earlier, they are utilized more in these decades, with special attention given to the Chinese elements prevalent in Ilkhanid art.\footnote{It is still to be established whether there was increased interaction between the two regions during this period.} Two main workshops operating for royalty evolved over these two decades. While we are not sure of the patron of the first Qur’ān manuscript (Raṣīd 97), the remaining nine are connected to distinguished patrons. Three Qur’ān manuscripts belong to the major female patron of the period, Khawand Baraka, mother of Sultan Sha‘bān; these are Raṣīd 372, Raṣīd 80, and Raṣīd 6. Four Qur’ān manuscripts belong to Sultan Sha‘bān: Raṣīd 7, Raṣīd 9, Raṣīd 10, and Raṣīd 141. Amīr close to the sultan were also active and used the sultan’s workshops. One is Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafi, who is responsible for Raṣīd 54, and another is Şurghatmish al-Ashrafi, who is responsible for Raṣīd 15.

We will see in this chapter that muḥaqqaq has become the most important script by this time. It is the jewel in the crown of calligraphy throughout the fourteenth century, but especially during these two decades, when it was perfected. It has been aptly described by Martin Lings, and the Qur’ān manuscripts of Sultan Sha‘bān and his entourage corroborate this description:
We have an impression of overwhelming power, as of a tidal wave or a
river in flood. Especially effective in this respect are the shallow curves
below the line; the lack of depth being here made up for by an increase
along the dimension of breadth, that is, in the direction of the writing
itself, whence the momentum of its horizontal sweep. But, by way of
contrast, the alif rise up above the line each as straight as a minaret;
and they and the other towering vertical letters ensure that impetus of
movement shall in no sense detract from majesty of movement.\footnote{Lings, \textit{Splendours}, 37.}

\textbf{A Qur\’ān Manuscript by al-Nakhjawai (al-Nakhchivānī)}

\textbf{Raṣid 97}

Raṣid 97 is a curious codex that raises quite a few codicological questions. We
fortunately have a signature and a date for it. The colophon informs us that it was
finished in 762/1361. It is one complete codex, consisting of 209 folios of polished
cream paper, and measures 49x38 cm. The main script used is \textit{muḥaqqaq} written in a
thick black pen, and except for the opening pages and the pages with \textit{sūra} titles the lines
are seventeen to a page. \textit{Thuluth} and \textit{kūfī} are also used in the \textit{sūra} titles and panel
inscriptions. The calligrapher signed at the end of a long and elaborately executed
colophon (Pl. 207):

\begin{quote}
God, the Most Generous of those who utter the Truth and the Most
Truthful of those who Say, and His honest Prophet delivered what he
has carried from the revelation and that which is clearly alluded to,
and I am a witness to this. May God bless our master Muhammad the
last of the Prophets, and the nearest of the Angels (Archangels), and
all Prophets, Messengers, and the pure bearers of the Throne. [May
He] make special to the Day of Judgment a blessing (prayer) on
Muhammad, his pure family, his pure wives the mothers of the
believers/faithful, those who received the Prophet, and those who
immigrated with him. This is through the Grace of God to test
whether I will be thankful or whether I will be ungrateful. The one
who thanks gives thanks for himself, and as for the ungrateful one,
God is Rich and Generous. Mahmūd ibn Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-
Nakhjawai (al-Nakhchivānī) has written this blessed \textit{khātima} in
Shaʿbān, the year 762.
\end{quote}
This Qurʿān manuscript has two frontispieces, the first being the left side of a full double page opening. They are both of the same illumination program in spite of their varying styles, as will shortly be argued, and represent a culmination of the illumination practices we have seen in the previous chapter and fit well in the period.

The manuscript begins on folio 1a with what seems to be the left side of a frontispiece (Pl. 208). The design and motifs used in this frontispiece continue what we have seen in the past two decades. Elements from the earliest manuscript we examined in chapter two, Raṣīd 162, and from the last manuscripts examined, Raṣīd 62 and Raṣīd 70, are incorporated in this folio. The geometric panel of the central field, which is a square, is a combination of what we have seen in group four (volumes 16 and 17) and group two (volumes 7 and 9) of Raṣīd 70 frontispieces (Pls. 113, 114, 123, and 124). Similar to the conception of group four are the two large intersecting shapes. In the case of Raṣīd 97 two hexagons intersect, while in Raṣīd 70 it is two squares forming an octagram. The influence of group two consists of the intersecting circles forming a central rosette with convex sides. In the case of Raṣīd 97 there are twelve circles, producing a twelve-sided rosette, while in Raṣīd 70 eight circles intersect, forming an eight-sided rosette. The central rosette in Raṣīd 97 is decorated with a large lotus surrounded by other smaller floral patterns. By now the lotus was an important element from the chinoiserie repertoire used to adorn Qurʿān manuscripts, which started with the commissions of Sultan ʿHasan and amīr ʿSirghitmish. The various compartments
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357 It is also very possible that this was planned to be a one-page illumination and not a two-page one.
358 The earliest surviving use of a lotus in Mamluk Qurʿān manuscripts is in the Iran Bastan Qurʿān manuscript dated 1338. The first use of the lotus and peony on architecture were the stone carvings on the façade of the mosque of Sultan ʿHasan. David James assigns the first
created by the intersections are mostly filled with vegetal ornament, more naturalistic than abstract. Not a single full arabesque is used here on this page. In this sense the resemblance to Rašid 70 is uncanny. The color repertoire uses primarily orange, blue, and gold. Green is also present, but only sparsely.

Above and below the central field are rectangular panels, identical except for the inscription (Pl. 208). In the middle there is a cartouche with trilobed edges with a medallion attached to each end. The background of the cartouche is blue and it carries in kūfī Q 26:192, in white outlined in black and surrounded by tendrils and floral elements. Around the cartouche and the two medallions at each of its ends, the background is orange, with tendrils and floral elements in gold. At the two ends of the rectangular panel we see a trilobed end of a non-existing cartouche with a blue background and a gold and orange palmette. The two medallions at the end of the central trilobe-ended cartouche contain a floral element exactly like the marginal elements in Rašid 70. This element seems to be a stylized interpretation of a peony.

Framing the rectangular panels and the central field is the braided border made of the knotted grid of dots with small squares of blue and red. Around this border is another, much thinner, pearl band. The outermost frame resembles the multi-toned petals border, typically Ilkhanid, used in Rašid 162 surrounding the frontispiece (Pl. 3), the colophon’s polygonal rectangle (Pl. 2), and the marginal rosettes (Pl. 17), and used

appearance in manuscripts to Rašid 8 (757/1356). But he states a few pages later that its first appearance was the Iran Bastan manuscript. See James, Qur’ans of the Mamluks, 181, 187. It might have been Rašid 8 or any of the other Qur’ān manuscripts carrying the lotus and discussed in chapter two that were the originators. What is important is that it was in the 1350s that the use of Chinese elements in Qur’ān manuscripts and architecture began. In Iran its appearance in Qur’ān manuscripts can be traced to a manuscript in the Khalili collection, QUR 495, dated to 1250–1350. James, Master Scribes, 56–57.
also in Raṣīd 62 in the marginal medallions (Pl. 209). The petals are of two shades of blue, exactly like Raṣīd 162 and some of the medallions in Raṣīd 62. The petals do not all go in one direction as in Raṣīd 162, but in opposite directions like in Raṣīd 62 and most Ilkhanid examples. A few examples of this petal frame were given in chapter two, but the origin of this idea was not explored. Each petal seems to be a colored curled palmette leaf.

The earliest depiction of this motif in frames in a manuscript was in a Qurʾān manuscript in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Arabe 6041) dated to 506/1112 and produced in Bust (Pl. 210).359 It continued to be used before and during the Ilkhanid period. A pre-I lkhanid Qurʾān manuscript also in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (1610), produced in Iran between 607/1210 and 622/1225, shows them around marginal medallions (Pl. 211).360 They are also used in other Ilkhanid manuscripts produced in different centers. A Qurʾān manuscript in the Tehran Bastan Museum (4277) produced in Baghdad in 685/1286 by Yaqūt al-Musta’simī shows the petal border crudely executed in marginal medallions (Pl. 212).361 Another is a Qurʾān manuscript, Arabe 6716, in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, dated 686/1287 and produced in Iraq, which depicts a colorful use of the border (Pl. 213).362 A very refined and colorful example is a Qurʾān manuscript penned by Aḥmad ibn al-Suhrawardī and illuminated by

359 François Déroche, Le livre manuscript arabe: prélude à une histoire (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2004), 127. This is the only other Qurʾān manuscript so far found to be in seven volumes. A source of inspiration for this use of petals might have been the early ʿāya markers in Eastern Kūfī Persian Qurʾān manuscripts. An early example is an eleventh-century Qurʾān manuscript produced in Iran or Iraq; CBL Is 1607.2a. Wright, Islam: Faith, Art and Culture, 106.


361 Lings, Splendours, 61 (pls. 36–37).

362 Splendeur et Majesté, 62–63.
Muhammad ibn Aybak in 704/1304 (Pl. 214). Some manuscripts containing Rashid al-Din’s Chronicles also depict it as a border around medallions. Majmû’a al-Rashi’diyya produced in Tabriz between 707/1307 and 710/1310, now in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Arabe 2324), shows the border in the marginal medallions of the frontispiece (Pl. 215). An example that has been in Cairo since circa 726/1326 is the Hamadan Qur’ân manuscript produced in 1313, which shows these petals bordering marginal medallions (Pl. 216). A Shāhnāmah manuscript produced in Shiraz in 731/1330 also shows the petal border around the book title (Pl. 217). While in Mu’nis al-Ahrār, produced in Isfahan in 1341, it frames the frontispiece (Pl. 218). Even though it was not invented by the Ilkhanids, it is referred to here as the Ilkhanid frame, because it was most probably an Ilkhanid influence on Mamluk Qur’ân manuscripts, since it appeared in Mamluk lands with the fall of the Ilkhanids.

Folios 1b–2a form a full frontispiece that in style has nothing to do with the frontispiece just described (Pl. 219). However, there is a strong stylistic connection to the illumination program executed in Raṣîd 70. Frontispieces in group three in Raṣîd 70 (volumes 2, 4, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23) are very similar (Pls. 115–121). Here also the central field is a rectangle with a ten-fold star radiating into a rosette whose petals are

363 3548 in the Iran Bastan Museum. Other volumes are in the Topkapi Sarayi Palace Museum. Lings, Splendours, 68 (pl. 70).
365 Raṣîd 72.
368 The assumption here is that an artists’ diaspora might have been created and that some came to Egypt, along with many craftsmen. So far there is no proof that the petal border was used before the Mamluk era in Egypt. However, not enough Ayyubid material survives to provide evidence.
the pentagon-based hexagons and are similar to the Şandal workshop. The color scheme in Raşid 97 has much more gold in it and no green, which was abundantly used in the group-three frontispieces of Raşid 70. The plant fillings of the different geometric shapes are all from the palmette and its derivatives; no naturalistic or chinoiserie elements are used, as they are in Raşid 70. The rectangular central field is framed with a border made of the knotted grid of dots with small squares of blue, similar to the first frontispiece. However, here the squares are only blue and do not utilize red. Surrounding this frame is another frame with a blue background and a golden scroll of half palmettes with trefoils in a lighter blue surrounded by red.

The margin of each side holds a medallion/rosette, showing that this manuscript once again combines the early and late traditions of the past two decades (Pl. 219). The medallion is gold with a large lotus outlined in it, as seen earlier in the marginal decorations of Raşid 59 (Pl. 149) and Raşid 8 (Pl. 158), both commissions of Sultan Hasan in the late 1350s. Surrounding the medallion are petals of two shades of blue exactly like the ones framing the first frontispiece and found earlier in Raşid 162 (Pl. 3). The execution of these petals in this manuscript, both in this frontispiece and the first one, is more refined than in Raşid 162 and much closer to Raşid 62.

The opening pages on 2b–3a are for the most part alien to the tradition of the entire fourteenth-century Mamluk illumination style (Pl. 220). If it were not for the calligraphy, which is from one hand throughout the manuscript and exhibits characteristics of Mamluk muhaqqaq, this folio would seem at first glance to have been produced and imported from the Iranian world and added to the codex. The opening on a two-page spread does not exhibit al-Fâtiha on the ‘a’ side and al-Baqara on the other.
Folio 2b has al-Fātiḥa and the first three verses of suṣrat al-Baqara, which then continues on folio 3a. The full-page illumination of folio 2b consists of two unequal parts/rectangles divided by a rectangular panel. The upper rectangle contains a cartouche and the suṣra title of al-Fātiḥa in thuluth. The title is penned in gold on a blue background, decorated with a very fine green arabesque scroll carrying half palmettes. The execution is very Ilkhanid, quite similar to the productions of various Ilkhanid centers in the first half of the fourteenth century. An example of the latter is a Qurʾān manuscript in the TIEM (K. 430) penned by Yahyā al-Jamāḥī al-Ṣūfī in 739/1338–39, most probably in Shiraz (Pl. 221).\[369] The cartouche is then framed with a black line. Next to the two ends of the cartouche and at the end of the rectangular panel, golden flowers, rather than an arabesque, adorn the orange background in a Mamluk fashion. Beneath this panel is the suṣra text, which is in four lines, not counting the basmala. Below suṣrat al-Fātiḥa the suṣra title of the suṣrat al-Baqara is executed in a way not previously seen in the Mamluk tradition. It is in the same cartouche as above, but the golden thuluth is on a black background.

The black background was seen in juz ’1 in Raṣīd 60 (Pl. 68). The Ilkhanid origins of using black for the background go back to Baghdad and were continued by the Jalayrīds after the Ilkhanids (Pls. 221, 222, 223, 224, and 225).\[370] The arabesque scroll beneath the inscription is also golden and does not have palmettes or half palmettes. It
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\[369] Lings, Splendours, 64 (pl. 48).

has more naturalistic-looking plant motifs that are not, however, from the chinoiserie repertoire—we see no lotuses or peonies. They are very Shirazi in style and execution. The relevant comparative material comes from QUR182 and QUR181 (1330s–1350s) in the Nasser Khalili Collection, especially the marginal rosettes on folios 28b–29a (Pl. 8). The array of colors used is astounding within the Mamluk context: red, green, light green, and purple on black. The ends of the rectangular panels also have a black background with a stylized palmette flanked by half palmettes in gold. The illuminator used the palmette to adorn the more naturalistic elements, and the natural elements to adorn the palmette scroll. A lower rectangular panel is at the end of the full-page illumination. For the sake of symmetry this rectangular panel contains a cartouche with the same design and color scheme as the uppermost one. The inscription is different, as it carries the beginning of Q 56:77–80.

As for the border, instead of having a continuous frame, the three rectangular panels just described break it. Each section of the frame is adorned by the knotted grid of dots on a golden background, without the alternating squares of blue or red. The whole composition is further framed on three sides with a scroll not seen before in the Mamluk Qur’an manuscripts. It is stylized and uses black, blue, red, green, and gold. It is very similar to medallion borders in a manuscript in several volumes.

This manuscript is now housed in many libraries (Pl. 226). David James, who was not sure whether it was Anatolian or Central Asian, dated it to 735/1335. The

371 James, Master Scribes, 126–35.
372 Volumes 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 28 are in the John Rylands University Library, 760–773. Folios are scattered in the Chester Beatty Library and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. James, Qur’ans of the Mamlūks, 244. (The simple tendril appeared on Yuan pottery in the late fourteenth century.)
similarity of detail with Rašīd 97 suggest more of an Anatolian provenance, since Nakhchivān is closer.

Folio 3a is exactly like folio 2b (Pl. 220), except for the text and the middle panel, which is missing. Sūrat al-Baqara continues throughout the page, and the two rectangular cartouches at the top and bottom carry the rest of Q 56:77–80 in the upper and lower cartouches. The band of the knotted grid of dots is not interrupted; it appears as two parallel bars flanking the text to the right and left. Surrounding the full-page illumination are spiked tassels, which by now have become standard.

The marginal elements in this opening are not like those adorning the frontispiece (compare Pls. 219 and 220). They are typically Mamluk, made of concentric circles of gold and orange and carrying in kūfī the words khamisā (upper one) and ‘ashara (lower one) penned in gold. The medallion carrying khamisā has a little triangular tip, making it look like a teardrop, while the one carrying the ‘ashara is in the shape of a circle. Both have tiny tassels. The rest of the folios exhibit the same marginal elements, along with a few others that interestingly integrate the Iranian tradition, like the rest of the details so far encountered. The new shapes carry the words ḥizb and rubʿ ḥizb (Pl. 227). The shape carrying the ḥizb signifier is a hexagon with a thick golden border and blue six-petaled rosette interior. The rosette carries the word ḥizb in white kūfī adorned with small trefoils. The hexagonal composition is framed with multi-toned petals, but this time in different colors, not just blue. We see red/orange, green, and blue, similar to QUR 181 in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 8). The rosette carrying the rubʿ ḥizb is an almond shape bordered with a thick golden frame, with the multi-toned petal frame superimposed as well. The difference is that here the red/orange is used only four times
at the cross-axis of the shape. If the petaled frame were removed, it would be entirely Mamluk. An interesting treatment can be seen on folio 4a, where the rubʿ ʿhizb is attached to a teardrop carrying the khamsa (Pl. 228). The top of the almond shape is fused with the bottom of the circular medallion of the khamsa.

The text of the sūras in the opening pages is encased in clouds, around which an outlined fine scroll can be seen (Pl. 220). The palmettes and trefoils it displays are often adorned with blue dots.

The closing pages, on folios 208b–209a, contain the last sūras and the colophon (Pl. 229). Folio 208b carries the last five sūras interspersed with golden thuluth for the sūra titles. The only other illumination is the verse markers of the gold-rayed rosettes with blue and red dots. Folio 209a contains a full-page illumination bordered by upper and lower rectangular panels carrying Q 6:115 in a cartouche. The inscription is in a blue thuluth encased in a golden cloud on a blue background decorated with a scroll of half palmettes. The ends of the rectangular panel flanking the inscription cartouches have an orange background with a large golden lotus in the middle, surrounded with smaller lotuses and plant motifs. The text block in the rectangle carries twelve lines of muḥaqqaq with benedictions on the Prophet Muḥammad, the angles, other Prophets and messengers, Archangels, the Prophet’s family and wives, and those who immigrated with him from Mecca to Medina. The calligrapher then signs his name at the end and gives us his nisba, ‘al-Nakhjawānī’ (al-Nakhchivānī), and the date. Flanking this text block to the right and left is a border with a blue background and an undulating golden scroll, containing trefoils and looking like the very old vine scrolls of early Islamic art.
The marginal elements on the left margin are curious, as they combine the typical medallions of the period flanking a shape, a style that goes back a few decades, especially to the 1330s and 1340s. This multi-lobed shaped is gold and orange with chinoiserie elements.

**Calligraphy**

Al-Nakhjawānī is clearly a master calligrapher; his hand is steady, uniform and sure. However, a few anomalies exist. The word *al-Rahīm* in the *basmalas* of the opening *sūras* is executed differently (Pl. 220). The one before *sūrat* al-Baqara shows more affinities with *naskh* in the letters *yāʾ* and *mīm*. His *muḥaqqaq* becomes perfected by the end of the manuscript, and the last five *sūras* of the Qurʾān on folio 208b are aligned perfectly with four proportionate and symmetrical *basmalas* (Pl. 229). All the *basmalas* are exactly the same and thus give a very balanced feel to the page. The same proportionality, balance, and sureness of execution can also be seen in the beginnings of the last two *sūras* of this folio. They begin with the same three words and thus clearly show his mastery: *qul aʿūdhu bī-rab*. Proportionately small *sūras* can also be seen on other folios (Pl. 230). An error is resolved elegantly in the title of *sūrat* al-Māʿūn, where the *rāʾ* in the word *sūra* was added later.

The style of al-Nakhjawānī’s *muḥaqqaq* is not like that of the early Ilkhanid school, but instead shows the Egyptian characteristic of cutting the pen at an angle that is not close to 90 degrees. Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī’s hand and workshop, the Ilkhanid
counterpart, is characterized by an increased angle, one that is closer to 90 degrees. This would result in slimmer vertical letters and thicker horizontal ones.\footnote{Mansour, \textit{Sacred Script}, 74–75.}

Al-Nakhjawānī’s work raises an interesting question: was he trained in the Mamluk lands after starting out in the northwestern Iranian world, or is he irrelevant to the illumination program altogether and his \textit{nisba} had no bearing in this case?

**Endowments by Khawand Baraka**

\textbf{Raṣīd 372}

Only \textit{juz’} 17 survives from this \textit{rab’a} commissioned by the most important female patron of the arts of Bahri Mamluk Cairo, Khawand Baraka, the mother of Sultan Sha‘bān. She endowed it to her \textit{madrasa} in 770/1369, as stated at the end of the \textit{waqf}: It consists of 41 folios of polished cream paper and measures 18x13 cm. The text of the \textit{sūras} is in black \textit{naskh} verging on \textit{muḥaqqaq}, with five lines to a page. The \textit{sūra} titles are all in \textit{thuluth}. We have no names for the artists responsible for its production.\footnote{The original folios of the codex are pasted on newer paper.}

The manuscript starts on folio 1a with a \textit{juz’} title page (Pl. 231) reminiscent of Raṣīd 148 (Pl. 36). The full-page illumination consists of a rectangle with a blue frame containing an upper wide rectangular panel with the inscription cartouche. The words \textit{al-}\textit{juz’} \textit{al-sābi’} ‘\textit{ashar} are inscribed in blue and surrounded by a golden cloud on a blue background like the one seen in the colophon of Raṣīd 97 (Pl. 229) and the openings of Raṣīd 147 (Pl. 52). The text and golden cloud are further adorned by half palmettes in gold. The spandrels of the rectangular panel around the cartouche have an orange background surmounted by golden half palmettes and plant motifs that are not part of a
scroll but are scattered around. The style is certainly derived from QUR 807 in the Nasser Khalili collection (Pl. 41). The ornaments around the sura title and the spandrels around the cartouches are almost identical. As mentioned in chapter two, the style probably stemmed from the workshop of al-Maydūmī, who was throughout the 1350s and must have had disciples who were possibly working until the end of the century. Raṣīd 372 is certainly from the same tradition as QUR 807.

Below the rectangular panel we have a square with the waqf text inscribed in a smaller and rougher version of the naskh seen throughout the codex (Pl. 231). It reads:

The mighty, lofty, preserved, veiled, al-mukhadhara (?) Khawand Baraka, mother of our lord the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Shaʿbān—may God make his dominion eternal and preserve her veil—has made all of this noble rabʿa a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from its reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. She has made a stipulation that its place is the madrasa known to have been built by her in the street of al-Tabbāna in Cairo the Protected. She has made a stipulation that she is the administrator of this waqf throughout her life, and after her whoever has been stipulated to do so in all [things], on the 15th of the blessed Shaʿbān the year 770/1369.

One marginal medallion adjoins the upper rectangular panel. The medallion is circular with a blue outline framing a golden border encircling a golden palmette on an orange background. The large palmette has a small trefoil in the middle. A more detailed depiction of a full palmette of this kind is in a Mamluk manuscript, Sulwān al-Mutaʿ, dated to the fourteenth century (Pl. 232). The only illumination in the interior is that of the ayā markers, which consist of small rosettes stamped with gold.

375 James, Master Scribes, 176.  
Calligraphy

A few of the letters in this naskh derive from muḥaqqqaq; these include the final nūn, final ‘ayn, final ʾain, final lām, and final yāʾ. The calligraphy shows links with a Qurʾān manuscript described in chapter two: Raṣīd 56 has close affinities in the treatment of certain letters (Pl. 19). This is particularly interesting because it shows that muḥaqqqaq influenced naskh greatly throughout the 1340s and the 1350s.

This naskh is not specific to the later period of the fourteenth century. It seems that the calligraphers who produced both this manuscript and Raṣīd 56 might have been disciples of Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Aḥmad al-Anṣārī al-Khazrajī, working in the court of the child al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (Pl. 233), or else disciples of the prince-calligrapher Shādhi ibn Muḥammad ibn Shādhī ibn Dāwūd ibn ʿIsā ibn Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb, who also worked for al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (Pl. 145), because of the way in which some of the final letters end in the naskh they produced.

Certain idiosyncrasies exist in the hand of our calligrapher here. These include the way he sometimes writes the final lām-ʾalif(ʾal-ṣalāt on folio 41a) (Pl. 234), the very small ʾsad he occasionally uses (same folio) (Pl. 234), and the very rounded final rāʾ.

Raṣīd 80

Surviving in thirteen volumes is this rabʿa from Khawand Baraka, which was also made waqtīn 770/1369 and dedicated to her madrasa. Each volume measures an average of 24.2x16 cm and consists of polished cream paper, with a text block of 18x10.5 cm. Each page contains seven lines, penned in a very good muḥaqqaq. Sūra titles are in thuluth or
The waqf of this one is a little bit different from the preceding one. It reads (Pl. 235):

The mighty, lofty, preserved, veiled, al-mukhadhara (?) Khawand Baraka, may God protect her veil, mother of our lord the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Sha'bân—may God make his dominion eternal and preserve her veil—has made all of this noble rab'a a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from its reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. She has made a stipulation that its place is the madrasa known to have been built and constructed by her in Cairo the protected in the street of al-Tabbâna, and that it may not leave the aforementioned place unless a collateral of a stated value is placed. She has made a stipulation that she is the administrator of this waqf throughout her life, and after her whoever has been stipulated to be the administrator in all of her waqf, on the 15th of the blessed Sha'bân the year 770.

Juz’ 1 starts on folio 1a with only the left side of the frontispiece; unfortunately the right side is missing (Pl. 236). The fully illuminated page, which lacks marginal decoration, consists of one large rectangle with two adorned borders; the inner border is the pearl band and the outer is the knotted grid of dots with blue squares, which in this case have a dot of red in them. The design of the rectangle is a star polygon, the center of which is a ten-pointed star radiating into a ten-fold rosette, the petals of which are blue pentagon-based hexagons with a palmette and a trefoil plant motif. The central star is adorned with a stylized golden peony, seen on marginal medallions earlier, on a blue background. The design grows to form pentagons alternating with diamond shapes, a combination not seen earlier in other manuscripts; this pattern sets this frontispiece apart, adding to its innovative quality. The pentagons and diamond shapes are blue, with golden palmettes. Orange is used as a background for all the other polygonal shapes in the composition, which is also an interesting design choice. The infinite pattern grows
and is contained and framed so that one-fifth of each of the four ten-pointed rosettes can be seen at the four corners of the rectangle.

The full rectangle with its adorned borders is framed with a thick blue border and another thin blue one, from which short, thick tassels sprout.

Folios 1b–2a carry the opening pages, which contain only *sūrat al-Fātiha* on a two-page spread (Pl. 237). The full-page illumination consists of two rectangular panels flanking the central field carrying the text of the *sūra*. The *muḥaqqaq* appears in clouds, from the outline of which sprout stalks with half palmettes adorned with a blue dot each. The way these stalks and palmettes are executed is very crude compared to earlier Qur’an manuscripts. It is similar to the floral elements that surround the *sūra* titles in this decade for the small multi-volume Qur’an manuscripts. Instead of full undulating arabesques, sprouting stalks of palmettes or other floral motifs have become sufficient.

In spite of the multi-lobed ends of the cartouches, the rectangular panels are similar to those of Rasīd 372 (Pl. 234) and Rasīd 148 (Pl. 36) in having the blue script in a golden cloud on a blue background. The upper and lower sides of the cartouche join the border of the rectangular panel, as in QUR 317 (Pl. 13). It leaves no space for the ornamentation there, as in Raṣīd 372 (Pl. 234).

The rectangular panels contain cartouches with inscriptions presenting the *sūra* title and then Q 56:77–78,377 which is used on the frontispiece more than on openings (Pl. 237). The cartouches have trilobed ends and are on a blue background; the inscription is *kūfī* in blue encased in a golden cloud from which small plant motifs are sprouting. The spandrels of the trilobed ends are orange with golden half palmettes, like

---

377 In the volumes where the beginning does not coincide with the beginning of a *sūra*, the four cartouches carry Q 56:77–80.
those surrounding the main text of the sūra. The frame here around the full-page illumination and rectangular panels is not the knotted band of the grid of dots, but rather an angular braid of gold encrusted with orange and blue. The same blue line with the short, thick tassels on the frontispiece is encountered here as well.

Each side has three marginal medallions, the one in the middle being bigger than the other two. The middle medallion contains a stylized golden peony on a blue background, exactly like those used in the margins of all the frontispieces of Raṣīd 70 (Pls. 104–109 and 115–121 for examples). These are the only two Qur’ān manuscripts with such medallions, and this resemblance suggests that the same workshop or the same person were responsible for both. The two flanking medallions contain a golden palmette on orange.

Folio 2b starts with the sūra title for sūrat al-Baqara, which is different from all other sūra titles but done in the same manner as the waqf title in all other volumes (Pl. 238).378 A rectangular panel carries the thuluth inscription in gold outlined in black and encased in a cloud. The letters which can be depicted in this manner use the tams technique,379 which we never see in muḥaqqaq, and are filled with blue. Surrounding the cloud and on a red hatching are half palmettes and plant motifs sprouting from the edges of the cloud. On the right border of the rectangular panel is a golden medallion that is off center.

Throughout juz’ 1 the marginal medallions carry the khamsa and ‘ashara markers. The khamsa is in the circular medallion with the triangular top, while the ‘ashara is in a simple circular one. Both are entirely in gold with blue outlining. The

378 Juz’ 1 lacks the page with the waqf dedication.
379 Filling in the empty parts of certain letters.
words are inscribed in *kūfī* in gold outlined in a thin black pen. Nothing special marks the closing pages of the *juz̲’,* but on folio 34a we have two lines of text saying “*sadaqa Allahu al-‘Azīm wa sadaqa rasūluhu al-karīm.*” The *sadaqa* formula ends all the volumes of this *rabʿa* (Pl. 239).

The other volumes do not have a frontispiece like *juz̲’* 1. *Juz̲’* 10 begins on folio 1a with the *waqf* dedication of Khawand Baraka (Pl. 240). A large rectangle with a golden frame and a blue outline encloses a rectangular panel in its upper part. This rectangular panel is executed in the same way as the *sūra* title of *sūrat* al-Baqara and the *waqf* statement in *juz̲’* 1, with the same text as the *waqf* in *juz̲’* 1. The rest of her titles, and the place and date of the endowment, continue in small *naskh,* with some letters verging on *muḥaqqaq,* on the rest of the rectangle beneath the decorated panel. In the middle of the rectangle, surrounded by the endowment text, is a cartouche of two intersecting circles, as in Raṣīd 148 (Pls. 35 and 37), carrying “*al-juz̲’* al-‘āshīr” in blue *thuluth* surrounded with a golden cloud on an orange background. Golden plant motifs surround the golden cloud.

The same grandiose opening is found in all volumes, even if the *juz̲’* in question does not begin with the beginning of a *sūra.* *Juz̲’* 10, whose beginning does not coincide with a *sūra* title, has an opening on folios 1b–2a similar to the opening of *sūrat* al- (*)(āl-*) in the two-page spread (Pl. 241). The difference is in the script in the cartouches in the rectangular panels. Here it is not *kūfī,* but *thuluth* in a blue darker than the ultramarine used for the background of the cartouche. The *thuluth* itself is encased in a golden cloud from which small golden leaves sprout. Since there is no *sūra* title to be enclosed in the cartouches of the four rectangular panels on the two page spread, Q 56:77–80 is used.
The verses inscribed in the central fields in *muḥaqqaq* are carried in clouds over red hatching. From the clouds sprout large leaves and floral (chinoiserie) elements.

*Juz’* 28 begins on folio 1a (Pl. 235) the same way *juz’* 10 begins (Pl. 240), with the same design, decoration, and text as *juz’* 10. The difference is in the text appearing in the two intersecting circles in the middle: here it reads “*al-thāmin wa-al-‘ishrūn,*” dropping the word ‘*al-juz’* since there is no space for it.

Folios 1b–2a carry the opening pages of the *juz’*, which coincides with the beginning of *sūrat* al-Mu’mūn (Pl. 242). They are decorated in the same way as the opening pages of the previously described volumes, but closer to *juz’* 1 than to *juz’* 10. The four cartouches carrying the *sūra* title and Q 56:77–78 are inscribed in *kūfī*, not in *thuluth*. The state of these panels is very dilapidated; it seems that the script was done in gold, which got scraped and stuck on the opposite page. Beneath the *kūfī*, on a blue background, we see a finely executed arabesque scroll whirling into clear circular undulations with half palmettes and chinoiserie elements in gold. The verses in the central field are in clouds on red hatching; large half palmettes and comma-like motifs sprout from the edges of these clouds. On top of the *bism* of the *basmala* there is a winged plant motif.380

**Calligraphy**

The large *muḥaqqaq* was used in this Qur’ān manuscript (*jafl*). Although it looks like an Egyptian style, it contains quite a few elements from the Ilkhanid school; it combines both styles, but not in a spectacular manner. Words like *lakum* (folio 7b) (Pl. 243),

---

380 This technique was to influence greatly the workshop of Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī, who will be discussed shortly.
yastahzi’ (folio 4b) (Pl. 244), or tajri (folio 6b) (Pl. 245) in juz’ 1 indicate an Ilkhanid muhāqqaq, not a Egyptian one. This shows that the now-extinct Ilkhanid school of Baghdad still exerted an influence and that the style was thriving in Mamluk Cairo probably because of calligraphers trained in its ways.

The ink occasionally runs in this script—an impression no calligrapher wants to leave. He also forgets a few words and sometimes parts of ayās, but he deals with it elegantly as al-Qūmshī does in Raṣīd 70 (Pl. 246). However, in general his hand is steady and no other Qur’ān manuscripts so far examined can be linked to this same hand. He might have been one of the less important insha’ employees.

Raṣīd 6

This Qur’ān manuscript is in one codex and is quite magnificent. As will shortly be demonstrated, this Qur’ān manuscript is a culmination of most of the styles examined in this chapter and the preceding one. It displays the perfection of the execution of geometric patterns, arabesque scrolls, and chinoiserie elements. Even though it does not introduce new elements, the whole composition seems new. Elements from the early and mid-fourteenth century are combined in a work of exceptional quality. It is a huge codex, measuring 71x50 cm. It was dedicated by Khawand Baraka to her madrasa on al-Tabbāna street in 769/1368. Now in a new leather binding, it consists of 320 folios of polished paper with a pinkish tint, inscribed in a black muhāqqaq in eleven lines to a

---

381 This manuscript and the next two will be analyzed together with the two after that. Included in the discussion will be Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59, from chapter two. This group of manuscripts shares similarities that tells us they were indeed produced by the same workshop. The only signed one is Raṣīd 8, which gives the name of the calligrapher. The approach here follows the lead of Martin Lings and David James. It will, however, enter into a more detailed analysis.
page. *Sūra* titles are in *thuluth* and *kūfi*. It is most regrettable that no names are given in the codex. The *waqf* dedication in the beginning reads (Pl. 247):

The mighty, lofty, preserved, *al-mukhadhara* (?), veiled Khawand Baraka mother of our lord, the noble, the blessed, the great, the Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Abū al-Muẓaffar Sha’bān—may God make his dominion eternal and preserve her veil—has made this blessed *mushaf* a rightful and lawful *waqf* so that all Muslims can benefit from its reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. She has made a stipulation that its place is the *madrasa* known to have been built and constructed by her in Cairo the protected in the street of al-Ṭabbāna, and that it may not leave the aforementioned unless a collateral of a stated value is placed. She has made a stipulation that she is the administrator of this *waqf* throughout her life, and after her whoever has been stipulated to be the administrator after her. She was witnessed on all of this on a blessed Monday 3rd of the month of Dhī al-Qi`da the sanctified, the year 769 of the Prophetic Hijra.

The manuscript begins on folio 1a with the *waqf* statement beautifully inscribed in *tawqī‘* in eight lines framed with a golden border outlined in blue (Pl. 247). The first and last lines are in gold outlined in black, with red vocalization and some blue-filled letters (*tams*). Folios 1b–2a carry the frontispiece (Pl. 248). The full-page illumination displays a square as the central field, as in Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 154). The rosette unfolds into pentagon-based hexagons and polygonal shapes. In each corner of the square a fourth of a star (like the one in the middle) can be seen. Only gold and blue are used to highlight the different shapes embedded in the star polygon. Green is used in the heart of the palmettes that are used as fillers for the various shapes that make up the geometric design. The center of the twelve-pointed star contains a small six-pointed star surrounded by palmettes braided into a wreath. At the four ends of the cross-axis of the central field, a green scroll on a pink background adorns each of the four polygonal shapes. The line used to construct the star polygon in the central field is not a simple black line, but a thin pearl band.
Framing the star polygon is a thin braid bordered by a frame in a style seen here for the first time. On a vermilion background, pinkish-white lotuses alternate with orange lotuses, carried on a very thin and delicate golden scroll. Flanking each lotus is a small pinkish-white flower adorned by a green dot, like the one adorning the lotuses. In conception the large flower border was seen in Raṣīd 70 (Pl. 107), but the use of the exclusively chinoiserie elements and the delicate execution make this border stand out. The scroll is relegated to a secondary role and the focus is on the floral elements.

Two golden rectangular panels flank the central field and its borders on the top and bottom. Each panel contains a cartouche, with pronounced trilobed edges. The difference between the trilobed edges here and other trilobed-edged cartouches is that the three lobes here are of the same size. At each end a quatrefoil rosette adorns the spandrels.\(^{382}\) This use of the quatrefoil (with the rounded ends) is found in the early Ilkhanid school of Baghdad, as seen in the work of the illuminator Muḥammad ibn Mubādir and the calligrapher Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī (Pl. 249).\(^{383}\) It seems that most of the Ilkhanid connections that we have seen so far relate to the early Baghdad school, when manuscript production reached its height under Ghāzān, Rashīd al-Dīn, and Uljäytū. It might be that these later Mamluk artists were trained by or originated from the workshops of Baghdad primarily and other centers secondarily.

The cartouche and flanking rosettes have a blue background and carry script in kūfī. The inscription is Q 26:192–97, divided among the four cartouches. Framing the central field and the two flanking panels is the band of the knotted grid of dots executed in black on gold with small white squares, not blue or red. To the right and left of the

\(^{382}\) As in the opening pages of Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7.

\(^{383}\) Lings, *Splendours*, 69 (pl. 76).
knotted grid band, a thin pearl band is clearly visible. Bordering all of this is a lotus band. The lotus here is different from the inner band on vermilion and is not set on a scroll; it is part of lush vegetation in gold on orange. Two different lotuses alternate as they circle around the rectangle. One is mostly pink, with blue in the two lower petals and center, while the other has blue petals except for the two lower ones and the center, which are pink.

The arabesque band framing the entire composition is not new but is one of the best: it is a golden scroll with half palmettes and full palmettes adorned in green and red on a blue background. A medallion adorns the center of the margin on each page, almost identical to the medallions used in the margins next to the frontispiece in Raṣīd 8, where we first saw it (Pl. 154). It is certainly Ilkhanid-inspired.\textsuperscript{384} The background is blue, adorned with an undulating golden arabesque scroll going in circles and displaying a central motif forming the horizontal axis of the composition. This central motif creates the symmetry between the two sides, but this symmetry does not interfere with the continuous execution of the arabesque scroll. The central motif is made up of half palmettes with an orange center. They are topped with a closed lotus bud in pink and two shades of blue, which connect via the scroll to a closed half palmette combination in gold with a trefoil in the middle. This connects in turn to a smaller plant in gold and green.

The opening pages on folios 2b–3a are as elaborate as the frontispiece and use known elements in new parts of the composition (Pl. 251). The two-page spread carries

\textsuperscript{384} Similar Ilkhanid examples earlier than Raṣīd 8, hence before 757/1356, include the works of Muḥammad ibn Aybak in the early years of the fourteenth century. An example of them is Pl. 250. The Ilkhanid material does not use circles like the Mamluk ones; it is the filling that is similar.
the *sūrat* al-Fātiḥa on one side and al-Baqara on the other side. The script is in gold *muhāqqaq* outlined in black, displayed in a cloud, with five lines to a page including the *basmala*. The background is unprecedented. Various pink chinoiserie elements are placed in a busy manner, looking as if wind is blowing through them. No scroll can be seen. It is a very naturalistic rendering in the movement of the floral elements, but the execution of the flowers themselves is the Mamluk interpretation of the Chinese-inspired elements borrowed from the Ilkhanid style. This becomes clear when this manuscript is compared to one of the earliest painted Ilkhanid manuscripts, the *Jāmī‘ al-tawārīkh* of Rashīd al-Dīn (714/1314). The throne on which Luhrasp is sitting is decorated with the same blossoms in the same manner, but not in pink (Pl. 252).\(^{385}\) A Chinese prototype is seen, also in a Mongol context, in a mural on the north wall of a tomb in Dongercun, China, dated to c. 1270 (Pl. 253).\(^{386}\)

Verse markers are not the simple rayed rosettes we have been seeing in almost all Qurʾān manuscripts, but rather medallions of gold, outlined in blue, with a central rosette of whirling petals (Pl. 251). Even Raṣīd 8 has the typical markers (Pl. 156). This is possibly due to the changes and evolution in the workshop in charge; there is about a decade’s difference between the two manuscripts. A golden frame, a pearl band, and a floral band, similar to the one surrounding the central field on each side of the frontispiece, surround the central field here, carrying the verses. This floral band has a red background with plant motifs and a stylized peony alternating with a lotus. Blue is used heavily alongside the pink and white in the lotus and peony flowers. Another thin

---


\(^{386}\) Kadoi, *Islamic Chinoiserie*, 183.
pearl band frames the lotus-peony band. A band of the knotted grid of dots, in black on gold, frames the entire composition.

Each page, 2b and 3a (Pl. 251), has two rectangular panels flanking the central field, carrying the sûra titles and the verse count of each in floriated kūfī in lobed cartouches. The design of the rectangular panels is quite masterful. The cartouche has a blue background with an undulating arabesque scroll and the kūfī. Each of its ends is a semicircle with shoulders and a small green circle at the apex of the semicircle. The innovation is not only in the cartouche’s end but also in the spandrels, which contain a design typical of central fields of frontispieces. Each spandrel has an eight-pointed star unfolding into an octagonal rosette, the petals of which are pentagon-based hexagons on a blue background with golden palmettes. Since a star polygon design is infinite, the edges of another star surround the ends of the cartouche. The outermost band framing the entire rectangle is a stylized scroll with half palmettes in gold and green on blue. The medallions in the middle of the margins are the same as the ones in the frontispiece, but with a larger plant motif at the edge of the medallion.

The inner folios are as fascinating as the beginning. The āya markers are different from those used in the opening pages and from anything else we have seen so far (Pl. 254). They are medallions of orange with a blue outline, containing a golden peony with blue dots. A golden frame, outlined in blue, frames the text of eleven lines. The marginal elements are unusually large, which was possible because of the size of the margins. The khamsa markers appear in the medallions with rectangular tops, while the ʿashara ones are in circular medallions. Both are outlined in blue with a golden filling and kūfī script on an orange background.
Sūra titles are varied and are as innovative as the rest of the illumination program (Pl. 255). Each is a rectangular panel with four or five cartouches carrying the text in white *muḥaqqaq*. The background is sometimes blue or orange and there are golden floral elements beneath the text. Some of the cartouches in these rectangular panels carry black *muḥaqqaq* on the paper color and no decoration; in these cases this text consists of the final words in the preceding *sūra*. The cartouches come in various shapes: almond, circular, and multi-lobed. From each *sūra* title a roundel protrudes into the margin, with a large lotus in gold and blue on orange and other chinoiserie elements. This idea was seen earlier in Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 85), which was part of the Sultan Ḥasan group like Raṣīd 8, and Raṣīd 8 is connected to this manuscript.

Similar to the opening pages (2b–3a) are the closing ones (319b–320a) (Pl. 256); the differences are perhaps intended to show the excellence of the illuminator. The text of the last two *sūras*, al-Falq and al-Nās, is in black *muḥaqqaq*, rather than gold in clouds. It is also indented on both sides and so does not extend to the full width of the rectangle. This is perhaps the first instance of this style. The backgrounds of the text and the ʿāya markers are the same as the opening pages. A floral band, flanked by two thin pearl bands, surrounds the text as in the opening pages. Here, however, the flowers are a lotus alternating with a full palmette. Both flowers have blue petals (two tones of blue), red (two tones), and green at the base of the palmette. The background is orange, and golden and green stalks fill the spaces between the flowers. This is further framed with a band of the knotted grid of dots, black on gold, but in this case with red squares.

The two rectangular panels adorning each of the closing pages and carrying the *sūra* and verse count are also very similar to those of the openings. Even though the
spandrels are decorated with the same geometric pattern, here the eight-pointed star has more orange than gold. The cartouches carrying the kūfī are filled with blue and have thin delicate scrolls of gold beneath the text. These cartouches differ from those of the openings, and each ends in octagons with convex sides as seen in Rażīd 149 (Pl. 30). These small octagons are decorated in the center with a golden lotus on an orange background. In the outermost frame, the scroll of palmettes can be easily identified here, unlike in the opening pages where it is not clear. More colors are also used here, especially orange.

A medallion adorns the middle of each margin. The medallions here have a simpler scroll than the ones in the opening or the frontispiece. The result is that the medallion appears more blue than gold. Some of the floral elements are dark orange and green, which adds to the dark look of the medallions.

A Qur’ān Manuscript for Arghūn Shāh al-Malakī al-Ashrafī

Rażīd 54

This manuscript was produced for Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafī, an amīr associated with a very important patron, Sultan al-Ashraf Sha’bān. It consists of 388 folios measuring 69x51 cm with eleven lines to a page, on cream polished paper. We do not have a date, but the waqf naming Arghūn Shāh on folio 1a gives us 778/1376, his death date, as the terminus ad quem. It unfortunately does not give us any names for those who produced it. The waqf statement on folio 1a is in three lines, the first of which lacks its first half (Pl. 257):

…Arghūn Shāh al-Malakī al-Ashrafī, may God glorify his victories and fulfill his wishes and wants in the two homes (this world and the next),
all of this blessed *mushaf* on all the Muslims so that they benefit from reading it and all other aspects…

Codicological examination suggests that someone intentionally removed the word *waqf*, and possibly a year that was inscribed after it, from the first line. The culprit was possibly Muṣṭafā Shūrājī Mirza, who might have confiscated this codex for his mosque in Būlāq in 1100/1698, since it was brought from there in the nineteenth century to be deposited in the National Library. ³⁸⁷

This manuscript is interesting, as it fits between Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 7 from the Sultan Sha'bān subgroup to be discussed shortly. It was most certainly produced by the same illumination workshop, as will be seen from the description and analysis of its details. It is also the same size as Raṣīd 6. The double-page frontispiece on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 258) has the same number of borders as Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248). The central field, which is also a square, is a sixteen-pointed star unfolding into a sixteen-fold rosette. The illuminator here is experimenting with a bigger star than in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 6, which was twelve-pointed. Because of its size we cannot see the star segments in the corners of the square. The outermost visible layer of the rosette consists of pentagon-based hexagons alternating with half stars. The innovation here is in the color used for the pentagon-based hexagons, which is red. The use of red adds a different feel to the entire composition and distinguishes it considerably from Raṣīd 6. A thin pearl band forms the contours of the geometric pattern. The central star has a white center surrounded by a multi-layered fret with tiny trefoils in gold and white on blue. The floral border around the central field has orange peonies with green centers alternating

³⁸⁷ This fact is recorded in tiny script beneath the *waqf* statement.
with pinkish-white lotuses, also with green centers. The background is blue, rather than orange as in Raṣīd 6, and the golden scroll around the chinoiserie elements also holds blue and green petals, flowing naturally.

In the four rectangular panels, the cartouches bearing the central inscription merge with lateral elements, forming a lengthy multi-lobed cartouche carrying Q 26:192–97 (Pl. 258). Each cartouche fills the entire rectangular panel, leaving little space for the spandrels. The kūfī is in white on a blue background with a fine golden arabesque scroll. The band of the knotted grid of gold dots frames the whole composition and is further framed with a band of white and blue lotuses and peonies alternating on a golden background, with golden plant motifs and stalks. The same kind of band is seen in Raṣīd 6, but with lotuses only (Pl. 248). The outermost border is an arabesque scroll on blue. The scroll has cream-colored trefoils and green closed lotus buds. The marginal medallion is also very similar to the ones in Raṣīd 6: large circles of blue with an intricate golden arabesque scroll around a closed, cream-colored lotus and a green heart. Here the illuminator adds a white scroll to intertwine with the golden one. As an innovation, the white scroll features half palmettes in black outlined in white.

Folios 2b–3a carry the opening sūras (Pl. 259): sūrat al-Fāṭiḥa on folio 2b and sūrat al-Baqara on folio 3a. Five lines of golden muḥaqqaq, including the basmala, beautify the two pages. Āya markers are exactly like the ones in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251). The tams of the letters is red. The four rectangular panels displaying sūra titles and verse count spread over the two pages and contain multi-lobed cartouches. The central cartouche containing the sūra title in white floriated kūfī is on a blue background with a fine golden arabesque scroll. The spandrels created by the cartouche are filled with a
quatrefoil each, like the quatrefoil in the same place in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 6. In these quatrefoils the background is also blue, the scroll is green, and the floriated kūfi is in gold. The bits of the spandrels that are not occupied by any of the lobes have a black background adorned with white plant motifs, unlike in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 6 where it is gold instead of black. Each rectangular panel is framed with a golden band of the knotted grid of dots, and the whole composition is framed with a floral border, which not only surrounds the central field carrying the text of the sūras but goes in and out around the rectangular panels and the central field.

The marginal medallions in the opening (Pl. 259) are like those in the frontispiece (Pl. 258), and resemble those in the frontispiece and opening of Raṣīd 6 as well (Pls. 248 and 251). All the other medallions adorning the inner pages (Pl. 260) are exactly like those seen in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 254). The khamsa is in the circle with the triangular top, while the ‘ashara is in a circle. As in Raṣīd 6, the area in the margins next to every sūra title is adorned with a circular golden medallion displaying a lotus.

Sūra titles throughout the codex present a dazzling array of elaborately decorated rectangular panels containing several cartouches in varying shapes (Pl. 261), from the same repertoire of shapes used for the sūra titles in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 255). In the instances where the cartouches do not have colored or decorated backgrounds, it is because the text is part of the last āya or the last āya of the given sūra.

The closing pages, folios 387b–388a, carry the two last sūras (113 and 114) in five lines each, including the basmala (Pl. 262). The golden muḥaqqaq is interspersed with āya markers with interesting details. The medallions, whose outer border is red, have an inner circular border of blue and red Ilkhanid petals. The innermost circle is gold.
with an outlined rosette, surrounded by a tiny pearl band. The āya markers are spiked in the same manner as marginal medallions. A frame not encountered before in the Mamluk milieu borders the central field, which carries the text in five lines. It is a simple floral scroll with red and green flowers on small golden stems. The background of this peculiar border is black.

The four rectangular panels containing cartouches with the sūra titles (Pl. 262) are also reminiscent of Rašīd 6 (Pl. 256). The central cartouche is certainly new, resembling a butterfly with opened wings. Its spandrels, however, are done in the same way as the spandrels of the opening and closing pages of Rašīd 6: an eight-pointed star polygon with pentagon-based hexagons adorning them. The band of the knotted grid of dots surrounds the entire composition, along with a floral frame of lotuses alternating with peonies on orange. The outermost, stylized golden palmette scroll on blue and the medallions in the margins are typical of this workshop.

Endowments by Sultan Sha‘bān

Rašīd 7

The first codex on the list for this great patron fits perfectly within the workshop that produced both Rašīd 6 and Rašīd 54. Rašīd 7 was dedicated by Sultan Sha‘bān (r. 764–78/1363–77) to his mother’s madrasa in 770/1369. It was not produced in this year, but was most certainly produced in the 1360s and during his reign. It consists of one codex of 409 folios of cream polished paper and is penned in black muḥaqqaq with eleven lines per page. Sūra titles and the accompanying verse count are in floriated kūfī. This codex is a bit bigger than the previous two, 83x54 cm, possibly because it was for the monarch.
himself. Like the previous two Qur’ān manuscripts, we have no illuminator or calligrapher to whom to assign this work. However, the long and elaborate waqf dedication that characterizes the manuscripts of Sultan Sha‘bān reads (Pl. 263):

Our lord, the mighty, the noble, the lofty, the lordly, the sulṭānī, the imāmī, the ’ādili, the mujāhdi, the murābītī, the muthaghirī, the hīṣnī, the malādhī, the mālikī, the māra, the ashrāfī, the nāṣiri, upholder of the victory of the world and religion, the sultan of Islam and Muslims, the slayer of the unbelievers and polytheists, the supporter of those against whom injustice was inflicted by the unjust, oppressor of the khawārij, and the atheists, Abū al-Muẓaffar Sha‘bān—may God make his dominion and rule eternal and make his justice and goodness overwhelm all his subjects and renew for him a victory every day and make him possess all the land and sea—son of our lord, the mighty, the noble, the glorious Ḫusayn, son of our lord the sultan, the happy, the martyr al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, son of the martyr sultan, the king al-Mansūr Qalāwūn al-Saliḥi—may God have mercy on all of them—has made this noble mushaf a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. He has made a stipulation that its place is the madrasa known to have been built by his mother in Cairo the protected in the street of al-Ṭabbaña, and it may not leave the aforementioned place unless a collateral of a stated value is placed. He has made a stipulation that he is the administrator of this waqf throughout his life, and after his death whoever has been stipulated to be the administrator in his waqf. He was witnessed on all this on the 15th of Sha‘bān, the year 770. May God make its events/consequences good through his blessings on whomever he wishes; He is the All-Powerful. May God bless/pray for our master Muḥammad and his family.

This waqf statement is the first illuminated element we encounter. On folio 1a a knotted border with golden frames and a blue outline encases a large rectangle, the upper part of which is contained in a cartouche with curved ends enclosing an inscription in thick golden thuluth on a blue background. The scroll beneath the text is an undulating arabesque scroll in red, green, and gold. By this time, green has become a very important color for scrolls. The rest of the rectangle, carrying the text of the waqf in black muḥaqqaq with some characteristics of naskh, contains thirteen lines with the name “Sha‘bān” in large golden thuluth. A simple blue scroll with half palmettes tops
the text, and a golden one on a blue background depicting different views of the lotus flower adorns the bottom.

While this manuscript is most certainly from the same workshop as Rašīd 6 and Rašīd 54, the illuminator takes things a step further here. The double-page frontispiece on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 264) is adorned by a central field with a sixteen-pointed star as in Rašīd 54. The color scheme is closer to Rašīd 6 (Pl. 248) than it is to Rašīd 54 (Pl. 258), since red is not used. A novelty is the use of black as a background to some of the star polygon shapes. We find it as a background to the arrowhead-shaped motifs, the central star, and the palmette bases in the pentagon-based hexagons.

The central field is surrounded with a border of simple cartouches alternating with medallions displaying rosettes, which is a new and innovative appearance for a border. The cartouches have a blue background with a golden arabesque scroll beneath white kūfī. These cartouches carry Q 35:29–32 (ending at the word bi al-khayrāt) starting on folio 1b in the right bottom cartouche on the vertical border cartouche and ending on the lower left cartouche on the horizontal border on folio 2a in the left bottom cartouche. The rosettes in the medallions are compound peonies: one small green and white peony in the middle surrounded by a larger one in shaded orange. Small white trefoils in white on black occupy the small areas between the medallions and the cartouches. A thin pearl band surrounds the cartouches and the medallions, tying them together.

A golden floral border frames the entire composition, including the four rectangular panels at the top and bottom of the central field. Multi-lobed cartouches, eight in total, two in each panel, are juxtaposed and carry Q 26:192–97 in white
floriated *kūfī* on a blue background and a golden arabesque scroll. The spandrels created by both cartouches are black, with white mirrored scrolls with a red center.

The chinoiserie floral border characteristic of this workshop is also found here around the whole composition, but with full and closed palmettes and lotuses in degraded pink and blue alternating with smaller green lotuses, surrounded by a naturalistic golden scroll on an orange background. The outermost border with a blue background is also typical of this workshop.

The marginal medallions in the frontispiece are very similar to Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248) and Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 258). The difference is primarily in the two half palmettes flanking the middle flower and forming wings. The central flower is cream and green; the half palmettes around it, making up wings and even tails, are white with red detailing. On the golden scroll on top of the blue background, the central flower and white half palmettes stand out.

The opening pages on folios 2b–3a (Pl. 265) are very similar to the opening pages of Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259). The double-page spread with *sūrat al-Fātiḥa* on the right and *sūrat al-Baqara* on the left has a central field with five lines of golden *muḥaqqaq*, including the *basmala*. The āya markers are like the ones in the closing pages of Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 262); the differences are in the lack of the spiked border and the emphasis on the petals on the cross-axis of the medallion. The background of the text is unlike Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), which has a scroll, or Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259), whose background is plain; this Qur’ān manuscript has faint lines of semicircles, with a dot at the top of each semicircle. Bordering the central field only is a floral band with flowers like those in the same band
in the openings of Raṣīd 54. They are neither peonies nor lotuses. But here the blue is minimal and the orange background is still bright.

The four rectangular panels carrying sūra titles and verse count are also like those in the openings of Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259). The multi-lobed cartouche in the middle, with the main text in white floriated kūfī on a golden scroll with a blue background, is flanked by two quatrefoils whose floriated kūfī is gold on a green scroll with a blue background. The spandrels are orange with golden blossoms. This workshop borders its design details with a thin pearl band. It is very interesting to see how the use of this band has evolved through the ages. In addition to the band of the knotted grid of dots in gold used as a border, an extra border reminiscent of the black floral border is used here, as in the closing pages of Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 262). Here in Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 265) the background is golden but the peonies are red, the same red that is used in Raṣīd 54, which gives this manuscript the same feel.

The outermost border is the same as in the Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259) and Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251) openings, with minor differences in the color choices, the most significant of which is the use of red. The marginal medallions are also similar to the previous two Qurʾān manuscripts, but especially resemble Raṣīd 54 in the employment of white half palmettes and petals filled with red. The innovation is in the use of a thin white crescent to border part of the medallion. This white crescent thins as it approaches the top and then disappears. This element has its roots in the early Qurʾān manuscripts of the Ilkhanids. For instance, a Qurʾān manuscript penned by Aḥmad al-Suhrawardī and illuminated by Muḥammad ibn Aybak in Baghdad shows a marginal medallion with a crescent (Pl. 214).
Suṣra titles are once again a fabulous display of shapes and manipulation of script. Kuṅi, thuluth, and muhaqqaq are used in the different cartouches making up the rectangular panels of the Suṣra titles. In one case in Suṣra al-Dīn the word makkīyya is placed vertically (Pl. 266). In Suṣra al-Kawthar, the word al-Kawthar is also placed vertically in an almond shape, in gold on blue surrounded with gold scrolls (Pl. 267). It seems to be inspired by the late twelfth/early thirteenth-century Jazira tradition. QUR 497 in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 12) displays in its frontispiece almond shapes that look very similar to these, except for the use of text.388 Also like the previous two Qurʾan manuscripts, the text of some Suṣras, parts of āyas, or complete āyas are sometimes placed in the cartouches of the following Suṣra title (Pls. 266 and 267). They are always in muhaqqaq on a plain background.

Marginal medallions take us back to the previous decades, the 1340s and 1350s, and to the Ilkhanid world once again. Colored petals in various hues adorn almost every marginal medallion. All the medallions are circular, some bigger than others. Some have a long tassel at the top and bottom; others have a base of two large half palmettes that look like wings and support the entire medallion. Beside every Suṣra title throughout the codex is a medallion with a central lotus, as in Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 54 (Pls. 254, 255, 260, and 261).

The āya markers in the inner folios are different from the ones in the two previous Qurʾan manuscripts (Pl. 268). They are simpler here; each is a whirling golden rosette.

388 James, Master Scribes, 44.
The closing pages (Pl. 269) also reflect the same illumination program of this workshop. They display the same compositions as seen earlier, so it is not necessary to describe them in detail. However, the main differences are important to point out. An innovation is in the medallions in the spandrels of the cartouches carrying the *sūra* titles. Here they are octagons with convex sides, creating triangles between them and the bigger cartouches in the middle. The floral band around the central field has a green background; this use of green is another innovation. Peonies are employed in this band, the first time they have been used in this size. Golden dots, encountered here for the first time, frame the four rectangular panels carrying *sūra* titles. The marginal medallions incorporate petals in different hues into the crescent surrounding them.\(^{389}\)

Analysis: Raṣīds 6, 54, and 7 and their Relation with Raṣīd 8
(Star Polygon Group workshop)
It is most fitting to begin with Richard Ettinghausen’s comment on Raṣīd 54, which applies to all the manuscripts believed to have been produced by this workshop:

These decorative pages represent the highest form of non-objective painting in the Arab-Muslim world. Although their vibrant discs and starlike polygons were genetically associated with the sun—as is evident from the Arabic designation, *shamsa*, from *shams* (sun)—these products of abstract thinking and geometry have gone beyond the concrete shapes of the material world. These configurations made of straight lines and segments of circles have reached a higher, more basic form of esthetic perfection, a kind of platonic ideal “whose beauty is not relative like that of other things”; as Socrates says in *Philebus*, “they are always absolutely beautiful.”\(^{390}\)

\(^{389}\) It is interesting that the same motifs are re-employed in different places, giving rise to infinite possibilities, just like the geometric compositions on which they are based.

Indeed, this workshop produced the greatest Qur’ān manuscripts of the century, if not the entire history of Islamic Egypt. Martin Lings was the first to suggest that these manuscripts were produced by the same hand or group of hands. David James concurred and gave them the name “Star Polygon Group.” He establishes Sultan Ḥasan’s Raṣīd 8 as the link between an earlier Qur’ān manuscript, kept in the Iran Bastan Museum, produced in 1339 and penned by Aḥmad al-Muḥṣinī, probably for al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, and the three manuscripts Raṣīd 6, 54, and 7. Another manuscript to be added to the group is Raṣīd 59 from the Sultan Ḥasan subgroup, which, as seen in chapter two, is clearly connected to and produced by the same workshop that produced Raṣīd 8 for Sultan Ḥasan. We will now examine the connections between the manuscripts in some detail, since it is clear that it was indeed the same workshop that produced all of them and potentially Raṣīd 8 and 59 as well—a workshop that evolved over two decades and utilized Ilkhanid-Chinese elements in the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscript tradition. David James assumes that it was most probably located in Damascus, but a Cairo center is also possible. These connections regarding the Ilkhanid-Chinese elements are contextualized in the discussion of the patrons in chapter six, since the current, if preliminary, assumption is that artists and scholars from the Persian lands came to Cairo during the reign of Sultan Ḥasan because of the support given to them by amīr Ṣirghitmish. Sultan Ḥasan’s own connection to the Persians is yet to be established.

391 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 180.
392 Iran Bastan Museum, Tehran, 2061. James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 147, 180.
393 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 188. He argues that the workshop originated in Damascus, which might be the case.
Frontispieces

The most important characteristic of this workshop is the square central field. It is certainly not an innovation, but the rectangle was the most popular shape to be used for central fields during the century. This workshop made the square their stamp rather than an exception. The closest thing to a square central field during this time can be found in Raṣīd 70: the frontispieces making up group two are set in a square.394

The abundant use of gold starts with Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 154), where it is used in unprecedented amounts. Only the outermost border and the marginal medallions in Raṣīd 8 introduce other colors besides gold and blue. The other three manuscripts, Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248), 54 (Pl. 258), and 7 (Pl. 264), use other colors besides gold and blue, but gold is still the king.

The central star is twelve-sided in both Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 6. As the workshop evolves throughout the decade, by the date of Raṣīd 54 and the later Raṣīd 7 the star has become sixteen-sided. In contrast, the largest stars found in earlier Mamluk Qurʾān frontispieces were ten-sided. The Iran Bastan Museum Qurʾān manuscript, however, also has a twelve-sided star (Pl. 155).

In all of these manuscripts, more attention is given to the geometric pattern than to the fillers. Throughout the previous chapter it was seen that both were important in earlier decades. This was certainly the case with the Șandal workshop, which must have been the original base for this style because it emphasized both.

394 It is most interesting to see how the presence of Raṣīd 70 has influenced several other manuscripts. It might not have been copied exactly, but the myriad of new elements it introduced clearly inspired and influenced other works.
The cartouches carrying the text all have a blue background. The script is white in all except in Raṣīd 6, where it is the paper’s color, pinkish. All have a golden arabesque scroll. The Iran Bastan Qurʾān manuscript shows golden kūfī on a white scroll. The script is kūfī in Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 7—and, one might add, it is the same floriated kūfī. Raṣīd 8 is in thuluth, in keeping with the style preferred by Sultan Ḥasan. In this respect it is quite different from the other three, which changed over a decade. It is also not on an arabesque scroll, but features scattered plant motifs. This is where Raṣīd 59 comes in. It does not have a frontispiece, but the opening pages (Pl. 86) have cartouches done in the same exact way as the cartouches in Raṣīd 8. The script, the plant motifs, and the spandrels of the cartouches are all the same. These spandrels in both Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59 are in gold with the chinoiserie blossoms flowing around in an outlined black, exactly like the background of the text in the opening pages of Raṣīd 6. In Raṣīd 6 the background is pink, and is drawn behind verses of sūrat al-arters and sūrat al-Baqara. As has already been stated, this is a copy of Chinese depictions of the same ornaments on different media.395

A very important characteristic of this workshop, after it had developed further under the rule of Sultan Shaʿbān, is the border of lotuses and/or peonies, which are lacking in Raṣīd 8. The peony was used in a very abstract manner in Raṣīd 70. Their depiction here in a frame is quite different, however. It is not a lotus in a medallion or a peony as a central star, but rather a row of lotuses and peonies delicately executed and colored. In the three Qurʾān manuscripts, Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 7, these rows

around the central fields make the manuscripts stand out and tie them together to the same hand.

Another development is the extended color palette that was introduced by Rašīd 6, Rašīd 54, and Rašīd 7. While gold and blue are still the primary colors, the central fields of these three introduce red and green.

Also very important for tying the manuscripts together are the marginal medallions. They bind the four manuscripts, Rašīd 8, Rašīd 6, Rašīd 54, and Rašīd 7, together even more closely and constitute substantial proof that they belong to the same workshop. The medallions are almost the same in all of them, with minor variations in the arabesque scroll and the positioning of the closed flower bud. They are quite different from the marginal medallion in the Iran Bastan Museum, and closer to Ilkhanid examples in not being contained in a circle.

**Opening Pages**

Rašīd 8 (Pl. 156) differs from the other three with respect to the opening pages. It is almost exactly like the opening in juz’ 1 of Rašīd 59 (Pl. 86), except for the text and its distribution. The other three manuscripts stand as witnesses to the innovations of this workshop. Rašīd 54 (Pl. 259) and Rašīd 7 (Pl. 265) are the most similar, because of the cartouches in the rectangular panels carrying the sūra title and āya count. The experiment in Rašīd 8 of employing golden text in the uppermost and lowermost lines of text was successful enough to lead to the innovation of presenting the three opening pages entirely in golden script.
The chinoiserie band that identifies this workshop is in the three manuscripts, but on a smaller scale than on their frontispieces. Other naturalistic floral elements are also employed, especially in Raṣīd 7, whose row of red flowers has not been seen before.

Each background to the text is different, Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251) being the most elaborate of all of them and the one with the most Ilkhanid connections.

The marginal elements of the three manuscripts are like those adorning the frontispieces and differ from the marginal elements in both Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59. However, the similarity between these medallions and those in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 8 connects Raṣīd 8 once again to this group of manuscripts. In Raṣīd 7, as mentioned earlier, there is a white crescent around the medallion. This is a Mamluk interpretation of an earlier Ilkhanid example.

**Inner folios (with most sūra titles)**

Sūra titles appear in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 255), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 261), and Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 266 and 267) in a myriad of shapes contained in the rectangular panels. These cartouches are all created by the intersection of variously sized circles; we have full circles, almond shapes, rounded quatrefoils, and others. Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 159) is different in having no cartouches; the text is on top of the scroll in the rectangular panels. Similarities are in the color palette, which is made up mostly of blue, gold, orange, green, and white. Kūfī and thuluth are used in Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 7, while Raṣīd 8 uses only thuluth.

A important link between the three Qur’ān manuscripts and Raṣīd 8 is the continuation of the text of the sūras in the rectangular panels carrying the sūra titles. In all four manuscripts when this happens the text is invariably muhaqqaq on a plain
background. This technique has not been encountered before in Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts, but once again has an Ilkhanid root. As mentioned earlier, Raṣīd 72, which was commissioned in 1313 by the Ilkhanid wāzīr Rashīd al-Dīn, has been in Cairo since the 1320s. It is rather surprising that this manuscript did not have a more direct impact on the overall design and look of Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts. However, a few of its individual elements were adopted. This continuation of the text in the panels reserved for the sūra titles happens in Raṣīd 72 (Pl. 270). As an Iraqi/Iranian tradition it has a long history. The same technique is seen in an early Qur’ān manuscript, CBL Is 1439, dated to the late twelfth/early thirteenth century and ascribed to Iraq or Iran (Pl. 271).\textsuperscript{396} This Qur’ān manuscript was penned in naskh, a naskh that looks like a smaller muḥaqqaq yet not a rayhān. The text continues in naskh in the rectangular panels which also carry the sūra titles in kūfī; its background is adorned, not plain.

Considerable development in the marginal medallions can be seen when the chronological sequence is observed. Raṣīd 8 medallions fit in the 1350s but differ in that some of them have a lotus, gold on orange (Pl. 156) or blue on orange (Pl. 158). The gold-on-orange lotus also appears in the other three manuscripts, but the medallions are bigger, with more frames, and the lotus contains a little blue. The increase in the number of frames culminates in Raṣīd 7 (Pls. 266 and 267), where the colored petal border, which is very Ilkhanid, makes for a perfect finale.

\textsuperscript{396} Wright, \textit{Islam: Faith, Art and Culture}, 12.
Closing Pages

The most important aspect of the closing pages, for comparative and analytical purposes, is the presence of Chinese floral elements in the background of the text in the central field. This can be seen in the openings pages of Rašīd 8 (Pls. 156) and again in its closing pages (Pl. 158). All the closing pages (Pls. 256, 269, and 158), except for Rašīd 54 (Pl. 262), have this background. It will be recalled that a floral/arabesque sūra background is not new; what is new is the adoption of this specific background, seen in Chinese and Ilkhanid art, into Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts. This development supports the possibility that these artists were the disciples, or disciples of disciples, of Ilkhanid masters operating in the Mamluk world after the Ilkhanid world collapsed.

Calligraphy

Egyptian muḥaqqaq at its best is used in all of these manuscripts (Pls. 254, 255, 256, 259, 260, 261, 262, 266, 267, 268, 153, 156, 159), and in Rašīd 59 as well (Pl. 89). Rašīd 8 is the only one that gives us a name for the calligrapher: Yaʿqūb ibn Khālīl ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafī (Pl. 272). He is a master calligrapher, as is clear from his hands. He himself, or a disciple of his, may have been responsible for the other manuscripts as well. Comparisons of some letters and anomalies will help shed light on this matter. The argument put forth by David James is that, because of the differences between the scripts, one man could not have penned all three of these manuscripts. James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 184.
The opening pages of Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 156), Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259), and Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 265) are in gold muḥaqqaq, which is not a novelty in the Mamluk world but a rarity. An earlier example is the Qurʾān manuscript for al-Nāṣir Muḥammad penned by amīr Muḥammad ibn Bayāfīk al-Muḥsīnī in 730/1330 (Pl. 273).\footnote{James, Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks, 184.}

We may take one of the small sūras as an example for comparison, for the sake of clarity. Sūrat al-Masad is a good example. We will begin with Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 261) and Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 267), because in both of them all the letters and words in the two lines of text are exactly the same, with the same placement of vocalization, the same size, and the same treatment of the ḥurūf al-muhmala (the letters that are not dotted) and the ḥurūf al-muʿjama (the letters that are dotted). The only exception in a letter treatment is the ḥāʾ in labab. The ʿayn and ghayn are the same with the same proportion; they are both oversized as compared to the other letters and when compared to their execution in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 255) and Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 159). The kāfʿ in Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7 is exactly the same, and different from the other two manuscripts. Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 8 show the same kāfʿ. The letters that are identical in all four manuscripts are dhāl, śad, rāʿ, mīm, and tāʿ. Raṣīd 6 shares with Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7 the lām, the final hāʾ, and the word masad, the last word in the sūra, with the three dots below the sīn in a row. Raṣīd 54 and 7 were composed within the same time frame and thus share many features. Raṣīd 6 strengthens the link of Raṣīd 8 to the group. Yaʿqūb would not have maintained the same exact hand over decades. Practice and experience yield minor differences, and if indeed it is he who is responsible for all the manuscripts, he had developed his hand to perfection by the time he completed Raṣīd 7.
Sizes

Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 6, and Raṣīd 54 are almost the same size, all monumental, with Raṣīd 7 varying considerably from them. Raṣīd 8 is 73x51 cm, Raṣīd 6 is 71x50 cm, Raṣīd 54 is 69x51 cm, and Raṣīd 7 is 83x54 cm. The facts that all of the manuscripts are among the largest, and that they are so close to the same size, further support the theory that they come from the same workshop.

Raṣīd 9

Discussed by David James in his *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, this Qur’ān manuscript deserves a second evaluation because of its magnificence and innovative techniques. It is in two volumes, each with its own elaborate *waqf* dedication by Sultan Sha‘bān and its own different frontispiece. The endowment was made in 770/1369 to his mother’s *madrasa* in al-Tabbāna. Both volumes consist of 808 folios in total and each measures 75x51 cm. The paper is pinkish cream polished paper with seven lines to a page. The script is a large *muḥaqqaq*, which accounts for the fact that the manuscript runs to two volumes, while *sūra* titles are in *kuḥi*. Unfortunately, here, as so often, we have no names for the calligrapher or the illuminator. Each volume (Pls. 274 and 275) carries a *waqf* statement like the one encountered in Raṣīd 7. In volume 1 it reads (Pl. 274):

> Our lord, the mighty, the great, the noble, the lofty, the lordly, the suľṭānī, the imānī, the ‘ādīlī, the mujāhīdī, the murābiṭī, the muthāghirī, the ḥiṣnī, the malāḏī, the māliḳī, the malakī, the asbraṭī, the nāṣīrī, upholder of the victory of the world and religion, the sultan of Islam and Muslims, the slayer of the unbelievers and idolaters, the supporter of those against whom injustice was inflicted by the unjust, oppressor of the *khawārij* and the atheists, Abū al-Muẓaffar Sha‘bān—may God make his dominion and rule eternal and make his justice and goodness overwhelm all his subjects and renew for him a victory every
day and make him possess all the land and sea—son of our lord, the mighty, the noble, the glorious Husayn, son of our lord, the sultan, the happy, the martyr al-Nāṣir Muhammad, son of the martyr Sultan al-malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn al-Salihī—may God have mercy on all of them—has made all of this first volume from the blessed mushaf a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from reading and other sorts of lawful benefits. He has made a stipulation that its place is the madrasa known in Cairo the protected in the street of al-Tabbāna, and that it may not leave the aforementioned place unless a collateral of a stated value is placed. He has made a stipulation that he is the administrator of this waqf throughout his life, and after his death whoever has been stipulated to be the administrator in his waqf. He was witnessed on all this on the 15th of Sha'ban, the year 770. May God make whatever it produces/the turn it takes good.399

Throughout the codex there are marginal notations in muhaqqaq pointing out variant readings of some words (Pl. 276). Although it lacks a signature, Martin Lings noted decades ago that it was illuminated by the same hand as Raṣīd 10, namely Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī. The analysis that follows will amply demonstrate that it was indeed produced by Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī.

Folio 1a in both volumes (Pls. 274 and 275) carries the waqf statement, whose illumination resembles the one in Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 263). Volume two, however, has a medallion in the left margin (Pl. 275), by the waqf title, in blue and gold. It is most certainly the same person/workshop producing these folios with the waqf statement. Layout, illumination, and calligraphy testify to the same hand. However this Qurʾān manuscript is produced by a different workshop from that which produced Raṣīd 7, as will be shortly demonstrated. Thus these three waqf statements do not necessarily give us the exact date of production, but rather the date of endowment. Sultan Shaʾbān might have had several workshops/individual artists working for him in the 1360s producing

399 The difference between the two volumes is in the title of the first volume, and in a mistake by the calligrapher, calling each volume the first of two. Comparison of the two volumes shows that words are sometimes missing.
all of these manuscripts, which he eventually endowed to the *madrasa* once they were finished. 400

We commence with volume one, whose frontispiece on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 277) is an innovative project, one that departs from the workshop that had produced Rašīd 6 (Pl. 248), Rašīd 7 (Pl. 264), and Rašīd 54 (Pl. 258). However, there are also similarities. For instance, the central field is a square and not a rectangle like earlier productions of the fourteenth century. This connects the manuscript to the previously discussed workshop. Even if they had distinct styles, they operated within the same milieu and for the same patron and his entourage. The geometric pattern is no longer focused on a center from which patterns bloom. Rows of eight-lobed rosettes of the same size alternating with quatrefoils (Rašīd 70 has come a long way!) adorn the central field. The eight lobes are the result of eight small intersecting circles surrounding a circle or an octagon. The position of the rosette and quatrefoil differs from one row to the other, resulting in what appears to be a central rosette surrounded by four rosettes on its diagonal axis. This central rosette shows four pink lotuses. The other whole rosettes have a peony each as a center. The fillers of the rosettes are a combination of arabesque scrolls and fret patterns. The color schemes of the two pages (folios 1b and 2a) differ, but not significantly. The quatrefoils are in white and shades of blue. Four trefoils mark the cross-axis of the quatrefoil, each on a tiny scroll looking like a cloud band. The whole arrangement is bordered by the pearl band.

The four rectangular panels carrying Q 56:77–80 (Pl. 277) are not as complex as Rašīd 6 (Pl. 248), Rašīd 54 (Pl. 258), and Rašīd 7 (Pl. 264). A cartouche with multi-
lobed ends displays a green scroll on a blue background and the text in golden *kūfi*. The spandrels of the cartouches are golden, and the scroll is contained within shapes with a green dot in the middle. At the ends of the rectangular panels, beyond the spandrels of the cartouches, are blue squares adorned with a symmetrical scroll in gold with blue and red detailing. The band of the knotted grid of dots with small blue squares frames the entire composition. The outermost border is a symmetrical scroll repeating itself on a blue background. Parts of the scroll are of the paper color and not in blue; these resemble the stucco decoration of the earlier period.

Before proceeding to the inner pages, it is better to discuss the frontispiece of the second volume, in order to highlight the innovative aspect of this artist (Pl. 278). The composition is very different yet of the same spirit. The outermost border is almost the same, but the rest of the details are different. No rectangular panels carrying inscriptions are used here, and there is no difference between folio 1b and folio 2a. The central field is a rectangle of highlighted fillers. The main shapes are relegated to the back in favor of the fillers. Rows of circles alternate, but we do not clearly see the contours of these circles; instead, their intersections and filler parts are made more visible by giving them a blue or black background. Three circles appear in full (although their contours do not show), while two are only partially visible. The middle row consists of large intersecting circles. The intersection is made into an elongated quatrefoil with a black background and a colored symmetrical scroll in each. Each of these large circles has a multi-lobe shape in blue, with a symmetrical scroll of varying colors in its center. The rows with smaller circles Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7 emphasize the

---

401 Green scrolls on blue backgrounds were seen earlier, in *juz’* 1 of Raṣīd 60.
centers of the circles, or their tops and bottoms, rather than their intersections. The scrolls filling the different parts are gold, green, orange, pink, and blue.

Around the central field is a border of the knotted grid of dots, with blue squares outlined with a pearl band. A wider band surrounds them. It has a black background with floral elements on stalks, not scrolls. The floral elements are peonies and lotuses in green, pink, purple, and blue. In between them there are small two-petaled or three-petaled flowers. The way the floral elements are organized is interesting: each group of three large blossoms produces two triangles meeting at their apex and decorated with a blue Greek key motif (meander). A pearl band surrounds it, which in turn is surrounded by green petals overlapping each other and growing out from a blue center. This whole composition has a pearl band around it, framed by a grid of dots the same size as the inner one. The outermost border is the same as in volume one.

Returning to volume one and its inner pages: Folios 2b–3a are the opening pages (Pl. 279), which in this case include only surat al-Fatiha and not surat al-Baqara. Each folio has three lines, including the basmala. The central field containing the text is a square, the background of the text is in three rows of an arabesque scroll made of four spirals in each row. The scroll is outlined in black, like a pencil line, and some of its floral elements are colored green, brown, and blue. On top of the bism a medallion or rosette made of a circle with a triangular top in gold is surrounded by flowing petals of degraded blue. The Mamluk and Ilkhanid traditions are drawn together by the use of Chinese elements. The text, in large black muhaqqaq, is in clouds, which separate it from the surrounding scroll. The aya markers are circular medallions of gold carrying the word ‘aya’ in the center and outlined with a blue line. The central field is bordered by
alternating blue rectangles and circles on a black background—a new style. The rectangular panels with the sūra titles and verse count are inspired by the previous workshop. The cartouches have a gold background and gold floral elements, while the text is white kūfī. The spandrels and sides of the cartouches are black, with a vine scroll holding green and red trefoils with golden bits. Each cartouche is outlined by a pearl band that knots into a circle topping the lobed ends. To the right and left of each cartouche is a rectangle containing a decagon with a pentagonal center. Instead of the octagons in Rašīd 6 (Pl. 251) and Rašīd 7 (Pl. 265), the variation we see here is a decagon contained in a rectangle. Its background is mainly blue, with some black areas. The surrounding scroll is green. Some of the half palmettes are white, and some fillers are red. A golden peony adorns the pentagon in the center.

The whole composition is framed by the same border that surrounds the rectangular panels—a knotted grid of dots. The outermost border is different from that of both frontispieces. In fact, it is quite different from anything we have seen—a frenzy of a scroll with many colors.

Folio 3b (Pl. 280) is the beginning of sūrat al-Baqara with a magnificent sūra title and marginal decorations. Various ideas from previous frontispieces are incorporated in the spandrels of the cartouches carrying the sūra title and adorning the rectangular panel crowning the page. A teardrop-shaped medallion juts out from the rectangular panel into the margin. It has a blue background and a golden and green scroll, with a border of trefoils in different shades of blue. By now the colored petal border has come a long way. The khamsa markers are always in teardrop-shaped medallions, the triangular top framed, with colored petals going in different directions,
some curling inward. The ‘ashara markers are all in circular medallions (Pl. 281). The colors are quite varied. All the sūra titles are quite elaborate in this manuscript. Like the previous workshop, sometimes the last word or few words in a sūra are placed in the rectangular panel of the preceding sūra (Pl. 285). It seems that regardless of the workshop/artist, Sultan Sha‘bān did ask for the most elaborate work, possibly to match his grandfather’s ardor.

The last page in volume 1 is fully illuminated (Pl. 283), the rectangular panels carrying their inscriptions in white kūfī on a blue background and a central field of three lines, presenting the last words of the last āya of sūrat al-Kahf (18:110). The decoration in the middle of the right margin is, surprisingly, a small medallion the same size as the āya markers. It is gold with a golden lotus on an orange background.

Folios 2b–3a in volume two are the opening pages of the codex (Pl. 284). They commence with sūrat Maryam, which coincides with juz’ 15 in a thirty-volume rab’a. The two pages are fully illuminated. The central field containing the verses is rectangular and not squarish, but like the opening of the first volume it has three lines to a page including the basmala. Here the basmala is topped by a composite blossom, but there are quite a few of them on other pages are placed on top of the scroll background. The earliest that a blossom on a basmala was seen was in a Cairene manuscript, produced in 744/1343 and kept in the Topkapi Sarayi, Y 365 (Pl. 15).402 Very Chinese in

402 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 151. David James mentions that the style looks like al-Āmīdī’s. Could it have been him operating at an early stage, or is it simply a pervasive Anatolian/Ilkhanid style? The year 1344 was before the Black Death caused the displacement and relocation of people. Or perhaps there was an artists’ diaspora with the fall of the Ilkhanids after 1335.
inspiration, these blossoms are in varying shapes and each is made of lotuses and
trefoils.

The rectangular panels carry the *sûra* title, the verse count, and Q 56:77–79 (Pl. 284), which is very different from other *sûra* titles in Qur’ān manuscripts discussed so far. The Ilkhanid imitation has been modified: green *kūfī* on a white arabesque scroll on a black background, instead of the green scroll. The cartouche is surrounded by semicircular lobes, each with half a peony.

The last folio, which is the right-hand side of what would have been a double-page illumination, shows the last verses of the Qur’ān and part of *sûrat al-Nās* (114) (Pl. 285). The other side, had it existed, would probably have contained the signature of our calligrapher and/or illuminator.

**Rasîd 10**

Another masterpiece endowed by Sultan Sha’bān, but to his own *madrasa* near the Citadel in 778/1376, is this Qur’ān manuscript. It consists of 217 folios in one codex and measures 73x51 cm. The paper is thick cream polished with a pinkish tint with thirteen lines to a page. The script is black *muḥaqqaq* with incidentals in *kūfī* and *tawqīṭ*. We are fortunate in having a colophon at the end, giving us the calligrapher’s name and the date he finished the copy. It was completed by ‘Afī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi (d. 808/1406) in 774/1372, four years before it was endowed. His last *nisba* tells us he was in the service of Sultan Sha’bān, whose *kunya* is al-Ashraf. His signature reads (Pl. 294):

> This noble blessing was finished on the 15th of the month of God Muḥarram, the year 774/1372, by the hands of the poorest of God’s
slaves and the most in need of his forgiveness, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi, thanking God for all his blessings and praying for/blessing His Prophet Muḥammad, his family and companions.

The illuminator’s signature reads:

The number of āyāt in the Mighty Book is 6,666 of which 1,000 are commands, 1,000 denials, 1,000 promises, 1,000 narratives and 1000 proverbs. 500 tell what is permitted and what is forbidden, 100 are prayers and supplications, and 60 are abrogating and abrogated. The Prophet said: ‘whoever honours a learned man it is as if he honours seventy Prophets’. The illumination of this noble Qur‘ān was completed at the hands of God’s weakest slave, Ibrahim al-Amidī, may God forgive him…

The waqf reads (Pl. 287):

Our lord the mighty, the great, the noble, the sultāni, the mālikī, the malākī, the ashrafi, Abū al-Muẓaffar Sha‘bān ibn Ḥusayn, son of the mighty and noble, the martyr, our deceased lord, the Sultan al-mālik al-malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, son of our lord the Sultan al-malik al-Mansūr Qalāwūn al-Ṣalīḥī—may God have mercy on both of them—has made all of this noble musḥaf a rightful and lawful waqf so that all Muslims can benefit from reading and other sorts of lawful benefits, to become nearer to his Lord the Almighty. He has made a stipulation that its place and the reading from it should be in the Ashrafi khānqāh/madrassā’ mosque known to have been built by the mighty and the noble in the Ṣuwwa close to the victorious Citadel in Cairo the protected. He has made a stipulation that he is the administrator of this waqf throughout his life, and after him the administrator of the khānqāh, on the date of the month of Muḥarram, the year 778.

The manuscript begins on folio 1a with a large rosette carrying the waqf statement, nine lines of golden tawqī’ on a pink background. The text is in clouds in the paper color. The scroll beneath the text is a blue arabesque undulating scroll in a concentric spiral, with small half palmettes in blue and bigger closed lotus buds and stylized rosettes in white and brown. Flying cloud bands with tails are also floating around. A dark blue border with a simple golden scroll adorns the edges, and there is a

---

403 Quoted from David James; see James, Qur‘āns of the Mamlūks, 199.
red blossom in the middle of every scroll. Each of the eighteen lobes of the rosette is treated as a single cartouche, which is why the scroll does not flow through the entire circumference but is restricted to the compartments.

The frontispiece on folios 1b–2a is unprecedented in conception (Pl. 288). Two main elements make it unusual: a very wide arabesque border on blue and a rectangular central field separated by a golden band of the knotted grid of dots with blue squares. The illumination details indicate that the same hand who produced Raṣīd 9 must have produced this one too. The first such detail is the use of decagons with pentagonal centers, seen in the opening pages of volume one of Raṣīd 9 (next to the kūfī cartouches) (Pl. 277), as the main decorative elements for the frontispiece. The central field of each side consists of these decagons. They are mostly gold, with blue, orange, and green fillers. Surrounding them is a myriad of small geometric shapes on a mostly blue background. Some shapes have a peony surrounded by smaller buds. Some have a knotted white scroll with black fillings. Others have a golden flower on red, while a few are gold and black on blue. The surrounding wide outermost border seems to be a typical one multiplied by two and mirrored. It is very busy, with details and colors on a blue background.

As in Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 279), the opening pages, folios 2b–3a, display the sūrat al-Fātihā (Pl. 289), but with three lines on each page including the basmala. Also like Raṣīd 9, a gold teardrop surrounded by petals, in this case white outlined in blue, tops the bism in the basmala. But here it carries the word ‘Allah’ in gold on an orange background. Other elements fill the interlinear spaces: half palmettes, closed lotus buds, and cloud bands all in blue adorn the pages. The script is in clouds, but the background
is not an arabesque, but rather three small dots in pyramidal shapes, as has been seen several times earlier (Pls. 68, 282, and 290). This three-dot figure is one of the Chinese influences in the codex, brought in through the Ilkhanid world. One of the earliest Ilkhanid examples of this feature is a Qurʾān manuscript produced in Baghdad in 1311 (Pl. 291).^404

The four rectangular panels adorning the two-page spread, folios 2b–3a, and carrying the sukra titles, the, verse count, and Q 56:77–80 (Pl. 289), are exactly like those in the opening pages of volume one in Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 279). The difference is minor color variations in parts of decagons used next to the cartouches carrying the kūfī and in the text itself. It will also be argued shortly that the same calligrapher is responsible for both.

Folios 3b–4a carry the first verses of sukra al-Baqara (Pl. 292). The text is framed throughout the manuscript in a knotted border outlined in blue. The middle of the side overlooking the wide margin on each folio has a half a rosette sitting on the border. It has a blue background and the arabesque in it is gold, red, black, and green. The sukra title of al-Baqara is executed in golden kūfī on a blue background and green scroll. The golden kūfī is articulated with red dotting. The spandrels of the cartouche carrying the sukra title are innovative in that they contain an eight-lobed rosette on a pink background. These rosettes carry golden tawqī’ giving us the verse count, word count, and letter count. In between the rosette and the cartouche the spaces have an orange background decorated with golden lotuses.

^404 James, Qurʾāns of the Mamluks, 200.
The *sūra* titles are quite interesting and varied. The last *sūras*, six different titles on a two-page spread (folios 215b–216a) (Pl. 293), are proof of the genius of the illuminator. Rectangular panels containing *kūfī* for the *sūra* title in a cartouche, or more plainly in the rectangle, are flanked by squares or rectangles of differing sizes to display the word and letter count. Each *sūra* title appears as a buildup of geometrical shapes.

Marginal decoration throughout the manuscript is like that of Raṣīd 9 (compare Pl. 281 and Pl. 293). The differences are that this manuscript contains the *ḥizb*, half-*ḥizb*, and quarter-*ḥizb* markers. The quarter is always in a teardrop medallion, while the half is in a composite shape. Both are adorned with the Ilkhanid colored petal border. Other marginal elements are found next to the *sūra* titles. Teardrops with colored petals are always present in the margins next to *sūra* titles. Their colors and details differ from one *sūra* to another.

The closing pages, on folios 216b–217a (Pl. 294), are busy with details. The central field on each page is reserved for the text, which is five lines to a page. Folio 216b contains *sūrat* al-ʿNās, the last *sūra* in the Qurʾān, and folio 217a carries the colophon of the calligrapher. The background of the central field is pink and contains an elaborate thin arabesque scroll, the undulations of which are not in systematic concentric circles but flowing. Half palmettes, half lotuses, and full closed lotuses in white, blue, and grey adorn the stalks and surround the clouds around the text. Cloud bands are also seen here, flowing in the interlinear spaces. The rectangular panels with the cartouches are also very busy. The spandrels of the arches of the cartouches consist of half of an eight-petalled rosette each, with a blue background and a gold, black, and red scroll. The areas between the cartouche and the rosettes have a black background,
like the openings, but contain blue peonies other flower buds in red and green. Two medallions, one on top and the other at the bottom, are knotted via a pearl band around the cartouches. These medallions have an orange background and contain a golden lotus. The cartouches themselves carry golden kūfī on a white and blue undulating arabesque scroll. The band of the knotted grid of dots with the blue squares frames the whole composition and is further surrounded by a large arabesque scroll (very busy) on the four sides of the margin, instead of only three. The right margin on folio 216b and the left margin on folio 217a contain a teardrop medallion in gold, framed with two rows of petals in two shades of blue.

Analysis: Raṣīḍs 9, 10 and 15⁴⁰⁵ (The workshop of Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī)

As much as it departs from the previous workshop, this one still derives its style from the Ilkhanid world, as will shortly be seen. To avoid repetition, the similarities between Raṣīḍ 9 and Raṣīḍ 10 will not be discussed again. The various elements will be discussed in order, as with the previous workshop.

The Frontispieces

The most important characteristic of the workshop is the wide outermost arabesque scroll frame, which has grown in size compared to earlier productions. Frames are no longer multilayered; the emphasis is on one very wide frame. The second volume of Raṣīḍ 9 (Pl. 278) does show multiple frames, however. This wide frame does not leave space in the margins for medallions and so they are not present. Frontispieces lacking

⁴⁰⁵ Raṣīḍ 15 is mentioned below.
medallions have already been seen in the British library Baybars al-Jāshnakīr Qurʾān manuscript.

The emphasis is no longer on a central star. Instead, various shapes in rows give the impression of a garden. This is the second important feature of this workshop. The frontispiece still presents a geometric pattern, but one where the emphasis is on the fillers, the opposite of the previously discussed workshop.

The Ilkhanid influence is still present in certain details. The concept of the eight-petaled rosettes in rows (Pl. 277), as it appears in Raṣīd 9, was used in the Uļjāytū Mosul Qurʾān manuscript (Pl. 167). Lotuses and peonies in bands or as fillers have been used in Mamluk manuscripts for twenty years now, but their Ilkhanid origin cannot be denied. A very vivid color palette is another important element, also like the Mosul Qurʾān manuscript. The emphasis is still on gold and blue. Orange, so prominent in previous Mamluk Qurʾān manuscripts, is used only occasionally.

Opening Pages

The blossom on top of the bism is an important Āmīdī trait. This is part of his fascination with chinoiserie (Pls. 279 and 289). Not only Chinese blossoms are used, but Chinese cloud bands are inserted between the text in Raṣīd 10. The cloud band was also copied by the Ilkhanids, and eventually reached the Mamluk world. The frontispiece of Tārīkh-i jahān-gushā (Suppl. Pers. 205 in the Bibliothèque National de

406 TIEM 541. James, Qurʾāns of the Mamluks, fig. 69.
407 Clouds have been recorded as early as 1500 B.C. in Chinese art on bronze vessels. The cloud with a scroll was used to symbolize immortality and good fortune. The artistic representation of two parts—a cloud and a stem—to make up one element was first encountered in the Tang dynasty (618–906). Yuka Kadoi, “Cloud Patterns: The Exchange of Ideas between China and Iran under the Mongols,” Oriental Art, n.s., 48, no. 2 (2002): 25.
France), produced in Baghdad in 1290, shows these cloud bands painted above a horse (Pl. 295). The *Manāfiʿ al-Ḥayawān* of ibn Bakhtishu, produced in Maragha around 1300, also displays these clouds (Pl. 296). There are more examples from Ilkhanid illustrations, especially *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, and Chinese paintings, especially when dragons are portrayed; dragons are always associated with clouds since they are believed to live in them. A closer Mamluk example, in terms of depiction, is in *Kashf al-asrār* in the Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Pl. 297).

The idea of presenting the ends of the rectangular panels carrying the *sūra* titles as stand-alone rectangles was encountered first in Raṣīd 97 (Pl. 220), but it is also of Ilkhanid inspiration. Some of the early Ilkhanid Qurʿān manuscripts show the same. Examples include a Qurʿān manuscript written by ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abū al-Qāsim al-Tūvī al-Rūdravārī for Rashīd al-Dīn in 715/1315 (Pl. 298), the frontispiece of *Athār al-bilād*, dated 729/1329 and produced in Shiraz (Pl. 299), and *Jawāmīʿ al-ḥikayāt*, dated 732/1332 and also produced in Shiraz (Pl. 300).

The scroll of the outermost border is tightly knit and gives the feel of a mold repeating itself rapidly.

**Inner Pages**

The most important characteristic of the inner pages is the marginal rosettes with the colored-petal border in Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 281), Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 301), and Raṣīd 15 (Pls. 303–

408 Kadoi, “Cloud Patterns,” 29.
The originally Iraqi and later Ilkhanid border is here colored in the same manner as Shirazi manuscripts.

Closing Pages

The closing pages are very different in these manuscripts. The important one in this respect is Raṣīd 10, since it has a border on all four sides (Pl. 294). This is a revival of one of the styles used by the Şandal workshop, and a very elaborate one indeed. The scroll in the back is a development from the Sultan Ḥasan subgroup, but with a cross-hatching in the background with red dots. It is a combination of many techniques in one. 414

Calligraphy

We have the names of two calligraphers in two of the three manuscripts. Both are called ‘al-Mukattib,’ which refers to their capacity as professional calligraphers. They also could have been inshā’ employees, and were probably from the dast category rather than the daraj. 415 Both are master calligraphers, as is evident from their muḥaqqqaq. The question is whether Raṣīd 9 was in the hands of one of them. Before attempting to answer this question, both hands need to be examined in some detail.

414 David James states that such a background is rarely found in Mamluk Qurʾāns. James, Qurʾāns of the Mamluks, 200.
415 Kātib al-dast is also called the muḥwaqqi’. He is responsible for responding to petitions and reports directly to the head of the diwān. Kātib al-daraj is responsible for letters of appointment, fief grants, and the like. For more details on these jobs, see Muhsin Jassim al-Musawi, “Vindicating a Profession or a Personal Career? Al-Qalqashandi’s Maqamah in Context,” Mamluk Studies Review 7 (2003): 111–35.
Rašīd 10, by al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi, shows a green dot/circle on top of the alif in *alif-lām* at the beginning of the word (*hamzat al-wašl*) (Pls. 292, 293, and 294), which the other two manuscripts lack. The initial *kāf,* in most cases but not all, lacks its upper horizontal line and a small *kāf* is inscribed in place of this horizontal line. All his letters are perfectly proportioned, better than in the other two manuscripts. When the opening pages of this manuscript (Pl. 289) are compared to that of Rašīd 9 (Pl. 279), it is easy to see variations that indicate that they were produced by two different hands. The positioning of the dot beneath the *bāʾ* in *Rab,* the lack of the *alif* after the ‘*ayn* in *al-‘ālamīn* and after the *mīm* in *mālik* in Rašīd 9 and its substitution with a detached red *alif,* and the final *nūn* in *al-dālīn* are examples of these differences.

Even though Rašīd 15, by al-Mukattib al-Shihābi, is also an example of an excellent *muḥaqqaq* (Pls. 303–310), al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi had a better script. Rašīd 15 is much bigger—the only Bahri Mamluk Qurʾān manuscript that is more than a meter in height—and was potentially more difficult. Al-Mukattib al-Shihābi does not keep to the rules of *muḥaqqaq,* which can be seen in some of the final *rāʾ* (*al-thamarāt* and *fāraḍ,* this also happens in Rašīd 9).

Rašīd 9 is in a third hand; neither of these calligraphers produced it (Pls. 276, 279, 280, 281, and 284). The pen is much thicker and the words are bigger, but these are not the decisive features. It is more formal and not as flowing as Rašīd 10. Everything is proportionate, but not with the same elegance as Rašīd 10. When he runs out of space, final letters suffer.
This Qur’ān manuscript does not have an endowment statement in the name of Sha‘bān, but is grouped here because its completion date is 776/1374, and the calligrapher’s nisba, al-Ashrafi, puts him in the service of Sultan Sha‘bān. The waqf statement in the manuscript is on the margin of folio 3a. It is written in a bad hand and notes that Sīdī Muḥammad ibn Idrīs dedicated it to the mausoleum of Imām al-Shāfi‘ī in 1060/1650. It is in one codex of 397 folios of polished paper, 54x40 cm in size. Penned in black rayḥān, it has nine lines per page, with incidentals in kūfī and tawqī‘. The name of the calligrapher given at the end in the colophon on folio 397a, which lacks a couple of lines at its end, is Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṭūrī al-Tūnūkhī al-Malakī al-Ashrafi. He finished the manuscript in Cairo, probably for the sultan. The surviving part of the colophon reads (Pl. 311):

Mūsā ibn Muhammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṭūrī al-Tūnūkhī al-Malakī al-Ashrafi, the poor slave of God Almighty, the one who seeks His pardon and forgiveness, has written this noble khāṭima in Cairo [the protected] on the date of the middle ten [days] of the month of Rabi‘ al-Akhar, the year 776.

The text block has come loose from the binding and a few pages are loose from the quires. The first folio, which is now completely detached from its quire, contains an interesting frontispiece (Pl. 312). It is a square and does not fill the whole the page. The square is gold, outlined in blue. On the upper and lower sides of the square a bulbous medallion with a straight base (looking like a dome) juts out. This was probably inspired by the opening page in juz’ 1 in Raṣīd 61, produced two decades earlier (Pl. 73). This technique was to influence the Iranian tradition of the fifteenth century, and the closest

---

416 This codex is in very bad condition.
resemblance is CBL Is 1521, dated to 1430 (Pl. 313).\footnote{Wright, \textit{Islam: Faith, Art and Culture}, 70.} The left margin has a simple circular medallion in gold. The innermost part of the design is a golden circle set in a blue square. The circle contains Q 56:77–80 in white \textit{rayhān}, and Q 59:21 adorns the four cartouches, each within one of the sides of the square. A simple arabesque scroll in gold decorates the spandrels of the circle. An interesting feature, which is very odd and might have been a mistake, is that the horizontal bottom cartouche carries the text upside-down.

Folio 1b contains the Fatiha (Pl. 314) and 2a contains \textit{sūrat} al-Baqara (Pl. 315), both fully illuminated. Two rectangular panels border the text of the \textit{sūra}, in the case of \textit{sūrat} al-Fātiha, the panel at the bottom is missing. Inside these panels are the cartouches, with trilobed ends, carrying the \textit{sūra} title and verse count in golden \textit{kūfī} on a green arabesque scroll with a blue background. The green scroll on the blue background beneath the script gives an Ilkhanid aura, but in a Cairene tradition, which is proven by naming the city in the colophon. The spandrels are filled with a blue circle each surrounded with gold leaves on black. In the left margin and sitting in the middle of the left border is a hasp with two semicircles and an abstract trefoil. It is quite interesting to see that this tradition, which goes back to the early decades of the fourteenth century, is being revived in the 1370s. The hasp is flanked by a medallion to the right and left like those seen in chapter two. The background is orange, the ornaments gold and blue, and the outline blue. Without the date one could have easily placed it in the time period of chapter two.
The text of the *sūra* is in gold and surrounded by a golden scroll, which is not very successful since it reduces the legibility of the text and the clarity of the letters. The scroll is interlinear and not relegated to the background, which adds to the lack of clarity.

*Sūrat* al-Baqara continues on folios 2b–3a in a new fashion (Pl. 316). Three rectangular panels adorn each page: one at the top, one in the middle, and one at the bottom. The top and bottom ones are orange with a golden scroll, while the middle one is blue with a golden scroll. The gold text inscribed in these panels is part of the āyas of the *sūras*. What happened was that the calligrapher, who was possibly the illuminator as well, highlighted some lines by placing them in these rectangular panels and by enlarging the script. Using different sizes of script or different scripts is an Iranian tradition, one that never appealed to Mamluk taste. The rest of the manuscript continues normally without these added panels. The *sūra* titles are simple lines in golden *tawqī‘*. We have no marginal markers, and words like *hīz* and *nisf hīz* are inscribed in the margins in gold.

**Calligraphy**

This Qur’ān manuscript was penned in a good *rayḥān*, a script not much favored by the Mamluk calligrapher, but it seems that Mūsā, who was working from Cairo, wanted to produce something that was very different for his sultan, Sha‘bān. The illumination is really one of a kind and there is the possibility that he was also the illuminator. In this case we are dealing with an artist who had his own style/workshop that differed greatly from what was being produced around him in the realm of Qur’ān manuscripts.
Even though there is a great rayhān Qur’ān manuscript in Dār al-Kutub, Raṣīd 72 (Pl. 216), its script varies significantly from this one and it seems that it exerted no influence on it despite its presence in Cairo at the time. Other Ikhanid Qur’ān manuscripts in rayhān are much earlier and different from this one. Was Mūsā experimenting with the script?

**A Qur’ān manuscript for al-Ashraf Ṣurghatmish**

Raṣīd 15

This Qur’ān manuscript fits well into the Sultan Sha‘bān subgroup since the illumination seems to be in the hand of Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī. The copy was commissioned in 776/1375 by a very close amīr to Sultan Sha‘bān, al-Mu‘izz al-Ashraf Ṣurghatmish (d. 778/1377). His nisba ‘al-Ashraf,’ preceding his name, tells us that he was in the service of Sultan al-Ashraf Sha‘bān. It is in one codex in 292 folios of polished cream paper, eleven lines to a page. It is a huge codex, larger than the commissions of the sultan, 108.3x77 cm. The text block is 75x54.5 cm and the script is large black muḥaqqaq. The majestic muḥaqqaq was penned by Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihābī, who signs on f. 292b (Pl. 302):

The poor slave of God Almighty, the noble and lofty al-Ashraf al-Sayfī Ṣurghatmish, may his victories be glorified, ordered the scribing of this noble, blessed, and great khātima—may God benefit him with it in this lifetime and the next—by the hands of His slave and His poor one Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihābī, may God forgive him. Finished on the 17th of Dhī al-Qi‘da the year 776, and this muṣḥaf was known as muṣḥaf al-kāf.

This manuscript is missing its frontispiece and opening pages, which could have only been as impressive as the rest of the manuscripts belonging to Sultan Sha‘bān and
his entourage. The closing pages are fully illuminated on folios 291b–292a (Pls. 309 and 310). The central field of each folio, 291b carrying sūrat al-Falq and 292a carrying sūrat al-Nās, has text in five lines including the basmala, in black muḥaqqaq on a fully adorned background. The background consists of an elaborate undulating arabesque moving in concentric circles. It has half palmettes and trefoils. Above the bism in the basmala one of the small trefoils is made in gold on a blue background to emphasize the basmala and to break the horizontality of the extension of the sin (Pls. 309 and 310). In sūrat al-Nās on folio 292a the stress on the bism also includes a half palmette, from the middle of which sprouts a trefoil, making it look like a winged motif.

The sūra titles are in cartouches with multi-lobed ends placed in the rectangular panels. The titles are in golden kūfī on a blue background with green arabesque for the floriation. This is a more successful combination than the green on black. The outermost border of the whole composition is not an arabesque scroll, but a scroll with half palmettes and alternating blossoms of gold (the most frequent color), light blue, green, orange, white, and dark blue. These alternating blossoms are made of two half palmettes facing each other and three sepal chalices.

The colophon on folio 292b is reminiscent of the sultan’s commissions. It is like the waqf rosette in Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 287). The difference is in the details of execution, such as the border around the rosette. Raṣīd 15 revives borders from Raṣīd 62; we have seen a similar one around the roundel of the colophon of juz’4 (Pl. 162).

Like Raṣīd 9 and Raṣīd 10, the illumination program is completely consistent, as mentioned earlier. Al-Āmidī’s style is prominent and clear. It will be recalled that we are judging the similarities from the closing pages, the sūra titles, and the marginal
medallions across the codex since it is missing its frontispiece and opening pages. The *khamsa* markers are in a teardrop medallion of gold and orange bordered by colored petals in different hues, similar to Raṣīd 9 and Raṣīd 10. Also like these two manuscripts, the ‘āshara marker (Pl. 304) is in a circular medallion, the *kūfī* is gold on orange, and the border is blue with a series of half palmettes. The āya markers are also like Raṣīd 9 and Raṣīd 10: a circle outlined in blue with an orange background and golden *kūfī* spelling the word āya.

**Preliminary Conclusions**

The analysis has described a group of manuscripts characterized simultaneously by a continuation of style and by innovation. This group comprises Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54, which continue the work of the illuminator(s) working in 1357 for Sultan Ḥasan (Raṣīd 8). This style in turn is a development of the Iran Bastan Museum Qur’ān manuscript, produced in 1339, probably for that great patron of the first half of the fourteenth century, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. This style as manifested in these manuscripts, but especially in the workshop that produced Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54, is a development from the Șandal workshop, but with variations in geometry and proportions. Chinese-Ilkhanid elements also introduced by the Sultan Hasan subgroup, primarily Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59, in the late 1350s permeate these manuscripts, as they become a standard for illumination details. The refined execution is also unprecedented in this subgroup; every detail is perfect. This was indeed the workshop of a master illuminator.
The other workshop, represented by Raṣīd 9, Raṣīd 10, and Raṣīd 15, that of Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī, also shows a master at work. He does not seem to be continuing an existing tradition, but he does use all the details available before and during his time. Chinese-Ilkhanid elements are the common elements that tie this workshop with the previous one. This link is not to suggest the same artists, even though the possibility is not far-fetched, but rather the utilization of the same motifs that were brought into the Mamluk artistic milieu a decade earlier and heavily employed in these two decades.

Representative manuscripts of the tradition of smaller multivolume Qurʾān manuscripts, ṭabʿas, are Raṣīd 80 and Raṣīd 372. However, far more multivolume Qurʾān manuscripts exist from the previous two decades, suggesting that the patrons of the 1360s and 1370s, Sultan Shaʿbān and his entourage, were more interested in monumentality and single volumes than smaller multivolumes. Their Qurʾān manuscripts are much larger than earlier ones.

These smaller ṭabʿas, Raṣīd 372 and Raṣīd 80, also continue design elements from the earlier two decades. The workshops producing Qurʾān manuscripts for Sultan Ḥasan and amīr Şirghitmish al-Naṣīrī worked for Khawand Baraka.

The calligraphy of the period is predominantly muḥaqqaq, more so than the previous two decades. Only Raṣīd 372 is written in naskh, a naskh that verges on muḥaqqaq. Raṣīd 141 is written in rayḥān, which is a smaller muḥaqqaq. The monumentality and great sizes must have encouraged the overuse of muḥaqqaq, which is a script best suited to large sizes. In explaining one of the reasons behind the rising star of the large cursive scripts, Martin Lings says:

The establishment almost simultaneously of two new dynasties in the middle of the 7th/13th century, the Mamluks in Egypt and Syria and the
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already mentioned Mongols in Persia and Iraq, both lavish patrons of the arts, might have been expected to have an invigorating effect upon calligraphy; and in fact this political change seems to have acted as antidote to decadence as an incentive in the direction of grandeur and strength, allied with a certain directness and simplicity, all these being qualities to which the scripts in question particularly lend themselves.\footnote{Lings, Splendours, 36.}

This incentive for grandeur and strength, both qualities of \textit{muhāqqaq}, made it most suitable to continue over the middle decades of the fourteenth century and to flourish during these two decades, because there was more of a need to express this grandeur.

The calligraphers themselves, who left us quite a few signatures, will be discussed in chapter five. Each of the Qurʾān manuscripts in this chapter is very well calligraphed, the best hands being those of the anonymous team or individual calligrapher producing Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54 and the \textit{inshāʾ} employee ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi who produced Raṣīd 10. Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihābī probably trained with ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi. Both are \textit{mukattibs} working with the same illuminator, al-Āmidī, but al-Shihābī’s hand is less sure than that of al-Ashrafi. All of them had an excellent command of \textit{muhāqqaq} and this proficiency was shown in their execution. Al-Nakhjawānī (Raṣīd 97) is a master calligrapher as well, but on a different level from those just mentioned. Mūsā al-Tunūkhī (Raṣīd 141) was experimenting, and even though he was unsuccessful with the opening pages, the rest of the folios are elegantly executed in a delicate \textit{rayḥān}.\footnote{Lings, Splendours, 36.}
Chapter Four:
Qur’ān Manuscripts from 784/1382 to 815/1412

By 1382 there was a new regime in Egypt that ended the Qalawunid line. It was represented by a new ruler of a different ethnicity, the Circassian Sultan Barqūq. It was a time of political and economic upheaval. As explained in chapter one, in his meteoric rise in rank Al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Barqūq managed to become the atābak and the stepfather of both of the sons of Sha'bān (the greatest patron of Qur’ān arts in our previous chapter), al-Manṣūr ‘Aflī and al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī, and then became sultan himself. He faced resistance from several amīns, who were extremely upset about a Circassian ruling instead of a Turk. He also coped with major economic problems and a very unhappy populace. His reign started in 784/1382 and ended in 801/1399 with one interruption (first reign: 784–91/1382–89; second reign: 792–801/1390–99). After his death in 801/1399 his son Faraj was enthroned and ruled from 801–15/1399–1412. Our survey of manuscripts ends in 815/1412, when Faraj died.

These two monarchs left us a total of fifteen Qur’ān manuscripts in Dār al-Kutub, which are the focus of this chapter. Other Qur’ān manuscripts from their reign or in their name survive in other collections around the world. Sultan Barqūq left us three Qur’ān manuscripts in one volume each: Raṣīd 12, which is most certainly part of the Star Polygon Group workshop seen in the previous chapter; the monumental Raṣīd 11, penned by the greatest calligrapher of the period and a continuation of the workshop of Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī; and Raṣīd 75, introducing some new and unsuccessful decorative motifs and color palettes. Barqūq also left us eight rab‘ās: Raṣīd 123 and Raṣīd 79,
which are very similar to each other; Raṣīd 120 and Raṣīd 121 from the same workshop; Raṣīd 76 from the same workshop that produced rabʿas for Sultan Ḥasan and amīr Șirghitmish in the late 1350s; Raṣīd 78; Raṣīd 125; and Raṣīd 124.

His son, Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq, left us Raṣīd 16, with strong connections to the Star Polygon Group workshop and suggesting the same illuminator(s) or disciples of the illuminator(s) responsible for the Star Polygon Group workshop. It shows more Persian influence, centering around the Shirazi-style illumination of the late fourteenth century. He also left us two rabʿas: Raṣīd 77 and Raṣīd 153.

Differences from the earlier manuscripts seen in the previous chapter are primarily due to some changes in calligraphy and experimentation with some letters, and the inclusion of minor elements from Shirazi illumination. These later Persian influences differ from the early Ilkhanid influences we have seen so far; they derive primarily from Baghdad or the northwestern regions of Iran rather than Shiraz.

**Endowments by Sultan Barquq**

**Raṣīd 12**

It is most fitting to begin this chapter with this Qurʿān manuscript, because it is a beautiful codex that is most certainly a product of the Star Polygon Group workshop discussed in the previous chapter. It was found in the Complex of Sultan Barquq and identified by Bernhard Moritz and the old Khedivial catalogue as a waqf by Sultan Barquq. Moritz mentions that it is undated and calls it the “Kurʿān of Sultan Barkūk”;

213
he assigns it a date range of 784–801/1382–99.\footnote{Moritz, \textit{Arabic Palaeography}, plates 68–67.} It consists of 255 folios measuring 68x49 cm, and was penned in ten lines to a page in golden \textit{thuluth}. It seems that the name of the calligrapher was intentionally removed from the first folio where he was explaining how he vocalized the text (Pl. 320).\footnote{The third line from the bottom on folio 1a shows the effaced part.}

The work begins on folio 1a (Pl. 320) with a big rectangle of plain gold, framed with a knotted golden border outlined in blue to reflect the \textit{naskh}, which is also in blue. Jutting out of the left side of the rectangle is a blue intertwined knotted ribbon forming a palmette-shaped motif. The text is in blue \textit{naskh} verging on \textit{tawqi’} in seventeen lines and reads:

\begin{quote}
Thank God who had the Qur’ān descend in seven letters in successive clarity from the Prophet of God, from Gabriel, and from God who taught man. We thank Him for making this a favorite Book by making its terms copyable and recitable from memory and teachable throughout the ages, and we witness that there is no God but God Alone with no partners. The One who made its recitation an ordinance in prayers, and we are indebted to Him for His provision of good—He is the Filler and the Multiplier of beneficence. And we witness that Muhammad is His slave and His sincere and honest Messenger and his unlettered Prophet, who does not insert (add) anything in His miraculously versed Book. For every eloquent one a tongue. May God have peace and blessings on (pray for) him and on his family and companions who have collected the Qur’ān and reconciled . . . and the text and its pronunciation. I have vocalized this \textit{mushaf} with some of their vocalization for sake of becoming blessed, because most of the people of this (the calligrapher’s) time do not know it. The intention is to give the reciter its letters in whichever vocalization it has been put in. All are markers known by those who give the letters their rights from . . . the throat and the tongue. May its scribe be rewarded . . . The folios . . . with . . . the finishing of every \textit{sūra} from it, a full \textit{khatima} protected from every man and \textit{jin}, as God protects it and crushes his enemies and grants him victory and remains . . . as long as the day and night last.
\end{quote}
The frontispiece spread on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 321) is reminiscent of the Star Polygon Group workshop, and a magnificent work. The central field on each page is a square centered around a twelve-pointed star. Equal importance is given to both the geometric elements of the composition and the fillers. The twelve-pointed star is filled with a golden knotted frit with golden half palmettes and white three-sepal flowers on a blue background. Pointed edges are orange and gold as is always the case, while the pentagon-based hexagons have a blue background with golden half palmettes and white three-sepal flowers. Arrow-shaped motifs are golden, and other star forms have a red/brown background decorated with lotuses in shades of blue and white. Since green has gained more importance in these decades (1380s–1390s), we find it as the background of the border surrounding the star pattern. Peonies and lotuses alternate on the green border and are surrounded by a fine golden scroll. The peonies and lotuses are both the same colors: shades of blue and white.

The rectangular panels flanking the central fields are occupied with three multi-lobed cartouches each. The middle cartouches carry Q 56:77–80 in golden floriated kūfī on a blue background surrounded by a white arabesque scroll. An interesting addition is at the top and bottom of these middle cartouches: a small black panel bears a golden tendril with flowers reminiscent of Raṣīd 97 but on a much smaller scale (compare Pl. 321 with Pl. 229). The side cartouches are decorated in several colors: white, red, green, black, gold, and cream. The design is a symmetrical intertwined scroll around an eight-
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421 Similarities and differences with this group will be analyzed in a section right after the description of the codex. We will attempt to show that the same workshop was still operating under Barqūq and produced this codex for him.
pointed star. All geometric elements making up the whole page are bordered with a pearl band.

Around the rectangular panels and the central field is the band of the knotted grid of dots. A peony and lotus border then frames the whole composition, exactly like the inner peony and lotus border, but bigger and with different color combinations. The background here is orange, and the flowers are primarily shades of blue (the inner one had flowers of mostly white and shades of blue). A pearl band separates this floral border from the outermost one. The outermost border is smaller than those employed in previous decades (1360s and 1370s), and employs a variety of colors like the ones seen in the late 1370s.

The marginal medallions are another link to the Star Polygon Group workshop. They are made up of the full undulating scroll symmetrical around the center of the circle (horizontal diameter). A full palmette/blossom, in white, black, and blue, acts as the focus of the design.

Folios 2b–3a carry the splendid opening (Pl. 322). Folio 2b contains surat al-Fātiḥa while 3a contains surat al-Baqara. The central fields hold five lines each, including the basmala, in golden thuluth. Tams in black has been applied on all relevant letters. A beautifying addition is a half palmette on a tendril in white decorating the tams in all the letters that have enough space: the šād, ẓād, and fāʾ. The sukūn has also been filled in with black. The background of the script is in the paper color but ornamented with the pyramid of three dots. This Chinese influence was brought in via the Ilkhanid world. One of the earliest fourteenth-century Ilkhanid examples is a Qurʾān manuscript (Pl. 323) penned by Āḥmad al-Suhrawardī in 704/1304, most probably in
Baghdad, and illuminated by Muḥammad ibn Aybak.\textsuperscript{422} Also early is another Qurʾān manuscript in the TIEM (538) (Pl. 324), commissioned by Sultan Uljāytū. This would date to 1304–16, his reigning years.\textsuperscript{423} Another Qurʾān manuscript also produced in Baghdad in 710/1311, now in the TIEM (238), shows these Chinese features as well (Pl. 291).\textsuperscript{424}

The rectangular panels carry the sūra titles, āya count, and place of revelation in white kūfī in blue cartouches decorated with a golden arabesque scroll. The cartouches are rectangular with broken ends. Flanking them at the top and bottom are panels with an orange background crowded with golden flowers with green centers. The spandrels of the cartouches are filled with the fragments of two eight-pointed stars. Thus, instead of the full eight-pointed stars as seen in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), it is the area in between stars that receives the attention. The five-pointed stars and the pentagon-based hexagons are the main elements in these spandrels.

Surrounding the central fields and the rectangular panels is a band made of the knotted grid of dots, which is separated from the outermost band by a pearl band. There are a total of four marginal medallions, each flanking a rectangular panel. The circles in this case are not attached to the decorated frame in any way; no tendril or spike can be seen, nor do they rest on the frame. They are simply floating in the margins. In this respect, they resemble the marginal medallions carrying khamsa or ʿashara markers. They are gold, with a little orange seen in the background of the inner circle. This is the


\textsuperscript{423} \textit{The 1400th Anniversary of the Qurʾān: Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art Qurʾān Collection}, ed. Seracettin Şahin (Istanbul: Antik A.Ş. Cultural Publications, 2010), 248.

\textsuperscript{424} James, \textit{Qurʾāns of the Mamluks}, 200.
most usage of gold we have seen in a marginal medallion. There are floral decorations in
the inner circle, all in gold, outlined in black on the barely visible orange background.

The inner pages are decorated with āya markers, marginal medallions, and the
occasional sūra titles (Pl. 326). The āya markers are like those in Raṣīd 9 (the work of
the illuminator al-Āmīdī) (Pl. 282), gold circles with an orange inner circle and a blue
outline. The word āya is written in golden floriated kūfī. The text is contained in a
border of gold outlined in blue. The marginal medallions that carry the khamsa and
‘ashara markers are innovative in their decoration. Even though the ‘ashara is in a circle
while the khamsa is in a circle topped with a triangle as usual, they are decorated in a
new manner. They are mostly gold, with orange and blue. The innermost circle is
orange, with the word in golden floriated kūfī inscribed in it. This innermost circle is
framed with gold and white and bordered by petals, arranged like the border of some of
the medallions in the beginning of Raṣīd 62 (c. 1356–61) (Pl. 164). An orange shadow
surrounds these petals and flowers. Two circles of gold, outlined in blue, adorn the
outermost boundaries.

Other marginal medallions are purely decorative and emphasize the sūra titles
which they flank. They vary in their details; they are sometimes connected to the sūra
title via a tendril and other times left floating. A floating one can be seen next to sūrat
al-Anfāl (Pl. 327). It has an orange background bordered with gold and displays a gold
lotus surrounded by golden leaves and tendrils. Others, attached to the sūra titles of the
final sūras, contain split full palmettes with trefoils in their center.

The sūra titles (Pl. 328) differ from each other but do not compare to the
variations encountered in the Star Polygon Group. Here they combine elements from the
Star Polygon Group workshop and elements from Sultan Hasan’s Qurʾān manuscripts. It has already been argued in chapter three that the Sultan Hasan Qurʾān manuscripts, namely Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59, are strongly connected with the Star Polygon Group, and so it is not surprising to see this mix here. We find examples with circles alternating with cartouches with rounded ends carrying the sūra title, āya count, and place of revelation in black thuluth decorated with clouds on red hatching or green scrolls. We also find, on the final pages, three titles on the same page (Pl. 328); the uppermost and the lowermost have the same structure and filling while the one in the middle is different. In the middle one we see the text in white kūfī surrounded by a golden arabesque scroll on a blue background in a cartouche with rounded ends. The spandrels of the cartouche in the rectangular panel are occupied by a golden lotus in a circular medallion of orange, exactly like in Raṣīd 8 (1356–61) (Pl. 156) and Raṣīd 59 (1356–61) (Pl. 87). Triangular spaces around the medallion are black with white trefoils/flowers. The other two sūra titles on this page are the rectangular panels divided into three parts, with no cartouches. The middle part is an orange rectangle carrying white thuluth in a golden cloud, from which sprout golden leaves and tendrils. Each end of the rectangular panel is a blue square with a golden lotus surrounded by golden tendrils.

The closing pages on folios 254b–255a (Pl. 329) are also an ambitious project and differ in concept from the opening pages. Folio 254b carries the last sūra, sūrat al-Nās. The central field carries four lines of text including the basmala. The letters of the thuluth are treated in the same way as those in the opening pages, with tams and the occasional white tendril. The text here, which also lies on the three pyramidal dots, is contained in clouds, unlike the opening pages, where clouds are surprisingly not seen.
The rectangular panels flanking the central field and carrying the *sūra* title, *āya* count, and place of revelation contain cartouches with pointy ends like stars. The *kūfī* is white on a golden arabesque with a blue background. The spandrels are minimal and are decorated with the intersection of the pearl band making up the cartouche and another one intersecting with it. The spaces thus formed are orange with golden flowers or tendrils. Four of them, however, are black with a small white trefoil.

All around the rectangular panels and the central field is a red band with orange peonies alternating with golden blossoms on a golden scroll. Around this band is a wide border of blue cartouches alternating with octagonal orange ones. The blue ones carry white *kūfī* on a golden arabesque, reading, from top right corner onwards, the words “Your God’s words have been completed in honesty and justice, nobody changes these words, He is the All Hearing and All Knowing” (Q 6:115). The orange octagons contain golden lotuses surrounded with golden flowers and tendrils. In between are small shapes in black with white trefoils. A golden knotted grid of dots and a white meander knotted band surround the whole composition. This in turn is framed by an outermost border of intricately intertwined arabesque. This time the outer border uses large amounts of red.

The marginal medallion, which is connected to the outermost border, is like that in the frontispiece, with the addition of a petal border. In its execution it is related to the Shirazi style (Pl. 8) because of the colored petals acting as a border, especially since these petals point in differing directions and alternate with full blossoms.

The opposite page, folio 255a, is unfinished, or was possibly added at a later date when copying the surviving folio (254b). The text, the tasseling at the edges of the outermost border, and the marginal medallion are missing. It reflects the opposite page,
folio 254b, with two variations. First, the octagons at the top containing lotuses have a blue, not an orange, background. Second, the words in the cartouches are different in content and execution. Here they are mirror images. The top and bottom horizontal lines carry the word *li-kalimātihī* (‘for His Words’) mirrored: the left side has three cartouches, the first and last of which are *wa huwa* (‘and Him’) mirror-imaged, while the right side has three cartouches with nothing mirrored (*wa-huwa al-sāmī‘ wa-huwa—‘and He is the All Knowing and He’). It seems that the illuminator forgot to mirror the last *wa-huwa*, which should have been mirrored like the one on the left side.

**Calligraphy**

The unknown calligrapher has an excellent hand and his choice of *thuluth* is most peculiar. The contemporary treatise entitled *Tuḥfat ʿūlī al-albāb fī ṣināʿat al-khaṭṭ wa-al-kitāb*, written by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh (he will be discussed further under the next Qurʾān manuscript, Raṣīd 11), ascribes the invention of *thuluth* to Ibrāhīm al-Sinujrī, who was a disciple of Išāq ibn Ḥammād, one of the two men whom he claims were responsible for the development of the various scripts. Ibrāhīm al-Sinujrī lived under the Abbasid ruler al-Mahdī (d. 785). It was perfected by the Muqla brothers, and its rules, like the rules of all the other scripts, were set by Abū ʿAḥī ibn Muqla. *Thuluth* is one of the seven original scripts; it is the Mamluk architectural script par excellence. It is quite distinct from *muḥaqqaq*, and on paper (manuscripts) *muḥaqqaq*

---


427 The other six are *ṭūmār*, *tawqī‘*, *muḥaqqaq*, *naskh*, *riqʿa*, and *ashʿār* (*ghubār*). Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, *Tuḥfat ʿūlī al-albāb*, 106.
appears more graceful and clearer. Our unknown calligrapher here sticks to the rules of
the script; his alif has tahdīb and thus is not as slim as the alif of muḥaqqaq (Pl. 327). He
does not always use the three teeth for the sīn or shīn; there are often only two. An
interesting peculiarity of his hand is that his treatment of words he forgot or had to
squeeze in does not take away from the beauty of his execution (Pl. 327).

His hand is steady and he manages gold very well. There is no thinning or any
trouble with the outlining of the letters in black. He also fills in some of his letters
(tams) throughout the entire manuscript.

Fitting in the Star Polygon Group workshop:

Comparison with Raṣīd 6 (1368), Raṣīd 54 (1370s), and Raṣīd 7 (1369)

Frontispiece

Of all the different parts of this manuscript, the element that places it most securely in
the Star Polygon workshop is its frontispiece. The central field is a square with a star
center, a feature that goes all the way back to Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 154) and the Iran Bastan
Museum Qurʿān manuscript (Pl. 155), two of the first possible productions of this
workshop (739/1338), which were discussed in the previous chapter. The star is
twelve-pointed like the one in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248) and displays a very similar frit pattern in
its middle. The arms of the star have a golden background like the rest of the Qurʿān
manuscripts in the group, and the pentagon-based hexagons surrounding them are blue,
also like the others. These pentagon-based hexagons have a palmette split in half

---

428 MS number 4242. Lings, Splendours, pl. 119.
embedded with a white bud in all four Qur’ān manuscripts. Raṣīd 12 reintroduces the lotus as a filler in some of the geometric elements making up the central field. This was previously seen only in the Iran Bastan Museum Qur’ān manuscript (Pl. 155), although the lotus there is different from the lotus in Raṣīd 12. The latter fits the later decades of the century and looks like all the lotuses we have seen in marginal medallions, from the late 1350s (Pls. 56 and 87) to the Star Polygon Group. It has many petals and is grander than the one in the Iran Bastan Museum Qur’ān manuscript.

In Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 258), and Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 321) there is the same border of peonies alternating with lotuses surrounding the square of the central field. Each of these borders is a different color, but their execution is the same. The border framing the whole composition, including the rectangular panels, right before we reach the outermost border, is another feature that the four have in common. It is made up only of lotuses in Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 7, but in Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 12 it is made of peonies alternating with lotuses. As with the inner border, the colors differ in all four of them.

Cartouches in the rectangular panels are not identical in any of them, but they all show the same idea. None of them employ the simple rectangular cartouche to carry the Qur’ān verses inscribed, but rather multi-lobed cartouches and/or rosettes. Raṣīd 12 introduces more colors in the scrolls used in its cartouches, and also introduces the use of symmetrical stoic arabesque, not just the undulating spiraling arabesque. This is an important treatment that will spread more widely throughout the fifteenth century.

The outermost border in all of them is the same size and uses buds in the scrolls. The marginal medallions are all based on the ones in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 8 (Pl.
The development in Rašīd 12 is that there is a golden border that frames the circle. In a sense Rašīd 12 is less complex than the rest, since its medallion does not feature a lot of undulations in the scroll.

**Opening Pages**

The link between the four opening pages is the outermost border, which is of the same size, and in three of them (Rašīd 6 (Pl. 251), Rašīd 54 (Pl. 259), and Rašīd 12 (Pl. 322)), it is almost identical, only with different colors. The one most similar to Rašīd 12 is Rašīd 6, since the treatment of the rectangular panels, cartouches, and their spandrels carrying the suṣra titles is very similar. The spandrels all enclose parts of a star polygon. In Rašīd 12 the innovation consists in the extra attention on the areas between the stars, while in Rašīd 6 it is the star itself that is the focus. The marginal medallions connect Rašīd 12 to the earliest manuscript in the group, Rašīd 8 (Pl. 156). Unlike the other three, Rašīd 12 (Pl. 322) has two medallions, each parallel to a rectangular panel, instead of one in the middle. The medallions in both Rašīd 8 and Rašīd 12 are similar not only in concept but in execution as well. They contain a golden lotus on an orange background and are bordered in gold. They are not identical—the lotus is clearer in Rašīd 8 than it is in Rašīd 12. Also, Rašīd 12 has floating medallions, unlike Rašīd 8 where they are linked to the illuminated frame with a sprout.

The golden text can be seen as another commonality between Rašīd 12, Rašīd 6, Rašīd 54, and Rašīd 7. However, the entire text in Rašīd 12 is in gold, not just the opening pages.
Closing Pages

In Raṣīd 12 the closing pages (Pl. 329) are not comparable to Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 256), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 262), or Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 269). Still, certain details link these pages to other pages in the three manuscripts. The idea of having cartouches carrying text surrounding the central field and the rectangular panels was seen before only in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 264). The marginal medallion surrounded by the colored petals was also seen in the inner folios of Raṣīd 7.

Size

Raṣīd 12 is almost exactly the same size as Raṣīd 54 (only a millimeter difference) and about 8% smaller in length than Raṣīd 6. This size is consistent with their being contained in a big codex, a phenomenon that started in the 1360s and 1370s. Thus it fits the within the framework of the same workshop.

QUR 595—Another Member of the Workshop

Another manuscript that should be included in this discussion is a Qurān manuscript in the Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 595. It was produced in 784/1382–83 by Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-‘Ajamī al-Mudhahhib, who was both the calligrapher and the illuminator. It most certainly fits with the Star Polygon Group workshop productions; was al-‘Ajamī a disciple associated with this workshop who continued work under Sultan Barqūq? Could he have worked on Raṣīd 12 as well?

429 Rogers, Arts of Islam, 154; James, Master Scribes, 190.
The central field of the frontispiece (Pl. 330) is a copy of the central field of Raṣīd 54 (the one for Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafī) (Pl. 258). Since the codex is dated, there is no room to speculate that Raṣīd 12 might have been produced earlier and Sultan Barqūq confiscated it. The workshop was still functioning under Barqūq, as is proven by QUR 595, and the elements that were further developed in Raṣīd 12 help verify that Raṣīd 12 is simply a product of the same workshop producing for a different monarch. Already QUR 595 shows different borders and marginalia. The lotus/peony border is lacking from the frontispiece. The marginal elements on the frontispiece are numerous and occupy the top and bottom margins as well (a trait found in the frontispiece of Raṣīd 141—Pl. 312). The cartouches that usually carry text are made of a scroll. The outer border is very Shirazi-like in style (Pl. 331). The two medallions flanking the cartouche are unique, a flower surrounded by the \( w \) motifs seen in marginal medallions of Raṣīd 60 (Pl. 71).

Marginal medallions throughout QUR 595 show a different illumination program, however. They are simple, and even the \( sūra \) headings do not compare to the elaborate frontispiece.

The calligraphy, like Raṣīd 12, is in gold, but in \textit{muḥaqqaq} and not \textit{thuluth} (Pl. 332). The gold is also outlined in black and shows \textit{tams} in blue and occasional red. Raṣīd 12 has a text framed in gold and blue, while QUR 595 has no frame.

These similarities raise the question of whether al-ʿAjamī might have penned Raṣīd 12 as well. Since each of these manuscripts uses a different script we cannot compare his style, but for now it is safe to assume that he could have worked on both for Sultan Barqūq. More images are needed, in order to examine more details.
Raṣīd 11

In its details we will see in Raṣīd 11 the two prominent styles of the 1360s and 1370s, but Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī’s style is the predominant one. This manuscript was made waqf by the first Circassian sultan, Barqūq, who wanted to vie with the previous Bahri sultans by commissioning this huge codex of 105x61 cm. It consists of 255 heavily restored folios, and was penned in the great script of the period, black muḥaqqaq, eleven lines to a page. The scribe who fortunately signed is none other than the star of the 1390s and the first half of the 1400s, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh, who produced it in 801/1399.430 His colophon reads:

The poor slave of God Almighty, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh, who is thankful to God for all his blessings/grants, and who believes and prays for our lord the Prophet Muḥammad and his family and companions and his good and pure kin, and submits with deep submission, was honored with writing this noble muḥāf, The viewer of this noble muḥāf should know that God Almighty has aided me to write it in one pen in sixty days and nothing less, thanks and gratitude be to God. Its completion coincided with the inundation of the blessed Nile on the 6th of Dhi al-Hijja the year 801. And the reason behind the making of this noble muḥāf was the poor slave to the Mercy of his Bountiful God, Muḥammad ibn al-Batūt, the Damascene (al-Dimishqi) in origin, the one from the town of al-Ṣāliḥiya (al-Ṣāliḥi bāldān). May God forgive him and his parents and all Muslims.431

430 He was born in 770/1368 and died in 845/1441. He is referred to as a follower of the workshop of the early fourteenth-century calligrapher Ibn al-‘Aṣif. Chapter five presents his biography. He left us five Qur’ān manuscripts, two in Dār al-Kutub (Raṣīd 11 and Raṣīd 16); one in the Library of Azhar (767/16); and one in the Chester Beatty Library (Ms. 1503). He also penned the poem of the Imām al-Būṣīrī al-Burda, now in Dār al-Kutub (Adab 455). In addition to teaching calligraphy and scribing Qur’ān manuscripts, he also wrote on the science of writing, and left us the very important work on calligraphy entitled Tuḥfāt ʿulī al-albāb fī ṣīnāʿat al-khaṭṭ wa-al-kitāb or Risāla fī al-khaṭṭ wa-barī al-qalam. More will be said about him in chapter five.
431 Ibn al-Batūt was not found in any of sources, unfortunately. That he is mentioned as the reason behind the codex does not mean he commissioned it. He must have been the inspiration behind the work or the person recommending Ibn al-Ṣāyigh to the sultan.
Because of the heavy soiling of the pages and the condition of the manuscript, only the left side of the frontispiece remains. On folio 1a this remaining part is an impressive and monumental project (Pl. 333). The central field is a square adorned with five eight-pointed stars, two each on the uppermost and lowermost rows and one in the center of the middle row. These stars alternate with octagons, each of which is surrounded by four five-pointed stars. The arrangement with the central octagon harks back to the Şandal workshop. The central field of the frontispiece of the second seventh of the Baybars al-Jāshnakîr Qur‘ān manuscript shows a similar composition (Pl. 334). Another Cairo production that is also similar but relatively closer in date to Raṣīd 11 is the Qur‘ān manuscript penned and illuminated by Âḥmad ibn Kamāl ibn Yaḥyā al-Anṣārî al-Mutatabbib (Pl. 39). Another similar idea can be seen in the Anonymous Baghdad Qur‘ān manuscript (Topkapi Sarayi, EH 250, 702/1303) (Pl. 130). The size of these geometric elements, and the use of these particular colors and fillers, make one focus on the fillers as much as on the geometric elements. Even though it is not as extreme as Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 278), where the fillers dominate, it still emphasizes the fillers at the expense of the geometric elements. A thin pearl band frames all the elements; the backgrounds are either blue or vermilion/orange. Octagons, eight-pointed stars, and pentagon-based hexagons are all blue, while the five-pointed stars and the triangular tips around the eight-pointed stars are vermilion framed with gold. Varying mirrored arabesques fill all these shapes in gold, blue, red, and green except for the five-pointed stars, where the main filler is a small peony in gold and blue.

432 James, Qur‘āns of the Mamlûks, 44, fig. 22.
433 Chester Beatty Library, 1476. James, Qur‘āns of the Mamlûks, 140.
434 James, Qur‘āns of the Mamlûks, 90, fig. 58.
The borders of the central square are varied and integrate elements from Rašīd 97 (762/1361), the Star Polygon Group workshop, and al-Āmīdī’s workshop. To the left and right are two slim rectangles with an orange background, and a simple golden palmette scroll with blue detailing. Once again the frame is a thin pearl band. Around this rectangle is a border with a black background, carrying a scroll that looks more Chinese, made up of peonies and small lotus blossoms in gold with orange detailing. This scroll was seen earlier in Rašīd 97 (Pl. 229) and the Star Polygon Group workshop productions (Pls. 248, 258, and 264). Framing all of this is a simple scroll on a blue background with green, gold, and red peonies, lotuses, and small blossoms. The vertical borders create a rectangular rather than a square frame.

The central field has elaborate panels at the top and bottom. The panels with the inscription cartouches are even more elaborately decorated. As in al-Āmīdī’s work, the ends of the panel around the cartouche are formed not only of spandrels, but also of stand-alone squares with an elaborate geometric design (compare Pl. 279). The cartouches are elaborately multi-lobed in a way not seen earlier. Because of the huge size of the folio, the space devoted to the inscription, Q 56:79–80, is big; hence the golden kūfi has very elongated alifṇ. The scroll beneath the script is a thin green arabesque scroll. As discussed in the previous chapter, this green scroll represents an Ilkhanid influence on the Mamluk tradition. It becomes more popular in succeeding decades, and green will be used even more in the fifteenth century. The spandrels have an orange background with gold stylized scrolls detailed in blue. The two squares flanking the spandrels consist of an eight-pointed central star that grows out, and the edges of which are a semicircle alternating with a trilobed semicircle, exactly like the
edges of the cartouche carrying the inscription. The background of most of the elements is blue; the rest are orange, like the central field of the whole composition. Surrounding all the main elements of the frontispiece is a knotted grid of dots with blue squares of encrusted gold.

The frame around the frontispiece is an arabesque scroll on blue. The scroll is golden with black fillings. A new feature in this border, and an innovative way of using the full-blossomed palmette, is the presentation of this full closed palmette blossom with petals in varying colors. We have seen this full blossom in Khawand Baraka’s Raṣīd 372 in the marginal medallion (Pl. 231), but it was in gold. Here, the petal border surrounds the marginal medallion of the frontispiece. This circular medallion with the petal border links this manuscript with al-Āmiddī’s Raṣīd 15 (Pls. 304 and 305). We will see, in a comparison with al-Āmiddī’s work, that this Qur’ān manuscript, Raṣīd 11, must have been produced by the same workshop, but by a disciple of al-Āmiddī, since al-Āmiddī was already dead when this volume was produced.

The opening pages are very elaborate as well (Pl. 336). Folio 1b has surat al-Fātiḥa in five lines including the basmala in the central field. The last line contains one word, al-ḍālin, in the center. The black text is encased in white cloud bands; each cloud band ends with the end of the āya. The background of the text is red hatching interspersed with the three-dot pyramid seen in Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 289). The interlinear space is further decorated with blue cloud collars or blossoms that look like chandeliers. This treatment of the blossoms was seen in Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 284) and Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 289); here, however, it is overdone and too repetitive. They become the focus of the viewer and thus take away from the text. Perhaps if the illuminator had kept to the style of the
originator of the workshop, it would have looked better. These blossoms will be discussed again in the comparison with al-Āmidī’s Raṣīd 15, below. Around the central field is a thin frame of blue with a scroll of small lotuses and peonies in green, gold, and white.

The two rectangular panels flanking the central square are like those in the frontispiece in concept. Cartouches with trilobed (half-quatrefoil) ends carry the sura title, ʾāya count, and place of revelation in gold kūfî with elongated alif with a blue background. The undulating arabesque scroll in the background is in gold, while the spandrels are orange. In the spandrels and opposite each trilobed end is another trilobed end but with no cartouche to finish it. This is further adorned by a vertical black border with a simple golden scroll holding half palmettes. At each end is an independent square containing an eight-pointed star.

The final outermost border does not contain the colored, full-closed palmettes like the frontispiece. It has a blue background, and the elements of the scroll are red, gold, and black. The right margin features three marginal medallions; the middle one is a teardrop while the two flanking it are circular. These two are like the medallion in the frontispiece, but without the petal border. The teardrop in the middle has a smaller golden teardrop in its center, and its outermost border is a colored petal border. The marginal elements adorning the remaining folios are not as elaborate as the ones in the first folios. The ʿashara marker is always circular, while the khamsa marker is a teardrop (a circle with a triangular top). All are dominated by gold. The ʿashara marker has an orange center with the writing in gold kūfî, and the khamsa has a blue center with the
writing in gold kūhī. No arabesques or scrolls are used to frame them. The only plant form is a sprouting bud around the words.

Calligraphy

The hand of a master calligrapher is at work. Ibn al-Ṣāyigh managed to control the muḥaqqaq on a very large scale and not to lose the balance or the proportion of the words or the letters (Pl. 337). He interchanges the different forms of the letter kāf comfortably and often. All the letters and proportions show a master of Egyptian muḥaqqaq as demonstrated, for instance, by the last line on the folio depicted in Pl. 47, where the wāw, rāʾ, and final mīm follow each other in a sweeping motion.

It is useful to compare his writing with that of Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihābī, the calligrapher of Raṣīd 15 (Pl. 303). Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s mastery becomes even clearer upon this comparison. Even though al-Shihābī is good, his muḥaqqaq is certainly of an inferior quality and of a different workshop from that of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh. Al-Shihābī’s letters do not keep the same thickness throughout, as they sometimes thin, unlike Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, who teaches and practices balanced lines. This is especially clear in final ḥāʾ or fīm. The kāf that Ibn al-Ṣāyigh uses are all well executed. Al-Shihābī’s are not as elegant because of some thinning of the curves and his occasional inability to balance the horizontal stroke of the kāf.

Throughout his treatise Tuhfat ʿulī al-albāb fī ṣināʿat al-khaṭṭ wa-al-kitāb, Ibn al-Ṣāyigh stresses the importance of keeping a steady and proportionate hand, and he certainly applies this to himself. He mentions in the colophon that he finished it in only sixty days and in one pen, which is almost a miracle. To keep using the same pen is very
difficult. If indeed he did that, it means that his control of his tools was even better than his control of his letters. The other meaning to this statement is that he finished it in one script, since ‘qalam’ can be translated as script type.

Fitting in Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī’s Workshop

**Frontispiece**

The focus in the central field on several geometric compartments instead of one central element is certainly a link to both Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 278) and Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 288). The squares at the ends of the cartouches are another connection. The color scheme is also reminiscent of the frontispiece of the second volume of Raṣīd 9.

The marginal medallion is similar to those seen in Raṣīd 15 (Pl. 304), which is also al-Āmīdī’s work.

**Opening Page**

The most important and apparent link is with Raṣīd 9. The opening pages of volume 2 of Raṣīd 9 show compound blossoms and heart/cloud motifs in the interlinear spaces, similar to those used in the interlinear spacing in Raṣīd 11 (compare Pls. 284 and 336). The difference is that in Raṣīd 11, these shapes are filled in, and are blue with white tops. They are also overdone in Raṣīd 11. One of the early examples of such ornamentation in an opening is in Qurʾān manuscript 430 in the TIEM (739/1338) (Pl. 221).435 The TIEM manuscript was produced by Yahyā al-Jamālī al-Ṣūfī, probably in

Shiraz. We can for now consider this as another Ilkhanid influence on the details of Mamluk illumination.

**Size**

This codex is the largest in this chapter, and its size is certainly inspired by al-Āmīdī’s workshop. It is closest in size to Raṣīd 15 (108.3x77 cm). Both Raṣīd 9 and Raṣīd 10 are around thirty centimeters less in length. Of all the manuscripts examined so far, Raṣīd 15 and Raṣīd 11 are the only two in a category of gigantic codices exceeding a meter in length.

**Raṣīd 75**

This Qurʾān manuscript is the earliest in date among the Sultan Barqūq commissions in Dār al-Kutub, where it was brought from the Mosque of Sultan Barqūq. It is in one volume and marks a major change in style, while keeping some old traditions. It consists of 374 folios of white cream paper. It is not a huge codex, as it measures 55x39.5 cm. It has been heavily restored from a dilapidated condition. This is why the name of the calligrapher in the colophon is unfortunately not complete. He penned it in *rayhān* alternating with *muḥaqqaq* in black in 789/1387, eleven lines to a page.436 He signs at end (Pl. 338):

> Has written . . . the weakest of the slaves ʿAlī ibn Māhmūd al-Dāshī (. . . (?) . . . Jumādā II 789.

It begins with the remains of the left side of the frontispiece on folio 1a (Pl. 339).

This remaining part shows an illuminator who is combining earlier traditions of the

---

436 Five years into the first reign of Sultan Barqūq.
fourteenth century with the most recent ones. The central field is a rectangle, which does not take up most of the space allocated for illumination on the page as we are used to. It is a ten-pointed star that grows out to form the rest of the geometric piece, which is all outlined with a pearl band. The appearance of this central field takes us back to the early decades of the fourteenth century, while the fillings of the different elements that make up the star and its extensions are new. The background is blue and the other fillers are a mix of half-palmette arabesques and simple flowers. Simple five-petaled flowers in green are used in some of the compartments. Some of the small geometric pieces of the puzzle have a black background instead of a blue one. The flowers are white, green, and gold. The amount of green used for these floral elements is unprecedented and gives green a new and important role. The border of this rectangle is a knotted golden grid of dots with blue squares. Around it there is a border derived from the floral borders in the workshop group discussed in chapter three, but here it is of an inferior quality (compare with Pls. 248, 258, and 264). This border is wide in proportion to the other elements of the design, especially when compared to its original prototypes in the Star Polygon Group: Rašīd 6 (Pl. 248), Rašīd 7 (Pl. 264), and Rašīd 54 (Pl. 258). The background here (Pl. 339) is blue and the scroll has lotus-like buds (a simplified lotus) alternating with another bud. At the two visible corners of the border we see a multicolored peony. These two flowers are colored in pinkish orange, green, and blue. Even though the original in the Star Polygon Group also depicts multicolored flowers, the execution is very different. This difference indicates that the same workshop did not produce this Qurʾān manuscript. The artist of this Qurʾān manuscript was inspired by the artists of two
decades earlier. An interesting addition is a black line to each of the sides of this border, around which another knotted grid of dots with blue squares can be seen.

The break in style is evident in the use of a wide inscription band to frame the composition. It has a red background carrying in gold *thuluth* the last verse of *sūrat al-Baqara* (Q 2:286) on a beautifully executed white arabesque scroll. This illuminator seems to have no trouble with the traditional palmette-based scrolls, but he is not a master of Ilkhanid-Chinese elements. This band is reminiscent of the bands seen earlier in the inner pages of Raṣīd 141 (Pl. 316), where the first and last line of some folios are in golden *rayḥān* on the same red background. The scroll in the case of Raṣīd 141 is gold with some white petals. The script uses *tams* as well, as in in Raṣīd 141. This combination of colors and style of band connects the two manuscripts and tells us that there must have been a common style that influenced both compositions. This kind of treatment has not been seen in any other Qur’ān manuscript of the period.

The outermost border has a blue background showing a stylized arabesque with a few half palmettes and mostly full blossoms. Intertwining with this band is a white and green line forming arches over the floral one.

The opening pages on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 340) are of the same quality of execution as that of the peony/lotus band around the central field on the frontispiece. Folio 1b carries *sūrat al-Ḥāfiẓa* and folio 2a carries *sūrat al-Baqara*. The text is in an excellent black *rayḥān* in five lines including the basmala. The interlinear space contains a simple scroll, each parallel to a line of text and bearing small white buds. The thin frame of the central field contains narrow curved rectangles with a line in the middle alternating with a circle. Here the line is in the same green that was used in the fillers of the geometric
pieces of the frontispiece. The four rectangular panels flanking the central fields are simple rectangles without cartouches, framed by small green rectangles alternating with circles. These rectangular panels carry *sūra* titles in floriated white *kūfī* on a golden arabesque scroll finely executed on blue background, and Q 56:77–79 decorated in the same manner in the lower two rectangles. Around the rectangular panels and the central fields is a floral band similar to that on the frontispiece, although it is not exactly the same since the peony is lacking here. The same execution of the floral elements and the same color palette is used. The outermost border of the stylized arabesque has orange three-petaled calices (the same new shade of orange as on the frontispiece). No marginal elements were found on the frontispiece; they might have been there originally, but are now gone. However, none were planned for the opening pages.

The *sūra* titles in the inner pages are not illuminated. They are simple golden *thuluth* lines of text with red dotting for the vocalization of the letters (Pl. 341). Marginal elements include the ‘*asharas*, in circular medallions of gold with an orange center and blue outline, and the *khamsa* markers, done in the same manner but in smaller circles with triangular tops (not a complete teardrop). Both the ‘*ashara* and *khamsa* are written in golden *kūfī*. A medallion of the same type as the *khamsa* carries a *naskh* saying “*al-hamid li-Allāh*” on the last folio of the manuscript (folio 374a, Pl. 338) next to the bottom left corner of the colophon.

The most interesting and beautifully executed illumination piece of this Qur’ān manuscript is the colophon. On folio 374a (Pl. 338) a rectangle with a circle in the middle contains the signature of our calligrapher in *thuluth*. Around the circle, in the spandrels created by it on an orange background, are the floral Ilkhanid elements
(Chinese in origin) seen in the Star Polygon Group and executed in the same manner. They are mostly made of lotuses in gold with minimal blue detailing. These blue dots resemble the green dots used in the similar foliage on the frontispiece of Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 321). This is a decorating technique not found in the earlier productions of the Star Polygon group workshop examined in the previous chapter; it came into fashion in the 1380s but no earlier.

The circle itself is surrounded by the same floral border in the openings and the frontispiece, but on a small scale, which makes it look better. The thuluth is on a blue background except for the name of the calligrapher, which is contained in a cartouche whose background is of the paper color. The scroll beneath the text is an arabesque in green. Some letters show ৎams and their dotting is red.

**Calligraphy**

Again, a master calligrapher is at work (Pls. 338, 340, and 341). As in Raṣīd 141 (Pl. 316), he uses the rare rayḥān, and he seems to be a master of it. Two big lines of muḥaqqaq flank the rayḥān lines on the full text pages. His muḥaqqaq is also excellent; however, it shows elements of Ilkhanid rather than Egyptian muḥaqqaq. It is similar to the muḥaqqaq in Raṣīd 60 (Ilkhanid, by Mubārak Shāh, Pl. 68) and Raṣīd 70 (al-Qūmshī, Pl. 58). He is better than either Mubārak Shāh or al-Qūmshī, the calligraphers of those two Qurʿān manuscripts. The Ilkhanid-looking words and letters are wadū māʾanittum in the last line on folio 38a (Pl. 341) and sayasla nāran dhāt lahab in the last line on folio 373a (Pl. 342).437

---

437 The letters are rounder than in Egyptian muḥaqqaq.
As explained in the previous chapters, the use of two different scripts and sizes was not the preference of the Mamluk calligrapher or patron. This is a Persian preference, which became popular in later centuries. But it seems, especially Raṣīd 14 (Pl. 343), that the experiment which did not succeed earlier in the fourteenth century gained some popularity by its end. Could this calligrapher have been part of an Ilkhanid or post-Ilkhanid workshop that was dismantled?

Raṣīd 123

This is the first rabʿa on the list of the multivolume Qurʿān manuscripts endowed by Sultan Barqūq. It is a rabʿa of great importance because it tells us where it was produced, by whom, and when. In so doing it also helps position the next Qurʿān manuscript on the list, Raṣīd 79, which, as will be seen, is most certainly produced by the same workshop. Only seven volumes survive from this thirty-volume rabʿa. Each juzʿ measures 43x32 cm and has eleven lines to a page. The script is big muḥaqqaq alternating with naskh, both in black. Aḥmad al-ʿIsfahānī penned it in the Complex of Sultan Barqūq, definitely for the sultan, in 789/1387. Our calligrapher is Persian or lived there for some time, since his nisba is ‘al-ʿIṣfahānī.’ He signs at the end of each juzʿ (Pl. 344):

Completed by the help of God Almighty and His excellent granting of good success in the blessed madrasa built by the sultan al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Abū Saʿīd, may God glorify his victories, by the hands of the poor [slave] to his Great God Aḥmad al-ʿIṣfahānī on the tenth of Dhi ʿ al-Ḥijja the year [7]89.

438 There is a dot on top of the letter hāʾ in this word, which is very peculiar.
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As in many of these small *rabʿas*, the frontispiece is one-sided and not a double-page spread, and is in fact a *juzʾ* title page. *Juzʾ* 3 begins on folio 1a (Pl. 345) with a frontispiece that is both incomplete and heavily restored. It is incomplete because the medallion in the middle, which is also the main element of the illuminated page, is empty. This is the case with all the surviving *ajzāʾ*. It most probably was going to contain the name of Sultan Barquq. The heavy restoration does not show the marginal medallions, which we will see in *juzʾ* 8, 11, 19, and 28 (Pls. 346, 347, 348, and 349). The main element, the medallion in the middle, is outlined with a pearl band and is multi-lobed because of the intersection and overlapping of a multi-lobed diamond shape with pointed horizontal edges and a square with circular edges, making it almost into an octagon (Pl. 345). The areas where they overlap have a blue background, on top of which are winged three-sepal calices (tripartite buds with half palmettes acting as wings) in gold and brown. The spandrels of this multi-lobed medallion have a black background, simple full blossoms on scrolls, and sprouts in gold, blue, green, white, and red. They are somewhat related to the floral band in Rašīd 75 (Pl. 339).

These simple full blossoms, which could be a simplified palmette or even an interpretation of the lotus produced in this way to save time, are important because they characterize these last two decades of the fourteenth century. They are present here on the frontispieces of all the volumes and the opening pages of all the volumes as well. They are also seen in the next Qurʾān manuscript on the list, Rašīd 79 (Pl. 350). They are used as the main filler of spaces. They are usually green or blue and are sometimes interspersed with peonies, as seen in *juzʾ* 28 (Pl. 349). An important Mamluk Qurʾān manuscript which utilizes them and is also important because of its frontispiece is
Qur’an manuscript 445 in the TIEM, dated to approximately the 1380s (Pl. 351). It is in one part and is quite big, 75.5x50.5 cm. The frontispiece of this manuscript has an interesting central field: a figure of intersecting shapes very similar to what we have in Raśid 123 and Raśid 79 (Pls. 345–350). Minor differences do exist, but the main one is the lack of a frame around the middle circle. Borrowed from the Star Polygon Group is the idea of a floral border, which should have been lotuses and peonies. But here in TIEM 445 the inner floral border is made up of a flower derived from the peony alternating with a flower derived from the lotus. The outer border, which is on a black background, is made up of a peony alternating with the same flower that is found in the spandrels of the central field of the frontispieces of all the volumes in Raśid 123 and Raśid 79. This is the same flower that was earlier said to have been used as the main filler of spaces, and is usually green or blue.

The rectangular panels carrying the juz’ title in thuluth, which is tarnished white, are mostly occupied by the cartouches, with the space left for the spandrels being negligible. The background is blue, and the plant forms are full closed blossoms in gold, sprouting from stems rather than from a scroll. There is a huge difference between this and the sprouting in similar cartouches in the Khawand Baraka rab‘as (Raśid 80, Pl. 235 and Raśid 372, Pl. 231) in chapter three. These look more like sprays, and thus have a Shirazi quality to them.

Folios 1b–2a are the opening pages of juz’ 3 and are heavily illuminated (Pl. 352). This is the first time we see the illuminated beginning of a juz’ without rectangular panels and cartouches, even if it does not coincide with a beginning of a

---

439 1400th Anniversary of the Qur’an, 258.
sūra. The muḥaqqaq begins in the middle of the field and is in three lines in each of the opening pages. Each line of text is contained in a cloud, around which is vertical hatching decorated with sprays of flowers and blossoms in blue, green, and gold. The floral elements are a range of closed palmettes and a couple of lotuses. Two peculiar flowers are at the top of folio 2a to the left and right of the rectangle. That the background is not on an undulating arabesque scroll as we are used to, or even the busy Chinese foliage (as seen in Raṣīd 6 – Pl. 251), is a break in style. Beauty, grandeur, and meticulousness are essential, but surely time and cost were of the essence in such politically volatile times.

Simple marginal medallions adorn the interior of the codex (Pl. 353). As has now become usual, the khamṣa marker is an oval or a circle with a triangular top, while the ḍaḥṣa marker is circular. The sūra titles are not adorned; they are simple golden thuluth alternating with the rows of black naskh and muḥaqqaq that make up the text of the sūras.

Juz’ 28 is almost exactly the same, with just a few differences. The frontispiece displays quite a few (Pl. 349). The areas of overlap between the two shapes making up the multi-lobed medallion in the central field of folio 1a have an orange background. Each contains a spray of flowers, not a winged one. The spandrels around the medallion have a blue rather than a black background. At the corner of each of the four spandrels there is a peony with a pointed end, a detail not found in juz’ 3 or juz’ 8 (compare Pls. 345, 346, and 349).

---

440 Juz’ 8 is also of the same exact design but utilizing different colors (Pl. 346).
In this *juz’*, 28, the marginal medallions survive. They are typical of small Qur’ān manuscripts and are imported from earlier decades. They are comparable to some of the examples seen in chapter two in the Sultan Hasan and Șirghitmish groups.

Since the beginning of this *juz’* coincides with the beginning of a *sūra* (*sūrat al-Mujadala*), there is a rectangular panel, without a cartouche, carrying the *sūra* title (Pl. 354). The text is in white *thulūth* on a blue background, surrounded by golden flowers and sprouting elements. To the side of this rectangular panel and in the margin is a marginal medallion of gold and orange. The central fields are the same as the ones in the opening of *juz’* 3 (Pl. 352). The difference is in the text, which is a line of *muhaqqaq* alternating with one of *naskh*. This arrangement of the scripts certainly detracts from their effect.

**Calligraphy**

The *muhaqqaq* used is certainly the Ilkhanid one and not the Egyptian one. It seems that al-İsfahānī might have been trained in the Persian lands, or at least in Persian techniques, before scribing this Qur’ān manuscript. His hand is a fine one but not excellent, and his *muhaqqaq* is much better than his *naskh*. Also, the *naskh* is much smaller than *muhaqqaq* and so is relegated to a secondary importance and is almost invisible. The first impression is that the text is a commentary, but it is not. This technique is certainly not effective or suitable for the verses of the Qur’ān, where every word is as important as another. The trouble is also with the disproportionality of the two scripts, the *muhaqqaq* being too big and the *naskh* too small.
**Raṣīd 79**

This is another *rabʿa* where one *juzʿ* only survived, *juzʿ* 13. It was also found in the Complex of Sultan Barqūq and must have been produced by the same workshop as Raṣīd 123, since it is almost exactly the same. It measures 43x32 cm and contains sixteen pages. The text is in both *muḥaqqaq* and *naskh* in black; a line of *muḥaqqaq* alternates with four lines of *naskh* in most pages. No signature is present, but the calligrapher is most certainly Ahmad al-Īsfahānī. The date is most probably 789/1387, like Raṣīd 123.

The *juzʿ* starts on folio 1a (Pl. 350) in exactly the same way as those in Raṣīd 123 (Pls. 345–349). Only the differences will be pointed out, since for the most part they are the same. The cartouches carrying the *juzʿ* title have a golden background instead of blue. The multi-lobed medallion in the central field, which is also left empty, has two circles at its left and right sides instead of a pointed lobe. These circles have a black background and encircle a golden peony. The spandrels are blue, as in *juzʿ* 28 of Raṣīd 123, but the floral elements are like those in the spandrels in *juzʿ* 3 of Raṣīd 123.

The opening pages, folios 1b–2a (Pl. 355), are also like those in Raṣīd 123. While it does not coincide with the beginning of a *sūra* and so there are no rectangular panels carrying the *sūra* title, the text is organized like the beginning of *juzʿ* 28 of Raṣīd 123 (Pl. 349), which does begin with a new *sūra*. There are five lines in total, one line of *muḥaqqaq* alternating with one line of *naskh*. Each line is contained in a cloud. The āya markers do not interrupt the cloud, but are placed within it.

---

441 I think that it is the same *rabʿa*. This would mean that Raṣīd 123 and Raṣīd 79 are one and the same Qurʾān manuscript, and that some confusion arose when they were first brought in to Dār al-Kutub in the late nineteenth century. However, in spite of this suspicion I am dealing with them as two different manuscripts.
The inner pages (Pl. 356) are also exactly the same as in Rašīd 123 (Pls. 353 and 356–359), so they will not be elaborated upon; even the marginal medallions are exactly the same. The calligraphy is also the same and was most certainly done by Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī. A comparison of any of the folios shows the same plan for the lines of *muḥaqqaq* and *naskh*, and the same execution of letters and words.

**Rašīd 76**

This manuscript is a *rabʿa* dedicated to the *khānqāh* in the complex of Sultan Barqūq. Twenty-four volumes of the thirty survive, measuring an average of 32.8x23.8 cm. Each cream polished folio has five lines, which became a standard for small *rabʿas* in the 1350s. The script is thick black *muḥaqqaq*. We unfortunately have no signature or date in it. The dating, however, is to be placed between the construction of the *khānqāh* and the death of the sultan, thus between 786/1384 and 801/1399.

The two volumes to be discussed are the second and the last. We will begin with the last, *juzʿ* 30, because it is more complete. It begins on folio 1a (Pl. 360) with a rectangle in the upper third of the page. The page is not fully illuminated; we see only the rectangular panel carrying the *juzʿ* title, as we have seen before in Rašīd 148 (Pl. 37) and Rašīd 58 (Pl. 77) from the late 1350s, in chapter two. The same workshop might have been involved in producing this as well, a workshop that was used by Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī and Sultan Ḥasan, different from the one that produced other *rabʿas* like the Rašīd 59 (related to the Star Polygon Group) for Sultan Ḥasan. The style of this panel mixes decorative elements from earlier decades of the fourteenth century with those of

---

*442 Two volumes from this *rabʿa* will be discussed (2 and 30).*
later ones. The rectangular panel has three golden frames, the one in the middle being the knotted grid of dots with orange squares. These frames surround a rectangular blue cartouche, whose ends are not curved. The idea of the rectangular panel as the title without further illumination was seen in the 1350s, while the way in which the floral elements sprout from the cloud around the letters is akin to Khawand Baraka’s small Qur’an manuscripts from the 1360s (Pls. 231 and 235).

The marginal medallion rests on the left side of the rectangle and contains a gold lotus on orange. This is borrowed from the other workshop under Sultan Hasan which produced Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 87).

Beneath the rectangular panel the waqf inscription, in a chancery script, reads (Pl. 360):

Our lord the Sultan al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Abū Sa‘īd Barquq, may God glorify his victories, has made this noble khatima in thirty volumes a waqf to the khānqāh he built in Bayn al-Qaşrayn and stipulated that it does not leave it. Whosoever changes this after having heard it, its sin is on those who have changed it. God is All-Knowing and All-Hearing.

The inner folios (Pl. 361) are decorated only with the āya markers and the almond shapes denoting the rub’ ḥizb. These are outlined in blue and filled with gold and orange, while the thuluth in them is blue. The sūra titles are in gold muḥaqqaq, and not thuluth as we are used to.

Juz’ 2 starts on folio 1a (Pl. 362), which is the left side of the opening pages of this juz’. It is the second part of Q 2:142. The text is in black muḥaqqaq in three lines, with a golden frame outlined in blue. Each line is in a cloud surrounded by a spiraling arabesque outlined in black on parallel hatching. The arabesque is well drawn, composed
mostly of half palmettes and trefoils. The inner pages (Pl. 363) are like those seen in *juz’* 30 (Pl. 361), with the illumination being contained in the almond-shaped *rub’ ħizb* markers.

The last pages of *juz’* 2, folios 40b–41a (Pl. 364), contain only seven words in two small rectangles like those in the opening, but much smaller.

In both volumes examined we have seen the hatched ground with the arabesque around the clouds containing text. This tradition is traced back to early Cairo productions from the Şandal workshop. One of the early examples was seen earlier in TIEM 450, which was illuminated by a disciple of Şandal in 713/1313 (Pl. 365).\(^{443}\) Comparative material closer in time, which again ties this Qur’ān manuscript to the workshop that produced for Şirghitmish and Sultan Ḥasan, is found in Raṣīd 147 (Pl. 52).\(^{444}\)

**Calligraphy**

The black *muḥaqqaq* is proportionately big and combines features from Ilkhanid *muḥaqqaq* with those of the Egyptian *muḥaqqaq*; however, it is more Egyptian.

Examples of words that show the Ilkhanid influence are *al-dhikrā* and *yā laytañī* on folio 26b (Pl. 75) in *juz’* 30, and *fā-idkhulī* and *irji ‘ī* on folio 27a (Pl. 77), also in *juz’* 30.

These two folios also show that our calligrapher’s ink thins or grows faint, which does not speak well for his work.

\(^{443}\) James, *Qur’āns of the Mamlūks*, fig. 36.

\(^{444}\) Another example that fits into this group is Arabe 393 in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Pl. 514). It has been dated to the fifteenth century, but a stylistic analysis places it with this group of Qur’ān manuscripts and especially with Raṣīd 76. See *Splendeur et Majesté*, 51.
What is most interesting is that the suṣra titles are all also in muḥaqqaq, but in gold, and are in the hand of the calligrapher. It is thus possible that he was also the illuminator.\textsuperscript{445}

\textbf{Raṣīd 78}

Only one volume remains of this \textit{rab’a}, juz’9 of the thirty-volume set. It was found in the Complex of Sultan Barqūq.\textsuperscript{446} It is rather small, measuring only 18.5x12.1 cm, while the text block is 11.4x 7.5 cm, penned in a black \textit{naskh}, five lines to a page, that shows features from muḥaqqaq. We unfortunately have no signature or date. The dating, however, is to be placed between the construction of the khānqāḥ and the death of the sultan, thus between 786/1384 and 801/1399.

The first few āyās of juz’9 are missing because the first folio is missing, so it begins in the middle of Q 7:89 (Pl. 366). The illumination found is primarily in the marginal medallions (Pl. 367). They are treated in a new way, looking like a \textit{shams} (sun) because of the disproportionately long tassels and the golden filling. There are only ‘ashara markers, which are circular medallions with a blue frame and blue inner circle on which ‘‘ashara’’ is inscribed in golden kuṭīḥ. Most of the circles are gold; six of them are alternating blue and orange.

The final folio, 40b (Pl. 368), has the other illuminated element of the manuscript. The final words of the juz’ are inscribed in two short lines in a rectangle. The script is in clouds on a hatched red background decorated with a big scroll of half

\textsuperscript{445} I believe that many of these small Qurʾān manuscripts were produced by one person, who would both scribe and illuminate.

\textsuperscript{446} It is in very bad condition. It has lost its binding and is missing its first page.
and full palmettes. The border of the rectangle is a wide golden one outlined in blue. This treatment of the last page connects this Qur’ān manuscript to the previous one, Raṣīd 76 (Pl. 364), because of the hatching and the scroll. However, the execution is a bit different. This rectangle is in between what we see in Raṣīd 76 (Pl. 364) and the Raṣīd 82 from the 1350s (Pl. 96). The plant motifs here on the scrolls are bigger and are partly colored because of the presence of the blue and red notches.

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy in the manuscript shows strong connections to Raṣīd 56 (late 1340s) (Pl. 19) and Raṣīd 149 (c. 1356) (Pl. 27) from chapter two. The *naskh* is in an excellent hand and displays features of *muḥaqqaq* in some letters, such as the final *qāf*, final *nūn*, or final *bāʾ* (Pl. 367). It looks like a natural development out of the earlier *naskh* with some *muḥaqqaq* features: more letters look like *muḥaqqaq* than in either Raṣīd 56 or Raṣīd 149, and the *muḥaqqaq*-like final letters (*qāf*, final *nūn*, final *bāʾ*) are thin at the most curved parts, as in Raṣīd 15 (calligraphy of al-Shihābī, chapter three) (Pl. 304).

**Raṣīd 125**

Twelve volumes of the thirty survive from this *rabʿa* made *waqf* by Sultan Barqūq. Not as small as other *rabʿās*, each volume measures 38x27 cm. It is penned five lines to a page in black *muḥaqqaq*. No signatures survive in any of the volumes, but stylistic connections to the illumination of Raṣīd 13 suggest the same workshop or a disciple from the workshop, and thus show affiliations to the Star Polygon Group workshop. The dating is to be placed between the construction of the *khānqāh* and the death of the
sultan, between 786/1384 and 801/1399. However, it was most probably produced in the late 1390s because of the connections to Raṣīd 13.

In both *juz’*27 and *juz’*25, folios 1b–2a (Pls. 369 and 370) carry the opening pages of the *juz’,* which are fully illuminated even though they do not coincide with the beginning of a *sūra. Juz’*25 is in bad condition and only part of the folio has survived. The black *muḥaqqaq* in three lines is in clouds, preserving the paper ground; each cloud encases an āya marker. Around the clouds of text the background appears pinkish because of the parallel red hatching behind the scrolls and sprays like those to be seen in Raṣīd 13 (to be discussed later) (Pl. 371) and Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), but not as crowded. It is somewhere in between the arabesques in the opening pages of Raṣīd 76 and the crowded floral ground in Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 13. The Chinese origins of these elements have already been explained. They are important because this puts this *rab‘a* in the same workshop as Raṣīd 13. The rectangular panels contain cartouches with rounded ends in blue, carrying Q 26:192–93 in white *kūfī* surrounded by an undulating golden arabesque, the half palmettes of which have orange dotting. Flanking each of these cartouches and in the spandrels are two circles containing a colorful peony each, a peony similar to what we will see in Raṣīd 13. The colors used for the peony are red, orange, green, purple, and gold. These large colored large peonies are also present in a Qur’ān manuscript in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 372). Surrounding the central fields and the rectangular panels is the knotted grid of dots.
QUR 187 is a single volume, juz’1, remaining from a rab’a. The stylistic resemblance between it and Rašīd 125 speaks of the same workshop.⁴⁴⁷ Not only are these peonies the same in design, color, and placement, but they flank the sûra titles in white kūfī on a blue background and golden arabesque in a curved rectangular cartouche in the same way. The spandrels differ in that in QUR 187 there is more space to have a full half-palmette and not just a small trefoil as in Rašīd 125. This feature in Rašīd 125 copies Rašīd 12 (Pl. 329). Both spandrels are black with white floral elements. The pearl band around these cartouches in both manuscripts surrounds the rectangle and the two roundels with the peonies in the same way: it is knotted at the intersection between the medallion and the curved ends of the rectangle. David James has assigned QUR 187 a date of 1340–50,⁴⁴⁸ and Michael Rogers dates it to 1350–60.⁴⁴⁹ While both concur that it belongs to the second half of the fourteenth century, it is more accurately placed in the 1380s, since the similarities between QUR 187 and Rašīd 125 speak of the same workshop. There is nothing to prove that Rašīd 125 is an earlier production that was confiscated by Sultan Barqūq. Stylistically, such treatment of the peony with its varied colors would put it in later decades rather than earlier ones. Multicolored plant forms appeared in Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts later, not earlier. The treatment of the marginal medallions in Rašīd 125, the ones that are simpler than the Star Polygon Group yet based on it, would also put it in the later years, certainly not in the 1340s or 1350s, when such treatment of marginalia in Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts did not exist.

⁴⁴⁷ At first, comparing the illumination, I thought that QUR 187 must be the same manuscript as Rašīd125, especially since juz’1 is missing from Rašīd 125. However, the calligraphy proves that they are two different manuscripts.
⁴⁴⁸ James, Master Scribes, 180.
⁴⁴⁹ Rogers, Arts of Islam, 144.
The outermost border resembles the one in the opening pages of Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259), Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 265), and Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 322); the marginal medallions are a simplified version of those in the Star Polygon Group and the later al-Āmidī work. The marginal medallions carrying the ʿashara markers on the inner folios are like the ʿāya markers in Raṣīd 12, but on a larger scale. Medallions bordering sūra titles are like their equivalents in Sultan Ḥasan’s Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 87).

Sūra titles are also derived directly from the Sultan Ḥasan subgroup, especially Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 87). A rectangular cartouche with a golden border contains a blue cartouche with rounded ends and white thuluth in a gold cloud. Instead of scrolls, the text is surrounded by tendrils with leaf forms in gold. The spandrels are orange adorned with a gold lotus around which golden tendrils form. The lotus has blue notches inside of it. A marginal medallion, extending into the margin for each sūra title, does not sit on the frame, and contains in its center a full closed palmette/blossom in gold on orange.

Calligraphy

The calligraphy is excellent muḥaqqaq, but the ink sometimes thins in the hand of our calligrapher (Pl. 373). It has some characteristics of Egyptian muḥaqqaq but is not the most typical variant as seen in Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, Raṣīd 54, or Raṣīd 10 in chapter 2. The sweeps are not as long or angled. The final ḥāʾs and final jīms connect it to the hand of al-Shihābī in Raṣīd 15 (Pl. 305). These two letters are also not as proportionate as they ought to be. The horizontal stroke is not always the same in the execution of all of them; sometimes it is big as compared to the curved stroke beneath and at other times it is small.
The words are not always spaced proportionately on the page. Folios 30b–31a in *juz’*27 clearly show this feature of his hand (Pl. 374). Folio 30b features lines with more space between the words than folio 31a.

**Raşid 120**

This is another *rab’a* found in the complex of Sultan Barqūq that can be grouped with the small *rab’as*, and was most certainly produced by the same workshop/person that produced the following one (Raşid 121). Ten volumes of thirty survive. They measure an average of 30x27 cm and were penned in black *muḥaqqaq*, five lines to a page. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Imām signs as its *muḥarrir*. We unfortunately have no date; however, it can be placed between the construction of the *khānqāh* and the death of the sultan, between 786/1384 and 801/1399.

*Juz’*1 opens on folio 1a (Pl. 375) with a partly empty rectangle, the one meant to carry the *waqt*’statement. The rectangle is not centered in the page; it is placed more towards the upper part of it. A knotted golden border with blue hexagons frames the rectangle, and its upper quarter is occupied by a rectangular panel carrying the *juz’* name. The “first *juz’* from the noble *rab’a*” is inscribed in white and blue *thuluth*. The sentence is encased in a narrow golden cloud that is surrounded by a golden spray of crudely executed flowers with orange detailing. The background of the panel is blue. In the panel’s left margin is a golden medallion displaying a peony with six petals on an orange background and a blue center. This is the medallion that is used throughout the *juz’*. Below the rectangular panel the space is left blank, and so unfortunately we do not
have the *waqf* or dedicatory inscription which most probably would have filled this space.

The opening pages of the *juz’*, folios 1b–2a (Pl. 376), carry *sūrat* al-Fātiḥa on two pages in fully illuminated rectangles. The central fields contain three lines of black *muḥaqqaq*, each including the *basmala* on folio 1b. Each line is in a cloud, the background of which is the paper color. The background around the clouds is filled by red hatching. On folio 1b, we see the outline of a faint cloud collar, chandelier, or blossom. Perhaps it was intended to be finished in the same way as the ones on the opening pages of *juz’*24 (Pl. 377), as we will see shortly.

The central fields are flanked by rectangular panels carrying the *sūra* title, verse count, place of revelation, and Q 56:77–79. The inscriptions in *thuluth* are done in the same way as the *juz’* title on folio 1a, with the same color schemes and floral elements. The margins are handled differently since they have two extra elements: a medallion at the bottom as well as the top, and in the middle a semicircle articulated with two more semicircles in blue with orange around them. A crude peony, trefoil, and half palmettes are used to decorate the elements in the semicircle.

The interior of the *juz’* features orange almond-shaped medallions with the words *rub‘ ḥizb* inscribed in them in *thuluth* and encased in a golden cloud (Pl. 378).

*Juz’*24 is different in details compared to the first *juz’*. It starts on folio 1a (Pl. 379) with the same rectangle as seen in *juz’*1 (Pl. 375), also with a blank central field. The rectangular panel is, however, decorated differently. It contains a cartouche with rounded ends, producing orange spandrels ornamented with a blue circle in the middle. The inscription of the cartouche is in white *thuluth* giving the *juz’* title. It is also in a
golden cloud. The sprays of the flowers are not in a scroll, but small comma-like motifs and leaves sprout from the cloud.

The medallion in the right margin is orange with a golden and blue frame and a golden flower in the middle. The flower is a bud from which three sepals are sprouting, detailed in blue.

To match the juz’ title, the opening pages (folios 1b–2a) (Pl. 377) are decorated in the same details. The central fields carry three lines of text each. The lines of muhaqqaq are contained in clouds in paper color and surrounded by red hatching. The interlinear spacing is decorated with cloud collar/plant motifs similar to those seen in Rašid 11 (Pl. 336). Here they are blue and green.

The rectangular panels carrying Q 56:77–80 (no sūra titles in this case) echo the ones on folio 1a (Pl. 379); they contain cartouches with rounded ends and have the same color scheme and decorative details. The marginal medallions are also like the one on folio 1a. In the middle of each margin there is a curved shape (ansa) in blue with golden floral elements. As in juz’ 1, the inner pages display rub’ ādīb markers, which are not in an almond shape but rather in a golden teardrop (Pl. 380).

**Calligraphy**

The calligraphy is very much like Rašid 62 (the work of Sawunju al-Rasūfī and his son Muḥammad, late 1350s) (Pl. 193), but is not necessarily by the same hand. It is Egyptian muhaqqaq by a good but not a master’s hand. The strokes are not very steep and the letters are sometimes not proportionate; see the kāf on folio 15a in juz’ 24 (Pl. 380). The teeth of the sīn and shīn are not always pronounced enough. The hand is steady,
however, and his ink does not thin anywhere. The most interesting feature of his hand is that he almost always uses the middle ʰāʼ for the beginning, that is, it is always the Persian ʰāʼ.

**Raṣīd 121**

Only one volume survives from this *rab‘a*, *juz‘*24. This too was found in the Complex of Sultan Barqūq and looks exactly like *juz‘*1 of Raṣīd 120. It measures 30x27 cm and is penned in black *muḥaqqaq*, five lines to a page. We unfortunately have no signature or date. The dating, however, is to be placed between the construction of the *khānqāh* and the death of the sultan, between 786/1384 and 801/1399.

To avoid redundancy it will not be described. Only the differences or additions will be mentioned. The only difference between Folio 1a and *juz‘*1 in Raṣīd 120 (Pl. 375) is in the inscription differs; this one says it is the twenty-fourth volume (Pl. 381). Folios 1b–2a (Pl. 382) are decorated in exactly the same way as the opening pages of *juz‘*1 in Raṣīd 120 (Pl. 376). The difference is that here the Qur‘ān text in the rectangular panels is longer: Q 56:76–80. The marginal medallions and decorative details are all the same.

In this manuscript we have an inner *sūrah* title, which is elaborately done. On folio 11b (Pl. 383) the *sūrah* title of *sūrat* al-Mū‘min (Ghāfir in modern Qur‘ān editions) is set in a rectangular panel exactly like the one of the *juz‘* title (Pl. 381), at the bottom

---

450 I have a suspicion that this *juz‘*24 belongs to the previously discussed *rab‘a*, Raṣīd 120, and that the *juz‘*24 of Raṣīd 120 should have been given a different number. Stylistically it is exactly like *juz‘*1 of Raṣīd 120, and consequently differs in details from *juz‘*24 of Raṣīd 120. The trouble is that there is no way of proving that a cataloguing error happened in the nineteenth century when these manuscripts were being collected from their various buildings.
of the page. Even its marginal medallion is like that on the juz’ title, the only difference being the size. Above this medallion is another bigger one with the word nisf inscribed in thuluth in it. It is circular with an orange background and golden flowers.

Calligraphy

It is in a similar hand to the previous manuscript, but probably not produced by the same calligrapher. It might have been the work of a disciple, because it is not as good as Raṣīd 120. This can be seen by comparing the opening pages of the respective volumes 24 (compare Pls. 377 and 382), which have the same words and placement. The pen in Raṣīd 121 is thinner and the letters are more spread out. In both Raṣīd 120 and Raṣīd 121, letters like ṣād and ẓād are surprisingly small when compared to the same ones in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251) or Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 265). This muḥaqqaq here is different from most of the muḥaqqaq we have seen in chapter three. The ‘ayn and the ghayn are also not as big, in proportion to the other letters, as we often see in muḥaqqaq.451

451 Another Qurʾān manuscript could be added to this group, but will not be dealt with here because of its fragmentary and incomplete state that does not provide much useful information. This manuscript, Raṣīd 124, is the last one in this group and only juz’ 20 survives from this rab’a. It too was found in the Complex of Sultan Barquq. It measures 33x24 cm and is currently in a binding that does not belong to it. Each of its 26 folios is inscribed in five lines of text in a peculiar script, a naskh with thuluth and muḥaqqaq features. There is no signature or date. The dating, however, is to be placed between the construction of the khānqāḥ and the death of the sultan, between 786/1384 and 801/1399. Unfortunately it seems to be unfinished; no illumination survives and the spaces for sūra titles are left blank, since it is the illuminator who provides them (Pls. 384–385). A student must have been responsible for this Qurʾān manuscript and not a master. His naskh is big and the main thuluth feature is its curvilinear appearance. While the muḥaqqaq letters are some final rā’, other final rā’ are very much like thuluth. It seems to have been an interesting but unsuccessful experiment, because the end result is a script that looks like an attempt at a fancy chancery script and not a majestic Qurʾān script.
Raṣīd 13

Raṣīd 13 is a monumental codex that is to be ascribed to Sultan Barqūq. It measures 105x79 cm and consists of 411 folios of cream polished paper. Penned in a large and elegant black muḥaqqaq, it has ten lines to a page. It was found in the madrasa of the sultan and so was most probably commissioned for it. We unfortunately have no name for the artists involved in it. Nor do we have the first two folios and so we are missing the frontispiece, which one can only imagine must have been superb.

Folio 1a carries sūrat al-Baqara, since the first few pages are missing (Pl. 371). This fully illuminated page bears witness to what must have been a great and ambitious project. The central field that carries the text of the sūra is a huge square with six lines of verses, including the basmala, in golden muḥaqqaq. Some of the letters employ tams in black. The background, on a pink scroll, as in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), shows delicately executed white and blue lotuses and full peony blossoms, which are not only perfectly placed but do not distract from the text in any way, unlike the interlinear additions in the openings of Raṣīd 11 (Pl. 336).

The illumination program of this page hints at the possibility that a disciple in the workshop of the Star Polygon Group was involved, or that it came from this

---

452 There is no colophon. The modern unpublished catalogue does not mention the calligrapher either, but states that it was a waqf by Sultan Barqūq himself. However, the nineteenth-century catalogue states that the colophon mentions that Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣayigh finished it in 814/1411 (Min fiḥrist al-kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 10). This date puts it under Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq and not Barqūq. Further confusion arises when the book Arabic Palaeography by Bernhard Moritz (director of Dār al-Kutub from 1896 to 1911) is examined. A few images of the manuscript are published under Sultan Barqūq instead of his son Faraj (Moritz, Arabic Palaeography, 69). The stylistic comparison I made some years ago in situ between this Qurʾān manuscript, Raṣīd 11, and Raṣīd 16 led me to conclude that it is not by the same hand as Raṣīd 11 and Raṣīd 16. Thus, the assumption now is that the Khedivial catalogue was mistaken on two counts: that it was written by Ibn al-Ṣayigh and that it was made waqf by Faraj. The ascriptions of Bernhard Moritz and the new unpublished catalogue will accordingly be followed here.
workshop itself. The rectangular panels containing the cartouches for the sūra titles and the fineness of execution of the various details point to this conclusion. The cartouches in the rectangular panels have multi-lobed concave ends and each of their spandrels is filled with a concave-sided octagon, as seen in the closing pages of Raşid 6 (Pl. 256). This octagon has a blossoming multicolored peony—green, red, light blue, and gold—surrounded by a black outline. The peony instantly recalls the one in Raşid 125 (Pl. 369), which, as discussed earlier, is also related to the Star Polygon Group workshop productions. It also ties in with QUR 187 from the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 372). This is further proof that both Raşid 125 and QUR 187 are not from the 1340s, 1350s, or 1360s, but from the later years of the fourteenth century.

Mirrored details of arabesque scrolls in gold occupy the other parts of the geometric piece on blue in the spandrels of the cartouche. The cartouche itself has a blue background decorated with a spiraling golden arabesque scroll topped by the white kūfī stating the sūra title, āya count, and place of revelation. The kūfī here is more proportionate than that in the sūra title of Raşid 11 (Pl. 336). Other spaces around the cartouche have an orange background with big golden scrolls and flowers. The border of the rectangular panels is red, with small alternating blue-white lotuses and red peonies. It is similar to the band in the frontispiece of Raşid 12 (Pl. 321) because of the background color and the color of the lotuses used.

An interesting variation is the outermost border, which consists not of an arabesque scroll but rather of petals around trefoils in blue, green, pink, and red, similar to the borders in the frontispiece medallions of juz’3 of Sultan Hasan’s Raşid 62 (Pl. 386), which in turn is like some Shirazi examples. We see it in the frontispiece (Pl. 387)
of *Tarjuma-i iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, dated to 744/1344, now in the Topkapi Sarayi (H.231).\(^453\)

The *sūra* titles are elaborate and majestic. They are different from each other, each exhibiting different shapes within the rectangular panel that carries the title, which is a strong connection to the Star Polygon Group workshop. Some *sūra* titles introduce new colors. Olive green as a background color can be seen on folios 31b, 409b, and 410a (Pl. 424, 426, and 427). The original is the one on folio 410a (Pl. 427), where it is very soothing to look at. The other two examples are most probably the result of the restoration work, where the green is unsettling and does not go well with the rest of the colors around it. As seen in the previous century, sometimes the last words of a *sūra* will extend into the design of the *sūra* title (Pls. 426–428).

The *āya* markers are a direct link to Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 322); they are exactly the same. The marginal medallions are interesting. The only *khamsa* marker shows the typical circle with a triangular top (Pl. 388). It is decorated with blue trefoils alternating with orange ones on a golden background, the like of which has not been seen before.

The closing pages (Pl. 429) provide the strongest link to the Star Polygon Group workshop. The *basmala* and the *sūra* make four lines of golden *muḥaqqaq* with black *tams*. The *āyas* are carried in big clouds on paper ground. A lush scroll holding lotuses and chrysanthemums with blue notching surrounds the clouds and is drawn over parallel black hatching. Again the connection to the Star Polygon workshop is seen in the natural flow of the scroll, which is akin to Chinese examples. The other connection to the Star Polygon Group workshop is the floral band of colorful lotuses and peonies

around the central field. The finesse of the gold outlining, the golden arabesque behind the \textit{kûfî} of the \textit{sûra} title, and the care for the details of the color hues are signs of the efficiency of the workshop and its excellence throughout the decades.

\textbf{Calligraphy}

The calligraphy is a very good example of \textit{muḥaqqaq} (Pls. 388, 424–428). The calligrapher’s hand is well balanced and varies certain executions of letters and words more than in Raṣīd 11 (the same verses were compared). These words are circled in red in the comparative plates of Raṣīd 11 and Raṣīd 13. Even though one calligrapher can have different styles, in this case the variations in the execution reveal two different calligraphers scribing Raṣīd 11 (Pl. 337) and Raṣīd 13 (Pl. 388). The \textit{muḥaqqaq} in Raṣīd 13 is not as graceful as Raṣīd 11 or Raṣīd 16 (Pl. 389); it does not flow as well and is much thicker. The downward strokes of final letters like \textit{wāw} and \textit{ra’} are not angled like those in either Raṣīd 11 or Raṣīd 16. Both these manuscripts, Raṣīd 11 or Raṣīd 16, show similarities with each other that are incongruent with the hand of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh. The pen is also not his as seen in the other two manuscripts; here it is not only thicker, but also causes some of the downward strokes to thicken at the end. An example of this is the word \textit{law} in the last line on the folio in Pl. 108. Also, the text here is contained in a rectangular frame, unlike in Raṣīd 11 or Raṣīd 16.
Endowments by Faraj ibn Barqūq

Rasāld 16

This Qurʾān manuscript is an ambitious project by Faraj ibn Barqūq and a logical
continuation of the work of the Star Polygon Group workshop, introducing more
elements from the Persian world.454 It was commissioned by Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq
and finished by the master calligrapher ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh in 814/1411. It
has 252 folios, measuring 95x73 cm, with the text penned in black muḥaqqaq, eleven
lines to a page. The text block is only 67.5x54 cm. A later waqt by Sultan al-Mūʿayyad
Abū al-Naṣr Shaykh is also present, which means he confiscated the manuscript but
never obliterated Faraj’s name. The colophon is on folio 252b and reads (Pl. 390):

The completion of the scribing of the noble, sublime, and great mushaf was in the month of Ramadan of great standing, the year 814. It was made by the orders of our lord the sultan, the possessor, the king al-Nāṣir Faraj son of the sultan, the king, the martyr al-Zāhir Barquq—may God make his dominion eternal and bestow on him the blessings of the great Qurʾān. By the hands of the poor slave of God Almighty ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh. May God bring peace and blessings on our master Muḥammad, his family and companions.

The manuscript begins on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 391) with a frontispiece whose
central field is a square centered on a twelve-pointed star. This star does not have a frit
or an arabesque, but rather the colored petals seen in the borders of marginal medallions
in the Star Polygon Group workshop productions and the workshop of Ibrāhīm al-
Āmīdī.455 Here we encounter a new placement for a motif that was previously reserved
for borders in its Ilkhanid usage and Mamluk adaptation. The fillers of the blue

454 This Qurʾān manuscript is very important for the study of Mamluk illumination in the
fifteenth century. Its details have influenced quite a few later ones.
455 This style was introduced from the Ilkhanid to the Mamluk world in the 1340s, as seen in the
previous two chapters.
pentagon-based hexagons employ gold and light blue. This integration of light blue as a color in its own right, and not simply in a flower to show different shades of blue, is new and does not work very well. Black is used in the background of some of the shapes, topped with white palmettes and half palmettes. We can also see purple/pinkish-red in some of the fillers. A new repertoire of colors not used by earlier craftsmen of the Mamluk milieu has apparently been introduced from the Eastern world. Flanking the central field to the right and left are two rectangular panels with cartouches. The cartouche is rectangular with trefoil ends filled with a green and white arabesque on a golden background, surrounding a circle in the middle of a blue background, with a scroll in a frit form in gold and red. The spandrels around the cartouche are blue with a green scroll. These cartouches are very Iranian-Shirazi looking, and the examples we have are from the same or later dates: an anthology of Iskandar Sultan (Pl. 392) which combines Shirazi and Jalayrid features has a double-page text opening depicting a very similar cartouche in the same place as Rašīd 16. This anthology was produced in 813–14/1410–11 and is now kept in the British Library (Add. 27261). On the frontispiece of the anthology we see the same cartouches in a smaller size alternating with a roundel in a band around the central field. It is very possible that, Ḥmād Jalāyr escaped to Egypt a few years earlier, some Jalayrid artists came with him and stayed on, and this was their influence on the Star Polygon Group, the main workshop of the late fourteenth century.

The rectangular panels above and below the central fields carry Q 56:77–80 in the middle cartouches with tripartite ends. The script is in white kūfī on a golden

---

arabesque with a blue background. At the top and bottom of the cartouche is the edge of a circle with a black outline and colored petals. (Apparently this artist was fascinated by colored petals!). The spandrels contain quatrefoils with symmetrical palmettes; the scrolls are no longer complicated. The colors are green, orange, black, and white on a blue background. The spaces between the cartouches and quatrefoils are orange with golden flowers. A knotted grid of dots runs around the compartments, while the whole composition is framed in a black floral border. This border displays peonies in orange, purple, and gold alternating with blue and white lotuses. Golden tendrils surround the floral elements. This band looks like the type that was seen in all the members of the Star Polygon Group, the most relevant of them in date being Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 321). Here the black background gives a different feel and does not work as well as the other colors used in the other manuscripts. A knotted grid of dots separates this black border from the outermost one. More stylized than before, the outermost border, which has maintained blue as its background for decades now, has a myriad of scrolls intersecting and crossing each other, carrying palmettes and floral elements and giving a very colorful impression.

The opening pages, folios 2b–3a (Pl. 393), are quite exquisite as well, but still cannot be compared to the production of the earlier decades. Folio 2b carries sūrat al-Fātiḥa and folio 3a carries the beginning of sūrat al-Baqara. Each central field carries five lines of golden muḥaqqaq including the basmala, where tams can be seen in the letters with small openings; thus the sād, dād, and tāʾ are not colored in black like the mīm, wāw, ʿayn, or hāʾ. The muḥaqqaq is in clouds of paper color, while the surrounding area is in red cross-hatching and decorated with a scroll of colorful half palmettes. While
the scroll has been seen since the early years of the fourteenth century, the colors are new. We see purple, blue, light blue, yellow, light green, red, and orange. The ʻāya markers are six-petaled rosettes of green and gold and spiraling petals of green alternating with blue. Above the basmala on folio 2b sits a lobed pyramid of colorful Ilkhanid petals bordered in black filled with golden tendrils. This shape is reflected on a bigger scale in the margin of both pages, as it adorns the middle area between two medallions. The basmala on folio 3a is topped with a full colored blossom/palmette.

The rectangular panels carrying the suʻra titles have cartouches with multi-lobed edges with thick green kūfī on a golden arabesque with a blue background. The green kūfī is also outlined in gold and knotted. Flanking these cartouches are blue eight-lobed rosettes decorated with a central frit and mirrored arabesques similar to the outermost borders. These rosettes are connected to the cartouches with a medallion like an ʻāya marker. The area left in the spandrels has an orange background with golden flowers and stalks with blue detailing, like those seen in the openings of Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 322) and Raṣīd 11 (Pl. 336) (originally seen in the frontispiece of juz’1 of Raṣīd 62, Pl. 166). Around the various compartments is the knotted border of the grid of dots. The outermost border introduces a new motif: the defined areas with a black background are ornamented with white dots around the colored half palmettes.

The margins contain three elements each. The one in the middle, as mentioned earlier, is a larger version of the motifs above the basmala on folio 2b. This ornament is flanked by two medallions, the border of which is reminiscent of the frontis-medallions of Raṣīd 62 (Pl. 394), surrounding a golden interior.
The inner pages display different ăya markers (Pls. 395–400)—the usual rayed rosettes of gold instead of the petaled rosettes. The marginal medallions are quite impressive here as well. The rub’ marker is in a teardrop bordered by colored Ilkhanid petals surrounding a blue interior, on top of which the word is written in white kūfī surrounded by golden flowers. The ‘ashara and khamsa are, unusually, contained in the same medallion, both in a circle. The ‘ashara is inscribed in white kūfī on an orange background surrounded by golden flowers, while the khamsa sits on a green background.

**Calligraphy**

Once again Ibn al-Ṣāyigh impresses us with his very sure hand (Pls. 395–400). His muḥaqqaq, as seen earlier in Raṣīd 11 (Pl. 337), is still balanced and proportionate. It is almost exactly like the execution we have seen in Raṣīd 11. Also noticeable is that his ‘ayn is not big as those of other hands. He sometimes elongates the horizontal stroke of the kāf, a peculiarity that is his alone. Like Raṣīd 11, this text is also in eleven lines and does not have a frame around the text. He is using the same pen, which is not thick.

**Raṣīd 77**

This is a special rab’a with only one volume surviving, the fifth. It was made waqf by Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq to the mausoleum within the Sultan Barqūq complex in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn. This puts it in the decade 1400–11. It consists of 41 folios of cream polished paper, measures 30.4x21.6 cm, and is penned in golden muḥaqqaq outlined in black with five lines to a page. There is no signature naming the highly accomplished calligrapher.
The manuscript begins on folio 1a (Pl. 402) with a circular medallion in the middle of the page bearing the juz’ title in white kūfī. This text is placed in a six-petaled blue rosette and is surrounded by gold leaf forms sprouting from the golden cloud in which the text is placed. The rosette, which is outlined with a golden border, is in an orange circle, forming spandrels. Each spandrel has a winged golden trefoil, the wings of which are half palmettes on stalks. The outermost border has a blue background, and the surrounding scroll has half palmettes converging into shapes. Two lines circle around and intersect to form a tripartite frame around each element. This use of the medallion as the frontispiece reminds us of the volumes of Raṣīd 62 (Pl. 394), where there is always a medallion of roughly the same size and usually circular. Here it carries the juz’ title and number, while in Raṣīd 62 it was not inscribed because the juz’ title appeared in a rectangular panel above.

Above the medallion, inscribed in a good hand but in an unplanned manner, is “Waqf ʾfor God Almighty al-[B]arqūqiyya in the tomb.” Above this line is another one in faint black ink, stating that the waqf was made by “Al-Malik al-Nāṣir Faraj for the khānqāh Barqūqiyya.”

A grand opening to the juz’ can be seen on folios 1b–2a (Pl. 403). Even though it is not the beginning of a sūra, the illumination program is a full one. The golden muḥaqqaq, with three lines in clouds of the paper color, has țams in black and is placed on red cross-hatching. The interlinear space is filled with winged plant motifs and half palmettes. There are no interlinear scrolls, but the work is very similar to al-Āmiddi’s work in the openings of Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 289).
The rectangular panels flanking the central fields have cartouches with tripartite ends. These cartouches carry Q 56:77–80 in white on a blue background, around which are naturalistic plant forms. The spandrels contain quatrefoils, as in the openings of Rašīd 54 (Pl. 259) and Rašīd 7 (Pl. 265) and one of the frontispieces of Rašīd 70 (Pl. 104), but here they have cross-shaped motifs inside of them. This treatment was later seen in some Shiraz productions. It does not look exactly the same, but the cross-shaped motif used in spandrels of titles can be seen in Five Mathnavis of ‘Attār dated to 819–21/1416–18 and produced in Shiraz (Pl. 404). The areas around the quatrefoils are orange with golden decoration. The quatrefoils themselves have golden cross-shaped motifs with orange detailing. The border for the rectangular panels is a pearl band, while the knotted grid of dots surrounds the rectangular panels and the central fields.

Each page has three marginal medallions. They are golden with orange or orange and blue filling. The middle one has a peony in its center, while the other two have lotuses in gold. They look exactly like those in Rašīd 70 (Pl. 102), and also like those used in the openings of juz’28 of Rašīd 80 (Pl. 242). Such peculiar marginal medallions, so far only encountered in these three manuscripts, strongly points to their origins in the same workshop. It does not mean that all were produced in the same year, but rather, as can be seen, there is a succession starting with Rašīd 70, then Khawand Baraka’s Rašīd 80, and finally Sultan Faraj’s Rašīd 77. Thus they operated from 1357 to 1400.

The āya markers are like those in Rašīd 12 (Pl. 322) and Rašīd 13 (Pl. 371). They are relatively large, and the word ‘āya’ in golden kūfī is inscribed on orange and framed with a circle of gold and another one of blue. The marginal medallions, also of excellent

\[457\] CBL Per 117. Wright, Look of the Book, 75.
quality, are an interesting adaptation of Injuid Shirazi elements. An orange circle in the middle carries the words *khamsa* or *‘ashara* surrounded by gold and then blue. The blue area displays a spray of three-petaled flowers rendered naturalistically. In the case of the *khamsa* markers we have a triangular top of gold, but the triangle has dents instead of straight edges, almost creating lobes. The way the wreath of flowers surrounds the center of gold with the *kūfī* inscribed in the middle can be seen in the margins of two Shirazi Qur’ān manuscripts in the Nasser Khalili Collection (QUR 182 and QUR 242), both dated to the 1340s (Pls. 405 and 406). There is a chronological gap between the Mamluk manuscript and the Shirazi ones, which brings raises the possibility of an influence or movements of artists from the East.

**Calligraphy**

This is the third Qur’ān manuscript in these decades to be penned entirely in gold (Pls. 403 and 407). The other two are Raṣīd 12 and QUR 595 in the Nasser Khalili Collection. No *tams* is employed here as in the opening pages, and the black outline around the gold script makes it easier to read. The calligrapher, who unfortunately did not leave us his name, is a master. He has a balanced hand and his letters do not crowd each other.

It is worthwhile to compare this golden *muḥaqqaq* with that in QUR 595 (Pl. 332); Raṣīd 12 is in *thulūth* and so cannot really be compared. The *muḥaqqaq* is very similar, not the same hand but very close. Main differences include the final *mīm*, which has a longer stroke than that in QUR 595; the final *lām*, which does not have a full curve

---

in our manuscript but rather a sweep; and the smaller ‘ayn, which is a distinct feature in our manuscript.

**Rasīd 153**

This is another *rab’a* by Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq dedicated to his *khānqāh* in the cemetery. This puts it in the decade 1400–11, between the construction date of the *khānqāh* and his death. Only eleven volumes remain from this set, and they were all found in the mosque of Jawhar Lālā (built in 833/1430). How they ended up there is a mystery; if Jawhar Lālā confiscated the volumes, he never removed Faraj’s name or added his own. The average volume measures 30x22 and is written in black *muḥaqqaq,* five lines to a page, framed in gold and blue.

All the volumes start in the same way with the same dedication. On folio 1a of each of the surviving volumes we find a rectangle carrying the *waqf* dedication (Pls. 408–411). The top part of the large rectangle is a narrow rectangular panel similar, if not identical, to the one in Rasīd 80 (one of the commissions of Khawand Baraka) (Pl. 235) carrying in golden *thuluth* with blue *fams* in a white cloud the text: “*waqf* of our lord, the lofty, the great, the noble.” This dedication is very similar to that in Rasīd 80, produced in the late 1360s. Surrounding the cloud are crudely executed leaves and tendrils with blue detailing. The text continues below in nine lines in white *thuluth* (no longer white) in golden clouds on an orange or blue background; a line of orange alternates with a line of blue. This text reads:

---

459 This manuscript might have been produced earlier. A mid-fourteenth century date might be very possible because of the binding: the eleven surviving volumes are bound in the style of the mid-fourteenth century. If this is the case, then Faraj might have reendowed it.
Our lord, the lofty, the great, the noble, the sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Abū al-Sa‘ādāt Faraj son of the sultan, the happy, the martyr, al-Malik al-Zāhir Barqūq, may God have mercy on him, has made a waqf all of this juz’ and whatever follows from the thirty volumes from this noble rab’a, so that all the reciters and jurists in his khānqāh in the khatt of Raḥbat Bāb al-‘Īd near the khānqāh of Sa‘īd al-Su‘ādā may benefit from it. He has made its place in the aforementioned khānqāh, and so the aforementioned endower has stipulated that it may not leave the aforementioned place in place of any collateral, and made the administrator of this the same as the administrator of the aforementioned khānqāh.

All the volumes also have the same illumination on the opening pages. The two-page spread in each, folios 1b–2a (Pls. 412–415), is decorated in the same way in all of them, except in juz’ 5 (Pl. 412) where two marginal medallions in each folio are missing. The differences are in the written text. Whether the beginning of the juz’ coincides with the beginning of the sūra or not, they are all alike. The central field consists of three lines of golden muḥaqqaq with black and blue tāms contained in clouds of the paper color and surrounded by red parallel hatching, decorated with half palmettes and other leaves sprouting from the clouds. These leaves and palmettes are decorated with green and blue.

The rectangular panels flanking the central fields all carry the juz’ title, and if the beginning of the juz’ coincides with the beginning of the sūra, then the sūra title is there as well. In some cases we also find Q 56:77–78. This text in white kūfī is carried in cartouches with rounded ends on a blue background. The spiraling golden scroll beneath the text is very fine. The cartouche is flanked to the right and left by a circular medallion connected with the cartouche via a pearl band on an orange background and decorated with a golden lotus. The spaces left in the spandrels around the cartouche are minute triangles colored in black and decorated with a golden floret each. All around the
central field and the rectangular panels is the knotted grid of dots containing blue squares with golden centers.

All the opening pages have three marginal medallions per margin, except in juz’ 5, where there is just one in the middle. It is a circle with an orange background, decorated with a big golden lotus surrounded by golden leaves. Framing the circle is the petal border, only here it is not multicolored; the petals are blue, outlined in gold. The marginal medallion in the middle is reminiscent of Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 87) in that it has the golden lotus on the orange ground, and of Raṣīd 162 (Pls. 1 and 3) and the Star Polygon Group in having the petal border. The two medallions flanking the middle one are the same, and each one borders a rectangular panel. They too are circular, but they are blue, decorated with a scroll mirrored on its horizontal axis. This axis has a small flower at its end.

The inner pages are all framed in gold and blue. The āya markers are the typical rayed rosettes and the marginal medallions are either circular, for the ‘ashara markers, or circular topped with triangles, for the khamsa markers. They all have an orange interior with the word written in golden kūfī and surrounded with a golden frame.

Calligraphy

A very good hand is at work here, but not that of a master (Pl. 416). His hand is steady and the ink does not thin. His muḥaqqaq is thicker than most examples we have seen. Proportionate to the page size, it is as thick as the one we have seen in Raṣīd 13 (Pl. 371), if not thicker. This muḥaqqaq is better than that of Raṣīd 13 and shows a more stable hand. Letters ending in long strokes end swiftly and taper at the bottom.
Raṣīd 74

Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq left us three rab’as. This is the last of them. Only juz’15 survives from it. It measures 28.1x20.2 cm. The text block is 20.2x11 in thirty-nine folios. Like most small rab’as it is written five lines to a page. The script is a modified muḥaqqaq in black with some characteristics from thuluth. It has a waqt by Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq, which puts it in the decade 1400–11.

The frontispiece over folios 1b–2a (Pl. 417) is a beautiful piece of work that revives some earlier traditions we have seen. The central field, which makes up most of the illuminated piece, is a rectangle decorated with a big octagon carrying the words fi-kitāb (on folio 1b) and tanzīl min (on folio 2a), part of Q 56:77–80, which begins in the upper rectangular panel on folio 1b and ends in the lower rectangular panel on folio 2a, in white kūfī on a blue background. Beneath the writing a spiraling arabesque scroll of six concentric circles in gold appears to be supporting half palmettes in blue, green, and black. We see here a new combination of colors and their different shades. The geometric pieces around the octagon are either orange and decorated with golden flowers, or blue with multicolored flowers and petals adorning them. The most interesting filling element is the blossom seen on the cross-axis of each central field. It is not the colored-petal motif but is reminiscent of it, especially in the way the border petals are drawn. All the floral on the blue background are outlined in gold, which might connect this manuscript to Raṣīd 16 (Pl. 391). The way the central field is occupied by such an octagon is reminiscent of the early years of the century, and specifically the Ṣandal workshop. It has been pointed out earlier, in the discussion of Raṣīd 11, which
has the same idea but on a smaller scale, that this design started with the Şandal workshop, but Raşid 74 is more true to the Şandal workshop than Raşid 11. We should recall that our early fourteenth-century examples include the second seventh of the Baybars al-Jâshnâkîr Qur’ân manuscript (Pl. 334), the Qur’ân manuscript penned and illuminated by Ahmad ibn Kamâl ibn Yaḥyâ al-Anṣârî al-Mutatabbib (Pl. 129), and the Anonymous Baghdad Qur’ân (Topkapi Sarayi, EH 250, 702/1303) (Pl. 130). Closer in date to Raşid 74 is Raşid 70 (757/1357), whose group five of frontispieces, discussed in chapter two, have the same design (Pls. 126–128).

The rectangular panels carrying Q 56:77–80 and flanking the central fields have a blue background with the text in white kūfî. The scroll beneath the text is golden, with half palmettes in varying colors. It resembles the scroll in the central field, but does not spiral.

The opening pages (Pl. 423) of the juz’ are fully illuminated but not very impressive. The āyas are contained in rectangular central fields in clouds from which sprout large half palmettes instead of full scrolls. They are good but might have been done in haste. Flanking the central field on the top and bottom are rectangular panels carrying the juz’ number. These panels contain a rectangular cartouche with the text in white thuluth. Each cartouche is in turn flanked to the right and left with a square decorated in a motif ubiquitous in Mamluk Qur’ân manuscript illumination. It could be viewed as a blue cross with a golden knot in the middle, or as a square with four small

---

460 James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, 44, fig. 22.
461 Chester Beatty Library, 1476. James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, 140, fig. 93.
462 James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, 90, fig. 58.
orange lozenges at its corners, a golden knot in the middle, and an interrupted blue frame. It almost seems to come from a manuscript of late antiquity.

Some of the marginal medallions are innovative (Pl. 418). They are teardrops filled with a big blossom made of petals of green, black, blue, and white. The petals resemble those of the blossoms in the central field and are colored like the half palmettes on the scroll in the central field. This amount of green, also seen in Raṣīd 16, seems to have become fashionable in the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The interior is decorated with āya markers, in the typical rayed rosette, and with marginal medallions. The marginal medallions are circles containing the ‘ashara markers and teardrops containing the khamsa markers. They are gold with an orange center.

**Calligraphy**

This muḥaqqaq can be grouped with the other thick muḥaqqaq examples we have seen. However, the letters are not all in muḥaqqaq. The treatment of some of the final dāl and rā’ resembles thuluth. This merging of scripts is not particularly elegant; the dāl in masjid (the last word on folio 1b (Pl. 423)) is disproportionate, for instance. This must have been one of the experiments that did not work very well, since none of the other examples from these decades or subsequent ones show a similar script. It gives the feel of a fancy chancery script and not elegant muḥaqqaq as seen in earlier examples.

**Preliminary Conclusions**

The most important conclusion to be drawn is the continuation of the work of the Star Polygon Group workshop all the way into the early days of the fifteenth century, as seen
in Raṣīd 12, Raṣīd 125, Raṣīd 13, and Raṣīd 16. The square central figure based on a star, the lotus-peony borders, and the spandrels of the *sūra* titles based on the star patterns are three main characteristics of this workshop. It cannot be assumed that it is definitely the same illuminators who were working, although it is possible; it might have been disciples of those same illuminators and thus the same workshop. The main problem is the lack of names associated with the illumination of the Star Polygon Group workshop codices. Raṣīd 16 is therefore very important because, having been produced by the most important calligrapher of the period, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh, it can help us study this great master and his large network in the next chapter. Another important manuscript in this regard is QUR 595 in the Nasser Khalili Collection, which most certainly belongs to the same group. Research on its calligrapher and illuminator, Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAjami al-Mudhahhib, who fortunately signed his work, could also help shed light on the originator of the workshop.

It is also important to see how the master Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī’s workshop continued, even after his death in 797/1395. Raṣīd 11, produced in 801/1399, shows the style still preserved: the focus on the compartments, the use of squares to define the spandrels of *sūra* titles, and the details of marginal medallions are all characteristics of this workshop. Especially relevant is Raṣīd 15, because of its size. These two manuscripts, both over a meter long, vie in grandness, majesty, and clarity.

Other minor workshops producing smaller multiple Qur’ān manuscripts (*rabʿas*) also shed light on the manuscript production of the period. We have names and dates for a few. We know through them that another artist with a Persian connection was active in Cairo, Aḥmad al-Īṣfahānī, who produced Raṣīd 123 and Raṣīd 79 in an identical
manner, and who worked from within the Complex of the Sultan. He employed Persian methods such as alternating script types, which was never popular in Cairo. A different workshop producing small rab‘as can be seen in Raṣīd 120 and Raṣīd 121. Their thin muḫaqqaq appears in the grandest rab‘ of the late 1350s, Raṣīd 62. Neither of these rab‘as was penned by Sawunju al-Rasūfi, the primary calligrapher of Raṣīd 62, but possibly by his son Muḥammad ibn Sawunju al-Rasūfi or another disciple. Thus the workshops of the artists of the 1350s were still operating, in addition to the newer ones of the 1360s and 1370s.

Other manuscripts in multi-volumes connected to workshops from the 1350s are Raṣīd 76, whose title pages bear resemblances to those of Raṣīd 148 and Raṣīd 58 (from the late 1350s), and Raṣīd 78, whose naskh, featuring muḫaqqaq characteristics, connects it to Raṣīd 56 and Raṣīd 149.

The Ilkhanid influences include more and more Shirazi elements from the 1340s. Could it be that artists from Shiraz also immigrated to the Mamluk world after the fall of the Ilkhanids and their successors, the Injus?

We also notice a decline in the quality of details. To some extent the details of the single codices, especially Raṣīd 12, Raṣīd 13, and Raṣīd 16, keep to the same standard seen in chapter three, but some of the rab‘as do not. Furthermore, after a hiatus in the production of rab‘as in the 1360s and 1370s, more appear in the 1380s and 1390s that are comparable to those produced in the 1350s. Could this mean that khānqāhs—where the rab‘as were mostly used by the Sufis, more so than in other institutions—were not as active in the 1360s and 1370s and then returned to their earlier activity in the 1380s and 1390s?
Muḥaqqaq was still the predominant script, but smaller variations playing on rayḥān and naskh were acquiring a level of popularity. The Persian fashion of using multiple scripts on a single page was also gaining popularity despite its unsuitability to the text of the Qurʾān, as explained in chapter three.
Chapter Five:
The Artists: An Analysis of the Sources

*Calligraphy is the geometry of the Spirit*[^63]

*The best amongst you are those who learn the Qur’ān and teach it*[^64]

**Introduction**

Now that we have seen the objects, it is important to look at the people involved in their creation. In an ideal situation one would have complete and thorough lists, names, processes, dates, and details concerning human interactions. While our situation is not an ideal one, because the information on the calligraphers and illuminators is not easy to locate in the sources and these artists have not been fully researched, it is still a reasonably good one. This is because the methodology of systematically going through the biographical dictionaries and chronicles of the period (those written by historians and those by religious scholars) entry by entry yields some very helpful results. It is thus the aim of this chapter to gather and analyze everything that is mentioned in the biographical dictionaries and the chronicles, even the minor details, concerning the calligraphers and illuminators involved in the production of the Qur’ān manuscripts discussed in the previous three chapters.

The collation of this data will begin by establishing biographies for the artists, even those who preceded our period, given their importance in establishing stylistic traditions or workshops. The first group will be those who predate our period, but are


[^64]: Ḥadīth number 4739 in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. 
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important for the discussion. The second group is those mentioned in each of the three chapters. These individual biographies are meant to be windows opening up a view onto the lives of the artists. Details about their professions, how they are viewed by the sources, personal peculiarities, and connections, particularly Sufi ones, are all relevant to the analysis that will follow the biographies. It will be seen that the souls of these artists are imbued with the Qurʾān and the ǧāḥīḍ. The Qurʾān and the Sunna (ǧāḥīḍ) are not only the foundation blocks of all Islamic sciences but of Islamic spirituality as well.465 These artists are very capable of channeling the verbal theophany in its visual manifestation.

It is most unfortunate that we do not have specific details on many illuminators. This is why most of the information in this chapter concerns calligraphy and how it is learned. Very little information regarding illuminators or the technicalities of their art during this period survives. Al-Maqrīzī mentions a title of a biographical collection in his Ḳhīṭat, ATEGORY D涉足 al-nibrās wa-uns al-julās fī akhbār al-muzawiqīn min al-nās.466 It would have been very helpful had it survived. Several calligraphers are known to have been illuminators and we are fortunate to be able to study them from this angle.

The sources examined will also be able to tell us about the learning process of these scholars-bureaucrats-calligraphers, and their own treatises will shed light on their views on calligraphy and the various techniques a disciple had to learn. We do not have a definitive source on the exact stages of learning or the way the calligraphers were taught. But enough information can be gleaned to allow us to reconstruct the apprenticeship of students and the skills they had to acquire from the master.

465 Nasr, Islamic Art, 6.
466 Abd al-Laṭīf Ibrāhīm, al-Maktaba al-mamlūkiyya (Cairo, 1962), 55.
Knowledge of the learning process, along with an understanding of their learning environment, is important because it puts their production in an intellectual, technical, and social context. It clarifies the setting, spiritual, educational, and social, in which our artists worked.

All of this will help us understand the connections between them while using the sources and the stylistic issues discussed in the previous chapters. It will also establish their links with the various patrons and how important this support was, or wasn’t, for determining their careers and their workshops, as will be discussed in chapter six.

Chapter six will focus on the patrons as people and as leaders. It will also examine their involvement in the artistic process and what it meant to be a patron during these times.

**Biographies**

Artists who predate the Collection under Study

**Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī**

Even though Yāqūt is not one of our artists, he must be included here since his name was brought up on several occasions earlier. He earned higher praise as the “Mayor of Calligraphers,” the “Qibla of Calligraphers,” and the “Sultan of Calligraphers,” whose school of calligraphy did influence some of the work we have seen in the previous

---

chapters. As he is the most studied calligrapher in the history of Islamic art, we will not
dwell on his details.\textsuperscript{468}

Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Durr Yāqūt ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Rūmī al- Mustaʿsimi was a
slave of the last Abbasid caliph to rule from Baghdad, al-Mustaʿsim bi-Allah (killed by
the Mongols in 656/1258), hence the \textit{nīsba} ‘al-Mustaʿsimī.’ All the sources refer to him
also as ‘al-Rūmī,’ which tells us that he was from Anatolia, possibly purchased there,
but al-Rūmī itself says nothing about his ethnicity.\textsuperscript{469} His name, Yāqūt, and Ibn Taghri
Birdī’s and Mustaqīm Zāda’s references to him as a \textit{tawāshi} in \textit{al-Nujūm al-zāhira} and
\textit{Tuhfāh-i khattātīn} respectively, point to his being probably a eunuch.\textsuperscript{470} In addition to
mastering the art of calligraphy he was also a poet, and his poetry is quoted in some of
these sources.\textsuperscript{471}

\textsuperscript{468} Most of these studies are in Arabic, the most comprehensive of which is Şalāh al-Dīn al-
Munajjīd’s book \textit{Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimi} (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Jadīd, 1985). In this book al-
Munajjīd lists the sources dealing with Yāqūt, confusions regarding his name, and all the
manuscripts that were signed by him or allegedly carry his signature. Other sources include
Persian scholarship on Yāqūt. There are a few Persian articles on Yāqūt and an English article

\textsuperscript{469} Ibn Ḥabīb, \textit{Tadhkirat al-nabīḥ}, 1:219; Ibn Taghri Birdī, \textit{al-Nujūm}, 8:148; Muḥammad ibn
Shākir al-Kutubi, \textit{Fawāt al-wafayāt wa-al-dhayl ‘alayhā}, ed. ʿĪsān ʿAbbas (Beirut: Dār al-
Thaqāfā, 1973–74), 4:263–64. The exceptions to this are Muṣṭafā ʿAff and Qādī Ṭāhir Qumī;
both are later sources, who mention that Yāqūt was originally Abyssinian. Muṣṭafā ʿAff,
\textit{Mustafā ʿAff’s Epic Deeds of Artists: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Ottoman Text about the}
\textit{Calligraphers and Painters of the Islamic World}, ed. and trans. Esra Akin-Kivanç (Leiden: Brill,

\textsuperscript{470} Sulaymān Sa’d al-Dīn Effendi Mustaqīm Zādah, \textit{Tuhfāh-e khattātīn} (Istanbul: Dawlat
Maṭba‘āsī, 1928), 575; Ibn Taghri Birdī, \textit{al-Nujūm}, 8:148. \textit{Tawāshi} can mean ‘eunuch’ but can
also mean ‘horseman’; see Linda Northrup, \textit{From Slave to Sultan: The Career of al-Mansūr}
Qalāwūn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678–689 A.H./1279–1290

\textsuperscript{471} ʿAbd al-Ḥāyy ibn Ṭāhir ibn al-ʿĪmād, \textit{Shadharaṭ al-dhahab fi akhbār man dhahab} (Beirut:
Even though al- Musta'ṣim was killed, Yāqūt was spared and employed by Hūlāgū’s wazīr Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Atā’ Malik al-Jūwaynī (d. 682/1283). He also became a personal tutor to the wazīr and his children and nephews. His intimate connections to the renowned Jūwaynī family guaranteed a good life for the brilliant calligrapher, who also headed the library of the Mustanṣiriyā in Baghdad until he died in 698/1299.

Yāqūt’s two mentors were Ṣafī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn (d. 693/1294) and ‘Abdallāh ibn Ḥābīb (d. 683/1285). Ṣafī al-Dīn was also close to the Jūwaynī family after having been patronized and employed by the Abbasid caliph al-Musta’ṣim. He was a Shāfi‘ī scholar who studied at al-Mustanṣiriyā and was the co-chief librarian of the personal library of al-Musta’ṣim, in addition to being a renowned calligrapher and a musician specializing in playing the lute. His other mentor was ‘Abdallāh ibn Ḥābīb, a calligrapher and co-chief librarian of al-Musta’ṣim’s library, who excelled in the style of the great Ibn al-Bawwāb and was the Sufi shaykh of Ribāṭ al-ʿAṣḥāb. Thus we can see that Yāqūt was the product of a thriving cultural milieu under the last Abbasid caliph and the early Mongol rulers.

---

472 He was employed as a secretary for the Mongol Arghūn and then became the governor of ‘Irāqī ‘Arab and Khūzistān. For more see Ann K. S. Lambton, Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia: Aspects of Administrative, Economic and Social History, 11th-14th Century (Albany, NY: Bibliotheca Persica, 1988), 306.
473 Al-Munajjid, Yāqūt, 18–20.
474 Al-Munajjid, Yāqūt, 20. He wrote two books on music for Sharaf al-Dīn Hārūn, son of the wazīr Muḥammad al-Jūwaynī. He speaks of himself as someone who is passionate about music and a master in playing the lute, but his fame as a calligrapher superseded his renown as a musician. Al-Kutubi, Fawāt al-wafayat, 2:39.
Yaqūt’s style of writing was derived from that of Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 413/1022), which he must, in turn, have taken from his mentor ‘Abdallāh ibn Ḥabīb and from the various manuscripts he was in charge of in the Abbasid library. As mentioned earlier, while Yaqūt followed in the footsteps of Ibn al-Bawwāb, Yaqūt differed by cutting the nib of his pen at an angle. Ibn al-Bawwāb never declared his secret regarding cutting the nib of the pen, but in his poem he describes the cutting to be “in between an angle and a rounded edge.” In the fourteenth-century treatise Lamḥat al-mukhtaṭif fī ṣinā‘at al-khaṭṭ al-ṣalaf, written decades after Yaqūt’s death, the author mentions that there are five ways to cut a pen. One of them is the cut with an angle (muhārraf) for all scripts; he says that this is the way of Yaqūt and that it is best suited for scripts like muḥaqqaq. Another cut is round (mudawar). A third uses something in between with the right end higher than the left, which can be traced all the way to Ibn Muqla. A fourth does the opposite of Ibn Muqla, and a fifth cuts the nib in accordance with the script used, which is the way of Ibn al-Bawwāb. We can conclude from this that cutting the nib at an angle was not the invention of Yaqūt, but that he established it as a standard that was followed by almost all of the calligraphers who came after him.

Yaqūt was already famous during his lifetime, and after his death, his memory eventually grew into a legend. His signed manuscripts were sought after from early on.

In 877/1472 the great patron of the arts Sultan al-Ashraf Qāytbāy (r. 873–901/1468–95)

---

477 Al-Kātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtaṭif, 39–40. The discussion of material preparation and pen cutting is in a later section of this chapter.
478 This is from Ibn al-Bawwāb’s poem the Rāʾiyya. See Muḥammad Ṭāhir ibn ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Kurdi, Tārikh al-khaṭṭ al-ʿarabī (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Tijāriyya al-Ḥaditha, 1939), 429.
sent the *mamlūk amīr* Barsbay al-Sharafi to the King of the Rum (*mutamallik al-rūm*) with several precious gifts, among them a Qurʾān manuscript signed by the great Yāqūt.\(^{480}\)

His students were many, and quite a few were from among the intellectual and social elite. Six of them were renowned and operated primarily in the Ilkhanid lands (this also includes the later Jalayrid and Injuid realms). The list of the six famous ones, some of whose manuscripts we saw in the earlier chapters, including Aḥmad ibn al-Suhrawardī, Yahyā al-Jamāli al-Ṣūfī, and ‘Abdallāh al-Ṣayrafi, slightly varies in the accounts of the different historians.\(^{481}\)

**Al-Maydūmī**

Al-Maydūmī is another figure whose surviving Qurʾān manuscripts predate our period but who is nevertheless important to study.\(^{482}\) Ṣadr al-Dīn Abū al-Fatḥ Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn ‘Anān al-Maydūmī was born in 664/1265

---

\(^{480}\) Al-Sakhāwī, *al-Daw’*, 3:10. Yāqūt is said to have left a thousand Qurʾān manuscripts, in addition to other manuscripts, including Ibn Sinā’s *Kitāb al-shī‘ā*. This is a nineteenth-century count, reported in Ḥabīb Effendī Paydāpīsh, *al-Khaṭṭ wa-al-khaṭṭātūn*, trans. Sāmīa Muḥammad Jalāl (Cairo: al-Hay’a al-ʿĀmma li-Shu‘ūn al-Maṭba‘a al-Amiriyya, 2010), 136. Qāḍī Aḥmad Qumī mentions that Yāqūt used to copy two *juzʾ*s a day and that every month he finished two complete copies. He had seen 364 of these signed codices in the sixteenth century. Qāḍī Aḥmad, *Calligraphers and Painters*, 59. Many of the copies surviving today and allegedly carrying his name are forgeries, created because of his legendary reputation.


\(^{482}\) His manuscript Op 2707 in the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia was discussed earlier. Also see James, “More Qurʾāns of the Mamlūks,” 4–5. His other Qurʾān manuscript is in the Nasser Khalili Collection, QUR 317.
and died in 754/1354. He is important, first, because he was still alive in the 1340s and the early 1350s, in the period dealt with in chapter two, and he had several students. Second, the sources glorify him because he was a hadith scholar, not a calligrapher. This is important because many of our calligraphers and illuminators were religious scholars who were also artists, a fact that speaks to the religious-intellectual-artistic life under the rule of the Mamluks. Not mentioning that a scholar was also a calligrapher does not preclude the possibility that he was a calligrapher. Thus, it will be noticed that some of the biographies we examine do not mention that the subject of the biography was also a master calligrapher. Being a religious authority supersedes being a calligrapher. Third, he is important because his style as both calligrapher and illuminator influenced some of the manuscripts covered in chapter two, and his disciples must have been working throughout the period covered in this research.

His father was a scholar himself in addition to being in charge of the library of the Kāmilīyya madrasa, which must have given his son Muḥammad a chance to become a great scholar, and to see and learn from many manuscripts in such a great library. From an early age he was introduced by his father to the scholarly world and had


484 A very interesting example corroborating this fact is the female calligrapher Zaynāb bint Ṭahmābī (d. 740/1339), who was also a renowned muḥadditha and a teacher of many, including the historian al-Ṣafādī. We know that she was a great calligrapher from part of a Qurʾān manuscript, penned in magnificent golden muḥaqqaq, which she signed and which is now kept at the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo under registry number 39277. None of the sources who praise her as a renowned scholar of the time mention the fact that she was such an accomplished calligrapher. See al-Ṣafādī, al-Wāfi, 15:68; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAṣqalānī, al-Durar, 2:209–10; al-Salāmī, Al-Wafayāt, 1:316–77; Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-Dhahabī, Muʿjam al-shuyūkh al-kabīr, ed. Rawḥīyya ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1990), 199.

485 Al-Ṣafādī, al-Wāfi, 2:10.
the chance to study with some of the important *hadith* scholars in Egypt, especially al-Najib, before teaching in Cairo, Fustat, and Jerusalem. However, he primarily practiced in Cairo and Fustat, and this is where most of his students were. His teaching career must have begun at an early age, since his father was able to obtain *ijāzah* for him when he was still quite young. His skill as a calligrapher is mentioned only by Ibn Ṭabarī al-Salāmī (d. 774/1374) and Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba (d. 851/1448). Al-Salāmī tells us that besides being the *imām* of the mosque of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn, al-Maydūmī also had a good hand. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba was quoting a scholar who told him that one of al-Maydūmī’s virtues was his good writing.

The two Qur’ān manuscripts he left—one now in the collection of the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia, and the other, QUR 317, in the Nasser Khalili Collection—show a capable artist. He might not be in the same league as Yaqūt or any of Yaqūt’s direct disciples, but one certainly would have expected the sources to say more about his skills.

**The Muḥṣinī Brothers**

Muḥammad ibn Bayfīk al-Muḥṣinī (d. shortly after 1361) and Ahmād ibn Bayfīk al-Muḥṣinī (d. 753/1353) are two very important artists and officials from the *awlād al-nās*

---


487 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭārīkh*, 2:55. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba says “*istajāzahu*” (‘took ijāzah on his behalf’).


category.\textsuperscript{491} Their father was \emph{amīr} Badr al-Dīn Bayūk al-Muḥṣinī, who was appointed as an inspector of Upper Egypt during the reign of Sultan Qalāwūn.\textsuperscript{492} He was then made the deputy in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{493} He built a \textit{qaysāriyya} outside of Bāb Zuwayla and after his death his son Muḥammad inherited its income.\textsuperscript{494}

The importance of Muḥammad lies in the fact that he not only left a Qur’ān manuscript that he finished in 730/1330,\textsuperscript{495} but he was also a \textit{shād al-ʾamāʿir al-sulṭānīyya} (supervisor of royal constructions) for Sultan Ḥasan and one of the two architects of the sultan’s huge architectural complex.\textsuperscript{496} The Qur’ān manuscripts of this sultan were discussed in chapter two, where we noted the abundant use of Chinese elements, especially the lotus and the peony, in Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts commissioned by this sultan and by his most important \emph{amīr}, Ṣīrghīmtīsh al-Nāṣīrī. At the same time, a similar phenomenon can be observed in the Mamluk architecture of Cairo. The first appearance of these elements was in Sultan Ḥasan’s complex. It is no coincidence, then, that the infiltration of these elements occurred during the rule of Sultan Ḥasan, and there is no doubt that Muḥammad was somehow involved, at least in their employment on the great edifice. As for Aḥmad, his importance is in the Iran Bastan Qur’ān manuscript signed and dated by him in 739/1339. He was certainly the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{491} Al-Ṣafādī is the only one who writes the name differently: “Baylbak.” It seems that he was most probably mistaken.
\textsuperscript{495} Keir Collection, vii, 9.
\textsuperscript{496} Muḥammad signed in the southeastern corner of the courtyard of the madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan as \textit{nashw dawlatihi wa shād ʾimāratīhi Muḥammad ibn Bayūk al-Muḥṣinī} (the elevated one of his [the sultan’s] reign and the supervisor of his [the sultan’s] constructions Muḥammad ibn Bayūk al-Muḥṣinī) (Pl. 436). We thus know that he was the \textit{shād al-ʾamāʿir}. Kahil, \textit{Sultan Ḥasan Complex}, 172.
\end{footnotesize}
calligrapher and most probably the illuminator as well. This manuscript, produced six years earlier than the period under study, is a base for the development of the Star Polygon Group workshop, as discussed in chapter three, and is the earliest surviving Qur'ān manuscript in Mamluk lands using the lotus. It is possible that artists studying with him were responsible for the great productions of Sultan Sha'bān, his mother, and his entourage, and another for Sultan Ḥasan as well (Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54).

A survey of the relevant biographical dictionaries shows that Aḥmad was born in 699/1300 and was educated in Shafi‘ī jurisprudence. He lived for some time in Damascus, where he became good friends with its nā‘ib, the famous amīr and patron Tankiz.497 His first trip to Syria was with his brother Muḥammad to Tripoli. Aḥmad was given an iqṭā’ in Damascus, and it was also in Damascus that he became acquainted with Tankiz.498 It seems that while there, he might have studied with some of the Syrian religious scholars such as Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, who would give him advice and correct his poetry.499 He left poetry, quoted by al-Šafādī in his ‘Ayu‘n, al-Maqrīzī in his al-Muqafā, and Ibn Taghri Birdī in his Manhal.500 He also left prose, and composed a book on Shafi‘ī jurisprudence called al-Tanbīh.501 His last post was in Egypt as the wāfī of Damietta.502 He died in 753/1353, which tells us that he might very well have met or

498 Al-Šafādī, A‘yān, 1:205; al-Maqrīzī, al-Muqafā, 1:355. He used to read his work to Tankiz and recite his own compositions whenever Tankiz wanted to feel better.
trained some of the artists involved in the production of our manuscripts. The most notable of his skills was his writing capabilities. He is even referred to by Ibn Taghrī Birdī as an *adīb* (‘man of letters’). The only one who alludes to his penmanship is al-Ṣafadī, who tells us that Aḥmad copied quite a few works.

Muḥammad was more involved in politics than his brother, and this led to his imprisonment on a few occasions. Neither his exact birth nor death dates are recorded. But he definitely died after his brother Aḥmad, since he built Sultan Ḥasan’s complex between 1356 and 1361. He died shortly after 1361. After returning from Tripoli in 742/1341, he was the *wālī* of Cairo, then was sent off to Damascus before returning to Cairo, where he was appointed as *mushīr al-dawla* (‘counselor of financial affairs’) in 754/1353. During the turbulent times of the 1340s he was imprisoned in Alexandria, but was released in 742/1343.

Before the Sultan Ḥasan Complex project Muḥammad was involved in another building project. In 755/1354, together with others, he had to build embankments in Fayyūm because of the unexpectedly high level of the Nile flood. Earlier still, under the rule of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, he had been in charge of the construction of the former Maydān al-Ẓāhirī as the Maydān al-Nāṣirī.

It was mentioned in chapter one that Sultan Ḥasan favored and supported *awlād al-nās*, that this was part of his plan for ruling the country, and that it was one of the

---

main reasons he was killed. It is most probably because of this preference that his relationship with Muḥammad was a close one. Muḥammad’s strong loyalty and closeness to Sultan Ḥasan has been noted before by Abdallah Kahil. ⁵⁰⁹ Towards the end of Sultan Ḥasan’s life in 762/1361, the notorious amīr Yalbughā al-ʿUmarī al-Khāṣṣakī revolted, and Muḥammad stood by the sultan until they were both caught by Yalbughā. The young sultan was killed and Muḥammad was imprisoned in Alexandria again, where he presumably died.⁵¹⁰

Besides scribing Qurʾān manuscripts and designing and building edifices, Muḥammad was also well traveled. Kahil notes that the administrator-geographer-historian Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī depended on Muḥammad for some topographical information. In his Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār he mentions that the learned amīr Muḥammad ibn al-Muḥsinī described Barqa and its topography in detail, and he uses this information in his book.⁵¹¹

ʿīmād al-ʿDīn ibn al-ʿAfiʿ

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī al-Shāfiʿī al-Ḥalabī (d. 736/1336) was one of the pillars of the school of calligraphy in Egypt, a workshop grew out of his teachings, and he is a link in the chain of the later great calligrapher ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyiḥ, whose works are discussed in chapter four. One of Ibn al-ʿAfiʿ’s works exists in Dār al-Kutub (Raṣīd 142) and it does show a very well-established calligrapher.

⁵⁰⁹ Kahil, Sultan Ḥasan Complex, 172–81.
Ibn al-‘Afi‘f was referred to as kātib, mujawwid, and muḥarrir by al-Šafadī, all terms used to describe an established calligrapher at the time. He studied Arabic with Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Nahḥās (who may also have taught al-Maydūmī) and excelled in grammar. Because of his excellence in Arabic he was also a poet and a writer. His main official position was as shaykh of the khānqāh of amīr Aqbughā ‘Abd al-Wāḥid (no longer in existence) in the Southern Cemetery. This tells us that he was also a Sufi. He taught calligraphy and transcribed several Qur’ān manuscripts. This activity might have taken place in the khānqāh where he was in charge. He died in Cairo in 736/1336 at the age of 81. It is interesting to note that the sources refer to him as shaykh al-kuttāb bi-al-diyr al-miṣriyya, which means he was acknowledged as the head or chief of all practicing calligraphers in Egypt during his lifetime.

Writing in Egypt four hundred years after the era of Ibn al-‘Afi‘f, Muḥammad Murtadā al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790), the ḥadīth scholar, Arabist, and lexicographer, mentions in his treatise on calligraphers that the mastery and chiefdom of calligraphy in Egypt was passed to al-‘Afi‘f, Ibn al-‘Afi‘f’s father, through another legendary

---

512 An important amīr whose khānqāh did not survive, but his madrasa by the entrance of al-Azhar does. He was a great patron of the arts and one cannot help but think that he must have supported Ibn al-‘Afi‘f. A Qur’ān manuscript in a rab‘a form, missing only the first and ninth volumes, survives in his name in al-Azhar Library and is kept under number 57/5. He had endowed it to his madrasa in al-Azhar.
513 Al-Šafadī, al-Wāfi‘, 1:238.
516 This term is used in the sources to emphasize the importance of the calligrapher as a mentor to others. Thus not only was his writing excellent but he taught calligraphy as well. Examples in the sources include al-Maqrizī’s al-Sulūk with respect to the deaths of 776/1374, where a calligrapher called ‘Īzz al-Dīn Aybak ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Turkī was referred to as “shaykh kuttāb al-mansūb.” He practiced and taught many people at al-Azhar. See al-Maqrizī, al-Sulūk, 3:248.
calligrapher called al-Wāfī al-ʿAjamī, who was an important teacher of calligraphy in the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{517}

In his encyclopedic work \textit{Ṣubḥ al-ʿaṣḥā}, al-Qalqashandi gives some of Ibn al-ʿAfīf ʿs views on calligraphy. This technical information ranges from the way a pen should be held,\textsuperscript{518} to letter proportions for the different scripts,\textsuperscript{519} to the two main ways to cut the nib of the pen.\textsuperscript{520}

The Team Responsible for the Baybars al-Jāshnākīr Qur’ān Manuscript

Ibn al-Wāḥīd

Muḥammad ibn Sharīf ibn Yusūf ibn al-Wāḥīd (d. 711/1311) is a calligrapher who is well covered in the sources. However, the only signed work he left is the Baybars al-Jāshnākīr Qur’ān manuscript. It was calligraphed in \textit{thuluth ash’ār}, which is a peculiar script for Mamluk Egypt as it was not seen again. Thus he cannot be said to have influenced subsequent hands, but he was one of the master calligraphers in Egypt. Not only did he practice and teach, but he also wrote an important commentary on the poem of Ibn al-Bawwāb on calligraphy and a few treatises.\textsuperscript{521}

The historian closest to his date is al-Ṣafādī who gives two full and very similar accounts of him in both his works, \textit{al-Wāfī} and \textit{Aʿyān}. The first thing al-Ṣafādī mentions about Ibn al-Wāḥīd is that he was a \textit{kāṭīb} with the best of hands and wrote excellent poetry. He was born in Damascus in 647/1249, preached in Baalbek, and

\textsuperscript{518} Al-Qalqashandi, \textit{Ṣubḥ al-ʿaṣḥā}, 3:41.
\textsuperscript{519} Al-Qalqashandi, \textit{Ṣubḥ al-ʿaṣḥā}, 3:47.
\textsuperscript{520} Al-Qalqashandi, \textit{Ṣubḥ al-ʿaṣḥā}, 2:452.
\textsuperscript{521} Al-Ṣafādī, \textit{al-Wāfī}, 3:151.
taught calligraphy there, but eventually settled in Cairo. He spoke several languages and was well traveled. He apparently met with the great Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣīmī in Baghdad but our historian does not say whether he studied with him or not. The assumption is, however, that he must have studied with the great master, if only for a short period of time, or at least learned something from him. In Cairo he had what seems to be a jealous brother who spoke ill of him.

In the Aʿyān, al-Ṣafadī emphasizes his excellence by telling his reader that if Ibn al-Bawwāb were alive he would have studied under the tutelage of Ibn al-Waḥīd. He describes his muḥaqqaq, naskh, and rayḥān as incomparably better than any other hand, and comments that his death was a great loss to the world of calligraphy. He was apparently being treated in the hospital founded by Sultan Qalāwūn, al-Bīmāristān al-Manṣūrī, since he died there.

His career was closely connected to a powerful patron, Baybars al-Jāshnakīr. When he was still an amīr Baybars saw the excellence of Ibn al-Waḥīd and commissioned him to write the seven-part Qurʾān manuscript now in the British Library. Al-Ṣafadī saw these volumes in the mosque of al-Ḥākim, where they were made a waqf, and also in diwān al-inshāʾ in the Citadel, and extols their magnificence and uniqueness. He makes it clear that both their calligraphy and their illumination were unprecedented in their magnificence. It seems that Ibn al-Waḥīd was the person in charge of the project, since he was given 1400–1600 golden dinars by the amīr, of which

---

522 Al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 4:466, 469; al-Ṣafadī, al-Wāḥī, 3:150.
525 Al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 4:467.
526 Al-Ṣafadī, al-Wāḥī, 3:151.
he spent six hundred on the project and took the rest for himself. Qur‘ān manuscripts signed by Ibn al-Waḥīd were sought after, and he would sell the unbound and un-illuminated copy of the Qur‘ān for 1000 dirhams. He allegedly had calligraphers with penmanship similar to his finish the copying of a Qur‘ān manuscript; he would then buy it from them for 400 dirhams, sign it, and resell it for 1000 dirhams.

Because of this great manuscript Baybars al-Jāshnakīr hired Ibn al-Waḥīd in diwān al-inshā‘. However, he did a bad job. Everyone was surprised that such a great calligrapher, a master of the seven scripts, would not finish a job, and would sleep on the letters and documents he had to prepare for people there.

In any event, he is considered to be one of the pillars of calligraphy in Egypt. His various teachings and commentaries on the technicalities of writing were also recorded by the fourteenth-century Mamluk author of Lamḥat al-mukhtaṭīf fī ṣinā‘at al-khaṭṭ al-ṣalaf. The author of this treatise, Muḥammad ibn Yāsīn ibn Muḥammad al-Kāṭib, gives a full description of what Ibn al-Waḥīd says about holding the pen while writing, as well as some of Ibn al-Waḥīd’ commentaries on ibn al-Bawwāb’s poem al-Rā‘iyya.

---

527 Al-Ṣafādī, al-Wāfī, 3:151.
528 Al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 4:467. This anecdote is quite interesting and important, as it opens the question of commercial production of Qur‘ān manuscripts in the Mamluk world. Ibn al-Waḥīd is possibly one example of many who copied and sold their work, when no patron commissioned them.
529 Al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 4:468; al-Ṣafādī, al-Wāfī, 3:151. His reputation as a bad employee reached the head of the diwān, Qāḍī Sharaf al-Dīn ibn Faḍl Allah, who wanted to test him for himself. He asked Ibn al-Waḥīd to prepare paper which he was able to do, and quickly write to the Rasūlīd ruler of Yemen a letter that was complicated and called for different literary styles to convey both firm and relaxed tones. Ibn al-Waḥīd apologized and said he was not able to write it. Al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 4:469.
530 Al-Kāṭib, Lamḥat al-mukhtaṭīf, 38, 47–48.
Şandal

Şandal’s workshop has been mentioned on several occasions in chapters two through four. Together with the two illuminators who aided him on the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript, they set an important base for Qur’ān manuscripts produced in Egypt. It is most unfortunate that the illuminator Şandal is not mentioned in any of the biographical dictionaries, except in passing by al-Şafadî in his ‘Ayān, and in Wāfî in his rather elaborate discussion of the calligrapher responsible for the same manuscript, Ibn al-Wahîd. When al-Şafadî talks about seeing the great manuscript in seven parts produced for the amīr Baybars in the mosque of al-Ḥākim, he mentions that its illuminator was Şandal.\footnote{“Wa zammakaha Şandal al-Mudhaḥhib,” in al-Şafadî, \textit{al-Wāfî}, 3:151; “Wa zammakaha Şandal” in al-Şafadî, \textit{A’yān}, 4:468.}

From his name it is to be assumed that he was a eunuch.

Aydughdi ibn ‘Abdallāh

Aydughdi ibn ‘Abdallāh (d. 729/1329) was one of the apprentices of Şandal and the only one who is mentioned in the sources, although only briefly. The other apprentice, Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, is unfortunately not mentioned. There are a few Aydughdis in the sources; only the ones with relevant dates are considered here, since none of them are mentioned as illuminators. The two considered are Aydughdi ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Barîdî\footnote{Al-Salāmî, \textit{al-Wafayāt}, 1:151.} and Aydughdi al-Khawārizmî.\footnote{Al-Maqriizi, \textit{al-Muqaṭṭâ}, 2:343–44; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalâni, \textit{al-Durar}, 1:454.} The first one seems to have lived his entire life in Syria and was once a 	extit{mamlūk} owned by al-Birzāfî’s father (the great \textit{muḥaddith}
and historian), but there is no indication that he was ever in Cairo. The second one might have been the one under study.

Amīr Alā’ al-Dīn Aydughdī al-Khwārizmī was one of the ḥājibs of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. He was a learned man, especially in history, and was sent by the sultan as emissary to Khan Anūk, the leader of the Golden Horde, and to the rulers of Morocco because of his good presentation skills. He died in 729/1329 in Damascus after being there for eight years on a mission for the sultan.

Artists Responsible for the Collection under Study

‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī’ī

‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī’ī is the calligrapher responsible for Raṣīd 111, as stated in chapter two. As is clear from his nisba, he was a Shāfī’ī by training and a religious scholar. His full name is ‘Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā’il ibn Aḥmad ibn Sa’īd ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd (d. 778/1376). He was born in Aleppo in 708/1308 and later moved to Egypt, and is therefore also referred to as Ḥalabī Mīṣrī Shāfī’ī. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba mentions his first and second qualities as a scholar and a calligrapher (katab al-khāṭṭ al-mansūb: ‘wrote the proportioned script’). He is noted to have been very good in Arabic. It was probably this ability, besides his skill as a calligrapher, that resulted in his appointment to the post of kāṭib al-sīrī (confidential secretary to the sultan) in Damascus. He was also the head shaykh in Damascus in 765/1363, but was deposed

534 Al-Salāmī, al-Wafāyāt, 1:151.
535 Ibn Ḥajar Al-‘Asqālānī, al-Durār, 1:454.
537 Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqālānī, Inbā’, 1:140.
from this position twice. Every time he was deposed he would return home to Egypt.\footnote{Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, \textit{Tārikh}, 2:526.} Towards the end of his life in Cairo he retired and dedicated himself to prayer until he died in 778/1376.\footnote{Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, \textit{Tārikh}, 2:526; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, \textit{Inbā’}, 1:140.}

Other calligraphers from chapter two, such as Sawunju al-Rasūlī al-Silāḥdār al-Malakī al-Nāṣirī, Muḥammad ibn Sawunju al-Rasūlī, Ya’qūb ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥafīl ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, and Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥaḍī al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī, were unfortunately not found under any entry in any of the biographical dictionaries so far examined. From their \textit{nisbas}, however, some conclusions can be gleaned.

\textbf{Sawunju al-Rasūlī} (Raṣīd 62) was most definitely an \textit{amīr}, the bearer of the arms of Sultan al-Nāṣir Ḥasan, and so most probably one of the \textit{khāṣṣakiyya} of the sultan. This would explain ‘al-Malakī al-Nāṣirī’ (‘belonging to the king al-Nāṣir’) in his name.\footnote{In a few of the colophons of this magnificent thirty-volume Qur’ān manuscript, examined in chapter two, the calligrapher inscribed the name of the sultan, al-Nāṣir Ḥasan, in small script on top of his own name.} His son Muḥammad, who signed other volumes of the same \textit{rab’a}, belonged to the category of \textit{awlād al-nās}, which, it will be recalled, were favored by Sultan Ḥasan.

\textbf{Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥaḍī al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī} (Raṣīds 70 and 71) seems to have been from Qūmsh and eventually passed through Irāq before settling in the Mamluk lands. He was also a religious scholar, since he signed as a \textit{qāḍī}.\footnote{The geographical dictionaries mention the city of Qums in Iran, pronounced Qūmsh by the inhabitants, the Persians. This province includes Simnān and Baṣṭān. Thus it is in the heart of Khurasan. Abū al-Fidā, \textit{Taqwīm al-buldān}, ed. Maḥmūd Murād (Cairo: Maṭba’at Abū al-Hawl, 2007), 27. Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī adds that it also includes Biyār and that Simnān is sometimes included within its boundaries and sometimes not. Shihāb al-Dīn Abū ‘Abdallāh Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, \textit{Mu’jam al-buldān} (Beirut: Dār Ṣadr, 1977), 4:414–15.}
Ibrāhīm al-Āāmidī

Among the artists we encountered in chapter three, the most important is Ibrāhīm al-Āāmidī, the illuminator, who produced Raṣīd 9, Raṣīd 10, and possibly Raṣīd 15. He also influenced a few of the manuscripts we saw in chapter four, where it was argued that some of these manuscripts might have been produced by his disciples. The sources mention two individuals named Ibrāhīm al-Āāmidī, neither of whom is described as an illuminator. However, by now it should be clear that not mentioning that a great religious scholar was a calligrapher or illuminator does not necessarily exclude the possibility that he actually was a calligrapher or an illuminator, as in the case of al-Maydūmī. A religious scholar who was also an artist was primarily measured by his scholarship, especially if he was a muḥaddith, since ḥadīth had been the most important and prestigious of all Islamic disciplines since the very early centuries of Islam.\footnote{Jonathan Berkey’s book *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo* makes this point throughout.}

The two Ibrāhīm al-Āāmidīs mentioned in the sources are both muḥaddiths. The one who is most probably the one we are looking for was a loyal disciple of Ibn Taymiyya, but a Shāfī‘ī and not a Ḥanbālī like Ibn Taymiyya.\footnote{The other al-Āāmidī died in 778/1376 and has biographies in Ibn Taghri Birdī, *al-Manhal*, 1:51; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Tārīkh*, 2:517; al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 56; al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, 1:68; Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī, *al-Durar*, 1:18, and Ibn al-‘Imād, *Shadhara>t*, 8:440. This other al-Āāmidī was a ḥadīth scholar born in 695/1295 in Damascus and lived most of his life there, but his origins are from Amid. He was a great muḥaddith and was also nāzir al-jaysh in Damascus. He thus occupied religious and administrative roles.} He was born in Āāmid in 714/1314 to Christian parents. He came to Damascus as a young boy (al-Maqrīzī is the only one who tells us he was seven when he came to Damascus), but it is not clear whether he was with his parents or alone, and there he was converted to Islam by Ibn Taymiyya. From then onwards he served and studied with Ibn Taymiyya until the
latter’s death in 1328. He moved to Cairo, where he was a hadith scholar and instructor authorized to relate and expound on many texts, including ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth by al-Maydūmī, as reported by al-Maqrizi. The later historian Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī mentions that he studied with al-Maydūmī, who might have also taught him how to illuminate, or at least shown him the basics of it. He died in Cairo in 797/1394.

‘Ālī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi

‘Ālī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi (Raṣid 10) (d. 808/1405) was a calligrapher and administrator who practiced and was a famed teacher of calligraphy. His full name is ‘Ālī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Nāṣir and his laqab was ‘Aṣfūr (‘bird’). He was an employee in the diwān al-inshā’ and assumed the prestigious position of muwaqqāt al-dast. He taught highly esteemed individuals calligraphy. While the sources do not tell us that he was employed under Sultan Sha’bān, who must have given him the nisba ‘al-Ashrafi’, we are told that it is he who transcribed the ‘ahd (diploma of investiture) for Sultan Faraj. He was probably selected for this honor because of his masterful script.

His style is said to have been derived from that of Yāqūt. Even though he was friends with Shaykh al-Ziftāwī, the great calligrapher who wrote in accordance with

545 Al-Maqrizi, Durar, 1:111. Al-Maqrizī, who might have known him in person, mentions that he was a student of al-Maqrizi grandfather and a friend of his father’s.
546 Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’, 1:496.
549 Shams al-Dīn al-Ziftāwī was a calligrapher and hadith scholar, born in 750/1349 and died in 806/1403. He was regarded as an expert of calligraphy with knowledge of all scripts, and he also wrote about calligraphy. His treatise is entitled Minhāj al-iṣāba fi awdā’ al-kitāba, it will be referred to in later sections of this chapter. His students in calligraphy include al-Qalqashandī
the rules of Ibn al-‘Aff, ‘Afi stuck to Yāqūt’s way, albeit in a Syrian fashion, as

It is most unfortunate that so far nothing has been found on Muḥammad al-
Mukattib al-Shihābī, Maḥmūd ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Afi al-Nakhjawānī (Jalayrid artist?),

Chapter four gave us quite a few names, the most important of whom is ‘Abd al-
Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh. Because he is the most famous of the artists in chapter four, and
because he continued operating until the middle of the fifteenth century and had several
students, his biography will be discussed at the end of this section.

\textbf{Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī}

Aḥmad ibn Iṣḥāq ibn ‘Āṣim ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Majd ibn al-Sa’d al-
Iṣfahānī (known as Shaykh Aṣlam, d. 802/1399) (Raṣīd 123 and Raṣīd 79) was born in
Cairo around 760/1358, grew up there, and studied jurisprudence with his father. He was
the shaykh in charge of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s \textit{khānqāh} in Siryāqūs, succeeding

\footnote{What he meant by “Syrian way,” \textit{ṭariqat al-shāmiyyīn}, requires further investigation.}
his father in this position.\footnote{\textit{Al-Maqri}z\i, \textit{Durar}, 1:357; al-Sak\h{h}w\i, \textit{al-\textit{Daw}}, 1:226; Ibn \H{h}ajar al-`Asqal\a{n}i, \textit{Inb\a}, 2:113; Ibn Q\a{d}\i Shuhba, \textit{T\a{r}\i\kh}, 4:113; Ah\mad ibn `Al\i ibn \H{h}ajar al-`Asqal\a{n}i, \textit{Dhayl al-durar al-k\a{m}ina}, ed. `Adn\a{a}n Darwish (Cairo, 1992), 81.} Thus he was a Sufi. Al-Maqri\z\i and al-Sak\h{h}w\i are the only two biographers who give more details about his personality and his relationship with Sultan Barquq (d. 801/1399). Both concur that he was a very decent and virtuous man, the best of his creed, who cared for and gave generously to the poor.\footnote{\textit{Al-Maqri}z\i, \textit{Durar}, 1:357; al-Sak\h{h}w\i, \textit{al-\textit{Daw}}, 1:226.} Al-Sak\h{h}w\i quotes, but disagrees with, the historian al-`Ayni, saying that he was not learned, was ill-mannered, and misused the \textit{kh\a{n}qah}'s money to feed the poor.\footnote{\textit{Al-Sak\h{h}w\i}, \textit{al-\textit{Daw}}, 1:226–27.}

Nothing is mentioned regarding his capacity as a calligrapher or illuminator, but his relationship to Sultan Barquq is discussed. The two men were close until, for some unknown reason, the sultan became upset with him and dismissed him from his position in the \textit{kh\a{n}qah}. He returned to it again after the death of Sultan Barquq and the enthronement of Sultan Faraj, and died there in 802/1399.\footnote{\textit{Al-Sak\h{h}w\i}, \textit{al-\textit{Daw}}, 1:226; al-Maqri\z\i, \textit{Durar}, 1:357.}

Nothing is mentioned regarding his \textit{nisba}, either; why is he `al-\I{f}ah\a{n}i'? It is not recorded that he visited there or that he was born there. In fact, he was born and lived his entire life in Cairo. It is possible that his family originated from there.

\textbf{Ah\mad ibn `Al\i al-`Ajam\i al-Mudhahhib}

Although Ah\mad al-Mudhahhib (d. 817/1414) did not illuminate any of the Qur\’\a{n}s in D\a{r} al-Kutub, his Qur\’\a{n} manuscript in the Nasser Khalili Collection (QUR 595) proved to be very important in the discussion in chapter four, since it was written under the
rulership of Sultan Barqūq and emulated the central field of the frontispiece of Raṣīd 54 (an important part of the Star Polygon Group workshop).

The only two sources who mention him are al-Sakhāwī, in his biographical dictionary *al-Ḍawʾ al-lāmiʿ fī ahl al-qarn al-tāsiʿ*, and al-Maqrīzī, in his biographical dictionary *Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farida fī tājim al-ʿayān al-mufīda*. He is mentioned in the latter work under the entry for Aḥmad ibn ‘Aštārī al-Rassām.555 He was born after 750/1350. His sole vocation was *al-rasm*, and thus he was a painter, which includes illuminating manuscripts or painting buildings or designs on buildings. These sources also mention that he was a poet who composed verse in the colloquial idiom and that this was very easy for him.556 He died in 817/1414.557

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyīḥ (nicknamed al-Zayn)

Ibn al-Ṣāyīḥ was the most important master calligrapher of the late fourteenth century and the early fifteenth century and very important to Turkish calligraphers.558 Modern scholarship on Ibn al-Ṣāyīḥ was initiated by Abd al-Laṭīf Ibrāhīm, who published an article in 1963 on the calligrapher and his school. In it, he examines his biography and lists his students as well as some of his extant manuscripts. Later, in 1981, Hilāl Nājī published an introduction to Ibn al-Ṣāyīḥ’s treatise on calligraphy, which he edited, and in which he discusses Ibn al-Ṣāyīḥ’s biography. In 1997 Farūq Sa’d also published and edited the treatise with an introduction in which he discusses the author.

---

Ibn al-Ṣāyigh was the son of a goldsmith. His full name was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Yusūf, and his nisba was ‘al-Qāhirī’ since he was born, lived, practiced, and taught his entire life in Cairo. He also acquired a second nisba, ‘al-mukattib,’ which of course comes from his profession as a calligrapher. His exact birth date is not known, but it was before 777/1368. He was known to be good-humored and smart. In addition to having been a student of Qur’ān recitation he knew a lot of poetry. It is most interesting that he received his lessons in recitation in the house of an amīr called Yalbughā al-Salāmī, and apparently this house was part of the palace of the Bahri Mamluk amīr Bashtāk. He even left his name inscribed on the floor where he studied, signing “and the mujawwid ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Yusūf al-Ṣāyigh al-Mukattib.” From this signature we can tell that he became a student of Qur’ān recitation after he was a calligrapher, since he refers to himself as al-mukattib. Al-Sakhawī gives the date of the lessons as Ṣafr 799/1396. Ibn al-Ṣāyigh was also a Sufi who belonged to and resided or frequented the oldest khānqāh in Cairo, that of Sa‘īd al-Su‘adā. He died, after being sick for some time, in 845/1441.

559 Al-Sakhawī, Ṭawr, 4:161; Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhawī, Kitāb al-tibr al-masbūk (Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyāt al-Azhariyya, 1972), 29. In Inbā’ al-ghumr Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī mistakenly gives the name of the father as ‘Afi, but al-Sakhawī points out the mistake and corrects it.
560 It seems that this huge palace was divided into houses/apartments in the late fourteenth century.
561 Al-Sakhawī, Ṭawr, 4:162.
562 Al-Sakhawī, Ṭawr, 4:162; al-Sakhawī, Tibr, 30.
563 Built by Ṣalāh al-Dīn.
564 Al-Sakhawī, Ṭawr, 4:162; al-Sakhawī, Tibr, 30; al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’, 4:192.
His silsila – His masters

Ibn al-Ṣāyigh is referred to by all sources as a lover of the way of Ibn al-ʿAfīf; they comment that he followed in the footsteps of the great early fourteenth-century master. The Egyptian calligrapher Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAfī al-Ziftāwī, mentioned earlier, taught ibn al-Ṣāyigh ibn al-ʿAfīf’s way, after he was taught by al-Nūr al-Wasīmī,565 who in turn was a student of Ghāzī. Al-Sakhāwī notes that Ibn al-Ṣāyigh developed his own new way which combined elements from both the school of Ibn al-ʿAfīf and the school of Ghāzī.566 Of course the silsila (chain of transmission) goes back to Shuhda (d. 574/1178), the calligrapher who was taught by Ibn Asd, who was a student of the great Ibn al-Bawwāb.567 Zaynab Shuhda al-Kātiba is the link between Ibn al-Bawwāb and Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī.568 However, there is no mention of Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī in any of the masters in Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s chain. Is Shuhda’s presence perhaps the link to Yāqūt?

His Students

Ibn al-Ṣāyigh taught in many schools simultaneously569 and had many students who continued as calligraphers, as well as those who received calligraphy lessons but specialized in other fields. The historians al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, the

568 Annemarie Schimmel, Calligraphy and Islamic Culture (London: I.B. Tauris, 1990), 21, 47.
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latter of whom was also a *muhaddith*, were his students in calligraphy, as were al-Sakhāwī’s father and uncle. He also had students who were famed calligraphers and who practiced in the fifteenth century. Illuminators and binders too were among his disciples; two important examples are Muḥammad ibn al-ʿIbyārī (Ibn al-Saddār) and Muḥammad ibn al-Shams al-Azraqī.

His importance

Ibn al-Ṣāyiğh’s importance cannot be overstated. That he instituted a new way in scribing was seen in his Qur’ān manuscripts in chapter four. He did indeed deviate from the typical straight and rigorous Egyptian *muḥaqqaq* seen in many examples, but he did not lessen its majestic effect or take away its balance. He taught so many of the leading names of the fifteenth century and may have contributed to the evolution of the *naskh* script as a leading script throughout the fifteenth century. He is also important to the Turkish school, which is the only functioning school today. Mustaqīm Zāda, in his *Tuhfah-i khaṭṭatīn*, mistakenly ascribes the invention of the *ijāza* to Ibn al-Ṣāyiğh.

The early sixteenth-century Mamluk Egyptian calligrapher Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭayyibī sums it all up in his treatise and album *Jāmiʿ maḥāsin kitābat al-kuttāb*, compiled for Sultan al-Ghūrī:

574 Mustaqīm Zāda, *Tuhfah-i khaṭṭatīn*, 253. *Ijāza* is the proof a scholar receives from his master that he is permitted to transmit his knowledge. In the present case, it is the certificate that proves that the calligrapher has been authorized by a master to practice and teach. A succinct explanation of *ijāzas* in general can be found in Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice*, 87–90.
I know no one from the calligraphers who has been described as such [great master], and those great in all scripts, who came after the great master ‘Ali ibn Hilāl known as ibn al-Bawwāb, except for the Shaykh, the imām, the learned master, the only one of the epoch, the unique one of the time, the one with the great students and fluid writing, the one who took the main way of the maydān, and no one from those before his time, contemporaneous to him or those who came after him was able to catch up with him, Zayn al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān, known as ibn al-Ṣāyigh, may God have mercy on him. He wove [his writing] in such an unprecedented way, and penned the letter like no other, because he collected the beauties of writing and penned it, divided its whites and illuminated it, and divided its portions and proportioned them, and thus he fixed/placed it in the best placement. If you look at his writing you would liken it to one of the flowers of the gardens of paradise or to the necklaces of jewels on beautiful young women. Whosoever follows his path is to be considered as the best of scribes, and whosoever deviates is ignorant, a failure and embarrassment to calligraphers; he would have no status or stature amongst them. His [Ibn al-Ṣāyigh] quality is that his hands are fashioned like jewelry to be admired by those who are unaware of the beauties of this craft. For those who scribe now, among the people of this craft, write in any way they please, and their penmanship is devoid of balance and grace.575

Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s Treatise: Tuḥfat āl-albāb fī ṣinā‘at al-khāṭṭ wa-al-kitāb or Risāla fī al-khāṭṭ wa barī al-qalam.576

The treatise begins by reviewing the importance of calligraphy and writing. He then goes into the origins of Arabic, tracing it back to Ḥira and the Tsm tribes, whose members formulated the Arabic alphabet in accordance with their names. He then discusses the theory that kūfī is the origin of Arabic scripts, but also adds that naskh might have been another source that existed side by side with kūfī.

After this historical foundation, he goes on to discuss the different scripts and their developments, and provides a “who’s who” in the world of Arabic calligraphy.

575 Al-Ṭayyībī, Jāmi‘ maḥāsin kitābāt al-kuttāb, 18.
576 The following summary is drawn from Farūq Sa’d’s edition of Risāla fī al-khatt wa barī al-qalam, pp. 33–35.
which includes, among others, the Ibn Muqla brothers, Ibn al-Bawwāb and Yāqūt al-Musta‘ṣimī.

He then proceeds to inform his readers about the technicalities of preparing and handling the pen, including the four different stages of its cutting: al-fāṭḥ, al-shaqq, al-naḥt, and al-qāṭ, and how each is to be done (Pl. 101). He describes how to hold the pen, according to the instructions of Ibn al-‘Afi‘f.

The description of the different letters and their geometry then follows, along with their vocalization and the issue of ्tams in connection with the different scripts. Letter proportions and sizes are also discussed.\textsuperscript{577}

Learning, Transmitting ʿilm, and the Calligraphers

Our next step is to reconstruct the interconnections between the above-mentioned calligraphers, especially those who are responsible for the Qurʾān manuscripts of the period under study. However, we must first discuss their traditional training and education and their status in the society in which they were living. A few important

\textsuperscript{577} The last calligrapher on the list is Muhammad ibn ‘Afi‘ al-Imām. He was actually just a muḥarrir (which, as explained earlier, could mean a calligrapher, which he was, but his involvement in the manuscripts was not as the main calligrapher). His name, found in Raṣīds 97, 120, and 121, appears on the verso of the last folio of all of these Qurʾān manuscripts written in red in a simple sentence, “ḥarrarahu Muḥammad ibn ‘Afi‘ al-Imām.” It was he who added the mad letters, the long alif, and the small recitation markers in the manuscripts in red. He signs his full name in small red script at the end of Raṣīd 97 as “Muḥammad al-Imām al-Ḥanafi‘ al-Ghazulī.” The only entry in the sources under this name is for an earlier religious scholar who died in 777/1375 and could not have been the same person, since our Muḥammad was working in 806/1403. The Muḥammad in the sources is Muḥammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ṣafi‘ ibn Qāsim ibn Ḥab al-Rahmān al-Kāṭib al-Ghazulī al-Miṣrī. We know from his nisba that he was a kāṭib. Born in 697/1297 and trained as a ḥadīth scholar by some of the most famous scholars at the time, he later also taught some of the most prestigious scholars of the next generation. He was known for his good hand but nothing is mentioned about his teaching calligraphy. He was a Sufi, since he was imam of the khānqāh of Baybars al-Jāshnākīr. He apparently lived his entire life in Cairo, where he also died in 777/1375. See al-Maqrīzī, Durrār, 3:178; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, al-Durrār, 3:408; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Inbā‘, 1:119.
studies have been conducted on the educational system, or the “transmission of knowledge,” as Jonathan Berkey puts it, in Mamluk Cairo and the status of the civilian elite of the medieval city. These studies include, among others, Ira Lapidus’ chapter “The Ulama and the Foundation of an Urban Society” in his book *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages*, focusing more on Damascus than Cairo; Carl Petry’s *The Civilian Elite of Cairo in the Later Middle Ages*, Jonathan Berkey’s *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo*, and Robert Hunter Moore’s PhD dissertation “The Role of the Madrasah and the Structure of Islamic Legal Education in Mamluk Egypt (1250–1517).” Focusing on Damascus is Michael Chamberlain’s *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350*. To this list we have to add, even if it does not focus on the Mamluk period, George Makdisi’s *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West*. None of these works focus on calligraphers and their modes of learning.\(^{578}\) Carl Petry does include them alongside the *kuttāb* in his discussion of the civilian elite of the city, but does not treat their training. These studies are important to use because, as seen earlier, our calligraphers were in many cases religious scholars, *muhaddithūn* or *fuqahā*. It should be noted that, just as there is unity in multiplicity in the Islamic art, there is a similar “unity in diversity” in Islamic learning.\(^{579}\)

---

\(^{578}\) There are several works on the Ottoman, Timurid, and Safavid periods discussing the teaching of calligraphy, but these will not be brought into the discussion because they are from a different era and region. A good summary of the Persian and Turkish material can be found in David Roxburgh, “The Eye is Favored for Seeing the Writing’s Form: On the Sensual and the Sensuous in Islamic Calligraphy,” *Muqarnas* 25 (2008): 275–98.

We must also look for the relevant material in the primary sources. We do not have a training book for calligraphy (a *mashq*) from the Mamluk period or a manual that describes the different stages of training that a calligrapher must go through. We do have, however, early and late medieval treatises on calligraphy and on the transmission of knowledge that are useful. Given our means and purposes, we will focus on texts written during the Mamluk period and under the Mamluk regime, some of which have already been used in the previous chapters. These sources include:

1. Relevant sections in *Subḥ al-aʿshā fī ṣīnāʿat al-inshāʿ*; by Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Qalqashandī (d. 821/1418).

---

580 Also called *musawwada* (Arabic) or *karalama* (Turkish), “these were ostensibly made as practice exercises over the course of a calligrapher’s career but quickly developed identifiable, formalized aesthetic features.” See Roxburgh, “Sensual and Sensuous,” 275. The muḥaqqaq *mashq* page published by Roxburgh has been attributed to Yāqūt, but was most probably not his. This is why Roxburgh puts the date before 1549. This example is preserved in the Topkapi Saray Museum, B. 410. Fol. 127b. See Roxburgh, “The Eye Is Favored,” 282.

581 This has been verified by the scholar-calligrapher Nassar Mansour, who includes in his book *Sacred Script: Muḥaqqa in Islamic Calligraphy* a muḥaqqaq copybook (*mashq*) that he devised himself. He used the above-mentioned primary sources and Ottoman material to help him in his reconstruction. See Mansour, *Sacred Script*, 201–48.
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5. Tadhkirat al-sāmiʿ wa-al-mutakallim fī adab al-ʿālim wa-al-mutaʿallim by Badr al-Dīn ibn Jamāʿa (d. 733/1333).\(^{586}\)

6. Tuḥfát ūlī al-albāb fī ʾṣināʿat al-khaṭṭ wa-al-kitāb or Risāla fī al-khaṭṭ wa-bārī al-qalam by Ibn al-Ṣāyigh (d. 845/1441).\(^{587}\)

7. Al-ʿInāya al-rabānīyya fī al-ṭariqa al-shaʿbānīyya by Shaʿbān ibn Muhāammad al-Athārī al-Qurashi al-Mawsīlī al-Miṣrī (d. 828/1424).\(^{588}\) The treatise was written in 790/1388 in verse and is addressed to the muwaqqīṭ, nāṣikh, and kāṭib. Thus it was composed primarily for the purposes of the bureaucrat and the calligrapher.

8. Minhāj al-iṣāba fī maʿrifat al-khūṭūf wa ʾalāt al-kitāba by Muḥāammad ibn Aḥmad al-Zīftāwī (d. 806/1403; resident of Fustat).\(^{589}\)

9. Ghaʿyat al-maraʿm fī takhāṭub al-aqlām by Abū Muḥāammad ʿAbdallāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Salāma al-Maqrīzī al-Ḥanāfī (was in the service of Sultan Barquq and died sometime in the 8th/15th century).\(^{590}\)

---


11. *Al-ʿUmda: risāla ʿīf al-khaṭṭ wa-al-qalam* by ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAfd al-Haytī (d. 891/1486).\(^{592}\) He was a Cairene religious scholar and calligrapher who studied calligraphy with Ibn al-Ṣāyigh.

The Environment in Cairo Responsible for the Formation of our Calligraphers and the Literature on Calligraphy

The intellectual and spiritual life of Cairo from the late days of the thirteenth century and continuing into the fourteenth century can be aptly described as a thriving one in spite of economic or political disturbances, which have been discussed in chapter one. A contributing element to this flourishing atmosphere was the Mongol conquest of Baghdad in 656/1258. Cairo was seen as the sole heir to Baghdad’s cultural throne, and consequently Baghdad’s supremacy in the world of calligraphy was passed on to Cairo.\(^{593}\) Many immigrants, partly a civilian elite, fled their towns in the east to arrive in Cairo in the wake of the destruction of their government’s structure and intellectual institutions.\(^{594}\) This contributed to an intellectually cosmopolitan environment in Cairo, the effects of which can be seen in the details of some of our manuscripts. This influx

---

\(^{591}\) Al-Kātib, *Lamḥat al-mukhtatif*.


\(^{593}\) Ibn Khalīdūn, *al-Muqaddima*, 469.

did not stop in the fourteenth century but continued into the early days of the fifteenth century with Timūr Lang’s invasions and destruction of Damascus. These invasions “marked the final stages of an era of migration and upheaval that had intensified after the career of Genghis Khan.”⁵⁹⁵ Cairo was now a very important international intellectual center.

The focus of the influx and the intellectual activity was Cairo, the capital of a world power of the time. Egypt was where the ruling and rich elite lived and sponsored various institutions, activities, and buildings, and the resources and funds created positions for ‘ulamā’ and other civilian elites.⁵⁹⁶ We must keep in mind that the households of Mamluk amīrs were quite big and created a lot of economic activity that also gave the civilian elite jobs by fostering the economic cycle.⁵⁹⁷ The sultan and amīrs, in most cases, saw themselves as the upkeepers of the city and facilitators of public life since they controlled most of the resources. This led them to build and restore the religious institutions, public works, and city streets.⁵⁹⁸ They believed that it was indeed their duty to support the intellectual life of the city. Thus our ‘ulamā’/bureaucrats/calligraphers/illuminators found opportunities and were able to practice their vocations successfully.

Carl Petry has clearly shown through his meticulous study of entries in the biographical dictionaries that most of the immigrants were from the Greater Syria area,

⁵⁹⁶ Petry, *Civilian Elite*, 40.
followed by the Iranian lands. The wave of immigrants/refugees from Iran was greater in the first half of the fifteenth century than later in that century because of Timūr Lang’s invasions. Migrants from the Persian lands assumed careers related to religious studies and functions. Among them were many Sufis, and some tended towards administrative positions in bureaucracy. They were also merchants and physicians, but most importantly calligraphers. They played a prominent role in the intellectual scene relative to their numbers and were strong vehicles for their culture in medieval Cairo. To a large extent their influence explains the heavy presence of Persian elements in our manuscripts.

Thus far we can picture a Cairo where control over resources lay in the hands of a ruling elite with the will to sponsor and encourage intellectual activities, a city with a learned elite of its own and a learned elite migrating to it due to the invasions by Mongols and Turko-Mongolian powers of the eastern lands, all interacting to produce an exquisite art.

This learned elite belonged, for the most part, to the ‘ulamāʾ class, whose training was primarily religious, as can be attested by many of the biographies cited in the first section of this chapter. Besides the ‘ulamāʾ the elite also included bureaucrats and representatives of the category of awlād al-nās. Joseph Escovitz has studied the bureaucrats of the fourteenth century. He searched the biographical dictionaries of the

---

599 Petry, Civilian Elite, 51–68. While Petry claims that there were no artisans from Anatolia, we know from the Qurʾān manuscripts, especially those by Ibrāhim al-Amidi, that there were. He did come through Syria, however, and this might be an argument that the influences he brought in were Syrian rather than Anatolian. See Petry, Civilian Elite, 72.
600 Petry, Civilian Elite, 64.
602 Petry, Civilian Elite, 68.
period looking for the backgrounds of the *kuttāb* and the employees of *diwān al-inshā‘*. His results, published in the article “Vocational Patterns of Mamluk Scribes,” show that most of the secretaries had a religious education, although they did not all come from scribal families where the profession was inherited. Many were also ‘*ulama*’ who specialized in *hadith* or jurisprudence. 603 This is not surprising in any way because traditionally, as mentioned earlier, education was religious in nature, and it was not out of the ordinary for an ‘ālim to have another vocation. 604 Al-Nūwayrī’s scribal curriculum starts with the memorization and thorough understanding of the Qurʾān. This is followed by memorizing as many *hadiths* as possible, understanding their meanings, their vocabulary, or their linguistic composition. 605 The disciple would then study all the writings on grammar, which would lead him to the study of *balāgha*. This entails knowing by heart the various speeches and sermons given by the companions of the Prophet and other important figures. The history of the Arabs was then studied: their battles, their tribes, and their cultural traditions. The history of other nations and memorization of poetry then followed. The last fields studied were proverbs and advice literature. 606 Judging by the fact that they received the most attention and explanation, Qurʾān and *hadith* are the most important part of this training. This is why an understanding of the customary modes of learning in this era, especially the religious ones, is important to the further study of our calligraphers.

604 “The status of being one of the ulama was available to workers and craftsmen. . . . Biographies indicate that many masons, stoneworkers, carpenters, coppersmiths, soap makers, and especially pharmacists were ulama.” See Lapidus, *Muslim Cities*, 109.
Modes of Learning—Their Training

Copyists were quite distinct from secretaries and clerks associated with the diwāns and courts. Copyists were tied to the religio-academic network, where the demand for written material was focused. Those copyists who actually became instructors tended to specialize in teaching the various accepted styles of script.607

Copyists were trained in calligraphy, a discipline in itself, and so some of them became established calligraphers. We see again the overlap with the category of the ‘ulamā’, and as indicated by Petry’s statistics, they were part of the religio-academic network. Petry was also able to show that individuals who assumed this craft (nāsīkh and/or calligrapher) were Sufis and were associated mostly with khānqaḥs.608

What was their training like? It cannot be overstated that most calligraphers had a religious education. George Makdisi in his monumental work The Rise of Colleges discusses Ibn Butlān’s tripartite division of learning: the Islamic sciences, the philosophical and natural science, and the literary arts. The most important were the Islamic sciences.609 In our case they were the most important indeed. There was not a standard curriculum or program for all professors; each professor devised his own and each founder/endower mandated in his waqf document how his institute was to be organized.610

607 Petry, Civilian Elite, 242.
608 Petry, Civilian Elite, 310–11 (table 11).
610 Makdisi, Rise of Colleges, 80.
The Mamluk calligrapher Sha'bān al-Āthārī (d. 828/1425) states clearly in his treatise-poem (his *alfiyya*) that the disciple must start with the discipline of calligraphy and then memorize the Qur’ān, and study what is ḥalāl and what is ḥarām (fa-ibdā’ bi-‘ilm al-khaṭṭ li-al-itqān wa-ba’daḥu bi-al-hifẓ fī al-Qur’ān). So did the student begin with the *khaṭṭ* or religious sciences? In many of the calligraphers studied here, the main vocation was that of a religious scholar, so perhaps they started with the religious sciences and then *khaṭṭ*, or perhaps both were being studied together. Al-Āthārī addresses his poem to the *muwaqqi’, nāsikh*, and *kātib*, and so it is possible he placed *khaṭṭ* first because as bureaucrats this should be their primary concern. Here we will start with the basic training in the religious sciences.

Students studied the following: (1) the Qur’ān; memorizing it was prerequisite to anything else. This was followed by (2) *ḥadīth* (also memorized); (3) Qur’ān sciences, which include exegesis and learning the variant readings; (4) *ḥadīth* sciences, which includes several interrelated and complicated typologies of studying the biographies of the transmitters; (5) *uṣūl al-dīn* and *uṣūl al-fiqh*; (6) one’s *madhab*; (7) *khilāf* between

---

611 It is very important to provide a biographical notice for this calligrapher here. Abū Sa‘īd Zayn al-Dīn Sha'bān ibn Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd ibn ʿAfī al-Āthārī was born in Mosul c. 765/1364, but lived and died in Cairo. He became a poet, Arabist, and scholar, and one of the major calligraphers of his time. He trained in calligraphy with the master al-Ziftāwī and became his most esteemed student and the one allowed to provide others with *ijāzās*. His career as an official of the Mamluk state was filled with hardships because he was deposed several times and had to flee to Yemen and India and then back to Cairo. At some point during his life in Cairo he was responsible for the Athār (remains) of the Prophet, and so acquired his nisba ‘al-Āthārī.’ He wrote thirteen different titles, nine of which have reached us, many of them on grammar and poetry. See al-Sakhāwī, *al-Ḍaw’,* 3:301–303; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’,* 3:353–55; al-Qalqashānī, *Ṣubḥ al-‘asha*, 3:14. For a comprehensive list of his titles see Hilāl Nājī, *Mawsū‘at turāth al-khaṭṭ al-‘arabī* (Cairo: Mu’assasat Turāth al-Khaṭṭ al-‘Arabī, 2002), 291–92.


one’s madhhab and others; and (8) jadal.\textsuperscript{614} This list is not to be thought of as a formal program of study or a curriculum.\textsuperscript{615}

All of these subjects were covered, but one need not be a specialist in each one: a muhaddith will focus more on the hadith sciences, while a jurist will have to master usul al-din and usul al-fiqh in addition to the different madhāhib. The base of traditional learning was memorization, which entailed repetition and learning by heart; this did not preclude understanding, which was also imperative. A student who only memorized without understanding was likened to a donkey carrying codices on its back. Mudhakara then aided in retaining what was memorized and how it was understood. Writing the material learned was as important as memorizing, because without a written record none of the works of the great scholars and commentators would have survived, thus the importance of the notebook according to Makdisi’s categorization.\textsuperscript{616} An important example of this in the world of calligraphy is the aforementioned treatise Minhāj al-īsāba fī ma‘rifat al-khūtūt wa ālāt al-kitāba by Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ziftāwī (d. 806/1403), the mukattib of Fustat and student of the muḥtasib-calligrapher Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Aṣī ibn Abī Ruqayba. The reason he gives for composing his treatise is for it to be a tadhkira for him throughout his life and to benefit others studying calligraphy after he dies.\textsuperscript{617}

Once our calligraphers had completed this religious training, what did they do to learn and practice their writing skills? The above-mentioned treatises and scribal encyclopedias of the Mamluk period will help us in determining the different steps. Al-

\textsuperscript{614} Makdisi, \textit{Rise of Colleges}, 80.
\textsuperscript{615} Chamberlain, \textit{Knowledge and Social Practice}, 87.
\textsuperscript{617} Al-Ziftāwī, \textit{Minhāj}, 220.
Qalqashandi’s *Subh al-a‘shā*, which covers many topics, focuses on calligraphy in volumes two and three primarily. The importance of this work for our purposes lies in the fact that he quotes the master calligraphers of the period, thus preserving for us opinions and methods we would not have otherwise known. Ibn Khaldūn’s *Muqaddima* preserves what he observed of this training in late fourteenth-century Cairo, which is our focus as well. Volume seven of al-Nūwayrī’s *Nihāya* includes a section on scribes and secretaryship, and this entails a discussion of calligraphy. *Mubīd al-ni‘am* and *Tadhkirat al-sāmi’* both speak of the duties and manners of students and teachers and include sections on calligraphy and calligraphers. The remaining treatises are the ones written by practicing master calligraphers of the century, and as such are the most important in telling us more about the art during that time. The following section will integrate all of these sources to construct the program that would have been followed to become a calligrapher and the rules they observed. To reiterate, none of these sources state the exact steps of the training.

Finding a master/shaykh under whom to train was the first and most important step. The shaykh had to be a master in all of the scripts, be generous with his knowledge, and not hide his skills from his disciple. He had to be capable of explaining the techniques of previous masters. Once this master was located, the disciple had to obey him in all matters. He had to work constantly until he excelled.618

The training began by practicing each individual letter over and over again. Days were spent in rewriting each letter until it was perfected. Ibn Khaldūn claims that this is the reason Egyptian scribes did a better job than the North African ones, who started by

---

copying words and failed to learn the rules of each letter.\textsuperscript{619} He commends the state of affairs in Egypt when he was there, for there were special masters who taught the laws behind the construction of each letter and dedicated their time to passing on the craft.\textsuperscript{620}

The students also practiced holding the pen and using the inkwell. The great calligrapher Ibn al-‘Afif is quoted in both \textit{Subh al-a’shā} and al-Ziftāwī’s \textit{Minhāj} as saying that “whosoever is not able to manage the face, chest, and width of the pen is not in any way related to the art of writing.”\textsuperscript{621} It was also said that “whosoever does not excel in getting the ink from the inkwell, sharpening the pen, splitting the nib of the pen, cutting the nib of the pen (nibbing), holding the sheet of paper, and handling the pen as he writes is not in any way related to the art of writing.”\textsuperscript{622} The first thing a student had to do was choose the appropriate inkwell, as explained by the great \textit{muhtasib}-calligrapher Sha‘bān al-Āthārī (a student of al-Ziftāwī).\textsuperscript{625} Al-Ziftāwī says that an inkwell is best made from ebony, because ebony does not influence the color of the ink, or from glass, according to al-Āthārī.\textsuperscript{626} It should be round with a wide neck.\textsuperscript{627} He had to choose a good wad, which has to be inspected regularly and softened as

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Ibn Khaldūn states that with the waning of Arab rule in Andalusia and Ifriqiya, the rules of writing that existed in the early days were forgotten, and their civilization, including the beauty of writing, diminished. Ibn Khaldūn, \textit{al-Muqaddima}, 469–70.}
\footnote{Ibn Khaldūn, \textit{al-Muqaddima}, 466.}
\footnote{Al-Ziftāwī, \textit{Minhāj}, 236; al-Qalqashandī, \textit{Subh al-‘ashā}, 2:464.}
\footnote{“To facilitate retention of ink.” See Gacek, \textit{Arabic Manuscript Tradition}, 78.}
\footnote{The word used here is \textit{al-ṭūnār}, which in some cases is the name of a script but here refers to the writing surface. See Gacek, \textit{Arabic Manuscript Tradition}, 94.}
\footnote{Al-Ziftāwī, \textit{Minhāj}, 235. Al-Ziftāwī is quoting others.}
\footnote{Al-Āthārī, \textit{al-‘Ināya al-rabānīyya}, 308.}
\footnote{Al-Āthārī, \textit{al-‘Ināya al-rabānīyya}, 309.}
\footnote{Al-Ziftāwī, \textit{Minhāj}, 239.}
\end{footnotes}
necessary. \(^{628}\) He would then choose the ink and the pen case. \(^{629}\) All of these skills were acquired following the master’s rules of practice. \(^{630}\)

The pen is the calligrapher’s heart and soul. A great deal of work therefore goes into its preparation, and a high degree of skill is essential for all the steps involved. The reed should not be more than 20 centimeters long for good balance. \(^{631}\) Al-Nūwayrī states that the fewer the sections of the reed and the smoother its exterior, the better it is. \(^{632}\) He also mentions that reeds from the muddy-pebbly marshes are better for paper than for parchment, and those from sea or river shores are more flexible. Thus the ones from the muddy-pebbly marshes are better. \(^{633}\) The reed has to be strong but not too strong and should not be very flexible; a strong reed is essential. \(^{634}\) This can be guaranteed by making sure that the plant grew in a place where sun and shade alternated, so that it was not always under the sun or always under the shade. Neither should it be still somewhat green. \(^{635}\) The knife used in most of the stages should have a fine and very sharp blade. A thick blade would be cumbersome and would not allow for fine carving or allow the pen to carry ink properly. \(^{636}\) The handle should always be held by the four fingers while pressing the thumb against the back of the knife itself. \(^{637}\)

An earlier calligrapher called Ibrāhīm ibn al-Mujāṣr/al-Mujashīr/al-Mahbas is quoted by both al-Ziftāwī and al-Qalqashandī as saying that learning how to pare or

\(^{628}\) Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 236; Al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 308.

\(^{629}\) Al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 308.

\(^{630}\) Ink for parchment was prepared differently, as it lacked soot and the gluing agent used in the mixture varies for parchment. The result was a more glowing black.

\(^{631}\) Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, Risāla, 103.

\(^{632}\) Al-Nūwayrī, Niḥāya, 7:19.

\(^{633}\) Al-Nūwayrī, Niḥāya, 7:21.

\(^{634}\) Al-Hayṭī, al-‘Umda, 415; al-Kātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtaṭīf, 31.

\(^{635}\) Al-Nūwayrī, Niḥāya, 7:22–23.


\(^{637}\) Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, Risāla, 108.
trim the pen is a more important step in the making of a calligrapher than learning to scribe. Others have said that paring and trimming the pen amounts to half the writing. The four main stages of making the pen in most calligraphy treatises from the different ages are opening, carving, splitting, and cutting (Pl. 101). These stages and their order have been attributed to the wazīr-calligrapher Ibn Muqla. Both al-Āthārī and Ibn al-Ṣāyigh place the splitting (shaq) before the carving (naḥt).

The opening (fath) entails the opening of the reed at its thin end. This reed is held in the left hand between the thumb and the index finger and the knife in the right hand, the reed is gently pressed against the knife, and the reed is cut. Another way is to place the reed in the left palm alongside the thumb. The opening should be as long as a pigeon’s beak or the second phalanx of a thumb.

Carving (naḥt) the pen consists of two main steps: carving the sides and carving the inside (batn). The sides of the pen have to be carved in equal amounts; it should look like a sword (ij‘alhumā musayyaftīn, ‘make the two sides like swords’). This is to make the ink flow, even the ink that has been kept for some time in the pen. The second stage of carving is to remove the inside where the fibers are; all soft parts are to

---

638 Al-Zifṭawi, Minhāj, 236; al-Qalqashandi, Subḥ al-‘ashā. 2:456.
639 Al-Zifṭawi, Minhāj, 236.
640 Mansour, Sacred Script, 153.
641 See al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabānīyya, 311; Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, Risāla, 106.
642 Al-Zifṭawi, Minhāj, 247. See Mansour, Sacred Script, 153 (fig. 49).
643 See Mansour, Sacred Script, 153 (fig. 50).
644 Al-Zifṭawi, Minhāj, 246; al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabānīyya, 313.
645 Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, Risāla, 106.
646 Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, Risāla, 106.
647 Al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabānīyya, 312.
be removed until the tough ground of the reed is reached. The face of the pen is the only part to be scraped in this way until a hard nib is produced.648

Splitting (shaq) the nib is done vertically in the middle. Ibn al-Bawwāb is said to have taught that it could be in the middle or more towards the left, making the right part a bit wider than the left.649 Splitting in the middle is perhaps the best since it makes the script balanced.650 Ibn al-Afīf taught that if the split is long the script will be thinner than if the split is short. A short split would make the script thick and strong, and the ink heavier.651

The last stage of preparing the pen is of crucial importance for controlling the type of script one is about to use. Yāsīn al-Kātib emphasizes that the skill of cutting the nib, when mastered, brings out the beauty of the script. He quotes the Rā‘iyā of Ibn al-Bawwāb to confirm his statement.652 Cutting the nib (qaṭ) is done with a specific tool, al-maqāt. Ibn al-‘Afīf is quoted as saying that it should be made from a strong material like ebony or ivory. It must be flat and not curved, otherwise it will cause the pen to splinter.653 There are four or five ways of cutting the nib, depending on the script to be used: muḥarrāf (angled cut), mustawī (angled cut), qā‘īm (intermediate angle), and muṣawwāb (intermediate angle).654 Mudawwar (almost straight) is added in Ibn Yāsīn al-Kātib’s treatise, based on his summary of all the techniques of all early master

648 Al-Athārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 312; Mansour, Sacred Script, 156.
649 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 248.
650 Al-Athārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 312.
651 He is quoted in al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 248.
652 Al-Kātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtatīf, 37.
653 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 250; al-Qalqashandi, Subh, 2:468.
calligraphers, and in Ibn al-Šāyigh’s Risāla, where he places it as the opposite of muḥarraf and equates it with mustawī. The muḥarraf, or angled nib, is argued by al-Ziftāwī to be the best, and Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī says it is fit for all pens. It is certainly the best for muḥaqqaq and rayḥān, which require the most angled nib. The mudawwar is most suited for riqā‘ and tawāqī‘, because the cut is almost straight. It also works for naskh. Thuluth is perfected when the pen is in between a tahri‘f and a tadwīn. The qā‘im cut was most preferred by Ibn Muqla. It is an intermediate angle, the right side being a bit higher than the left. In the muṣawwab the left side is higher than the right, and thus the opposite of what Ibn Muqla would have preferred. The mustawī is the least favorite of al-Ziftāwī, and he clearly states that it is the worst (ašadahā al-mustawī, ‘corrupted by al-mustawī’). In this style, the nib is cut straight and so it is not as maneuverable and does not yield good results. Ibn al-Šāyigh, however, dislikes a nib that is either too muḥarraf or too mustawī. He prefers one that is in the middle and quotes the earlier calligrapher Aḥī ibn Ibrāḥīm al-Barbarī to support his choice. He states later, however, that the best is a moderate tahri‘f. It is important to use the cut that is best suited to the script that is to be used, or else the script will not be as good as one wants. The calligrapher al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī stuck to mudawwar, so he

---

656 Ibn al-Šāyigh, Risāla, 111.
657 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 249
659 Al-Kātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtātīf, 39, 44; Mansour, Sacred Script, 158.
660 Al-Kātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtātīf, 44.
661 Mansour, Sacred Script, 158.
662 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 249.
663 Ibn al-Šāyigh, Risāla, 102.
664 Ibn al-Šāyigh, Risāla, 111.
mastered riqā’ and naskh and was not good at executing rayhān, because he used the same pen for all of them.665

The disciple also had to learn how to make the ink. A distinction is made in many of the sources between the ink to be used on paper and the ink to be used on parchment. Parchment ink will not be discussed here because we have no examples of parchment from our period. The best way to make ink for paper is to use ‘afṣ al-shām (gallnuts from Syria)666 as the main ingredient. A pound of this hard fruit should be smashed and then soaked in six pounds of water, together with myrtle, for one week.667 The next step is to boil the mixture until it is reduced to a half or two-thirds. Then it should be strained and left for three days, and then strained again. For each pound of liquid, an ounce each of gum arabic and Cypriot vitriol668 should be added. Soot from smoke is added to control the darkness of the color. Finally, honey and aloe are added.669 Al-Āthārī gives a different order of ingredients at the end: saffron, honey, salt, camphor, aloe, verdigris, indigo, and alum, in that order, adding the soot last.670 Yāsīn al-Ḵātib gives the same ingredients.671 They are also mentioned by al-Ziftāwī as suggestions put forward by others. Salt and honey preserve the ink for longer, while camphor gives it a good smell and prevents it from seeping through the paper. The aloe prevents flies from approaching it.672 The soot preparation requires several steps. Collected soot should be

---

665 Al-Ḵātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtatīf, 40.
666 Gacek, Arabic Manuscript Tradition, 100.
667 Al-Ḵātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtatīf, 72; al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 315.
668 Zaḥ is the word used in Arabic; it denotes vitriol, sulphuric acid, or a sulphate. See Gacek, Arabic Manuscript Tradition, 62.
669 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 244; al-Qalqashandī, Subḥ, 2:476; al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 315.
670 Al-Āthārī, al-‘Ināya al-rabāniyya, 315.
671 Al-Ḵātib, Lamḥat al-mukhtatīf, 72–73.
672 Al-Ziftāwī, Minhāj, 243–44.
placed in a smooth plate. A few drops of the ink mixture are dropped on it and it should be stirred well by hand. More drops of the ink mixture can be added if needed until the soot is completely smooth.\footnote{673}{Al-Kātib, \textit{Lamḥat al-mukhtāṭif}, 73.}

Since this ink cannot be erased, the disciple has to learn how to remove it when necessary. The techniques used for this purpose are \textit{kashṭ} and \textit{hakk}, which enable the calligrapher to neatly and elegantly scrape or rub out the ink from the paper. Compounds of vinegar, mercury, and ammonia, among other things, are used for these purposes.\footnote{674}{Al-\textit{Athařī}, \textit{al-\textquote{Ināya al-rabānīyya}, 317.}}

Holding the pen is another important skill, which precedes learning the letters and their proportions. Ibn al-Ṣāyigh quotes ibn al-Afīf that the thumb, index finger, and middle fingers must be laid straight on the pen, away from where the ink goes.\footnote{675}{Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, \textit{Risāla}, 114.} Al-Haytī and Yāsin al-Kātib, quoting Ibn al-Bawwāb, give a bit more detail, telling the disciple that the pen is to be placed on the tip of the middle finger with the tip of the thumb on the left and the tip of the index finger on the right.\footnote{676}{Al-\textit{Haytī}, \textit{al-\textquote{Umāda}, 417; al-Kātib, \textit{Lamḥat al-mukhtāṭif}, 47.}} The scribe-calligrapher should be sitting on the ground with his right knee up, touching his chest, and his left leg in a cross-legged position. His paper should be placed against the right knee as he writes.\footnote{677}{Al-\textit{Haytī}, \textit{al-\textquote{Umāda}, 417; al-Kātib, \textit{Lamḥat al-mukhtāṭif}, 48.}

As the calligrapher begins learning how to scribe, he has to learn the differences between the scripts and the letterforms. Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s \textit{Risāla} is very informative here. He lists all the existing scripts, explains most of them and their origins, and identifies
the seven main ones. The scripts he names are ātāmār, jāfīl, majmūʿ, riyaḍī, thuluthān, niṣf, thuluth, ḥawāʿijī, musalsal, ghubār al-ḥilya, mūʿāmarāt, mūḥadath, mudmaj, mūḥaqqaq, riqāʿ, rayhān, tawāqīʿ, naskh, manṭhūr, muqtarīn, ḥawāshī, ashʿār, līlūwī, khaṣīf al-thuluth, qalam al-maṣḥīf, faddāḥ al-naskh, ghubār, ʿuḥūd, and qalam al-dhahab. All these scripts can be made in one of the following styles: mūḥaqqaq, muʿalaq, mukhafaf, mursal, mabsūt, muqawwar, mamzūj, muftāḥ, and muʿmāṭ. The author of Ghāyat al-marām actually composed his short treatise as a dialogue among the scripts, each boasting of its excellence.

The seven main scripts that derive from the two basic ones, mūḥaqqaq and thuluth, are rayhān, naskh, mūḥaqqaq, thuluth, tawāqīʿ, riqāʿ, and ashʿār/mūʿannaq. Ibn al-Bawwāb explains that the most beneficial script to practice is thuluth because it strengthens the hand and aids with the rest of the scripts. Mūḥaqqaq, he says, is the most beautiful and most difficult of all the scripts. Yaṣīn al-Kāṭib explains that each of the seven scripts is to be used for a specific genre. He tells the disciple that mūḥaqqaq and rayhān are best suited for the Qurʾān and prayer books; naskh for ḥadīth, tafsīr, and other religious sciences; thuluth for educational matters; tawāqīʿ for official orders from the elites, amīrs, judges, and so on; riqāʿa to scribe the orders of less important individuals; and mūʿannaq to scribe poetry.

The basic rule for letters and their forms is that letters and combination of letters can be grouped in seven categories: muntaṣib, a vertical form; munsāṭib, extending
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678 A very informative article on the subject of Mamluk scripts is Gacek, “Arabic Scripts.”
679 Ibn al-Ṣayyigh, Risāla, 71, 83.
680 Al-Maqqūsī, Ghāyat al-marām, 201–205.
682 Al-Kāṭib, Lamḥat al-mukhtatīf, 47.
vertically from the calligrapher’s right to his left or left to right; mustadir, round; munhana, tilted; munkab, thrown to one side; mustalqi, lying on or above the line; and muqawas, curved or arched.\footnote{Al-Katib, \textit{Lamhat al-mukhtatifi}, 47; Ibn al-\textae{Si}y\textae{g}, \textit{Ris\textae{la}}, 158–59.}

All the calligraphy treatises have a section on each letter, explaining its form and how it is meant to be written/drawn in accordance with the script being used.\footnote{Al-Katib, \textit{Lamhat al-mukhtatifi}, 53–71; Ibn al-\textae{Si}y\textae{g}, \textit{Ris\textae{la}}, 120–43; al-Ath\textae{ri}, \textit{al-\textae{I}n\textae{a}ya al-rab\textae{ni}yya}, 321–33; al-Ziftawi, \textit{Minh\textae{ji}}, 257–73.} The alif mufrada (nothing attached before it), as the most important letter of all, will be used here as an example. A letter from the muntasib group, it is regarded as the base on which other letters are constructed. It consists of seven points, each point a square.\footnote{Ibn al-\textae{Si}y\textae{g}, \textit{Ris\textae{la}}, 120–21.}

To write it, one begins by using the full face of the pen and ends by tilting the pen a bit to the right (pressing on the right edge of the pen), except in writing muhaqqaq or rayhan, where no tilting towards the right is necessary. The tilt to the right is essential, however, in scribing thuluth, tawaqi, and riqa.\footnote{Al-Katib, \textit{Lamhat al-mukhtatifi}, 53; al-Ziftawi, \textit{Minh\textae{ji}}, 257.} The upper tip of the alif\textae{m} in muhaqqaq, rayhan, mu\textae{a}nnaq, thuluth, and tawaqi is always with a little head slanted to the right. In naskh this does not happen.\footnote{Al-Katib, \textit{Lamhat al-mukhtatifi}, 54.}

The alif\textae{m} attached to a preceding letter is written vertically from the bottom upwards, showing the angle of the cut of the nib if the scribe is writing muhaqqaq or rayhan. If he is writing naskh he can show it or not; if he is writing thuluth the end of the alif has to tilt to the left and the cut of the nib has to show. Tawaqi and riqa are
like *thuluth*, the main difference being that the *alif* can tilt to the right and not just the left.  

After years of practice and proving to the master that he is indeed capable of inscribing beautifully, the disciple receives an *ijāza*, which is the equivalent of his graduation certificate. It is the proof that he studied with a specific master and that he is now allowed to practice on his own or even teach. There does not seem to have been a standard timing for the *ijāza*, and this applies to religious subjects as well as calligraphy; each student takes the time he needs, according to his own ability. The biographical dictionaries are replete with examples of disciples who were granted the *ijāza* in very short periods of times; in the later Middle Ages, some examples included babies!  

We may conclude this section in the same way that al-Āthārī ended his educational poem: with a section on advice to the disciple. A disciple should always be eager to learn and to apply what he learns; he has to be knowledgeable in his field and other supporting disciplines to excel. He also has to be conscientious and fearful of God, doing his job with utmost meticulousness, since he will be copying important texts and will be an important part of the chain of knowledge transmission.

---

689 This is an exaggeration at times, to stress the genius of the person in question and the *baraka* passed on from a father to a son. A very early example is al-Maydūnī whose father obtained an *ijāza* for him as a child, as mentioned earlier in this chapter.
Most of the treatises surveyed here give the *silsila* of their author somewhere along the way. The *silsila* is very important, because this is how the calligrapher-author proves that he knows what he is talking about and that he was authorized through *ijāza* to teach and pass on his knowledge, which in turn is derived from previous, well-esteemed masters. The following tables will list the masters for three of the calligrapher-authors examined above, each of whom tells us of his own *silsila*. The three are ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyiḥ (d. 845/1441), Ḥūsayn ibn Yāsīn ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib (d. c. 9th/15th century), and Sha‘bān al-Āthārī (d. 828/1425). The last table groups all three of them together to display the overlaps.

### Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters of Sha‘bān al-Āthārī (d. 828/1425)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order from latest to earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Afiʿ Al-Ziftāwī, d. 806/1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Muḥtasib al-Sha‘bānī, d. 8th/14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Ruqayba al-Mahrānī, d. 778/1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imād al-Dīn ibn al-‘Afiʿ, d. 736/1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Afiʿ al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Halabī, d. 8th/13th-14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Walī al-ʿAjami, d. c. 7th/13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī, d. 698/1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaynāb al-Shuhda, d. 574/1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Imām al-Ibī, d. 506/1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī ibn Hilāl al-Bawwāb, d. c. 413/1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Asad, d. 410/1019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

692 The master-disciple connection in all disciplines of Islamic sciences was a revered one. It is understandably likened to the master-disciple relation in a Sufi chain. See Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice*, 108-10. The transmission of knowledge was sacred.

693 This is the famous calligrapher Muḥammad ibn ‘Afiʿ ibn ‘Aḥmad ibn Abī Ruqayba, an Egyptian Qur’ān reciter and a Shāfīī who was employed as the muḥtasib of Fustat. He was a student of Ibn al-ʿAfiʿ and was brilliant in calligraphy. He is referred to al-Imām probably because he was one of the imams of Sultan al-Kāmil Sha‘bān (son of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad), who reigned from 746/1345 to 747/1346 and whom he taught. He was also close to the great patron of Qur’ān manuscripts Sultan al-Ashraf Sha‘bān. He died in 778/1377. See al-Zabidi, *Ḥikmat al-ḥiqrāq*, 92n1; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭārīkh*, 2:536; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Inbāʿ*, 1:145.
Another master who taught Ibn al-Ṣayigh but is not in the silsila is Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-ʿUmarī al-Wasīmī al-Miṣrī al-Mujawwid who taught and practiced calligraphy in Egypt in the fourteenth century.\footnote{The first name (al-Ziftāwī) was taken from al-Sakhāwī’s \textit{al-Ḍawī al-Lāmi} and not Ibn al-Ṣayigh’s treatise.}

\footnote{Al-Zabīdī, \textit{Ḥikmat al-Ishrāq}, 92 and n8.}
He, in turn, was taught by Shiḥāb al-Dīn Ghāzī, who was born in 630/1232 and died in 709/1309. ⁶⁹⁶

Table 4.4: Shared Masters

[Shading of fields represents cities where they mostly operated: yellow for Cairo, red for Baghdad, and green for Mosul. Unshaded means unknown at present.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master (in order of transmission, latest to earliest)</th>
<th>Sha‘bān al-Athārī</th>
<th>‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣāyigh</th>
<th>Ḥusayn ibn Yāsīn ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ‘Aṭīf Al-Ziftāwī, d. 806/1403</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Muḥtasib al-Sha‘bānī, d. 8th/14th century</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abī ‘Abdallāh Muhammad al-Ṣāliḥī, d. c. 8th/14th century</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Ruqayba al-Mahrānī, d. 778/1376</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imād al-Dīn ibn al-‘Aṭīf, d. 736/1335</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aṭīf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḥalabī, d. 8th/14th century</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Wāfī al-‘Ajami, d. 618/1221?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqūt al-Musta‘ṣimī, d. 698/1299</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amin al-Dīn Yaqūt, d. 618/1221</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaynab al-Shuhda, d. 574/1178</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad ibn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While al-Qalqashandi does not give us a silsila for himself, he does write about the chain of transmission for the Egyptian school in his encyclopedic work, in his discussion of the origins of Arabic script and its masters through the ages. Table 4.5 gives the names he provides, stopping at Ibn Muqla.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chain given by al-Qalqashandi</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order from latest to earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Din Muhammad ibn ‘Ali Al-Ziftawi, d. 806/1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Muḥṭasib al-Sha‘bānī, d. 8th/14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Ruqayba al-Mahrānī, d. 778/1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imdat al-Dīn ibn al-‘Afīf, d. 736/1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Afīf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Halabī, d. 8th/14th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Walī al-‘Ajamī, d. 618/1221’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amin al-Dīn Yāqūt, d. 618/1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaynab al-Shuhda, d. 574/1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ali ibn Hilāl ibn al-Bawwāb, d. c. 413/1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad ibn Asad, d. 410/1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad al-Simsimānī, d. 415/1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad ibn ‘Ali ibn Muqla, d. 328/940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

697 Al-Qalqashandi, Ṣubḥ al-a’shā, 3:13–18.
As the tables show, there are a few differences, probably because a master will have a number of students passing on his knowledge. The only one who puts al-Ibrī as the direct master of his daughter Zaynab is Sha‘bān al-Āthārī. The others place Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik as her master and say that he himself was tutored directly by Ibn al-Bawwāb. It does make sense that she would have been instructed by her father, even if someone else also taught her. Her father is Abū al-Naṣr Aḥmad ibn al-Faraj ibn ‘Umar al-Ibrī al-Dīnūrī. His trade was making needles (ibar), thus his nisba ‘al-Ibrī.’ He was also a renowned ḥadīth scholar, who died in Baghdad in 506/1112. His daughter was also a ḥadīth scholar; she received instruction at the hands of important ḥadīth scholars of the time in addition to her calligraphy training. She was known for her mastery of both ḥadīth and calligraphy. Some of the sources write about her only as a ḥadīth scholar, without mentioning that she was also a great calligrapher. The science of ḥadīth supersedes, as we saw in the biographies surveyed in the first section of this chapter.

The most important discrepancy is the master of al-Wafī al-‘Ajamī: was it Amīn al-Dīn Yāqūt or Yāqūt al-Musta‘shīmī? First, since he has not yet been discussed, who was Amīn al-Dīn Yāqūt? Yāqūt ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Rūmī al-Mawṣīfī al-Malakī (al-Nūrī, as stated in Ibn al-Ṣayyīgh’s treatise), who bore the title Amīn al-Dīn, was in the service of the Saljuk sultan Malikshāh, hence his nisba ‘al-Malakī.’ In addition to being a famed calligrapher in the style of Ibn al-Bawwāb, he was also a grammarian and a man of

---

letters. He died in Mosul in 618/1221,\textsuperscript{700} about eighty years before Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī, which places him in a different generation. None of our Mamluk sources tell us that Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī was a student of Yāqūt al-Mawṣūli al-Nūrī. It is quite possible that al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī studied with both. The problem with al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī is that no biographical notice survives for him in the Mamluk sources. Two much later Persian sources, one of which is Ottoman-Persian (an Arabic translation of this source was used for this research), give us a bit more information. Both Ḥabīb Effendi Paydāpīsh and Mirza Ḥabīb Iṣfahānī say he was a student of Yāqūt al-Mawṣūli al-Nūrī and a good friend of Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī. The death date given is 618/1221,\textsuperscript{701} which is the same as the death date of Yāqūt al-Mawṣūli al-Nūrī, making it completely impossible for Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī to have been his friend. One cannot help but think that the death date given was wrong and that al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī did not die in the same year as his master, but later. This would enable him to have known and befriended Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī. It also would have made it possible for him to have instructed al-ʿAfīf, as mentioned by both sources.\textsuperscript{702} The modern scholar-calligrapher Hilāl Nājī provides a full name for al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī—Wafī al-Dīn ʿAfī ibn Zangi—and tells us that he was indeed taught by Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī and in turn instructed al-ʿAfīf.\textsuperscript{703} The source Ḥikmat al-Ishrāq ilā kutāb al-afāq by Murṭādā al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1790) gives his name as Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAfī

\textsuperscript{700} Ibn Khallikān, Wafâyāt, 6:119–22; Yāqūt al-Ḥamāwī, Muʾjam, 19:312. It is assumed that the Malikshāh mentioned is Malikshāh III, who died in 548/1153. Since Yāqūt al-Mawṣūli died in 618/1221, almost seventy years after Malikshāh, he must have lived into his nineties and probably served Malikshāh as a teenager.

\textsuperscript{701} Paydāpīsh, al-Khaṭṭ wa-al-Khaṭṭātūn, 135; Mirza Ḥabīb Iṣfahānī, Tadhkīreh-e khaṭṭ wa khaṭṭātan (Tehran: Intishārāt-e Kitābkhāneh-e Mustawfī, 1990), 64.

\textsuperscript{702} Paydāpīsh, al-Khaṭṭ wa-al-Khaṭṭātūn, 135; Iṣfahānī, Tadhkīreh, 64.

\textsuperscript{703} The source Hilāl Nājī gives for information on al-Wafī al-ʿAjamī is al-Qalqashandi, who mentions him in the silsila and gives no further information about, him not even his full name. Nājī, Mawsūʿa, 380.
ibn Zankî, but does not give any further details.\footnote{704} While we have no biographical notice in the Mamluk sources, al-Ṣafadî mentions him in passing in his \textit{al-Wâfi} and says that he imitated the script of Ibn al-Bawwâb and was actually better than he, in al-Ṣafadî’s opinion.\footnote{705}

**Institutions of Learning**

George Makdisi says that the institution of learning in Islam developed

from the masjid to a masjid-inn complex, to the \textit{madrasa} and other like institutions. At some point in the second/eighth century or earlier, the masjid had become a college providing salaries for its staff, and gratuitous tuition for the student. The masjid-inn complex went a step further and provided the student with lodging and perhaps foods. Finally the \textit{madrasa} provided him with all essential needs for learning.\footnote{706} The Cairo that stands today is a living witness to the extent of the educational system of the early and later Middle Ages. The buildings that remain from Mamluk Cairo, which represent only a fraction of what was originally there, tell of a city buzzing with educational activities. These centers were mostly \textit{madrasas}, \textit{khānqāhs}, and mosques where tutorials took place. Houses of masters or amirial palaces were occasionally used as well; we have seen that Ibn al-Ṣâyigh learned the recitation of the Qur’ân in the Palace of Bishtâk. Seventeen mosques, six \textit{khānqāhs}, and ten \textit{madrasas} were built during the period under consideration here (1341–1412).\footnote{707} Many more existed in Cairo then, but they have disappeared over time. Of course, this is in addition to what was already there; these numbers are of the new establishments during this

---

\footnote{704}{Al-Zabîdi, \textit{Hikmat al-ishrāq}, 88.}
\footnote{705}{Al-Ṣafadî, \textit{al-Wâfi}, 22:290, 292.}
\footnote{706}{Makdisi, \textit{Rise of Colleges}, 32.}
\footnote{707}{Islamic Art Network: www.islamic-art.org}
period. Al-Maqrīzī (d. 846/1442) mentions seventy-three madrasas that used to function or were functioning madrasas during his time.\textsuperscript{708} The traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited Cairo in the fourteenth century, is quoted by ‘Abd al-Laṭīf Ibrāhīm as saying that “the madrasas in Egypt were so numerous that they cannot be accounted for.”\textsuperscript{709}

*Madrasas* were not the only institutions of learning, and much learning took place in the other mosques and khānqāhs. The functions of institutions became interchangeable starting the middle of the fourteenth century when madrasas began to function as mosques, the first example being the complex of Sultan Ḥasan. An important example of a khānqāh functioning as both khānqāh and madrasa is the khānqāh of Sultan Barqūq in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn. A khānqāh could also be a mosque, like the khānqāh-mosque of Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq.

The question is whether these institutions played the most important role in the transmission of knowledge, or whether the shuyūkh (masters), who taught inside or outside of them, were more important. While the master-disciple connection was the most important element in the educational system in the world of Islam, some scholars stress the institution’s role more than others do. The scholarly discussion so far has only addressed the religious sciences, primarily the madhāḥīb. Jonathan Berkey and Michael Chamberlain present the very convincing argument that the personal relation between the master and the disciple was the most important part of the training and the institution had little effect on it. It was the master, not the institution, who dictated

\textsuperscript{708} Berkey, *Transmission of Knowledge*, 45.
\textsuperscript{709} Ibrāhīm, *al-Maktaba al-mamlūkiyya*, 40.
what was to be done and whether the student was ready. Other scholars, such as George Makdisi, Gary Leiser, and Devin Stewart, stress the role of the *madrasa* more.⁷¹⁰

Both the master and the institution are important, but the sources for our calligraphers tend to emphasize whom the calligrapher studied with, whatever the subject was. The merit and reputation of the teacher were the primary source of benefit for the pupil. The institutions where they taught are secondary. This does not in any way belittle the role of the institutions. On the contrary, these institutions were a very important part of the spiritual, religious, intellectual, and social life of the city during this period. However, they were not the main factor in the calligrapher’s choice of to study; his master was. These institutions provided the masters of all fields a livelihood so that they could pass on their knowledge. These institutions, as mentioned above, are not only the *madrasas*; they could be *madrasa-khānqāh*, mosque-*madrasa*, or mosque-*khānqāh*. In this context Jonathan Berkey is right in saying that all of these scholars regarded the transmission of one’s knowledge as a pious act and a means to worship God, so it did not matter what kind of institution they taught in.⁷¹¹ He is also correct in saying:

---


⁷¹¹ Berkey, *Transmission of Knowledge*, 55. Their mention of a location was probably to clarify with whom they were associated and the *baraka* bestowed on the place where they studied or taught.
Thus the apparent confusion of terms should be viewed, in the first place, through the lens of that flexible, personal system that characterized Islamic education and the transmission of Muslim knowledge. That a student’s authority derived from that of his teacher, and not from the venue in which his education had transpired, meant that no institution, not even the madrasa, could ever establish a monopoly over the inculcation of the Muslim sciences.\(^{712}\)

These sciences most certainly included the sacred art of calligraphy.

As to where the calligraphers produced their work, the manuscripts that still survive and carry their signatures, we unfortunately do not have a full picture. In a few Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts we are fortunate enough to be given a location. The examples we have range from a manuscript as early as al-Maydūmī’s, signed in 711/1311 and clearly stating that he finished it in the mosque of Sūq al-Šāgha in the Cairo of al-Mu‘izz (chapter two),\(^{713}\) to a manuscript in the Royal Ontario Museum (905.8.2) commissioned by the Circassian Mamluk sultan al-Ẓāhir Khushqadam (r. 865–72/1461–67) in 868/1463, penned by the amīr-calligrapher Jānim ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Sayfī Janībak, and illuminated by Muḥammad Abū al-Ṭayyib ibn Muḥammad al-Nastarāwī, who informs us that he finished it by the Lake of the Elephant. We also have various signatures in the fifteenth century by Mamluk amīrs who practiced writing the Qur’ān and mention their barrack names in their colophons but do not say whether they actually transcribed it there. The Azhar Library has the following examples: 7975/170, signed by Abrak ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn Yashbak from the barrack of the Qā‘a in 852/1448; 7982/177, signed by Jānim ibn ‘Abdallāh also from the Qā‘a barrack; 799/48, a thirty-volume set signed by Duqmāq ibn ‘Abdallāh from the Rafraf barrack and stating that his master

\(^{713}\) Op 2707 in the SS Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia.
was the calligrapher shaykh Shams al-Dīn al-Furnawī.\textsuperscript{714} Another interesting location gleaned from the sources is where the great calligrapher Ibn al-Waḥīd, calligrapher of the majestic seven-volume Qurʾān manuscript commissioned by Baybars al-Jāshnakīr and now in the British Library, executed his work. We have already seen al-Ṣafādī’s assertion that he finished the rabʿa in diwān al-inšāʿ in the Citadel!\textsuperscript{715}

Professors of the religious sciences did not necessarily limit themselves to one of the many institutions of the city. They moved around, and the same can be assumed for calligraphy masters, who in most cases also followed a vocation in the religious sciences; we have seen several muḥadithūn. The educational institutions hired scholars from the “same pool,” and this too made it easy for these scholars to move around.\textsuperscript{716}

Institutions were important in another respect for our Qurʾān manuscripts: they were all endowed to the various institutions. Without the buildings we would not have as many Qurʾān manuscripts from the period. Sufi gatherings in particular were instrumental because they needed the rabʿās to read the Qurʾān, and thus we can assume that these rabʿās were mostly commissioned for them. Also important were the mausolea attached to the buildings in question, where it was stipulated that the Qurʾān be continuously read and reciters were hired day and night for this sole purpose. The mausoleum attached to the madrasa of amīr Ṣīrghimish (built 757/1356) is a very good example. We saw in chapter two the number of Qurʾān manuscripts that have survived

\textsuperscript{714} I viewed these manuscripts in al-Azhar Library. They also penned other manuscripts besides those of the Qurʾān in their barracks, probably as part of their training. For a list of those other manuscripts (all kept in the Topkapi Sarayi Library) see Barbara Flemming, “Literary Activities in Mamluk Halls and Barracks,” in \textit{Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet}, ed. Myriam Rosen-Ayalon (Jerusalem: Institute of Asian and African Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977), 256–57.

\textsuperscript{715} Al-Ṣafādī, \textit{al-Wāfi}, 3:151.

\textsuperscript{716} Berkey, \textit{Transmission of Knowledge}, 54.
from the ones that were endowed to it, most in *rab’a* form: Raṣīds 147, 148, 149, 150, 60, and 61 in Dār al-Kutub, and 8099/182, 8100/183, 8101/184, and 8102/185 in al-Azhar Library. 717 Sultan Qalāwūn is known to have endowed his *madrasa* with several Qurʾān manuscripts in one codex or in *rab’a* form, all written beautifully, as described by al-Maqṣūrī. 718 The librarian of this *madrasa* was paid 40 dirhams per month and had five assistants to help him. 719 The *madrasa* of Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya (built 748/1348), to which Raṣīd 56 was endowed, had a renowned library as well. 720 Another important female patron from chapter three, Khawand Baraka, also had a great library in her *madrasa* in al-Ṭabbāna (built 770/1368), where several Qurʾān manuscripts were endowed, and we have already seen the magnificence of those surviving from earlier (Raṣīds 6, 82, and 372). 721 The mosque-*madrasa* of Sultan Ḥasan was another building of paramount importance; it housed a great library, to which Raṣīds 58, 59, 62, 82, and 5 were endowed. 722 Although it no longer exists, the *madrasa* built by Sultan Shaʿbān in 778/1376 must have had another impressive library; we have seen one manuscript (Raṣīd 10) endowed to it, which indicates the magnificence of the school and its library.

Great libraries were also attached to the institutions built during the Circassian period. Chapter four describes all the Qurʾān manuscripts endowed to the institutions of the period. The most important of these is the complex of Sultan Barqūq (built 786–67/1384–1410) in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn, where many such manuscripts were endowed. His son Faraj’s mosque-*khānqāh* (built 801–13/1398–1410) was another important building in

---

717 Waqf document 3195, pp. 33–34.
718 Al-Maqṣūrī, *al-Sulūk*, 1:1001. None of these Qurʾān manuscripts have been discovered yet.
721 Waqf document 47/7.
which many of these volumes were deposited. Faraj also confiscated the *madrasa* of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ustādār (built 797/1395) in al-Jamāliyya, renamed it al-Nāṣirīyya after his own title of al-Nāṣir Faraj, and continued sponsoring its huge library.

This library is particularly interesting because the *amīr* Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ustādār had his eye on the belongings of Sultan Sha‘bān and his mother Khawand Baraka and purchased several volumes at incredibly low prices (amounting almost to a confiscation). They included the great Qur‘ān manuscripts from al-Malik al-Šāliḥ al-Mansūr Ḥājjī (r. 783–84/1381–82, 791–92/1389–90), the last Bahri Mamluk sultan and son of Sultan Sha‘bān. This notorious *amīr* apparently made it his business to unlawfully confiscate the properties of this royal woman and her son. He did the same thing with the al-Ashrafīyya *madrasa* beneath the citadel, seizing parts of it for his *madrasa* before Sultan Barqūq took its remaining pieces. We know that he also appropriated the ‘*imāra* built by Khawand Baraka in the same area as his *madrasa* and took its doors to use in his *madrasa*.723 Thus, at the end of the fourteenth century or early in the fifteenth century the *waqf* of Khawand Baraka and her son Sultan Sha‘bān were already being violated and their Qur‘ān manuscripts removed from their buildings.

Libraries, as part of these institutions, were the home of our manuscripts. In addition to the important libraries attached to the various religious institutions to which all of our Qur‘ān manuscripts were endowed, libraries were also found in residential buildings; the library in the Citadel contained the sultan’s collection and there were libraries in the palaces of the various *amīrs* and ‘*ulamā*.724 Treatises have been written

---


about the special care and treatment that these volumes required. A prime example is
the *Tadhkirat al-sāmi‘ wa-al-mutakalim*, written by the important *qādī* of the Mamluk
period Badr al-Dīn ibn Jamā‘a (d. 733/1333).

The librarians in charge of the books in any institution who failed to ensure their
conservation and safety were severely reprimanded. An example is two librarians who
were in charge of the library of the *madrasa* of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ustādār, who were fired
one after the other for losing or disposing of some of the books. The first was al-Sirāj
Umar Imām, and the second was ‘Uthmān Fakhr al-Dīn al-Bakrī in 826/1423. Uthmān
was also beaten in front of the sultan (Barsbāy, r. 825–42/1422–38) and was forced
to pay a fine of 400 dinars. Eventually, because of the importance of its collection, this
library was assigned to the great ḥadīth scholar and historian Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī.725

Libraries offered services to the scholars, students, and copyists in the
institution, as books were not just consulted but also copied there.726 Paper of various
kinds, ink, and pens were available for such purposes.727 Carrying the Qur’ān
manuscripts was partly the job of the librarian, but was ultimately the responsibility of
the *mināwil* (‘the person who hands things over’), who was most probably a Sufi. He
was sometimes called the *khādim al-rab‘a al-sharīfa* or the *ḥāmil al-muṣḥaf*. This job
was specified in several of the *waqf* documents.728

---

727 *Waqf* documents provided this information to ‘Abd al-Latīf Ibrāhīm; these include the *waqfs*
50, 80. Al-Ibshādī’s *waqf* stipulates that a sum from the proceeds of the *waqf* is to be allocated
to the restoration of the books and the fixing of the inkwell, penknife, and book cabinets. See
728 *Waqf* document of Sultan Ḥasan 881, p. 451. Other *waqf* documents providing information
for the same job are mentioned in Ibrāhīm, *al-Maktaba al-mamlūkiyya*, 79n1. These include the
*waqfs* of Shams al-Dīn al-Wāṣītī, Jawhar Lālā, Qaytbāy, Qâni Bāy al-Rammāh, and Khāyr Bak.
Interconnections between the Calligraphers

The sources tell us about some of the interconnections between calligraphers, as we have seen. Summarizing these connections will give us a clearer idea of master-disciple relationship. We know that some of the calligraphers in question did indeed teach, either religious sciences or calligraphy, but for others we do not have definite information that they were authorized teachers of calligraphy. We know from al-Maydūmi’s biography that he was a renowned scholar and professor. He primarily taught hadith, but this does not mean that he did not also teach calligraphy. It is important to recall that the sources were primarily concerned with their subjects’ activity as religious scholars, and only secondarily as calligraphers. We have seen this phenomenon as early as Zaynab al-Shuhda. Al-Maydūmi was not in anyone’s silsila, which might lead to the assumption that he did not teach calligraphy. While this is always a possibility, his absence from calligraphy chains is primarily because his main vocation was as a muḥaddith, and secondarily because his calligraphy is good but not at the same level as the masters (compare Pl. 23 with Pls. 396 and 419). Thus the possibility that he was an instructor of calligraphy should not be dismissed. Ibn al-Wahid, the calligrapher-administrator, is another calligrapher who was not mentioned in any of the chains, but we know from al-Šafadī that he was indeed an instructor and that he taught calligraphy in Baalbek. This makes it quite possible that he also taught calligraphy in Cairo when he was living and practicing there. As mentioned earlier, he met with Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī and must have studied a bit with him; it is hard to believe that he did not pass on some of his knowledge.

Authorized teachers were the ones mentioned in silsilas, as seen in the tables.
The Muḥṣinī brothers, Muḥammad and Aḥmad, fall into a somewhat different category. Muḥammad was an administrator and a politician and Aḥmad was a religious scholar-administrator, and they came from the awlād al-nās, the favored class of Sultan Ḥasan. Nothing is mentioned of any students or disciples who might have studied with them in any discipline. The available information on Muḥammad shows that he must have been an architect, a city planner, and a civil engineer. He might not have had direct students, but those working with him on the buildings would have been taught by him within that context. While we cannot say whether he was also a calligraphy teacher, his Qurʾān manuscript and kūfī inscriptions in the complex of Sultan Ḥasan are an indication of a great calligrapher who might have passed on some of this knowledge to those working under his supervision in the Mamluk court. Aḥmad, on the other hand, composed books and held the position of wālī, and nothing tells of any understudies or disciples. But his surviving manuscript, the Iran Bastan Qurʾān manuscript (Pl. 155), which he penned and probably illuminated, had a great stylistic influence on the works of the Star Polygon Group workshop, as we saw in chapter three (Pls. 248, 258, and 264). It seems unlikely that it was simply an influence on them. It is more probable that one or more people actually trained with him, and that this influence is the result of their work with him. If this is true, then he did train the illuminators who produced Raṣīds 6, 7, 8, and 54.

Within the Star Polygon Group workshop, it was not only the illuminator(s) who did not sign their work; neither did the calligraphers in Raṣīds 6, 54, and 7. The script is magnificent muḥaqqaq, as seen in chapter three (Pls. 254, 260, and 268). Is it possible that the master calligrapher Ibn Abī Ruqayba, or some of his disciples, might have been
responsible for them? We have nothing surviving in his hand and this is a mere suggestion based on his closeness to Sultan Sha'ban, whose court is responsible for these manuscripts. He is an important part of the *silsila* in Egypt and a Shaf'i who was employed as the *muhtasib* of Fustat. He was a student of Ibn al-‘Aff and his calligraphy is in the traditional Egyptian school of *muhaqqaq*. He combined the mastering of calligraphy with religious training, since he was a man of law, and possibly had a background in the bureaucratic realm.\(^7\) A comparison of Rašid 6 to Rašid 142, penned by Ibn al-‘Aff (compare Pls. 254 and 419), shows clear similarities in letter execution. Whoever is responsible for Rašid 6 was from the same school or a disciple of Ibn al-‘Aff, just as Ibn Abī Ruqayba was.

‘Imād al-Dīn ibn al-‘Aff was the originator of the Egyptian school, and was a great master and teacher. His views on calligraphy were followed by all of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century calligraphers who left us treatises, and are cited in encyclopedias like *Subh al-‘asb* (al-Qalqashandī often quotes him throughout his work and especially in volumes 2 and 3). His influence is seen in several of the manuscripts we have studied. His method in *muhaqqaq* was used, and later altered, by Ibn al-Ṣāyigh. Ibn al-‘Aff was most certainly part of the master-disciple chain of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, who combined the method of Ibn al-‘Aff with that of another master, not in the Egyptian *silsila*, called Ghāzī (compare Pls. 396 and 419).

‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī‘ī, who penned Rašid 111, was most probably a student of Ibn al-‘Aff as well. A comparison of their manuscripts shows similarities in letter forms (compare Pls. 419 and 420). Even the illumination of Rašid 111 shares elements with

---

\(^7\) Carl Petry makes it clear that the only legal profession that most probably entailed a background in the bureaucracy was that of the *muhtasib*. See Petry, *Civilian Elite*, 223–34.
that of Ibn al-‘Afif. Comparison of the frontispieces (compare PIs. 421 and 422) shows that the outermost of both lack the colored background that eventually developed in the course of the century, and the central fields are rectangular. His biography does not mention that he studied with the great master, but stylistically it is evident that he was a student of Ibn al-‘Afif, which is why the style persisted after the 1350s.

Sawunju al-Rasūlī (Rāṣīd 62) was trying to keep with the school of Ibn al-‘Afif (compare PIs. 419 and 209), but his muḥaqqaq is not on the same level as that of the master. It also seems that Sawunju must have been his son’s master. His son Muḥammad, who left us his signature in the manuscript, is not as good as his father (compare PIs. 209 and 198), and their collaboration on one manuscript clearly indicates that the father was the master of the son and was training him.

The Qūmshī Iraqi calligrapher, if indeed he was from there and the nisba is not misleading, the scribe of Raṣīds 70 and 71 (71 was argued to be his, but lacks his signature), shows a closer affiliation to the Ilkhanid school. With the lack of a biographical notice on him, and his name not being in any of the sources, the stylistic element is the only thing we can judge by (compare PIs. 42, 205, and 214). Could he have been a qādī who crossed paths with one of Yaḡūṭ al-Must‘aṣīnī’s disciples on his way to Egypt, assuming that he did come to Egypt after his training?

‘Afī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi might not appear in any silsila, but we know from the sources that in addition to being an administrator and calligrapher he was also an instructor of calligraphy. His manuscript, Raṣīd 10, amply shows his skill (Pl. 292). Since he was friends with al-Ziftāwī it is possible they taught calligraphy together, with al-Ziftāwī sticking to the methods of his master Ibn al-‘Afif while ‘Afī
changed them a bit (compare Pls. 419 and 292). His students were from among the elite; perhaps, besides being *müwaqqa‘* al-*dast*, he was a teacher of *amīns* as well.

Another capable calligrapher who was a religious scholar and Sufi but not a bureaucrat is Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī (Raṣīds 79 and 123). His school seems to be different from that of Ibn al-‘Afīf (compare Pl. 419 with 353 and 356); the similarities between the two are minimal. The sources give us no information on his capacity as a calligrapher. He was influenced by the eastern tradition of using two different scripts on each folio. This was not a characteristic of the Egyptian school of calligraphy in the early days of the fourteenth century.

Early illuminators include the master Şandal, who was not given a lot of attention by the sources, but we have seen from the comparative material in chapter two that the colophons of his Qur‘ān manuscripts mention the names of his apprentices Aydūghdī ibn ‘Abdallāh and Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, and so we know the master-disciple chain from these colophons. Ibrāhīm al-Āmiddī, the religious scholar, is not mentioned as an illuminator by any of the sources. His influence can be seen in the details of Raṣīds 11 and 16 (chapter four), which is a stylistic proof that he must have had students who trained under him and continued working in the fifteenth century (compare Pl. 288 with 333 and 391). The later Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, illuminator of QUR 595 in the Nasser Khalili Collection and a follower of the Star Polygon Group workshop, cannot be said to have mentored anyone, because so far there is no information from the sources or later manuscripts to indicate it. A thorough study of fifteenth-century Mamluk Qur‘ān illumination might yield more information on this.

---

731 As mentioned in the earlier chapters, this relationship was studied by David James in his *Qur‘āns of the Mamluks*. 348
A very relevant and interesting example of a scholar, a prolific author whose work we have used extensively, a bureaucrat, and apparently a calligrapher and an illuminator of great skill is Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafādī (d. 764/1363), the author of *al-Ṭābi‘ bi-al-wafayāt* and ‘Ayān al-‘aṣr wa a‘wān al-naṣr (two very important biographical dictionaries of the Mamluk period). Adam Gacek has unearthed a Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī manuscript in Copenhagen that was penned, illuminated, glossed, and used for teaching purposes by al-Ṣafādī! The existence of this manuscript is proof that even though he was a good calligrapher and illuminator, al-Ṣafādī’s fame was due to his writing, which was his primary vocation. His later biographers left this fact out and concentrated on his scholar-author virtues. It is also proof that he taught, and it would not be surprising if he taught illumination techniques. This manuscript is also a clear indication that when al-Ṣafādī gave his opinion on the qualities of the calligraphers he had the eye and training to do so.

**Conclusions**

Mamluk sources have proven time and time again to be an extremely rich reservoir of information on many levels. While some information that we might have wished to find was not there, a great deal has been recovered. The treatises on calligraphy from our period are very informative on the skills and techniques that the apprentice calligrapher was expected to acquire. They are also important because they record the teaching and

---

the *silsilas* of much earlier masters. Biographical dictionaries and chronicles provide much information on the calligraphers, and the opinions of these artists expressed by the authors of these dictionaries is in most cases objective and truthful.

Stylistic comparisons are complementary to the sources, but without such comparisons the analysis is incomplete. The surviving manuscripts are living proof of the training and achievements of these calligraphers. They substantiate the master-disciple chain and show examples of the styles and documents referred to in the sources.

The sources also provide details concerning the background of the calligraphers and illuminators, which help us to place them in the intellectual context of the period. There are a few who are not mentioned at all—for example, Sawunju al-Rasūlī al-Malakī al-Nāṣirī, Muḥammad ibn Sawunju al-Rasūlī, Yaʿqūb ibn Muḥammad ibn Khafīl ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān, and Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-ʿIrāqī. We do not know why this is the case. It cannot be said that the sources only deal with religious figures, because Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-ʿIrāqī, whose *nisba* clearly shows that he was a member of the religious elite, was also a calligrapher. There is considerable overlap between religious training and bureaucratic or calligraphic training. It is possible that the people not mentioned had little influence on their social milieu or were not very ambitious. Their invisibility cannot be due to lack of skill, because the Qurʾān manuscripts they penned say otherwise.

The calligraphers who were commissioned to produce royal manuscripts, especially when the commission was to write the Word of God, did not necessarily belong to any specific favored groups. The calligraphers and the few illuminators we have dealt with were religious scholars and/or bureaucrats who were also Sufis. There
was no discrimination or preference as far as the commissioning was concerned. What was important was their skill as artists in producing a calligraphic work or illuminating it. Their fame rested on their ability to produce the Word of God beautifully in writing and allow the user of the manuscript, be it the patron or the student, to understand that calligraphy is the Word of God in material form. These calligraphers were highly esteemed in Islamic culture. The biographical dictionaries of the period commend those with good handwriting, because traditionally a fine hand in writing meant a cultured person.\footnote{Nasr, \textit{Islamic Art}, 19.}

The work commissioned from these artists was expected to be exceptional. The Qurʾān manuscripts we have examined were endowed to institutions and had to match those institutions’ architectural elegance and add to their beauty. The fact that they would be used and handled by many reciters, professors, and students did not mean they had to be void of craft. On the contrary, the primary concern was the respect to be accorded to the Word, and the importance of conveying this respect to those using it. If people were studying, teaching, praying, and meditating in a building, they had to be surrounded by beauty, and all the buildings to which our manuscripts were endowed are arguably amongst the finest and most beautiful ever built. Thus, these Qurʾān manuscripts had to be the finest and the most beautiful as well. They had to aid in the remembrance of God, as is recommended by the verses of the Qurʾān.\footnote{See Q 51:56 and Q 29:45 for examples. Michon, \textit{Introduction to Traditional Islam}, 51.}
Chapter Six:  
The Patrons Through the Sources

**Introduction**

Now that we have seen the objects and the craftsmen who produced them, it is time to examine those who not only paid for the projects but who also supported and believed in the necessity of this form of sacred art. While the artists deserve more credit than the patrons, since they designed and executed their work and without them it would not have existed, the role of the patrons is also indispensable. Without their power, money, and passion, many fewer objects of art would have reached us. This is why it is so interesting to get to know the patrons on a more personal level. It is the aim of this chapter to introduce these patrons as they are portrayed in the sources of the period and, to a lesser extent, through their architecture. Not all left us buildings, but many did. Not all of the events of their lifetime will be covered, just the ones that give us more insight into their personal traits and affirm or deny what the historians and their buildings say of them.

Three main categories of patrons will be investigated: sultans, royal women, and amirs. There are four sultans connected to the Qur’an manuscripts we have seen thus far: Ḥasan, Sha‘bān, Barqūq, and Faraj. Ḥasan and Sha‘bān are the last of the great Qalawunids, while Barqūq and Faraj represent the beginning of a new Circassian ruling elite. All are impressive personalities except for one, Faraj ibn Barqūq. All endured political and economic turmoil and yet, for the most part, proved to be passionate patrons for varying reasons. Only two royal women, both from the house of the
Qalawunids, left us Qur’ān manuscripts; Tatar, daughter of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, and Khawand Baraka, daughter-in-law of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and mother of Sultan Sha’bān. Far more is known about Baraka, compared to the scanty information found on Tatar. Both women were also patrons of architecture, but as seen earlier, Baraka was one of the major patrons of Qur’ān manuscripts in Mamluk Egypt. We have four amīrs: Şirghitmish al-Nāširī, Şurghatmish al-Ashrafi, Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafi, and Fāris al-Khāzindār. The most important of these amīrs by far was Şirghitmish al-Nāširī, whose position, authority, and patronage are comparable to those of the sultans.

The Sultans

Sultan al-Nāṣir Ḥasan (r. 748–52/1347–51, 755–62/1354–61)

Al-Malik al-Nāṣir Badr al-Dīn Abū al-Ma‘āli Ḥasan ibn al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn was the seventh son of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad to come to the throne, and the twentieth Bahri Mamluk sultan. He was enthroned at the age of eleven or thirteen and upon his enthronement he changed his name from Qumārī to Ḥasan. He was born in 735/1335 and died in 762/1361, and ruled twice: from 748/1347 to 752/1351 and from 755/1354 to 762/1361. His mother might have been one of the Greek concubines of al-Nāṣir, according to one account, or a Turk, according to another account. He was manipulated and tricked by the amīrs of his father and killed by one of his own. He was

---

735 Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, 2:27; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *al-Durar*, 2:38. Ḥasan wanted to emphasize his Arabic culture by changing his Turkish name to an Arabic one. This is a result of Ḥasan’s personality and his wish to distance himself from the Mamluk system, as will be seen shortly.
736 Al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī state that he was born in 735/1334, while Ibn Taḡrī Birdī says only that it was in the 730s.
a great patron of the arts and an intellectual in his own right, but unfortunately died at a young age.

A child with a freckled face and blond hair when he was enthroned, Ḥasan did not rule in the beginning but was merely a figurehead.739 His naʿīb (Baybughā Ārūs), wazīr (Manjak), and amīr kabiır (Shaykhū al-ʿUmarī)740 ruled on his behalf and managed the country.741 Their regency was considered bad by al-Maqrīzī, who says that all state matters were in limbo because of them.742 They also psychologically tortured Ḥasan by giving him a stipend of only 100 dirhams per day, controlled by Shaykhū, and delivered to Ḥasan by his servant. Ḥasan once needed three more dirhams and Shaykhū denied his request. This anecdote not only reveals how controlled Ḥasan was, but also shows that Shaykhū was possibly the most determined of the three regents to keep him this way: upon hearing about this incident, Baybughā Ārūs sent Ḥasan 3,000 dirhams. Shaykhū was furious, and eventually the three of them reached a unanimous decision never to increase Ḥasan’s stipend.743 Al-Maqrīzī says that this situation hurt Ḥasan deeply (fā-ʿazz ‘alayhī dhalik).744 Such oppression and control experienced at the beginning of his reign and at a young age must have affected his eventual preference for setting awlād al-nās in high positions, while trying to curb the powers of the Mamluk amīrs. It was a way to overcome strong, cruel amīrs, mostly those of his father.

---

739 Ibn Ṭaghribirdī, al-Manḥal, 5:130; Ibn Iyās, Badāʾīʾ, 1:579.
740 Shaykhū was the first amīr ever to bear the title amīr kabiır in Egypt. See al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:34.
742 Al-Maqrīzī, Durar, 2:27.
744 Al-Maqrīzī, Durar, 2:28.
This situation did not continue for long, however, because in 751/1350, when he was around sixteen years old, he decided to take matters into his own hands. At a meeting with the four qādīs and the amīrs, he asked, “Am I not an adult?” and they answered “Allah, Allah.” He continued, “Am I not capable of the sultanate?” and they answered “Allah, Allah.” He immediately ordered the arrest of Manjak, who was in the meeting, and the detention of Shaykhū and Baybughā Ārūs. A series of arrests then ensued; changes in positions, promotions, and confiscations also took place. His decisions were not welcomed and he was viciously opposed. Nine months after his decision, Ḥasan was dragged out of his private rooms by some amīrs, including Şirghitmis (one of our important patrons), and deposed. His brother al-Šāliḥ Şāliḥ was enthroned in the same year (752/1352) and ruled until 755/1354. Meanwhile Ḥasan was kept in royal imprisonment and spent his time praying, studying, and copying religious manuscripts. An example mentioned by al-Maqrīzī is two copies Ḥasan made of the book Dalā’il al-nubuwwa by al-Bayhaqī. The amīrs were not settled and fought among themselves, and as a result al-Šāliḥ Şāliḥ was deposed and Ḥasan was re-enthroned in 755/1354. Now around nineteen or twenty years old and having spent his imprisonment educating himself, Ḥasan emerged as a learned ruler. Historians differ in how they depict him. Ibn Qādī Shuhba, al-Şafafi, al-Maqrīzī, al-Maqrīzī, al-Sułūk, 3:1. This work by the Imām al-Bayhaqī is a very important treatise on the Prophet. Dalā’il al-nubuwwa (‘proof of prophethood’) is a genre to glorify the Prophet. Ḥasan’s work reflects upon his piety, since copying revered works bestowed baraka on the copyist. See Chamberlain, Knowledge and Social Practice, 144. Although it is not specifically stated that Ḥasan copied Qurʾān manuscripts, he might have done so, given his enthusiasm to commission them. As for his confinement, the amirial magnates needed no formal reason to depose and confine him. He simply opposed them and was not yet powerful enough to fight back.
and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī see him as a vicious and cruel sultan to both his subjects and his entourage, while al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Ṭaghri Birdī see him as a kind, good, and firm ruler.\textsuperscript{747} His second reign lasted for six years and seven months, during which he achieved a great deal. During this second reign he changed his \textit{nā`ib} often and even spent some time without one. He also changed the men occupying the position of \textit{amīr kabīr} often, and the \textit{iqtā}’s given to them were also redistributed annually.\textsuperscript{748} This was primarily a protection mechanism that limited their power. His main helpers in the beginning of his second reign were the \textit{amīrs} Shaykhū, Ṣirğhitmish, and Ṭāz.\textsuperscript{749} Once again the reign of these three strong \textit{amīrs} did not last for long. In 758/1357 Shaykhū was struck with a sword by one of the minor \textit{amīrs}, Quṭlūqujā (Bāy Qujā), who was upset about not being granted a promotion. While the blow did not kill him on the spot, in a few days he was dead.\textsuperscript{750} Ṣirğhitmish assumed Shayhū’s position and became the most powerful man in the state, but later was arrested, and in 759/1358 he was killed in his prison cell in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{751} Ṭāz was also sent to the prison in Alexandria and blinded there. However, he outlived Ḥasan, was freed from his imprisonment, and died in 763/1362.\textsuperscript{752}

Ḥasan’s first reign, while he was still a child, was characterized by many hardships, primarily because of the Black Death, which coincided with his first year of rule. In his biographical dictionary \textit{Durar al-‘uqūd al-fārida fī tarājim al-a’yān al-mufīda},

\textsuperscript{750} Al- Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:33–34.
\textsuperscript{751} Al- Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:44. More will be said about this \textit{amīr} later when his biography is discussed.
\textsuperscript{752} Al-Ṣafadī, \textit{A’yān}, 2:570–71.
speaking of the first years of his first reign, al-Maqřīzī summarizes the unfortunate events, while stressing Ḥasan’s merits as a ruler:

Various difficulties characterized his [Ḥasan’s] days. These were primarily the increasing poverty, dilapidation of many properties along the Nile’s littoral outside of Cairo, several fires, the violations committed by the Arab tribes in upper Egypt, the corruption of the Arab tribes in Greater Syria, the great annihilation [Black Death] the like of which was never experienced before, the drought that hit Egyptian lands, and the imbalance of the condition of people. In spite of all of this, he [Ḥasan] was excessively intelligent, in control of his expenses, knowledgeable, pious, chivalrous, if he only were to find a helper and a supporter.753

During this second reign, in addition to favoring awlād al-nās he also favored his own mamlūks, which might not have been a very good idea in view of the fact that his closest mamlūk killed him. In 762/1361 Ḥasan was informed that his amīr Yalbughā al-‘Umarī al-Khāṣṣīkī754 wanted to kill him, so Ḥasan summoned him and stripped off his clothes to see whether he was wearing his armor beneath them. Since Yalbughā was not wearing it, he felt humiliated by what happened, and three days later he ordered his own mamlūks to prepare for battle. He attacked the sultan and was victorious. Consequently, Ḥasan had to flee to the Nile and then to the Citadel. By Ḥasan’s side and in the forefront of the fighting was Muḥammad al-Muḥsini, our architect/calligrapher/administrator, who defended Ḥasan to the last moment.

Unfortunately Ḥasan was captured and his nephew Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar Ḥājjī

753 Al-Maqřīzī, Durar, 2:29. In his other renowned and elaborate chronicle al-Sulūk, al-Maqřīzī tells us how dreadful conditions were in agriculture, poverty, Cairo’s deterioration, and the horror of the Black Death. However, he ends by stressing the good qualities of Ḥasan: his intelligence, his chivalrous behavior, his caution, his religiosity, and the lack of any sort of support or aid. See al-Maqřīzī, al-Sulūk, 2:843.

was enthroned in his place. No one really knows what happened to Hasan, but it is said that he was tortured by Yalbughâ until he died, and that his burial place was intentionally hidden.\textsuperscript{755}

While a more positive tone or a report of Hasan’s good traits is available in most of the sources, the opposite is portrayed by Ibn Kathîr; as a Syrian religious scholar he would be against the sultan.\textsuperscript{756} Ibn Kathîr vehemently criticizes his gluttony, corruption, and disregard of the populace.\textsuperscript{757} It seems somewhat of an exaggeration, and may simply have been a topos by which Mamluk sultans were viewed by these Syrian religious scholars. He also disparages one of Hasan’s main achievements, his architectural activity.\textsuperscript{758}

Hasan’s two main accomplishments were his support of the class of awlâd al-nâs and his artistic patronage,\textsuperscript{759} which is manifested primarily in his architectural complex. His support of awlâd al-nâs is important since they were also involved in his artistic campaign. We have already seen how important Muhammad ibn Bayfîk al-Muhsînî was as an artist and administrator. He placed people from awlâd al-nâs as his deputies in the different provinces and promoted a few to the position of muqaddam alîf (commander of a thousand). These also included two of his sons (Aḥmad and Qâsim).\textsuperscript{760} It should be


\textsuperscript{756} Syrian religious scholars paid no lip service to the ruling elite and were often against them. This has been successfully argued in many modern studies, including: Little, \textit{Mamluk Historiography}; Li Guo, \textit{Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: Al-Yûnînî’s Dhayl Mirʾût al-Zanân} (Leiden: Brill, 1998); and Robert Irwin, “Mamluk History and Historians,” in \textit{The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Arabic Literature in the Post-Classical Period}, ed. Roger Allen and D. S. Richards (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 159–70.

\textsuperscript{757} Imâd al-Ḍîd Abî al-Fîdâ’ Ismâ ‘il Ibn Kathîr, \textit{al-Bidâya wa-al-nihâya fi al-târikh} (Beirut, 1990), 14:278.

\textsuperscript{758} Ibn Kathîr, \textit{al-Bidâya wa-al-nihâya}, 14:278.

\textsuperscript{759} His architecture, manuscripts and glass lamps speak volumes of his impressive patronage.

recalled that Hasan himself is considered one of the awlād al-nās. Technically his father, al-Nāṣir, was from this category as well, since he was freeborn and thus by extension belonged to it. This was one of the reasons the Mamluk amīr treated Hasan as such.\footnote{There are many similarities between Hasan’s circumstances and those of his father that are not apparent in the sources, and it is most interesting that his contemporary, the Moroccan poet Shihāb al-Dīn ibn Abī Ḥajala (725–76/1325–75), noticed this and listed these similarities. Ibn Ḥajala was living in Cairo when Sultan Hasan was ruling. He was in charge of the Sufis in Manjak’s building. He wrote his Sukrda’n al-sulta’n in 757/1356 in Cairo, tracing the number “7” in the history of Egyptian royalty, and he included stories of some of the prophets, such as Joseph and Moses. The personage to whom he paid the most attention was Sultan Hasan, the seventh of al-Nāṣir’s sons to rule, and there is a large section on him in the book. Ibn Ḥajala tells us that al-Nāṣir and Hasan shared seven things. The most interesting are that they were both deposed and re-enthroned, both went for some time without a wazīr, and both went for some time without a nā‘ib. See Shihāb al-Dīn ibn al-‘Abbas Aḥmad ibn Yāḥyā ibn Abīd Bakr (Ibn Ḥajala), Kitāb sukrda’n al-sulta’n, in the margins of Bāhā’ al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Ḥusayn al-‘Amīlī, Kitāb al-Mikhliḥ (Cairo: al-Ṭābā’a al-Maymāniyya, 1888), 91; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:62–63; Ibn Iyās, Badā’i’, 1:578; Kahil, Sultan Ḥasan Complex, 8.} Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad had suffered the same control and abuse by veteran amīrs during his first two reigns. The Mamluk regime had greatest respect for those mamlūks who were bought and sold and went through the system that established their rulership, but their freeborn children were not considered to be of the same caliber. They felt that power should be kept in the hands of those who had gone through the system that recruited them.

Hasan’s reasons for favoring and promoting this category is reported by Ibn Taghri Birdi, who tells us that when some of his entourage and amīrs blamed him for doing this, Hasan explained himself eloquently. He said that it was not out of love for them, but rather for his own personal benefit, the benefit of the populace, and the benefit of the state. He personally benefits from their obedience, which is less evident in the mamlūks, since the awlād al-nās’ families and companions will forbid them from disobeying the sultan in order to protect their incomes. The Awlād al-nās will benefit
the populace because they have not gone through deprivation, and are therefore not greedy and will not be unjust. The benefit to the state lies in the fact that they are more knowledgeable about the rules and policies of the state and know how to deal with the populace, since they share a culture. Whether these points were true or not, they still show how this monarch thought and how he explained his actions.

His second achievement is his artistic patronage, primarily as expressed in his magnificent complex in Rumayla Square beneath the Citadel (built 1356–64). This complex was not his only architectural accomplishment. Like his father, he loved the arts passionately, and it is possible that had he been given more time to live he would have built even more. He built structures in Mecca and added the door to the Ka‘ba and the kiswa. He bought the palace of Bashtāk in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn and renovated it. He had to tear down other palaces, though, to build his complex in Rumayla. The palace of his father’s amīrs Yalbūghā al-Yayḥyawī and al-Maridānī were demolished because they stood in the way of the complex. We do not need the sources to tell us of the complex’s magnificence, since as it stands today it represents an apex of Mamluk architecture. What the sources do affirm is that this is how it was looked upon during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as well. Al-Ṣafadī was asked by some of his friends to compose a panegyric for Ḥasan and his complex. Even though he does not see Ḥasan as such a great king in the beginning of the biography, in his poem he compares Ḥasan to Kisra Anūshirvān (the archetypical just ruler for medieval writers). Al-Maqrīzī compares

---

763 Abdallah Kahil’s book on Sultan Ḥasan’s complex is an excellent monograph on the building and the most comprehensive study of its details. See Kahil, Sultan Hasan Complex.
765 Al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 2:250–51.
the *qibla iwān* of the *madrasa* to the Iwān of Kisra, a *topos* Muslim historians always used to depict magnificence.\(^{766}\)

Although Ḥasan inaugurated the complex in 759/1360, he did not live to see the ambitious project completed.\(^{767}\) The building combines, on a grand scale and for the first time, a *madrasa* teaching the four schools of jurisprudence, a Friday mosque, a mausoleum, and a hospital (Pl. 430). Its important features include the cruciform *madrasa*, the biggest in Cairo, and the placing of the mausoleum behind the *qibla iwān*, making it the main façade overlooking the *maydān* (Pl. 431); it is indeed sad that Ḥasan was never buried there.

The great portal with its planned flanking minarets is reminiscent of Seljuk Anatolian *madrasas*, a fact that has been noted by several art historians (Pl. 432). The first was Max Herz Pasha in his monograph on the complex published in 1899.\(^{768}\) It also resembles Ilkhanid examples.\(^{769}\) The first minaret collapsed, with disastrous effects, killing three hundred schoolboys being taught in the *kuttāb* of the complex in addition to workers and passersby, shortly before the assassination of Ḥasan.\(^{770}\) (This event is reported in the building’s *waqf* document.) Ḥasan then decided not to reconstruct the fallen minaret and abandoned the idea of building the second.

---

\(^{766}\) *Al-Maqriži, al-Khīṭat*, 4:1:272.

\(^{767}\) Before his assassination the following was finished: the portal and its western minaret, the courtyard and the dour *iwāns* and *madrasas*, and the mausoleum and its minarets. See Kahil, *Sultan Ḥasan*, 33.

\(^{768}\) Max Herz, *La mosquée du sultan Hassan au Caire* (Cairo: Imprimerie de l’institut française d’archéologie orientale, 1899), 25.

\(^{769}\) The link to Seljuk Anatolia is stressed by Max Herz Pasha and J. M. Rogers, while the Ilkhanid connection is established by Michael Meinecke and Abdallah Kahil. The Ilkhanid material is closer in date than the Anatolian ones.

The portal’s architectural decoration is most interesting for our purposes. This building’s portal represents the earliest existing Chinese-inspired motifs carved in stone. These motifs include primarily peonies, some lotuses, and chrysanthemums, like those seen in the Qur’ān manuscripts in the earlier chapters, the main difference being the colors.\footnote{Many elements on this portal echo the elements in Qur’ān manuscript illumination. These include the vegetal band, the medallions, and the carved panels.} The decoration of the portal is unfortunately unfinished, as can be seen from some of the details. The most obvious Chinese elements are seen in the scroll around the medallion decorating the plinth, where peonies and chrysanthemums alternate (Pls. 433 and 434), and in the chamfering above the plinth, where a more flowing execution of a scroll carved with chrysanthemums and lotuses can be seen (Pl. 435). Another scroll with these flowers can also be seen, but unfinished, on the eastern and western lateral sides of the portal above the mastaba.

This is the first appearance of Chinese motifs on architecture here. We have seen them earlier in Qur’ān manuscript illumination in Egypt in the Raṣīds 8 (Pl. 156), 59 (Pl. 149), and 5 (Pl. 99) (chapter three), also commissioned by Ḥasan.\footnote{Others commissioned by his amīr Șirghtimish will be mentioned when Șirghtimish is analyzed later.} In these manuscripts the Chinese elements appear in medallions flanking sūra titles in the form of a lotus surrounded by small plant motifs, and in the spandrels around sūra titles, where they resemble the band in the chamfering above the plinth of the portal and the unfinished band adorning the eastern and western sides of the portal. It is suggested here that they appeared first in the Qur’ān manuscripts and were then executed on the building. Interestingly, the Qur’ān manuscripts endowed by Sultan Sha’bān and his entourage (primarily in Raṣīds 6, 7, and 54—chapter three) (Pl. 437) depict scrolls on...
their frontispieces more similar to the scroll on the portal here. These motifs are more fully elaborated on the portal than they are on the contemporary Qurʾān manuscripts; this elaboration was perfected a few years later in the late 1360s and early 1370s. As discussed in chapter three, the origins can be traced to Ilkhanid Qurʾān manuscript, and the Ilkhanid world was indeed the intermediary.

It is illuminating to review what others have said about the origins of the portal’s Chinese elements. It must be kept in mind that not all of the Qurʾān manuscripts discussed were available for these scholars to check and compare.

Abdallah Kahil discussed these bands and their Chinese floral elements in his chapter on the portal and its decoration. He suggests that they are directly linked to China through Chinese ceramics, textiles, and lacquer, since Cairo’s fourteenth-century elite actively sought Chinese products. He provides a list of Chinese objects from the Song Dynasty that carry such motifs. While it is absolutely true that the Chinese objects existed and were highly valued by the elite at the time in Cairo, the motifs as used in the manuscripts and the portal can also be seen in early Ilkhanid manuscripts, as described in previous chapters. The Ilkhanid examples are more similar to the Mamluk examples than are the Chinese originals, and would have been easier to copy. The fact that the Chinese products were present in Cairo must have made the motifs even more appealing, but it does not mean that they were the sole medium of copying. Michael Rogers suggests that the scrolls on the building were added in the fifteenth century.

---

because they resemble the blue and white Ming pieces (1368-1644), which date to this later period. This contradicts evidence from the manuscripts.  

Art historians have tried to read and interpret this building. Stephen Humphreys, discussing the mausoleum and its audacious placement, suggests that it is the tomb of the deceased royalty that was intentionally emphasized. Oleg Grabar sees it as a manifestation of a struggle between the urban intellectual elite and the unstable rule of the sultans. He also finds it interesting that the greatest of all Mamluk buildings is connected to a “singularly unimpressive personality . . . apparently a fairly pious young man,” referring to Ḥasan. This is really not the case. On the contrary, given the circumstances this son of al-Nāṣir had to endure, he is the most impressive of his siblings and the last of the great Bahri sultans. He is not like his father, but a thorough reading of the sources reveals a very smart, well educated, and strong person who tried hard but was overpowered by Mamluk amīrs. It is hardly surprising that a teenager who spent his time copying manuscripts, possibly in a good hand, would be the person to commission a great building and a series of impressive Qur’an manuscripts to adorn it.

Lobna Sherif’s PhD dissertation points out Ḥasan’s wish to be grander than his predecessors (primarily his father and grandfather). She also sees that in design and decoration the project reflects Seljuk Anatolian inspiration in all its aspects. However, while the portal’s details and the earlier minaret placement might be

---

Anatolian, the cruciform shape and other details are not.\footnote{On the origins of the cruciform plan see K.A. C. Creswell, \textit{The Origin of the Cruciform Plan of Cairene Madrasas} (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1922).} The chinioserie elements are most certainly Ilkhanid. Howayda al-Harithy provides an interesting perspective on the building, suggesting that it symbolizes, on the one hand, the relationship between the civilians and the \textit{mamlūks} in which Ḥasan supports the civilians. On the other hand, she interprets it as a symbol of overcoming the Black Death, commemorating the dead and uplifting public morale.\footnote{Howayda al-Harithy, “The Complex of Sultan Hasan in Cairo: Reading between the Lines,” \textit{Muqarnas} 13 (1996): 77.} Whether the purpose was to communicate Ḥasan’s greatness as a sultan or to express his support of the other factions over the \textit{mamlūks}, his interest in commissioning an artistic masterpiece that conveys an intellectual message would have been important to a knowledgeable monarch.

The latest and most thorough investigation is that of Abdallah Kahil. He amply demonstrates that the decorative details of the building are indeed the apex of Bahri Mamluk architecture. Kahil tells us that

\begin{quote}
The design of the building was linked to the desire of the Sultan to build an architectural manifestation of his political ambition to solidify the dynastic right of the Qalâwûnids to rule the Mamluk Sultanate. In creating the plans of the Tomb Chamber, the Central Unit, and the Portal of the Complex, the architects adopted plans and designs particularly from Qalâwûnid monuments, among other Cairene and Syrian buildings. They succeeded in bringing together several aspects of earlier buildings, including the concept of a large complex of Qalâwûn, the inclusive \textit{madrasas} for the four \textit{madhhab}-s of al-Ṭāhir Muhâammad and its plan, and perhaps the prominence of the mausoleum in the monument of his uncle al-Ashraf Khalîl. The result of this effort produced an impressive building that is both new and rooted in tradition.\footnote{Kahil, \textit{Sultan Hasan Complex}, 187.}
\end{quote}
To conclude our remarks on Sultan Ḥasan, it seems that we have here a monarch who was intellectually active and manifested this in his commissions. He was part of the *awlād al-nās* and promoted them as the social and intellectual elite of Cairo. They had the means to pursue scholarly and artistic lives and he made the opportunities available for them. He was also trying to centralize his rule and stabilize the dynasty, and this too was manifested in his commissions. It is especially evident in his complex, whose design is rooted in the tradition of the Qalawunids. In the details of his commissions the influence of the Ilkhanids is plain to see. The descendants of the Mongols, wherever they ruled (Iran, China, or the Caucasus), were highly respected by the Mamluks in all fields, and their artistic productions held a special attraction for the sophisticated Mamluk elite. In its details Ḥasan’s patronage shows a continuation and elaboration on the Ilkhanid artistic connection. In spite of the rivalry and earlier warfare, the Mamluks admired and felt an affinity to the Mongols.  

Sultan Sha‘bān (r. 764–78/1363–77)

Al-Malik al-Ashraf Abū al-Ma‘āfikhr Sha‘bān ibn Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn was a grandson of al-Nāṣir who was artistically ambitious like his grandfather and uncle (Sultan Ḥasan). His parents, although not rulers themselves, were also patrons of art.

---

782 Sultan Baybars al-Bunduqdārī is reported to have said to a French emissary, “Thank God, today we (the Mamluks and Mongols) are at peace, since we are of the same ethnicity and we should not let each other down.” See al-Qalqashandi, *Subh*, 8:37; Rabbat, *The Citadel*, 98–99.

783 The only study dedicated to him is al-Ḥajjī, “al-Ahwāl.”

784 His mother, Khawand Baraka, endowed Qur’ān manuscripts and built a *madrasa*, as will be discussed later. As for his father, no object or buildings remain in his name, but a Qur’ān manuscript listed in the nineteenth-century Khedivial catalogue of Dār al-Kutub bears his name. In any case, it does show that Ḥusayn was interested in commissioning Qur’ān manuscripts, like his father, his brother, his wife, and his son.
Sha'bān was born in 754/1353 and was enthroned at the age of ten in 764/1363 after the notorious Yalbughā al-ʿUmarī al-Khāṣṣākī deposed Sha'bān’s cousin Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar Ḥājī.785 He was thought of as a weak puppet by the amīrs who put him on the throne, since he was a child, but things would soon change. Because of Sha'bān’s age, Yalbughā was in charge of the state, holding the title atābak786 and possibly behaving like a dictator. Yalbughā was vicious with everyone around him, including his own mamlūks, and was perceived as ill-mannered. Other amīrs and Yalbughā’s own mamlūks harbored such great hatred for him that they decided to kill him, which they did with the aid of the sultan in 768/1367.787 An important role in this episode was played by Cairo’s populace, who fought for Sha'bān in 767/1366–67 when trouble was caused by the yalbughāwīyya mamlūks and the ajlāb.788

Once Sha'bān became a real ruler and not a figurehead, he was fourteen years old and possibly more capable of running things.789 It was not easy, though, since other amīrs, namely Asundumr, were eager to depose him. He won the fight, however, which

---

785 Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar Ḥājī was deposed by Yalbughā, allegedly because of his behavior. He played tricks on women of the amīrs and on his own concubines. He did not take part in many religious rituals and so was gotten rid off on the grounds of irreverent behavior. Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, 6:233–34; al-Maqrizī, al-Sulūk, 3:83; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujiʿm, 11:20; Ibn Qāḍī Shuḥba, Tārīkh, 2:524; al-Maqrizī, Durar, 2:123; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Dalīl, 344. Yalbughā, who might not be as evil as most sources portray him, was instrumental in installing Sha'bān as sultan and was managing affairs from behind the scenes. See Van Steenbergen, “The Amir Yalbughā al-Khāṣṣākī,” 427, 437.
786 The post of atābak under Sha'bān’s rule was more important than that of nāʿib al-saltāna. See al-Hajī, “al-Ahwāl,” 793.
788 Van Steenbergen, Order out of Chaos, 17n4; al-Nuwayrī, Kitāb al-Ilmām, 6:18; al-Ḥājī, “al-Ahwāl,” 785. The term ajlāb or jūlbān refers to mamlūks bought by the reigning sultan and belonging to him (sultaṇī mamlūks). See Ayalon, “Circassians,” n22; Levanoni, Turning Point, 100; Encyclopaedia of Islam, “Khāṣṣākīyya” (by David Ayalon).
789 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujiʿm, 11:43.
gave him a stronger base from which to rule. This was partly due to the support and encouragement provided by the *amīr* Uljāy al-Yusūfī, Sha‘bān’s stepfather.

The sources depict Sha‘bān as good to the inhabitants of Cairo, who had supported him earlier, and on many occasions he thought of their well-being. In 778/1377 a certain Aḥmad ibn Qāymaẓ, the *ustādār* (majordomo) of Muḥammad ibn Aqbughā Āṣ, rented a plot in the Ḫusayniyya area and converted it into an artificial lake to gather fish, by digging a channel to the Khafīj, but the project was not well executed and the whole area was flooded. More than a thousand houses were ruined. Sha‘bān ordered Muḥammad ibn Aqbughā Āṣ and his son to be arrested and banished as a result of this episode.

In 776/1374 prices were so exorbitant that Sha‘bān ordered *amīr* Manjak, his *nā‘īb* at the time, to gather the poor and destitute and assign to each of the *umara‘* alf one hundred persons to feed. He also assigned the merchants and elites of the bureaucracy a large number of people to feed and take care of. He then forbade the poor to roam around begging in order to limit the spread of contagious diseases.

The sources provide a very positive view of Sha‘bān, which might reflect the attitude of his populace. Even the religious scholar Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, who rarely spoke of any virtues in connection with the Mamluks, praised him in his *Tārīkh*. He quotes other historians, without identifying them, as saying:

> He was one of the good ones of the age; a king of his clemency was not seen before; he was mild and lenient, a lover of those who do good, and generous with the ‘ulama‘ and Sufis; he cared about the religious law

---

and always gave it attention. There was nothing about him to criticize except for his love of accumulating money. However, he was generous, and abolished the prostitution/singing tax, and built the madrasa beneath the Citadel. Life during his reign was tranquil/secure. All other monarchs would send him presents and he never had to pay lip service or be a hypocrite with the Arab tribes, the Turkmens, or others during his reign.  

Others describe Sha‘bān as brave, majestic, generous, and lenient with his subjects, mamluks, and relatives. The result was that his subjects loved him, as Ibn Taghrī Birdī notes: “li-maḥabat al-ra‘īyya fi al-Ashraf” (‘because of the populace’s love for al-Ashraf’).  

Sha‘bān’s piety, especially as manifested in his reverence of the Prophet and āl al-bayt, is most probably another factor in the appreciation the people had for him. In 773/1372 he ordered all the ashrāf in Egypt and Greater Syria to wear green turbans if they were men and green belts if they were women so that they would stand out and people would give them their due respect, a tradition that continued for decades in Egypt. A few poems were written at the time to commend him for this act. This love for the Prophet is also attested by his frequent visits to Ribāt al-Āthār.  

---

794 Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, Tārīkh, 2:524–25. Ibn Taghrī Birdī gives the same account with minor differences in the beginning and more information at the end, quoting Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī; see Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, 11:64–65. The positive views reflected in the sources, as mentioned earlier, were also due to his cancellation of the property sales tax (ḍamān al-qarārāt); see Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī, ‘Inbā’, 1:127.  


797 A building containing relics of the Prophet. For details on the building, its history, and uses, see Iman Abdulfattah, “Relics of the Prophet and Practices of His Veneration in Medieval Cairo,” Journal of Islamic Archaeology 1, no. 1 (2014): 75–104. He is not the only Mamlok sultan to visit the Ribāt; a small number of them gave it attention and reverence, including Khushqadam, Qāytbāy, and al-Ghūrī.
774/1373 when his mother was sick, probably to pray for her recovery.\textsuperscript{798} He also visited for no special reason or requests, as he did in 776/1375.\textsuperscript{799} This love and baraka-seeking is also clear in his decision to make it a rule that Sahîh al-Bukhârî would be read every day of the month of Ramadân in the presence of qâdis and scholars, to reinforce the prayers to alleviate the inflation that people were suffering from in 775/1374.\textsuperscript{800}

The madrasa he commissioned beneath the Citadel (al-Šûwa) is long gone, but in its place stands the bîmâristân of al-Mu’ayyad Shaykh (r. 815–24/1412–21), built between 821/1418 and 823/1420 (Pl. 438).\textsuperscript{801} How much of the original structure or plan was used by al-Mu’ayyad has never been investigated, but the madrasa of Sha‘bân was almost completely dilapidated when al-Mu’ayyad started his project. The portal of the bîmâristân is in the same place as that of the madrasa, but narrower.\textsuperscript{802} Before it had been confiscated by al-Mu’ayyad, it was confiscated by Faraj ibn Barquq (801–808/1399–1405, 808–15/1405–12), the second Circassian sultan, who will be discussed shortly. Faraj destroyed the whole structure, but its bases and material must have been used by al-Mu’ayyad. In 810/1407 Jamâl al-Dîn al-Ustâdâr bought from Sha‘bân’s son al-Šâlih/al-Manşûr Hâjjî brass windows and doors encrusted with gold and silver, and several manuscripts, including monumental Qur’ân manuscripts and hadîth and jurisprudence books, and placed them in his madrasa in al-Jamâliyya. It was such a rare and valuable collection that it included a Qur’ân manuscript said to be in the hand of Ibn al-Bawwâb and another in the hand of Yaqût. He paid 600 dinars, just one-tenth of its

\footnotetext{798}{Al-Maqrîzî, \textit{al-Sulûk}, 3:206.}
\footnotetext{799}{Al-Maqrîzî, \textit{al-Sulûk}, 3:234.}
\footnotetext{800}{Al-Maqrîzî, \textit{al-Sulûk}, 3:223.}
\footnotetext{801}{Al-Maqrîzî, \textit{al-Khitat}, 4:2:702.}
\footnotetext{802}{Al-Maqrîzî, \textit{al-Khitat}, 4:2:702.}
real worth.\textsuperscript{803} This anecdote is important because it reflects Sha‘bān’s and Khawand Baraka’s genuine interest in this form of sacred art. It seems that they enthusiastically collected precious copies of Qur’ān manuscripts in addition to commissioning them.

As for the long-gone madrasa at al-Ṣūwa, Sha‘bān started the construction project in 777/1376, using some of the remains from his aunt’s palace,\textsuperscript{804} which was close to Raḥbat Bāb al-Īd in al-Jamāliyya. He ordered two giant (‘azīmān li-al-ghāya) columns found in the ruins of the palace to be moved to the construction site of his madrasa. These columns were so big that the workers were not able to carry them, and someone had to be commissioned to construct a machine to transport them.\textsuperscript{805} The move took a few days, and the people of Cairo celebrated as the columns were moved along the main thoroughfare of the city. Unfortunately, the bigger column broke in two upon arrival at the construction site.\textsuperscript{806} We know nothing about its plan or details, only that it was magnificent and comparable to that of his uncle Ḥasan, and that it cost a lot of money. His mother’s madrasa, which also bears his name, is still standing and will be discussed when we discuss his mother (our most important female patron).

As mentioned in chapter one, the Qur’ān manuscripts that Sha‘bān endowed (Raṣīds 7, 9, and 10, considered the finest of all Mamluk production, chapter three), his grand madrasa, and the increase in the total number of madrasas during his reign


\textsuperscript{804} Her name is Tatar al-Hijāziyya. She will be discussed shortly, since she is responsible for Raṣīd 56. Her palace was built next to her madrasa in place of the Fatimid palace Qaṣr al-Zumurud.

\textsuperscript{805} It is very possible that these columns were in the Fatimid palace, Qaṣr al-Zumurud.

\textsuperscript{806} Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:251–52.
indicate that funds were available in spite of the economic decline. The awkward financial arrangements he set up, as revealed by the tax register of 777/1374–75 and discussed in chapter one, guaranteed more income for him and his family.

Sha‘bān’s death was untimely. Like Ḥasan, he was brutally murdered by the amīrs, when he was only twenty-four years of age. A few of Sha‘bān’s amīrs, the amīrs of Uljāy al-Yusūfī,808 who wanted revenge for the death of their master, and other older amīrs, planned his death. In the year 778/1376, though advised not to by some Godly men (ahl al-ṣalāḥ in al-Maqrīzī, al-ṣulāḥa‘ in Ibn Taghri Birdi), he decided to go on pilgrimage. His caravan was elaborately prepared and he set off with some of his amīrs, the Abbasid caliph, and some religious scholars. Back in Cairo a group of amīrs decided to cause a fitna (civil disturbance). They gathered some mamlūks and started preparing for battle. They took over the Citadel and started telling the populace that Sha‘bān had died, but that they should not worry and should go about their business as usual. They installed ‘Afi (778–83/1377–81), Sha‘bān’s son, on the throne and gave him the title ‘al-Mansūr.’ Sha‘bān was not dead but decided to cut his trip short and come back with the amīrs who were accompanying him. His fellow amīrs were murdered as they approached the Citadel, and Sha‘bān fled, hiding in the house of a singer whom he had known, named Āmina, in the heart of the Fatimid city. He was seen by a woman there, who

---

808 He was Sha‘bān’s stepfather and an important patron of the arts. He was one of the mamlūks of Sultan Ḥasan and only became an important figure when he married Khawand Baraka, Sha‘bān’s mother. He had good relations with his stepson the sultan until the death of Khawand Baraka. Upon her death a huge conflict arose between them over the inheritance that she left, which ended with Uljāy fleeing and drowning in the Nile. Sha‘bān ordered divers to bring his body out of the Nile, and he buried him in his (Uljāy’s) madrasa in Sūq al-Silāḥ. See al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulāk, 3:230; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, 3:42–44, 3:356; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Nujūm, 11:47–50.
informed on him and pointed out his hiding place in the bādhahanj (airshaft) of the house. After catching him, a mamlūk of Uljāy named Jarkas al-Sayfī, shādd al-‘amā’īr of Uljāy, strangled Sha‘bān to death. Jarkas was later promoted and became shādd al-‘amā’īr al-sultāniyya. Sha‘bān was then thrown into a basket and down a well. After a few days, the people living in the vicinity of the well recovered his body and buried him next to the mashhad of Sayyida Nafīsa. Sha‘bān’s eunuchs later removed him and reburied him in his mother’s madrasa in al-Tabbāna. 809

Sha‘bān was followed by two insignificant minors, his sons al-Manṣūr ‘Aṭī (778–83/1377–81) and al-Ṣāliḥ/al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī (783–84/1381–82 and 791–92/1389–90). Ibn Ṭaghri Birdī, who was writing in the fifteenth century, ends his biography of Sha‘bān in the summary of his major dictionary, al-Manhal al-ṣāfi, al-Dalīl al-ṣāfī ‘ala al-manhal al-ṣāfi, by telling his reader that Sha‘bān was one of the best kings of his time and that the prestige of the sultanate of Egypt had deteriorated from that time to his own, because none of those who ruled was worthy of the position after Sha‘bān’s demise. 810

It seems that sultans who were awlād al-nās, who wanted to centralize power and who were ambitious enough to want to rule, were always disposed of by the amīrs, who saw them partly as intruders. 811 It also seems that these ambitious sultans saw artistic patronage as a means by which they could establish themselves and manifest the Truth.

810 Ibn Ṭaghri Birdī, al-Dalīl, 344.
811 The exception is Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn.
Sultan Barqūq (r. 784–91/1382–89, 792–801/1390–99)

Al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Abū Sa‘īd Barqūq ibn Ānṣ al-‘Uthmānī al-Yalbughāwī al-Chärkasī is the only sultan on our list who has been heavily studied in both primary and secondary sources, mainly because he represents the transition from a Turkish ruling elite to a Circassian one. His sultanate brought an end to the Qalawunid line, which had been ruling for a century.⁸¹² He is described as one of the greatest monarchs since al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.⁸¹³ On many levels this is very true, since he was strong and managed to rule in spite of all the problems he faced. Barqūq was purchased as a child, named Altinbughā or Sudūn,⁸¹⁴ by the famous slave trader Khawājā ‘Uthmān (d. 783/1381), who subsequently sold him to the notorious amīr Yalbughā al-‘Umarī al-Khāṣṣakī, who gave him the name Barqūq and manumitted him. He was trained in military matters and was quite intelligent, so he outshone all of his colleagues.⁸¹⁵ After Yalbughā’s death


⁸¹³ Wa kān mīn aẓ zam mulūk mīṣr ba’d al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. See Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Dalīl, 188.

⁸¹⁴ Ibn Taghri Birdī believes that his name in his homeland was Barqūq, since all of Barqūq’s family and friends were brought from his homeland and none of them mentioned that his name was different at home. He ascribes the mistake to the slave traders, one of whom did not know Turkish while the other did not know Arabic. See Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, 3:286.

⁸¹⁵ De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (I) (II),” 65.
Barquq went into the service of Manjak, the nā‘ib in Damascus. Manjak is said to have appreciated Barquq’s skills and intelligence and so assigned him important tasks to improve his reputation. After serving Manjak he was summoned to Cairo by Sha‘ban, who ordered all the Yalbugha wiyya mamlūks to come and serve his sons. As a result he served Sha‘ban’s son, amīr ‘Afi, until Sha‘ban was killed. Al-Maqrizi alone mentions his year of birth, which Ibn Iyaş follows: 741/1341. Ibn Iyaş, however, is the only historian who tells his place of origin: Kasā. 

Barquq was among the mamlūks who rebelled against Sha‘ban while Sha‘ban was on pilgrimage. As a result, he was promoted from low-ranking soldier to amīr tablakhāna, then of one hundred, then of one thousand, until he became amīr akhūr and then eventually amīr kabīr. 

Barquq was not alone in his meteoric rise. He was accompanied by his best friend, amīr Baraka, to whom he always referred as a brother. Since both were in charge of the little prince ‘Afi, who became the puppet Sultan al-Mansūr ‘Afi after Sha‘ban’s death (r. 778–83/1377–81) and later of his brother, also a figurehead, Sultan al-Ṣālih/al-Mansūr Hājjī (r. 783–84/1381–82, 791–92/1389–90), they enjoyed equal

816 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (I),” 65.
818 Al-Maqrizi, al-Sulūk, 3:476; Ibn Iyaş, Badā‘i’, 1:2:319. This a county in the Caucusus.
819 Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, 3:286. The position of amīr kabīr was given additional power when the amīr Aynbak, who assumed this position, moved his residence to the Citadel in 779/1377. Barquq had agreed that Aynbak could be “the first al-amīr al-kabīr to mint coins bearing his emblem, as sultans customarily did upon their ascent to power”; Levanoni, “The Mamluks in Egypt and Syria,” 257.
820 The Latin biography of Barquq by B. de Mignanelli in 1416 is the most personal account of Barquq I have come across. De Mignanelli was apparently a fan of Barquq, knew him personally, and gave insights into personal details not found in other sources. He makes one feel that Barquq’s and Baraka’s relationship was extremely strong and stresses the emotional side.
power. However, they eventually turned against each other, and it seems that Barquq, with his very smart and sly nature, rid himself of his lifetime friend by ordering his imprisonment and later assassination. Ibn Qaḍī Shuhba states that the Circassian amīrs and the populace took the side of Barquq and aided him against his friend.

Bertrando de Mignanelli explains in detail how sly Barquq was in dealing with the whole situation and setting Baraka up. Barquq’s political astuteness is quite evident in his fight with Baraka. He made good use of the fact that Baraka’s outrages with respect to the general populace caused them to fear and hate him. Barquq played the role of the merciful one with them, which encouraged them to side with him against Baraka.

His troubles at the time were not only with Baraka, but with other amīrs as well. Several mamlūks of the Qalawunid family, who were transferred to the service of Barquq while he was amīr kabīr, plotted with others to get rid of their new master Barquq. He discovered the plot and they were all imprisoned in 784/1382, right before

---

822 Not much is known about this Italian traveler. He came from Italian nobility and was born in Siena in 1370. His wide travels in the Middle East made him a businessman, but he settled primarily in Syria. He became fluent in Arabic and occasionally translated letters for Barquq, whom he knew personally. For more on him see the introduction of Walter J. Fischel to the English translation of his biography of Barquq, “Ascensus Barcoch (I),” 59–61. Fischel describes this biography as “the first and earliest Western Christian comprehensive account on Barquq and his time. His work is characterized by an astounding degree of trustworthiness and reliability, free from any bias or tendentious derogatory remarks, considering that it was written by a devout Catholic Christian. . . . The value of his work is enhanced considerably by the fact that he wrote as an eye witness of most of the events which he described and as one who had personal connections with some of the leading emirs, and even with Barquq himself.” See introduction to “Ascensus Barcoch (I),” 62.
824 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:353.
he was enthroned. Only then, and with the death of Baraka, was Barqūq in full control. However, this was not an easy time for him and he encountered resistance over the next decade.

In 784/1382 al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī was deposed and the rule of the Qalāwūnid line was interrupted. However, al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī was reinstated later for a brief period of time before his final deposition. After al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī’s first deposition, Barqūq was enthroned ‘al-Malik al-Ẓāhir,’ so named by the famous qādī Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī because he was enthroned during the Zuhr prayer. Other powerful amīrs were not happy with this, and two specifically caused the most trouble: Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī and Miṇṭāsh. Al-Maqrīzī in his al-Sulūk, Ibn Taghri Birdī in his al-Nujūm, Ibn Iyās in his Badā‘i’, and de Mignanelli in his Ascensus Barcoch, all of whom treat his reign extensively, explain the details of this fitna. Both Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī and Miṇṭāsh went into battle against Barqūq and managed to scare him into hiding. He escaped to a house in the Ṣalība area next to the madrasa of Shaykhū.

Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī put al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥājjī on the throne one more time, with the title ‘al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī’ (second reign: 791–92/1389–90). Now Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī was the atābak and controller of the state’s affairs, together with Miṇṭāsh. Meanwhile Barqūq was apprehended and sent to Karak, where he was imprisoned. Miṇṭāsh wanted him killed, but Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī preferred to keep him imprisoned. This caused a quarrel between the two amīrs and Miṇṭāsh imprisoned Yalbughā al-Nāṣirī in Alexandria. Consequently, Mintash became the sole authority in the state. Described as an impulsive character, Miṇṭāsh marched towards Greater Syria to rid himself of Barqūq, who had

---

825 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:473.
managed to escape with the help of those holding him captive in Karak and the people of Karak, who supported him. The two small armies met at Shaqhab and a battle ensued, with Barqūq emerging victorious. Back in Cairo, Barqūq’s *mamlūks* who were imprisoned in the Citadel freed themselves, which helped Barqūq even more in reclaiming his throne.

After a detailed description of what happened with Minṭāsh and Yalbugā al-Nāṣirī, de Mignanelli recounts a speech given by Barqūq, to which he was supposedly an eyewitness, to the *mamlūks* and the peasants who aided him. This speech is not found in any other source, and thus it cannot be corroborated. It aims to show a compassionate and humble Barqūq, recounting his life and showing his disappointment in being betrayed. His gratitude to those who came to his aid seems to have been immense. He tells them, “My happiness was to see you happy.”

Barqūq deposed al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī and had him sent to the royal quarters in the Citadel where his family was residing. In this way the second reign of Barqūq resumed in 792/1390. Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba states that Barqūq went after all his enemies and eliminated all of them, so as to be able to rule without future trouble. De Mignanelli, whose view of Barqūq opposes that of Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, tells us that the whole of Egypt was happy as his second reign commenced. Even the young and deposed al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī was supposedly happy, since he was “completely effeminate and had no strength for anything else. Barqūq gave him a large income so that he lived splendidly and

---

Now that all the internal enemies were dead he started creating new positions, demoting Turks and promoting his fellow Circassians. He ruled in peace until Timūr Lang appeared on the scene.830

Barqūq’s excellent managerial skills are clear from many events, decisions, and anecdotes. As he fought his enemies throughout his first reign he still managed to pay attention to some of his duties, as the person with the most authority and then as sultan. For example, in 781/1380, when he was ruling on behalf of the young ‘Afi`, he ordered the cleaning and landscaping of the Rumayla square, which had been abandoned after the death of Sha`bān. He assigned the job of cleaning and repairing it to the amīrs, and it became beautiful again.831 In 782/1381, when he was still amīr kabīr, he abolished the prostitution/singing tax (ḍamān al-maghānī) in Ḥamāh, Karak, Shawkak, and Zefta. In ‘Ayn Tāb he abolished the taxes on salt, in Bira the taxes on flour, and other taxes in the cities of Egypt and Greater Syria.832 After Barqūq’s enthronement in 785/1383, Cairo flourished. Al-Maqrīzī comments on the availability and good pricing of foodstuffs from meat to barley.833 He fortified Cairo and other cities, such as Damanhūr, before the episode of Yalbughā al-Nāṣiri.834 Other major infrastructural works were carried out in many places across his empire.835

829 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 160.
830 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 166.
833 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Suluk, 3:509. It will be seen shortly that al-Maqrīzi wrote horrible things about Barqūq; he was the historian most critical of Barqūq, at times bordering on hate. Sami Massoud deals with this issue in his article “Al-Maqrizī as a Historian of the Reign of Barqūq.”
Barqūq’s personal traits, as described by the historians and gleaned from the detailed events of his reign, show an extremely clever and energetic character. His deep and loud voice was balanced by immense charm. As an amīr he was able to bring to Egypt his father and several of his family members, all of whom were given titles and jobs. (He asked the same slave trader, ‘Uthmān, who had bought him earlier to bring him his family.) His political acumen is clear from such anecdotes as the kindness he showed al-Manṣūr Ḥājjī in front of Cairo’s populace after he deposed him and started his second rule. After all, the young Qalawunid sultan was Barqūq’s stepson, since Barqūq married Sha‘bān’s widow. Barqūq is described as courageous, strict, chivalrous, extremely intelligent, possessing great political acumen, knowledgeable, extremely cunning, and a good planner and manager. He also involved himself in the judicial system and twice a week would go hear people and arbitrate between them, so that people were wary of inflicting injustice on each other. His personality was such that nobody could interfere or have a say in matters other than his own profession, which resulted in a high degree of specialization. It does not seem that he was a dictator, because he is described as a sultan who always consulted with his amīns and others about matters of state and took what they said into consideration. Ibn Khaldūn, who was, for all intents and purposes a fan and supporter of Barqūq, always stressed the shortcomings and evil behavior of Barqūq’s enemies so as to put Barqūq in a good light.

836 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 158.
837 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:403.
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Many of Barqūq’s decisions made him popular and loved by the populace and the mamluks. He reinstated certain rituals of the Bahri period including ceremonial processions, celebrating feasts, and, most important, making the great Iwān in the Citadel functional again.\footnote{Ibn Taghri Birdi, \textit{al-Manhal}, 3:337.} This Iwān is where he sat to mete out justice, arbitrate, and rule the mazālim court. Its other title was dār al-‘adl (hall of justice). The great Bahri Mamluk sultan al-Naṣir Muḥammad had previously used this to his advantage because of his heightened sense of danger, which Barqūq shared with him. Al-Naṣir Muḥammad presided regularly over the mazālim sessions himself, instead of the nā‘īb, in that same iwān, which he reconstructed in 711/1311.\footnote{Rabbat, \textit{The Citadel}, 192.} Thus Barqūq was simply reviving the act and memory of a great sultan, one who had been loved by the populace and had immense authority. Authority was partly derived from the administration of justice, which is why the Iwān was called dār al-‘adl.

Barqūq had a sincere interest in appearing as a just ruler in order to gain more support from the populace and control over his court officials. He knew what overly powerful amīrs were capable of doing from all the previous plots, skirmishes, and battles. Right after al-Naṣir’s death in 741/1341 the mazālim sessions were apparently held in the palace of the reinstituted viceroys and no longer in the great Iwān, which
meant that power was in the hands of the *amīrs* and not the sultans. Barquq’s intelligence drove him to use this structure and concept to assure that the first Circassian sultan had power and authority, and moved the tradition back to the Iwān in the Citadel from which he ruled and in which he presided over the *mażālim*, but according to al-Maqrīzi “it was only to assert the *rusūm* (protocol) of the kingdom” with no genuine care for justice.

Another thing that bolstered his popularity was his dedication to pious and religious people. His attitude to religious functionaries did change for the worse after they issued a *fatwa* for his death when he was imprisoned in Karak, but he still was trying to be good to them. He distributed a lot of alms and was particularly kind and generous to Sufis. He fed the poor and distributed money often in Cairo, the Ḥijāz, and other cities. Ibn Taghrī Birdī’s account gives many details of what he distributed and where. All of these factors and others contributed to the populace’s love of Barquq; even al-Maqrīzi comments that Barquq always protected them.

De Mignanelli sums up Barquq as an *amīr kabīr* before he ascended the throne:

Barquq won many friends by service but even more by ambition. . . . Thanks to the good head with which he was endowed, everything was prosperous. He gave good counsel, always in the name of the Sultan, his master as he called him, though the boy had little sense. While he was ruling with such shrewdness, he was much praised.

---

848 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (I),” 73.
As has already been mentioned, al-Maqrīzī has more bad than good to say about Barqūq.\textsuperscript{849} He emphasizes his negative aspects such as being avaricious, allowing lowly people to ascend to positions of power via bribery. Ibn Taghri Birdi argues against this view in his \textit{al-Nujūm}.\textsuperscript{850} One issue brought up by al-Maqrīzī that does indeed seem very truthful in view of the events of Barqūq’s reign is Barqūq’s conniving nature.\textsuperscript{851} This was part and parcel of his political acumen and an important reason for his ability to survive as long as he did while overcoming very strong enemies. It was his wisdom and patience in dealing with his enemies that enabled him to get rid of so many of them without appearing vengeful.\textsuperscript{852} Al-Maqrīzī’s bias seems to have included Barqūq’s entire ethnic group: he disliked all Circassians.\textsuperscript{853} He does eventually soften his opinion, and his criticisms of Barqūq’s second reign are not as negative or biased. He even mentions some of Barqūq’s good deeds and traits.\textsuperscript{854}

Barqūq dealt frequently with the international domain. The Jalayrid connection is very important in this context. Already in 785/1383, a year after his enthronement, messengers from Sultan Aḥmad Jalāyir (r. 784–812/1382–1410) arrived, bearing gifts of textiles, wild animals, and other items.\textsuperscript{855} In 788/1386 a letter arrived from Aḥmad

\textsuperscript{850} Massoud, “Historian of the Reign of Barqūq,” 121. Massoud has already shown that the bribery was only mentioned by al-Maqrīzī and copied from him by Ibn Iyās over a century later. No other historian reports this method for collecting money. See Massoud, “Historian of Barqūq,” 128.
\textsuperscript{851} Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:316, 379, 705, 734.
\textsuperscript{852} Massoud, “Historian of the Reign of Barqūq,” 124.
\textsuperscript{853} Massoud, “Historian of the Reign of Barqūq,” 129–30. The reason behind al-Maqrīzī’s animosity is not clear. It could have been his disappointment in the Turkish rule ending or a personal dislike of Barqūq. Al-Maqrīzī’s tone against Barqūq eventually mellowed down. Massoud, “Historian of the Reign of Barqūq,” 135.
\textsuperscript{854} Massoud, “Historian of the Reign of Barqūq,” 132.
\textsuperscript{855} Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:487.
warning against the advances of Timūr Lang.\textsuperscript{856} A year later Timūr defeated the Qarā Quyūnlū ruler Qarā Muḥammad and encroached on Ṭamīd. Barquq prepared a mighty army and sent it to Aleppo to face Timūr’s army. Since Barquq was always there helping, in 790/1388 Qarā Muḥammad struck coins in his name and called Barquq ‘sultan’ in the Friday prayers in Tabriz, himself settling for being Barquq’s deputy there.\textsuperscript{857} In 795/1392 a messenger came from Bistām announcing that Timūr had killed the last Muzaffarid ruler in Shiraz and sent his head to Baghdad, where Aḥmad was ruling. Timūr eventually took Baghdad from Aḥmad, who had a bad reputation as a vicious ruler but was a poet, an artist, and a great patron of the book.\textsuperscript{858} Aḥmad then fled to Mamluk lands after his throne was usurped by Timūr.\textsuperscript{859} Aḥmad arrived in Cairo in 796/1393 and was met graciously by Barquq, who welcomed him and prepared him a house or palace by the Lake of the Elephant. Barquq supplied him with money, clothing, and slaves. He even let him join his arbitration sessions in the great Iwān in the Citadel.\textsuperscript{860}

In the same year Barquq married Aḥmad’s niece, Tundi bint Ḥusayn ibn Uways. Later in the year Aḥmad prepared to reclaim his throne and was supplied with amīrs and soldiers for the task. Barquq lead them to the mausoleum of Imām Shāfī’i and then to Sayyida Nafisa’s to pray and distribute alms before the army marched with Aḥmad, in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[856] Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Sulūk}, 3:552.
\item[858] De Mignanelli describes Aḥmad as “a wretched and abominable person and . . . a disgrace to the nobility of his ancient house.” See de Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 168. The Arabic sources speak very badly of him as well; see Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAṣqalānī, \textit{Inbāʾ}, 2:465–68, and al-Maqrīzī, \textit{Durār}, 1:234–43 (where he is commended as a great poet and calligrapher).
\end{footnotes}
order to bestow *baraka* on them. Al-Maqrīzī was able to take Baghdad back. Meanwhile the Ottoman sultan Bayāzid Yıldırım (r. 791–804/1389–1402) sent to Barqūq, offering 200,000 soldiers to aid Barqūq against Timūr in case he needed them. Meanwhile, the Ottoman sultan Bayāzid Yıldırım (r. 791–804/1389–1402) sent to Barqūq, offering 200,000 soldiers to aid Barqūq against Timūr in case he needed them. 862

Al-Maqrīzī’s bias against Barqūq made him blame the sultan for ruining relations with the Turcomans in Anatolia and some Arab tribes in Egypt and Syria. In spite of this, his success as the only monarch to scare the ferocious Timūr must have made al-Maqrīzī’s words seem hollow. When Qarā Muḥammad took Tabriz, Barqūq’s name was inserted in the *khutba* and coins were minted in his name. This was also the case in Mardin, Mosul, and Sinjar. 864

The most important international interaction 865 was with Timūr. Timūr was unable to march on Barqūq’s kingdom while Barqūq was alive. 867 The minute he heard of Barqūq’s death, he attacked, and this is when he was able to take Syria. This shows how formidable Barqūq was! In 796/1393 he sent Barqūq an aggressive letter of admonition, which Barqūq answered fiercely. 868 According to the Arabic sources, this reply caused Timūr to withdraw. 869 Their encounters always led to Timūr’s retreat and it was Barqūq who managed to delay the massive destruction caused by the tyrant later on, after Barqūq’s death.

865 The focus is on his interactions with the East and not the West. Embassies to and from Italy will not be discussed here because there is thus far no evidence that they had any influence on Qur’ān illumination during that time.
866 Many details of the correspondences, encounters, and conversations are recorded by de Mignanelli. See de Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 166–69.
869 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 169.
Despite all the political trouble he experienced in his reign, he had the time and resources to become one of the greatest patrons of the arts. It seems that he had good taste and appreciated beauty. An anecdote recounted by de Mignanelli is very revealing. As de Mignanelli recounts a dream Barquq had while napping in the mosque that his first master, Yalbughā al-‘Umarī al-Khāṣṣakī, built outside of Damascus, he tells us that Barquq often went there because he liked the “jeweled floor,” presumably meaning the marble flooring and its patterns. We have seen the Qurān manuscripts he commissioned and endowed; this establishes a clear connection between himself the great Bahri sultans who preceded him. This was also true in the case of architecture. The complex he left in Bayn al-Qāṣrayn, the most important part of the city politically and economically, still stands to tell of magnificent and beautiful art. It is right next to the first cruciform madrasa in Cairo, that of al-Nāṣir, which is in turn next to the complex of Qalāwūn (Pl. 439).

Barquq was indeed making a statement and linking himself to these great monarchs by choosing this location. To accomplish this in the busiest area in Cairo during that time, Barquq had to exchange a funduq (hotel) owned by the descendants of al-Nāṣir which stood there, called Khān al-Zakāt, with a piece of land. The order for construction was issued in 786/1384. His amīr Jarkas al-Khalīfī, amīr akhūr (master of the horses), was in charge of the building and he did a splendid job. The completion date mentioned in the inscriptions on the façade and inside the mausoleum is 788/1386. He ordered that the bodies of his deceased children and his father be moved to the

---

870 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (I),” 66.
871 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:519.
872 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 225.
mausoleum in the new construction, and then had a huge banquet celebrating its opening together with the elite and the qādis. Both Jarkas and the engineer in charge were promoted.\textsuperscript{873} This engineer was Aḥmad ibn al-Ṭūlūnī (d. 801/1398), the most famous of Mamluk engineers, whose family spent the late fourteenth century and entire fifteenth century designing and building. They also were heavily involved in the government bureaucracy, and some were scholars. Both al-Ṭūlūnī’s daughter and sister were later wedded to Barqūq, which elevated the family’s status immensely. This master builder started his career as a stone mason and carpenter and eventually became very close to Barqūq. He is described as muhandis (engineer/architect), kabīr al-ṣunā‘ (lead craftsman), or kabīr al-muhandisīn (chief engineer/architect).\textsuperscript{874}

The madrasa was also a khānqaḥ and a Friday mosque. It taught the four madhāhib, Qur’ān exegesis, Qur’ān reading/recitation (the seven methods), and ḥadīth. It had seven teachers for each of these specializations.\textsuperscript{875} The numbers of students stipulated in the waqf were 125 and the Sufis lodged there were sixty.\textsuperscript{876} Four of these Sufis were to be assigned by the nāzīr to bring the rab‘as (seen in chapter four) from the madrasa to the khānqaḥ after ‘āṣr prayer to be read; after the recitation they were responsible for collecting and returning them. These four were paid a bit more than the


\textsuperscript{876} Waqf 51/9, line 829. Parts of this \textit{waqf} are published in Mustafa, \textit{Madrasa, Hanqāḥ und Mausoleum}, 120–39.
The rabʿas were returned to the khāzin al-kutub, also a Sufi, who was stationed in the madrasa where all manuscripts were kept and was in charge of their upkeep. Also assigned to the building was a good calligrapher, who had to be morally sound and knowledgeable in all calligraphy rules to teach the master scripts (thuluth, naskh, riqāʾ, etc.). He was assigned a spot in the building by the nāzir (administrator) to carry out his teaching.

The madrasa was cruciform with a qibla iwān that was said to have the most beautiful painted wooden ceiling in Mamluk architecture (Pl. 440). The doors overlooking the courtyard and leading into the individual madrasas are wooden with bronze fittings (Pl. 441). The bronze is in the shape of a bukhrāyya (medallion) seen on Qurʿān covers and on side medallions in frontispieces of the Star Polygon Group workshop, as well as on some of Barquq’s own Qurʿān manuscripts, an example of which is QUR 595 (Pl. 330). The doors in the building with this design are six in number, and an examination by James Allan suggested that this design “was to become characteristic of Burji door designs.” The octagonal stone minaret of the building resembles that of Umm al-Sultān Shaʿbān’s madrasa in having a carved middle section which is inlaid with marble. This was another connection to the very recent artistic past and a link to great Bahri patrons. Another such connection is a marble panel that meets the visitor in the frontal wall of the vestibule (Pl. 442), similar to one in the vestibule of the complex of Sultan Ḥasan (Pl. 443). The cruciform madrasa also recalls

877 Waqf 51/9, lines 854–58.
878 Waqf 51/9, lines 866–88.
879 Waqf 51/9, lines 2185–90.
881 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 227.
that of Sultan Hasan, albeit on a smaller scale because of space restrictions. The main or qibla iwān with the beautiful carpet-like painted wooden ceiling (Pl. 440) is composed of three aisles (a tripartite composition) (Pl. 444), seen earlier, in 1283, in the madrasa of Qalāwūn (Pl. 445), a few meters south of this complex. This is yet another connection to the Qalawunids. It also seems from this building that the craftsmen were ingeniously playing with the decorative details: not only was the wooden ceiling unique and magnificent, but his foundation inscription, placing his name on the right-hand side of the protruding portal, was also unique (Pl. 446). The beginning and ending letters of words in the thuluth script used are braided into something similar to Buddhist knots bordering the upper part of the inscription and lying on top of the delicate arabesque beneath the script.

The only sultan on our list of patrons who was not murdered was Barquq. During the final years of his second reign he elevated only men he had tested. He had collected a lot of wealth and was feared by everyone, because he was brutal in his punishments to those who, in his eyes, deserved it. He had Syria under control—the most troublesome area, since he was not liked there—and at the end of his life led a quieter existence with more repose. He died sometime in his sixties after coming back to Cairo from a confrontation with Timūr Lang in Diyār Bakr. His death took place in the year 801/1399 in the Citadel of Cairo after a few days of illness. The total length of his rule was around sixteen or seventeen years, not counting his days as amīr kabīr before ascending the

882 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 228–29.
884 De Mignanelli, “Ascensus Barcoch (II),” 171.
In accordance with his will, he was first buried in a hawsh built by the amīr Jarkas al-Khalīfī, where a few saints were buried. This was al-turba al-Zāhiriyya where the saint Abū Bakr al-Bajāʿī al-Maghribī al-Majzūb was buried, among others. He was placed at the feet of the saints already buried there, as his will directed. His wealth was immense, which is no surprise; he was, after all, a Mamluk sultan. Various historians give us a list of his possessions and their values. For instance, he left five thousand camels, six thousand horses, fur, clothing, money (cash), grains, and sugar, amounting to over a million dīnārs. This was in addition to many other things, including his own mamlūks, who numbered five thousand in total. These mamlūks were mostly Circassians; he preferred Circassians to other ethnicities and gave them more opportunities.

Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (r. 801–808/1399–1405, 808–15/1405–12)

Faraj was referred to as “Ashʿam mulūk al-Islām.” Al-Malik al-Nāṣir Zayn al-Dīn Abū al-Saʿādāt Faraj ibn Barqūq ibn Ānṣ al-Chārkāsī al-Miṣrī was born in 791/1388 to a Rūmī (Anatolian) mother as his father was escaping from Karak; this is why he changed his name from Bulghāq to Faraj. He was enthroned on the morning after Barqūq’s death in 801/1399 when he was only ten years old. As he grew older (he actually had a short life, since he died at twenty-four) he killed hundreds of the Circassian amīrs who

---

887 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, 3:328; Ibn Qaḍī Shuhba, Tārikh, 4:42.
890 Meaning fitna in Turkish according to al-Maqrīzī; see al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 4:227.
belonged to his father. It was under Faraj that the sources say that real and major economic decline actually began in 806/1403, which led to the devaluation of the dirham in the same year. Al-Maqrizi gives three main reasons for this decline under Faraj: corruption of officials, heavy taxation on peasants, and the use of copper coins in place of silver ones. The decline was also accelerated by the attack of Timur on Syria in 803/1400 and the devastation he caused there. Added to this were the natural calamities that occurred, especially the low level of the Nile starting in 806/1403, which lasted for years.

While he was too young to blame for the infighting of the amīrs during the early years of his reign it was still taken as a bad omen. About a year after his enthronement—so he must have been eleven years old—the first fitna between the amīrs commenced. It started with Faraj wanting to rule for real because he had reached puberty. Two factions opposed each other on this account, one in his support and the other against the decision to give him real ruling privileges. The infighting within the different mamlūk factions weakened the Egyptian army, as suggested by Ibn Taghrī Birdī, and might have been an important reason behind their eventual loss to the Timurid army in Syria. As the Timurid army was overrunning and ravaging northern

---

893 Al-Maqrīzī, Ighāthat al-umma, 43–47.
894 Ayalon, “Economic Decline,” 113. It is most interesting that even after taking Syria, Timūr sent gifts to the sultan of Egypt. In 806/1403 he sent messengers with an elephant mounted by a man carrying two green flags, a leopard, eagle, and clothes. They were graciously met by Faraj, who gave them money and food, ordered them not communicate with anyone, and then permitted them to leave. Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulīk, 3:1111–12.
896 Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, 8:383.
Syrian lands, the *amīrs* in Egypt were mismanaging affairs and fighting over *iqṭā’s*, refusing to believe that the danger was imminent or even real.  

When finally the severity of the situation became clear, Faraj decided to go—or was sent—to Syria with an army in attempt to save what still remained. He met Timūr’s army and was defeated in Damascus, but Timūr also suffered losses among his family members. We need to bear in mind that Faraj was still a child and it was in fact the *amīrs* who were taking all the decisions and fighting. Thus the Egyptian army was an army without a leader.

After the loss to Timūr in 808/1405, Faraj abdicated and disappeared for two months. The *mamlūks* enthroned Faraj’s brother ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and entitled him ‘al-Manṣūr.’ ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ruled only for seventy days and was killed by Faraj once he reclaimed his throne. Faraj continued to meet with resistance and fighting from many *amīrs*. They eventually killed him in 815/1412 in Damascus and did not even bury him, but threw his body on a rubbish dump. He was buried a few days later, after some people in Damascus found the body, in the cemetery of Bāb al-Fārādīs in Damascus.

Throughout his *al-Nujūm* Ibn Taghri Birdī does not give a good impression of Faraj, especially since his own father, *amīr* Taghri Birdī, was mistreated by Faraj and his money was confiscated. However, in the obituary in *al-Manhal*, he describes him as a courageous and generous young man before telling us that he was unjust, outrageous,

---

899 On this point Ibn Taghri Birdī gives a very interesting anecdote. He was told by *amīr* Asanbāy, who was taken by Timur and forced to serve him, that he had seen two (surprising) armies who faced Timur: an army without a leader, the Egyptian army, and a leader without an army, the Ottoman sultan Bayazid. See Ibn Taghri Birdī, *al-Manhal*, 8:394. 
and conspicuous in committing sins, in addition to being tyrannical. It has been held against Faraj that he killed so many *mamluks*—almost a massacre—because it was unprecedented by earlier sultans.  

The events of a relatively long reign (thirteen years) are mostly negative, partly because of mismanagement and partly because of natural disasters. Volumes 3/3 and 4/1 of al-Maqrīzī’s *al-Sulūk* and volume 12 of Ibn Taghī Birdī’s *al-Nujūm* are full of events of this sort. Among the misfortunes was a severe cold spell that caused the death of several people in 806/1403; food prices were exorbitant; and later in the year severe heat accompanied by wind caused ships in the Nile to sink, several people to die, and many diseases to spread. So many people were severely sick that the prices of medication escalated dramatically.  

The year Faraj died (815/1412) witnessed a series of *fitnas*, and he had to spend much time in Syria, fighting *amīrs* there and spending huge sums of money on these wars. All these factors contributed to a severe decline in the economy of his empire. It was not just Cairo that suffered, and the villages destroyed in Syria because of the military skirmishes, but also Alexandria, al-Buḥayra, al-Sharqiyya, al-Gharbiyya, and Giza. Even al-Fayyūm suffered severely, and Upper Egypt as well. Cairo’s suburbs were deteriorating quickly and the pneumonic plague killed several thousands. All of this was blamed by al-Maqrīzī on Faraj’s outrageous and sinful behaviors on many levels.  

Faraj was such an unimpressive ruler that it is difficult to imagine that he could have been such a successful patron of the arts, especially since the economic and

---

political situations were dire. The Qur’ān manuscripts we saw in chapter four

demonstrate this patronage, and so does his complex in the Northern Cemetery, which is

one of the finest buildings built under Mamluk patronage. The two buildings he

commissioned in Cairo are a grand khānqāh-mausolea in the Northern Cemetery,

planned by his father, and a small zāwīya in the heart of the city outside of Bāb

Zuwayla. Barquq, who was buried at his own request among many saints in the

Northern Cemetery, dedicated 80,000 dinars for construction purposes.905

The building is in riwāq style with two mausolea flanking the qibla riwāq (Pl.

447). The inscription running around the base of the dome in the northern mausoleum

states that it was built in 803/1400 by Faraj for Barquq; another beneath this one

mentions the name of Sultan ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Faraj’s brother, and the date 808/1405.

Faraj finally finished the entire construction in 813/1410, which is commemorated in the

inscription band around the southern dome. In charge of construction was Yūnus al-

Dawādār, appointed by Barquq, but under Faraj it was amīr Lajīn al-Ṭurunṭāy.906 It is

quite possible that the whole project was envisioned and detailed by Barquq and Faraj

simply followed the instructions.

Symmetry is the most important feature in this building (Pl. 448). The

decoration is minimal except in the mausolea, where the marble creates a colorful dado

around the walls (Pl. 449).

905 Behrens-Abouseif, *Cairo of the Mamluks*, 231.

The Royal Women

Khawand Tatar al-Hijāziyya (d. 778/1376)

Unfortunately very little is found on Khawand Tatar al-Hijāziyya in the sources. She is mentioned only as the daughter of al-Nāṣir who was married to amīr Malktumur al-Ḥijāzī and died in 778/1376.\footnote{Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’, 1:149.} In al-Jamāliyya she constructed both a palace and a madrasa in the area where the Fatimid palace Qaṣr al-Zumurrud stood. The amīr Qawṣūn al-Nāṣirī (d. 742/1342) had taken the Fatimid palace and made it into his residence, but after his death Tatar bought it and built both her palace and madrasa on the site.

Tatar’s palace was described by al-Maqrīzī as magnificent and highly adorned. He also mentions that Tatar put all her effort into making it beautiful and grand. However, at a later date it was abused by amīr Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ustādār and Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq, and at some point converted into a prison. By the early fifteenth century it was dilapidated, with all its marble and decorative features stripped out.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḳhitāt, 4:2:534.}

The madrasa is small in size, because of the narrow plot of land dedicated to it. It was finished in 761/1359.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḳhitāt, 3:231–32.} The plan is odd: the building is composed of two iwāns, each with a miḥrāb (Pl. 450). The stucco inscription band is typical of the Bahri period and is elaborately executed (Pl. 451). There is a mausoleum on the southwest side of the building. Tatar dedicated her madrasa to two schools of jurisprudence, Shāfi‘ī and Mālikī, and endowed it with a library. It also functioned as a Friday mosque since she assigned it a khutba. The mausoleum she built for herself was assigned Qur‘ān reciters

\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī, al-Ḳhitāt, 4:2:534.}
to recite day and night, while next to it there was a sabīl-kuttāb, where orphans were fed, clothed, and taught the Qur’ān. The madrasa met with the same fate as her palace when Jamāl al-Dīn al-U斯塔dār made it into a prison for people from whom he confiscated properties.

Umm al-Sulṭān Sha’bān—Khawand Baraka (d. 774/1372)

Several accounts survive of Khawand Baraka, but not much is said about her origins or her life before the ascension of Sha’bān to the throne. They all refer to her as ‘Baraka Khatūn bint ‘Abdallāh’ and ‘mother of Sultan Sha’bān ibn Ḥusayn.’ Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, in his Inbā’, mentions her under 774/1372, which is the correct date of death, but also by mistake in the deaths of 784/1382 as well. In 784/1382 the name he mentions for her is ‘Jahātāy al-Jahfaliyya mother of al-malik al-Ashraf.’ This is the only place where we find her original name.

910 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭāt, 4:2:531–32.
911 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭāt, 4:2:534.
912 The biographical dictionaries that have an entry on her are Ibn Taghri Birū’s (d. 874/1469) al-Manḥal al-sāfī wa-al-mustawfī ba’d al-wāfī, al-Daftī al-shāfī ‘alā al-manḥal al-shāfī, and Ṭarīkh ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s Inbā’ al-ghumr bi anbā’ al-‘umr, and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s (d. 852/1448) al-Durar al-kāmina fi a’yān al-mā’a al-thāmina. Al-Manḥal has her tarjama under “Umm al-Sulţān,” while al-Durar’s tarjama is under “Khawand Baraka.” As for the chronicles, the following were examined for information on her: Al-Maqrīzī’s (d. 813/1411) Kitāb al-sulūk li-ma’rifat duwal al-mulūk; Ibn Taghri Birū’s al-Nuṣūm al-zahira fi mulūk miṣr wa-al-gāhir, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s ‘Inbā’ al-ghumr bi-anbā’ al-‘umr, and Ibn Iyās’ (d. 928/1522) Badā’i’ al-zuhūr fi waqā’i’ al-duḥūr.
913 Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’, 1:271, 41. The name ‘Abdallāh, which we will see as part of the names of amīrs as well, is the invariable name for a fictitious father. It has been argued that this was done because in most cases the mamlūks did not know their fathers. However, David Ayalon successfully argues otherwise and suggests that it was used to make a distinction or create a veil between the non-Muslim past of any given mamlūk and his present. This makes sense because most of these mamlūks and slave girls were taken when they were young teenagers, and even if they had forgotten their homelands, they would not have forgotten the names of their fathers. David Ayalon, “Names, Titles and ‘nisbas’ of the Mamluks,” Israel Oriental Studies 5 (1975): 210–12.
Khawand Baraka is also referred to as *al-mūwallida* by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī and al-Maqrizī. David Ayalon has established that this title means ‘mixed breed,’ which tells us that she was most probably non-Turkish in origin. It was Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn who collected *mūwallidāt* in great numbers, because his taste in women towards the end of his life shifted to slave girls of mixed origins. After the death of al-Nāṣir the class of these *mūwallidāt* retained its power.

All our sources mention that Khawand Baraka married the *atābak* Uljāy al-Yūsufī after Ḥusayn’s death (son of al-Nāṣir), that she died in 774/1372, and that she was buried in her *madrasa*, the one she built in al-Tabbāna. She was considered one of the greatest women of her time. She was pious, generous, and known for her good deeds. She is best known for both her *madrasa* and her pilgrimage caravan. She went on pilgrimage in 770/1368, the same year the *madrasa* was built. Both the biographical dictionaries and the chronicles elaborately describe the *hajj* caravan. Because of the impressiveness of this caravan, the year 770/1368 was named the “year of Umm al-Sulṭān.” She distributed a lot of money in Cairo before leaving, and also while she was on *hajj* in Mecca and Medina. Al-Maqrizī adds in his *al-Khitṭat* that she also believed in and loved spiritual or godly people (*wa kān lahā iʿtiqāḍ fī ahl al-khayr wa maḥabatun fī al-ṣāliḥīn*).
Her husband Uljay became important because of his marriage to her, which gave him prominence among the amīrs.919 She apparently lived on Rawda island, because it is mentioned that Sha‘bān, who loved her deeply, visited her often on Rawda and was there by her side when she became sick and eventually died.920 The fact that Sha‘bān cared a lot for her and was greatly saddened by her death is emphasized by all of sources. Ibn Qadi Shuhba mentions the fact that he consulted with her in matters of state and never opposed her, and Ibn al-Shiḥna in his al-Dhayl min kitāb al-manhal fī al-tawarīkh says the same.921 In his second biography, under the wrong date (784/1382), Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī mentions that she managed everything before her son was old enough to rule on his own, and that she did a good job in governing both the mamlūks and the populace, both of whom cherished her.922

Ibn Iyās provides more information about her death, giving her obituary in the annals for 774/1372. He adds that when her son heard she was in bad condition he set out from the Citadel to visit her. On the way he stopped to visit Ribāt al-Āthār (Āthar al-Nabī), probably for prayer and supplication on behalf of his mother. He also adds that her funeral procession started from Ṣafība Street and many amīrs attended it. He says that the people, al-nās,923 were very sad at her death because she was viewed as a great intercessor on their behalf before the Sultan.924

921 Ibn Qadi Shuhba, Tārikh, 2:418. Ibn al-Shiḥna’s work is still in manuscript form and has not been examined. See ‘Abd ar-Rāziq, La femme, 30.
923 This could mean either the mamlūks or the people of Cairo.
Al-Qalqashandī mentions Khawand Baraka in his Șubh al-aʿshā in the context of women’s titulature. He used her as an example of the first level of the first type of women’s titulature and says that he has seen in some dasāīr the following titles for the mother of Shaʿbān: al-jiha al-sharīfa, which is the highest of the titles for royal women; al-ʿāliya, al-kubrā, al-muʿażamma, which is exclusively for women in reigning families; al-muḥājjaba, al-ʾismā, al-khatūni, jalāl al-nisāʾ, also reserved for women from the ruling class; sayyidat al-khawāṭir, jamilat al-muḥājjabāt, jafilat al-maṣūnāt, and wālidat al-mulūk wa-al-salāṭīn.925

Let us take a closer look at some of her titles. ‘Khawand’ is what she is often called. It is originally a Persian term for ‘master’ or ‘prince’ for both males and females, but was used primarily to address women.926 In this sense, is used to mean ‘lady’ and usually referred to the wives of sultans.927 Her other important title is al-jiha. Literally it means ‘the direction,’ but was used metaphorically for women and occasionally for noble men to connote order or command. Its earliest use is in an inscription in Mecca in the name of Razīn bint ʿAbdallāh, mother of Imām al-Mustaẓhar bi-Allah, dated to 512/1118. Other Fatimid examples exist, including Shajar al-Durr as well.928 Al-Maqrīzī mentions that this title was one of Shajar al-Durr’s titles that were used when praying in

---

925 Al-Qalqashandi, Șubh al-ʿashā, 6:172. ʿAbd ar-Rāziq comments on the women who used these titles and other titles of women in the Bahri Mamluk period; see ʿAbd ar-Rāziq, La femme, 91–120.
926 However, I have read conversations in many sources between al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalawūn and people who address him as Khawand.
927 Al-Bāshā, al-Alqāb, 281.
928 Al-Bāshā, al-Alqāb, 248–49.
her name in the mosques.\textsuperscript{929} Wives and daughters of al-Nāṣir assumed this title as well. Thus in the Bahri Mamluk period, this title was used by women of the royal house.\textsuperscript{930}

An interesting title mentioned only in two of the Qur’an manuscripts she commissioned is \textit{al-mukhadhara} (Raṣīds 6 and 372) (Pls. 452 and 453). It is not mentioned in Ḥasan al-Bāshā’s work on the \textit{Alqāb} or any other dictionary. Its root is \textit{kh-dh-r}. The closest word to it in a normal dictionary is \textit{khudhruf}, which means ‘turban’ or ‘top.’ If this title has the same meaning, then it might mean in her case ‘the turbaned one.’

She left us a very impressive building in Cairo. While it is not as spectacular as those of the sultans we have examined, it is definitely a gem. This impressive \textit{madrasa} is located in al-Tabbāna Street in the area of al-Darb al-Aḥmar. This area was one of the most important under Bahri Mamluk rule and was heavily urbanized under the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. The mosques of his \textit{amīns} still stand as witnesses to this urbanization program. It is outside of Bab Zuwayla and to the southeast connecting Fatimid Cairo to the Citadel of Cairo.

The \textit{madrasa} is a cruciform one with four \textit{iwāns} surrounding the \textit{šaḥn} (courtyard), which is typical for its period (Pl. 454).\textsuperscript{931} It was constructed to teach both the Ḥanafī and Shāfī‘i schools of law.\textsuperscript{932} The two blocks for these schools of law can be

\textsuperscript{929} Al-Bāshā, \textit{al-Alqāb}, 249.
\textsuperscript{930} Al-Bāshā, \textit{al-Alqāb}, 249–50. The following three titles mean essentially the same thing: \textit{al-muhajjaba} (‘the veiled’), \textit{al-‘īsmā al-khatūnī} (‘the pure/protected lady’), \textit{jamīlat al-muḥājjabāt} (‘the most beautiful of the veiled’), and \textit{jalīlat al-maṣūmāt} (‘the most majestic of those protected’). They all emphasize the chastity associated with royal women. Al-Bāshā, \textit{al-Alqāb}, 461.
\textsuperscript{931} Other examples include the \textit{madrasa} of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn, the mosque-\textit{madrasa} of Sultan Ḥasan, and the \textit{madrasa} of Uljāy al-Yusūfī.
\textsuperscript{932} Al-Maqrīzī, \textit{al-Khīṭṭāt}, 4:2:620.
seen on the plan, occupying the western and eastern corners.\textsuperscript{933} Flanking the \textit{qibla iwān} are two domed mausolea, the eastern one bigger than the southern one. Both mausolea are connected with the \textit{qibla iwān} through windows. The eastern dome houses the body of our patron Khawand Baraka and other female members of the family,\textsuperscript{934} while the southern one houses the body of her son, Sultan Sha‘bān.\textsuperscript{935} Also buried with Sha‘bān is his son al-Mansūr Ḥājjī (d. 814/1411),\textsuperscript{936} the last of the Qalawunid house and the Bahri Mamluk rulers. Both domes are simple and fluted, carried on squinches rather than the elaborate \textit{muqarnas}-pendentive known for the period. To access the eastern dome one has to go through another room that was most probably used for the Sufi \textit{hadras} (gatherings of Sufis for the remembrance of God) or for storing the Qur’ān manuscripts that were endowed to the building (Pl. 454).\textsuperscript{937}

The interior decoration is also simple. It is mostly of marble adorning the \textit{mihrāb} in the \textit{qibla iwān} and the inscriptions around the \textit{sāhn} (Pl. 455). Only the eastern mausoleum has a \textit{mihrab} in it; the other does not. This is probably due to a lack of space in the smaller mausoleum.\textsuperscript{938} The rooms that lodged the students no longer exist, but the rooms for the service area are still in place. They surround the entrance vestibule, which is considered an exception. Usually the service area was placed at the back of the


\textsuperscript{934} A cenotaph in this mausoleum has an inscription carved in marble that reads “Basmala, this is the cenotaph of the basil leaf of paradise, the lady whom mercy is upon (rayḥānat al-fanna al-sitt al-marhumā), the hidden pearl, lady of ladies, the most beautiful of all ladies, sitt Zahra, daughter of his Excellency the deceased, the glorified Ḥusayn, son of his Excellency . . .”

\textsuperscript{935} All the historians say he was buried in it, except for Ibn Iyās, who says he was buried in a dome in front of the \textit{madrasa} in question. Ibn Iyās was most probably mistaken. Ibn Iyās, \textit{Badā‘i‘}, 1:2:182.

\textsuperscript{936} Al-Sakhāwī, \textit{al-Daw‘}, 3:87.

\textsuperscript{937} Bakhoum, “Madrasa of Umm al-Sultan,” 102.

\textsuperscript{938} Behrens-Abouseif, \textit{Cairo of the Mamluks}, 220.
building, not as the first thing accessed. But our architect was challenged by the shape of the plot of land and had to place the service area at the front, overlooking the main street, al-Tabbāna, and the madrasa proper behind it. The architect in this case was “a master of compromise.”

The exterior is very dominating and impressive (Pl. 456). The façade is a broken one that goes with the street. The first thing encountered, if one is heading towards the Citadel, is the hawd or the animal trough carrying the kuttāb, and then a mighty portal. The portal is Anatolian-Seljuk style in a Mamluk garb (Pl. 457), like the portal of the complex of Sultan Hasan. Around the conch of the portal is a shallow arabesque carved in stone. Further on, on the façade and after the portal, is the sabīl. The façade is made up of mushahhar stone (red stone alternating with cream-colored stone) and recesses topped with muqarnas cornices. These recesses contain the windows of the rooms of the service areas.

Although little of the interior decoration survives today, what remains shows that it was extravagantly built. This was noticed by Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Wahhāb in the 1940s, who remarked that the remains of golden decorations and gilding were visible. He concludes that this is a characteristic of buildings commissioned by women. Al-Maqrīzī also comments on the beauty of this madrasa, describing it as jafīla, or ‘majestic,’ and makes a point of noting the beauty of the marble.

939 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 219.
940 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 220.
941 The first time such decoration was encountered was in the mosque of al-Maridānī, also in al-Tabbāna, in the interior and on the exterior around the portals of the complex of Shaykhū on Ṣaḥība Street.
942 ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, Masājid, 1:183.
943 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Khiṭat, 4:2:622.
All the founding inscriptions in the building say that the *madrasa* was built by Sha‘bān for his mother. Since the founding date given in these inscriptions is 770/1368–69, we can calculate Sha‘bān’s age when it was built. Ibn Taghrī Birdī tells us that he was ten when he ascended the throne in 764/1363, which means that he was fifteen or sixteen when he commissioned the building.\(^944\) This is not too young for a sultan to commission a building, but it is a young age nonetheless, which makes one think that maybe someone else is behind the construction. All the chronicles and biographical dictionaries of the period refer to Khawand Baraka being buried in the *madrasa* that she built or in ‘her’ *madrasa* (*al-latī ‘ammarathā*\(^945\), *madrasatiḥā* *al-latī ‘anshā‘atiḥā*,\(^946\) *madrasatiḥa*\(^947\)). This means that she was perceived as the one who gave the order, whether directly or indirectly. She is also the one responsible for the *waqf* of the building, which is in her name (Waqq 47/7 in the National Archives of Egypt). We can thus conclude that she told her son to build the *madrasa* in this place and he did build it for her. She might have kept it in his name in order to bestow the prestige on him. We do know that Sha‘bān built another *madrasa* beneath the Citadel, as mentioned above. It was never finished, and this is why he was buried in his mother’s *madrasa*.

Other insights into Khawand Baraka’s personality can be inferred from her *waqf* document, including the fact that freed slave women are among the beneficiaries. Is it because she was once one of them? What she did is not unusual, but it shows her appreciation and acknowledgment of their importance. She does consider them family.

The appointment of the manumitted eunuch (*lālā*) Dīnār ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Ashrafi

(tawāshī) as nāzir of the waqf alongside her husband Uljāy al-Yusufī also expresses this sentiment. Freed slaves were sometimes named as administrators of the waqf alongside the children of the wāqif, and this apparently continued into the eighteenth century in the Mamluk households of Ottoman Egypt.

The first category of the poor to benefit from the revenues of the endowed properties are the poor widows of Mecca and Medina. This provision also speaks of her kindness towards poor women—she was, after all, a woman herself.

The Amīrs

Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī (d. 759/1358)

Sayf al-Dīn Şirghitmish ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Nāṣirī was an amīr of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad; he became the de facto ruler of Egypt after the death of amīr Shaykhū during the reign of Sultan Ḥasan. Şirghitmish was brought to Cairo by the slave trader Khwāja al-Šawwāf in 737–78/1337 and was immediately bought by al-Nāṣir for 80,000 dirhams, which was a very high price, the equivalent of 4,000 dinars at the time according to both Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī. It is noteworthy, however that in spite of the high expense of acquiring him he was not close to al-Nāṣir and remained in the tibāq

---

948 Waqf 47/7, line 635.
950 Waqf 47/7, lines 583–85.
951 An interesting fact regarding Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī’s progeny is that one of his grandsons reigned for a very short time. This was Sultan al-Muzaffār Aḥmad (r. 824/1421), enthroned at the age of a year and a half after the death of his father, the Circassian sultan al-Mu‘ayyad Shaykh (r. 815–24/1412–21). This great Circassian sultan had married the daughter of Şirghitmish Khawand Sa‘ādat, who bore him Aḥmad. See Ibn Iyās, Badā‘ī’, 2:63.
(the barracks in the Citadel where mamluks were kept for training before manumission), possibly until al-Nāṣir died, since these were the last years of al-Nāṣir’s life. Al-Nāṣir indentured him to a few shops, probably the ones he owned in Ṣaliba Street.954

Nothing much is heard about the amīr until the sultanate of al-Muẓaffar Ḥājjī (r. 747–48/1346–47). This was probably just as well for him, because these years of the 1340s were the most troublesome and politically unstable, so he avoided all the intrigues and the fights between Baṣhtāk, and Qawṣūn and others. Under al-Muẓaffar Ḥājjī he was sent with the Silāḥdār amīr Fakhr al-Dīn to Aleppo, who was assigned as nāʿib there. Şirghitmish kept ascending until he was one of the major players in the first reign of Ḥasan, the reign of al-Ṣāliḥ Śāliḥ (r. 752–55/1351–54) and once again under Ḥasan’s second reign, when he and Shaykhu ruled powerfully together until Shaykhu died. When Shaykhu died, Şirghitmish became the only de facto ruler for ten months, until he was imprisoned by Ḥasan in Alexandria, where he died in 759/1358.955 In 749/1348 he was amīr tablakhāna and a jamādār, but was deposed from this position by Ḥasan in 751/1350. Soon enough, in 753/1351–52 he was reinstated by Ḥasan until his death.956

Under the interim sultan al-Ṣāliḥ Śāliḥ, anyone with a request had to go to Şirghitmish. The sultan could not issue any orders without Şirghitmish’s approval, and even if he did, Şirghitmish would overrule it.957 One can only imagine the power and authority that this amīr yielded and exercised, and the money he must have had to support his patronage of material culture.

954 Al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 2:556.
956 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, 10:221.
957 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, 10:208.
His immense power can be seen from the anecdote relating to the wazīr ‘Alam al-Dīn ibn Ibrāhīm, known as Ibn Zanbūr. Ibn Zanbūr had at some point annoyed Širghitmish by mistakenly assigning wrong promotions in 752/1351. When he came to power, Širghitmish arrested the wazīr and his entourage. He also sent his mamluḵs to the houses owned by Ibn Zanbūr in Fustat, where his family was, and marked their doors. Širghitmish confiscated all his belongings, from clothes, gold, precious objects, and books to land in Lower and Upper Egypt. He also had Ibn Zanbūr, his wife, and his son beaten up and deeply humiliated the entire family, ending by exiling them from Cairo to Upper Egypt. He then appointed a new wazīr. There are more details to this anecdote, and Širghitmish’s behavior toward Ibn Zanbūr is very possibly not just because of the promotions but an accumulation of things. What is important is the power that Širghitmish yielded and the proof that at some point in time he was indeed the de facto ruler of the country.

In 752/1351, when Ḥasan was being deposed from his first reign, it was Širghitmish who was sent to lead a couple of other amīrs to drag the young sultan from his quarters. The powerful Sitt Ḥadaq, chief in charge of the women of al-Naṣīr Muḥammad, screamed and insulted Širghitmish as he was taking him out, and all of Ḥasan’s servants were crying. This is another indication of his audacity, strength, and power.

959 Ibn Ṭaghṣīrī Birdī, al-Nujum, 10:218–20; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 2:880; Ibrāhīm, “Naṣṣān jādīdan (Part I),” 126–27. The full list of Ibn Zanbūr’s belongings is given by al-Maqrīzī and it is quite fascinating (including gold objects, pearls, eunuchs, and boats on the Nile). He gives details of furniture, ceramics, metalwork, and other items, many of which were carried off by Širghitmish himself.
960 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 2:842.
Şirghitmish was a great administrator. In 755/1354 he was appointed as the nāzir of the bīmāristān of Qalāwūn. This bīmāristān at the time had decayed because of poor management; it lacked someone who spoke Turkish and the judge Alāʿ al-Din ibn al-Aṭrūsh did a bad job of managing it, especially since he wasted money on gifts to amīns instead of maintaining the residential quarters of the building. Upon his appointment, Şirghitmish toured the hospital and its patients, and its general deterioration upset him. He reviewed the endowments of the hospital and came up with a budget for refurbishment. The revised budget and the new management made more money available, around 40,000 dirhams monthly, for the construction work. Work commenced and he ordered that all the patients who were there for treatment should be protected. Şirghitmish also inspected the conditions of the scholars and Sufis associated with the place, followed up with them regularly, and made sure each was doing his assigned task. In 753/1352 he refurbished a zāwīya of al-Sharīf Mahdī below the Citadel near the zāwīya of Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn al-ʿAjamī. The latter zāwīya was built by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad for this Persian shaykh, who died in 724/1324. Al-Maqrīzī reports that during the amīr’s lifetime it was a residential area for Persian Sufis. This fact might have been what interested the amīr in building next to it. Şirghitmish also built fountains and refurbished dilapidated areas in Mecca and Medina.

The historians’ descriptions of Şirghitmish paint the picture of a handsome, powerful, oppressive, and unjust amīr who was at the same time generous, courageous,

---

962 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Khīṭāt, 4:2:812.
964 Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manḥal, 6:343.
and majestic. Širghitmish is most interesting because of his intellectual activity, and because he preferred Persians and the arts of their lands. He enjoyed the company of scholars and debated with them often on the subjects of jurisprudence and the Arabic language, which means he must have been proficient in both. He was quite biased in favor of the Ḥanafi school of jurisprudence, to which he dedicated his amazing madrasa.

Širghitmish was also a good reciter of the Qurʾān. He wrote well—in other words, he was a good calligrapher. His patronage of the Qurʾān manuscripts he left us (Raṣīds 149, 148, 147, 150, and 61 in Dār al-Kutub and 8099/182, 8100/183, 8101/184, and 8102/185 in al-Azhar Library) clearly indicates that the beauty of the Word was one of his main concerns. He even had in his possession Raṣīd 60 (chapter two), the magnificent Ilkhanid rabʿa penned by Mubārāk Shāh ibn ʿAbdallāh in Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq, that might have been finished in Cairo on his orders. As we have seen, there is no knowledge of how it reached him, but his love of Persians would have made such a gift to him possible; he might even have commissioned it. His love of calligraphy, and his reputation for a good hand, is consistent with the report of the historian al-Ṣafādī, Širghitmish’s contemporary, who saw in person the inscription band that Širghitmish produced on the façade of the sultan’s madrasa in Aleppo.
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967 Al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 2:558. The inscription is a verse from poem saying, “Life always claims back what it had given, Wished its generosity was stinginess.” Ironic and true in his case, as al-Ṣafādī comments, since all that he received of power and wealth was eventually taken away by Sultan Ḥasan. Al-Ṣafādī also wrote a panegyric for the amīr recounting his beauty, good traits, and magnificent madrasa, but never had a chance to read it or show it to him. See al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 2:559–60.
All the sources mention his admiration for Persians (‘ajam).\textsuperscript{968} He dedicated his building to them and helped them in Cairo. He assigned Persian Sufis to live in the madrasa, and most of the scholars teaching there were Persians.\textsuperscript{969} In 759/1358, when he was taken to prison in Alexandria, many of the lowly inhabitants of Cairo attacked the Persians in the city and in his madrasa and stole their belongings; now that their protector was gone, it seemed like a good opportunity to loot. They also attacked and robbed the amīr’s own shops on Ṣalība Street where he lived and built his madrasa.\textsuperscript{970} His art reflects the apparently casual statement by the historians that he “favors and is biased toward Persians.” As discussed in chapter two, Raṣīds 149 and 60 display the Chinese floral motifs transported to Cairo via the Ilkhanid world. This was the first appearance of these motifs in manuscripts or architecture in Cairo as we saw earlier in the patronage of Ḥasan. Whether the appearance of these motifs is due to Ṣirghitmish’s influence or Ḥasan’s is something that we cannot know for sure. However, it seems likely that it was Ṣirghitmish’s sponsoring and patronage of Persians in the city that was the most important element in play here.

Ṣirghitmish’s madrasa on Ṣalība Street is one of the most beautiful examples of Mamluk architecture (Pl. 458). It is a cruciform madrasa with a few interesting Persian architectural details (Pls. 459 and 460). Right next to the mosque of Āḥmad ibn Ṭulūn (262/876), almost encroaching on its walls, lies this madrasa built near the residence of the amīr and the shops he controlled. The work started in 756/1355 after the demolition of a few houses in the chosen spot. At the same time, Ṣirghitmish, who must have also

\textsuperscript{968} Al-Ṣafādī, A’yān, 2:558; Ibn Ṭaghḥī Birdī, al-Manhal, 6:343; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, al-Durar, 2:305; al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:44.
\textsuperscript{969} Ibrāhīm, “Nassān jādīdān (Part I),” 130.
\textsuperscript{970} Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:42; Ibn Ṭaghḥī Birdī, al-Manhal, 6:343; Ibn Iyās, Badāʾi’, 1:208.
been the nāẓir of the mosque of Ibn Ṭulūn’s endowment, reviewed the waqfīs and managed it well, as he did with the Mansūrī bimarstān. In 757/1356 the construction was completed and the building was dedicated to the study of Ḥanafi jurisprudence and ḥadīth, stipulating that the students be Persians. Many poems were composed for the occasion, one of which was by the previously mentioned Moroccan poet Ibn Ḥajala.

Ṣirghitmish’s intellectual side and his desire to display it are emphasized in the foundation inscription, which is located around the jambs of the entrance portal. It gives his name, the date (757/1356), and titles, including murabī al-ʿulamāʾ (mentor of scholars) and bānī al-madāris wa-al-masājīd (the builder of madrasas and mosques) (Pl. 461). The cruciform plan is combined with a dome over the miḥrāb, in addition to the dome off of the western iwān functioning as a mausoleum, where the amīr’s body was moved after Sultan Ḥasan’s death. The dome in front of the miḥrāb was completely reconstructed by the Comité de conservation des monuments arabes du Caire based on some drawings made in the nineteenth century of a wooden skeleton (Pl. 462). As it stands today the design looks awkward and is most probably not related to the original in any way.

The funerary dome is a very interesting one since it is similar to Timurid domes, which are later in date. It is a double dome built of brick with a high drum. An inscription band topped by a muqarnas border adorns the drum (Pl. 463). Similar Timurid examples of domes with the same silhouette and combination of the inscription

---

971 Al-Maqriẓi, al-Sulūk, 3:22.
972 Al-Maqriẓi, al-Sulūk, 3:28, 42.
973 See poems in al-Maqriẓi, al-Sulūk, 3:29.
974 Behrens-Abouseif, Cairo of the Mamluks, 197.
975 Ibn Ḥādī Shuhba, Tārikh, 2:139. 
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and *muqarnas* are the Gur-i Mir, the domes in the Shāh-i Zindeh funerary complex, and the *madrasa* of Ulugh Beg in Samarqand. These features must have existed in Ilkhanid domes that no longer exist, which influenced both the Mamluk ones and the Timurid ones. Ilkhanid western Iran or Iraq might have supplied the inspiration.\textsuperscript{976}

Medallions similar to the ones adorning frontispieces and bindings of Qur’ān manuscripts can be found carved in marble with beautiful and delicate arabesques adorning the *qibla* wall, which usually has colored marble slabs. Such treatment is unique to this building. Two roundels flank the *mihrāb* (Pl. 520), and two more, also on the *qibla* wall, carry Şirghitmish’s titles as part of a commissioning statement and rank (Pl. 464), while three others have been taken to the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo.\textsuperscript{977} One of the ones in the museum depicts arabesques, birds, a mosque lamp, and hands holding stems (Pl. 325).

An important decorative detail in this *madrasa* that ties in well with his Qur’ān manuscripts, and can be considered as corroboration of what the sources say about Şirghitmish’s partiality to the Persians, is the decoration of his cenotaph. A beautiful marble cenotaph lies underneath the Timurid-looking dome. The lid of the cenotaph is of black marble carved like a *mihrāb* and decorated with elegant chinoiserie flowers similar to those seen on the façade of the complex of Sultan Ḥasan and the Qur’ān manuscripts in chapters two and three (Pls. 521, 522 and 523). The rest of the cenotaph is of cream-colored marble and also has these flowers on its sides (Pl. 524).

\textsuperscript{976} Behrens-Abouseif, *Cairo of the Mamluks*, 199.
\textsuperscript{977} Behrens-Abouseif, *Cairo of the Mamluks*, 199.
Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafi (d. 778/1376)

Arghūn Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Ashrafi was one of the closest amīrs to Sultan Sha‘bān. He accompanied Sha‘bān on the ḥajj that was never completed. He too disappeared upon arriving in Cairo, until he was caught and killed shortly after his master Sha‘bān.978 Throughout Sha‘bān’s struggles he was there with other mamlūks, fighting and defending the sultan.979 His closeness to Sha‘bān and his family was reflected in his patronage: he endowed Rasīd 54 (Pl. 258), which is a glorious example of the work of the Star Polygon Group workshop. This manuscript exerted so much influence that the Qur’ān manuscript made for Sultan Barquq (Nasser Khalili QUR 595) (Pl. 330) copied the central field of its frontispiece. Nothing else from this amīr remains and the sources do not tell us that he built anything in Cairo. His manuscript was found in an Ottoman mosque (Muṣṭafā Shūrbājī Mirza, seventeenth century) in Cairo; how and when it was taken there is not known, nor do we know anything about its movements before then. The question is: did the amīr initially dedicate it to the sultan’s madrasa by the Citadel, or, more plausibly, to that of the sultan’s mother in al-Ṭabbāna, since Arghūn Shāh did not build his own?

Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafi’s first promotion came in 770/1368 when he was made amīr ṭablakhāna.980 In 771/1369 he became amīr majlis (amīr of the council) and then rāʾs al-nawba (head of the guards).981 In 775/1373 he became amīr kabīr, which was the

---

979 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:274.
980 Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:177.
highest status for an *amīr* at the time.\textsuperscript{982} The immense wealth he left behind was bequeathed to *amīr* .fb$ for the time.\textsuperscript{983}

Şurghatmish\textsuperscript{984} al-Ashrafi (d. 778/1376)

Şurghatmish ibn ʻAbdallāh al-Ashrafi is another *amīr* who was very close to Shaʿbān, and once again the patronage proves it. He died in the same year as Arghūn Shāh al-Ashrafi and Shaʿbān, because of his support for the sultan. Ibn Taghri Birdī comments on the closeness of Şurghatmish and Shaʿbān. Şurghatmish al-Ashrafi was also with the sultan on the ʿibaḍ and was among those who came back with him and supported him, together with Arghūn Shāh. Thus he was killed just like his master and the rest of his *khushdāshiyya* in 778/1376.\textsuperscript{985}

This *amīr* chose the workshop of al-Ămidī to produce his monumental Qurʾān manuscript seen in chapter three (Rasīd 15) (Pl. 309). Three men are required to lift this manuscript up. Unfortunately nothing more is known of his patronage. The same question may also be asked here: did the *amīr* initially dedicate his manuscript to the sultan’s *madrasa* by the Citadel, or to that of the sultan’s mother in al-Tabbāna, since Şurghatmish did not build his own? In this case it is more plausible that it was dedicated to the sultan’s building since it fits into the al-Ămidī group.

\textsuperscript{983} Al-Maqriʿī, *al-Sulūk*, 3:287.
\textsuperscript{984} Spelled in this way because of the vocalization of his name in the colophon; see Pl. 302.
In 775/1373 Şurghatmish became an amīr silāḥ, and it seems that this was the first big promotion he received.⁹⁸⁶ A year later he was assigned as the nāżir of the bīmāristān of Qalāwūn.⁹⁸⁷ Upon his death in 778/1376, his wealth and iqtā’ were given to amīr Qurṭāy al-Ṭāzi.⁹⁸⁸

Farīs al-Sāqī al-Khāzindār al-Nāṣirī (d. 826/1423)

Farīs ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Sāqī al-Khāzindār al-Rūmī al-Ṭawāshī al-Nāṣirī was one of the amīrs of Sultan Faraj. He was a eunuch, which we know because Ibn Ḥajjar al-‘Asqalānī and al-Sakhāwī add ‘al-Rūmī al-Ṭawāshī,’ indicating that he was a eunuch from Anatolia. He reached his highest position, khāzindār, under Faraj, and retained it under the sultanate of al-Mu’ayyad. A good Bowman, he was also a trained calligrapher who was taught by none other than the calligrapher ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣayigh. He was also a good reciter of the Qur’ān, who was very keen on being in the company of students for the sake of learning.⁹⁸⁹ We have seen in chapter four how ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣayigh produced monumental Qur’ān manuscripts for Barqūq and his son Faraj. As a member of the royal entourage, Farīs thus had access to the great calligrapher, who taught him, produced a manuscript for him, and brought him to an artistic level that allowed him to follow in the footsteps of his master. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣayigh produced a medium-sized codex for the amīr in 813/1411 (CBL Is 1503) (Pls. 466, 467, and 468). While the only original illumination left is the colophon, it is clear that the

⁹⁸⁷ Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:238.
⁹⁸⁸ Al-Maqrīzī, al-Sulūk, 3:287.
⁹⁸⁹ Al-Sakhāwī, al-Dāw’, 6:183; Ibn Ḥajjar al-‘Asqalānī, Inbā’, 3:320; Ibn Iyās, Badā’ī’, 2:85. Most of this information is only in al-Sakhāwī’s al-Daw’.
naskh is of excellent quality, and the whole codex proves a pattern that we have seen with the amirs thus far: they patronize the same artists and workshops that their masters the sultans support.

Conclusions

As might be expected, the sultans, being the people with the most resources, were our most important and prolific patrons. It is fortunate that the four we dealt with, even though three of them died in their twenties, left us great buildings to support the claim to their patronage. Ḥasan was the first among his siblings to fight back against a system that wanted to crush him. His intellectual interests must have been the key points behind his moral strength. Even though he was killed too soon, it was not without a fight or a mark on the artistic history of Egypt. He must have seen what great patrons his father and grandfather had been, something that most of his siblings did not take into consideration, and decided to emulate them. The fact that he was a copier/calligrapher himself would have made him most interested in the beauty of the word, and it is thus no surprise that he left us magnificent Qur’an manuscripts and a building with the most exquisite epigraphic remains in Cairo. In this building, kūfī was revived as a script to be used on buildings, and the qibla iwān in his madrasa echoes the sūra titles that we saw in the Qur’an manuscripts, but on a much grander scale (Pl. 465). His encouragement of awlād al-nās was also of great importance, since they played an important role in his building and its decoration. His vision did not prevent him from possibly being influenced by a personal enemy, the amir Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī. Şirghitmish’s aesthetic preferences in favor of Persians and their art probably played a
significant role in the appearance of Chinese-Ilkhanid elements on the Qur’ān manuscripts and possibly also on Ḥasan’s building. Had Ḥasan been given a chance to live longer, he would surely have left more art and vied with his father for the title of best patron of Mamluk Cairo.

Ḥasan’s nephew Sha’bān was another sultan who worked hard to succeed. He too was killed too soon, unfortunately. While we do not know anything of his intellectual background, he must have been affected by the legacy of his parents and grandfather. His mother was a great patron when he was still a young sultan and his father did leave a Qur’ān manuscript, as mentioned earlier, but unfortunately it no longer exists. It is also most unfortunate that his madrasa did not survive; from what the historians say, it was monumental and magnificent, two qualities we have seen clearly in his Qur’ān manuscripts. His piety, and his love and respect for scholars and Sufis, can be taken as a sign of intellectual activity and interest, since we have no other information on his education. His constant attempts to rule well and to be a patron of sacred art affected his people, who did admire him and often supported him for this reason.

Cunning, extremely intelligent, and the survivor of a difficult life, Barqūq is the only sultan on the list who started his career as a young enslaved boy. His devious and cunning behavior was his strength; it enabled him to survive and become one of the most impressive rulers ever to rule Egypt. His political astuteness, coupled with hidden viciousness, was mostly manifested on fellow mamlūks, not on ordinary people or even the ‘ulamā’ who gave permission for his killing. His respect for the intellectual class and his constant seeking of baraka partly explain his patronage. He felt compelled to lead his entourage and Sultan Ahmad Jalāyir to visit the mausolea of Sayyida Nafisa and Imām
Sha'fi'i before sending them off to face Timur Lang. His eye for beauty, from the time he was a young mamlik in Syria, must have also played an important role in the art he left. He had a vision and left his son guidelines to follow for the complex he wanted built in the Northern Cemetery. Had he not left the budget and an amir in charge, the complex might never have been built. His grand vision included linking himself to the Qalawunid lineage. This is how he chose the location for his first architectural endeavor. This desire to connect himself with the Qalawunids led him to use the same two main workshops to produce his Qur’an manuscripts that were operating during the reign of Sha‘bān. This desire, together with his respect for the intellectual class, must have been the main reasons he patronized a calligrapher as great as ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh. While the sources do not mention a direct relation between them, this relation can be assumed from Barquq’s personality and management of affairs. Just as he himself had desired to become sultan and achieved it, he wanted to patronize the best artists, and respected people with knowledge in various fields.

Barquq’s son Faraj appeared as an unimpressive ruler in the sources, and if it were not for the Qur’an manuscripts and architecture he left behind, it would be very difficult to believe that he left any legacy at all. However, Faraj followed in the footsteps of his father in supporting artists and ‘ulamā’. He also completed his father’s projects, as evidenced by his khānqāh in the Northern Cemetery. The sacred art of the
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990 His position as the stepfather of the last Qalawunid sultan, al-Manṣūr Ḥājji, also helped in this connection.
991 His Jalayrid connection, which needs more exploration, would have been the reason for reciprocal influence between Mamluk and Jalayrid art and the reason for a revived exchange of decorative elements. The influence of Mamluk metalwork on Jalayrid metalwork has been discussed by Doris Behrens-Abouseif in “The Jalayrid Connection in Mamluk Metalware,” *Muqarnas* 26 (2009): 149–60.
Qur’ān manuscript under Faraj continued a tradition that Barqūq had inherited from the last Bahri sultans.

Khawand Baraka is the female star of our period, the greatest Bahri Mamluk female patron. Whether her patronage was at her husband’s instigation or an extension to it, we might never know. But it is certain that she was enthusiastic about sponsoring sacred art, whether in architecture or in Qur’ān manuscripts. Her legacy includes some of the most magnificent examples of Mamluk art. The Star Polygon workshop thrived under her patronage. Her waqf document (47/7) tells us quite a few things about her that might not have been clear from the sources. She owned many properties in prime locations around Cairo, which means that she was an astute investor. The spread of the buildings in the northeast of Fatimid Cairo, southeast of Fatimid Cairo, and in the newly developed area around Birkat al-Fil means the income generated from them must have been high. She seems to have been a real-estate woman who was aware of how to allocate resources to generate revenue, revenue that she used to sponsor sacred art.

With the possible exception of Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī the amīns show how influenced they were by the sultans whom they served. They used the same artisans to produce their masterpieces. Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirī was an exception because he was the de facto ruler of the empire and at one point stronger than the sultan himself. Not only this, but his own intellectual background and education influenced his artistic decisions, resulting in a major surge of Persian influences. While some Persian influence was already seen in some of the commissions of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, the concept was revived and focus on Chinese elements was increased with Şirghitmish and Ḥasan.

---

992 Waqf 47/7.
Chapter Seven:
Workshops and Styles: Summation and Conclusions
(1341–1412)

For the purposes of this study, we have established that a ‘workshop’ means a master-disciple chain of transmission, and not necessarily a specific physical working place. This follows the definition of Millard Meiss, mentioned in the introduction, that a workshop is a group of artists working together under a master craftsman.\(^{993}\) It is not necessary that the group of artists working with the master all be working at the same time or even know each other. Qurʾān manuscripts of the Mamluks were produced in an array of locales, most notably in religious establishments. We have enough evidence to say that there was no single place dedicated as a workshop in which the artists worked. Al-Maydūmī mentions that he finished his manuscript in the mosque in Sūq al-Šāgha (Pl. 24). It was most probably not an important building and unfortunately we know nothing of it; al-Maqrīzī does not mention it at all. But the muḥaddith chose to tell us of it and it must have been where he also taught during that year. Al-İṣfaḥānī finished his manuscript in the complex of Barquq (Pl. 344), built by this sultan. At that time Al-İṣfaḥānī might have also been involved with Sufis living in the khānqāh part of the complex. It is thus not unreasonable to assume that Ibn al-Ṣāyigh produced some of his manuscripts in the khānqāh of Saʿīd al-Suʿadāʾ, where he resided for some time. Nor is Ibn al-ʿAfīf’s scribing in the khānqāh of amīr Aḥbughā ʿAbd al-Wāḥid in the Southern Cemetery of Cairo an impossibility, since he was the shaykh there.\(^{994}\) As mentioned in

\(^{993}\) Croenen, “Patrons, Authors and Workshops,” 18.

\(^{994}\) Al-Ṣafadī, al-Wāfī, 1:238.
chapter five, an illuminator’s signature in a fifteenth-century Qur’ān manuscript in the Royal Ontario Museum (905.8.2) tells us that he produced it by the Lake of the Elephant (Birkat al-Fil) (Pl. 469). Was it in a workshop or in his house that he finished it? We cannot say for now, but we do know that during the Mamluk period this area was an upper-class neighborhood. It is also possible that he finished his work in one of the madrasas there. Other locations of production include the Citadel. Ibn al-Waḥīd penned his glorious rab‘a for Baybars al-Jāshnakīr in the diwān al-inshā’ in the Citadel, as recorded by al-Ṣafādī. Mamlūks in their barracks in the Citadel penned manuscripts where they were lodged, an example being Qur’ān manuscript 7982/177, now in al-Azhar Library, signed by Jānim ibn ‘Abdallāh of the Qā‘a barracks (Pl. 470).

The continuous production of such spectacular manuscripts as the ones we have discussed required a high level of skill and technique in the arts of calligraphy and illumination. It also required patrons who were compatible with the artists and had the intellectual and material means to support the production. This patronage had to exist in a production center to encourage and support the artists. It is thus no wonder that after the Ottoman invasion in 923/1517 this glorious support and manifestation of the arts in Egypt deteriorated enormously.

This high level of skill, and the styles and influences that affected it, have been analyzed in the chapters on the manuscripts. It is now time to synthesize the data in order to bring into focus the workshops we have identified. It is the aim of this chapter

995 It was commissioned by the Circassian Mamluk sultan al-Ẓāhir Khushqadam (r. 1461–67) in 1463. For more on this manuscript, its makers, and its place of production see Noha Abou-Khatwa, “Layout in the Service of Textual Studies: A Mamluk Qur’ān at the Royal Ontario Museum” in Troisième Journée d’Études Series Catalogorum, forthcoming.
996 Al-Ṣafādī, al-Wāḥī, 3:151.
997 I viewed the manuscript in al-Azhar Library.
to group the manuscripts together in accordance with their presumed workshops. Not every single manuscript discussed in the earlier chapters is mentioned here again, but many of them are. Even though the focus has been a particular time period (1341–1412), several of the earlier fourteenth-century manuscripts are introduced again because of the persistence of styles. However, they are freshly assessed in light of the unpublished manuscripts from Dār al-Kutub. There is no hard-and-fast line separating the decades; artists continue their work, manifesting influences and novelties throughout their lifetime under different rulers. However, some elements, or the placement of these elements, are seen to have changed and can be traced to specific decades. A clear line of development emerges from this analysis that connects the works of each workshop. There is also ample evidence for the exchange of motifs that becomes especially clear in the manuscripts produced in the early 1400s.

The deductions are based on the collation of the manuscripts in terms of letter execution for the calligraphy and general composition and floral details for the illumination. Similarities in these details are evidence for what we may call a master-disciple relation. The medieval system of knowledge transfer supports this assertion, as explained in chapter five; it was the master and his methods that were the focus of the process, not where the disciple learned his skills. Although an artist might not have trained with the initiator of the workshop but with his disciples, he still belongs to the workshop. In the case of calligraphers, the chain of transmission, when recorded, links names of masters and disciples who have not necessarily met each other. This is
important because it clarifies why sources might mention an individual as the ‘master’ of a calligrapher even though they lived a few decades apart.\textsuperscript{998}

Literature on the crafts of calligraphy and illumination has also been examined. While we have calligraphy treatises from the period under study, nothing comparable has survived for illuminators. As seen in chapter five, the calligraphy treatises are very helpful in understanding the techniques and styles of the period. They are also important in identifying chains of transmission. It is indeed most unfortunate that al-Maqrīzī’s work on illuminators, \textit{Ḍaw’ al-nibrās wa-UNS al-julās fī akhbār al-muzawwiqīn min al-nās}, has so far not been discovered in any library and may not have survived. As a biographical dictionary dedicated partly to illuminators, it possibly included valuable information on how the craft was passed on and the skills needed for proficiency. In all cases it seems that the illuminator also had to be proficient in other aspects of book production, such as calligraphy. The calligraphy encountered in frontispieces, \textit{sūra} titles, and marginal elements was all the work of the illuminator.

The master calligrapher ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh taught illuminators, as well as calligraphers who were also illuminators. It was assumed in chapters two, three, and four that some of the calligraphers were also the illuminators of their manuscripts, and it is no surprise that in some cases the production of the manuscript was a one-man job. The great and fabled calligrapher Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 411/1022), the source of most calligraphic knowledge, produced his only surviving Qur’ān manuscript in its entirety (CBL Is 1431), including the spectacular illumination and the binding.

\textsuperscript{998} When the word \textit{shaykhuhu} (‘his master’) is used for ‘master’ in the sources, it means a direct link and that the two certainly met.
Workshops

Calligraphy

The most revered and respected art of Islam is the art of the pen, calligraphy. The most important script for Qur’an manuscripts of the period is undeniably muḥaqqaq. The magnificence and inherent monumentality of the script helped to make it the sacred script of the period. Naskh played an important role as well, but since muḥaqqaq was the most widely used, more attention will be given to its styles. Four main style-workshops of muḥaqqaq can be identified: one that continued the style of Ibn al-‘Afi‘f; one that continued the style of al-Maydūmī; one that was in the style of Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq (Yaqūt al-Musta‘ṣimī’s workshop); and one that originated in the style of Ibn al-‘Afi‘f but modified it, namely that of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh.

Naskh presents more variants, but examples can still be roughly grouped. We have seen a standard naskh and a naskh which displayed some of the features of muḥaqqaq. Thuluth remained largely restricted to sūra titles and will not be discussed, since it was only rarely used as a main script for full manuscripts and thus development in style cannot be traced. The only exception to this is Raṣīd 12.

Ibn al-‘Afi‘f’s workshop of muḥaqqaq (Egyptian muḥaqqaq) continued to be used throughout the fourteenth century and into the early fifteenth century, when Ibn al-Ṣāyigh modified it and developed his own style. In the 1350s Raṣīd 62, produced by Sawunju al-Rasūfī and his son Muḥammad for Sultan Ḥasan, was a not–very-successful attempt at this style. Raṣīd 148 likewise displays the same inferior quality of penmanship. It was in the late 1360s and 1370s that this muḥaqqaq was perfected. The style of Ibn al-‘Afi‘f was perfected by the anonymous hands (same workshop) that
produced Raṣīd 6, 7, and 54 for Sultan Sha‘bān, his mother, and one of his principal amīrs. This script reached its high standard of development in spite of the challenging monumentality of the manuscripts in which it was used, aided by the inherent vertical character of muḥaqqaq.

Having briefly surveyed the styles, we now examine their development and details within the individual calligraphy workshops.

1. Ibn al-‘Afiṭ’s Workshop Continued:

To recapitulate, the Mamluk sources refer to Ibn al-‘Afiṭ (d. 736/1336) as kāṭib, mujawwid, and muharrir, all terms that are used to describe a professional calligrapher. Most importantly, he was shaykh al-kuttāb bi-al-diyr al-miṣrīyya, which means he was acknowledged as the head or chief of all practicing calligraphers in Egypt during his lifetime. Since his main position, as mentioned earlier, was shaykh of the khānqāh of amīr Aqbughā ‘Abd al-Wāḥid in the Southern Cemetery of Cairo, he was also a Sufi.999 He not only practiced calligraphy, but he was also a renowned teacher, so that his legacy thrived and continued long after his death in Cairo in 736/1336 at the age of 81.1000 His only surviving manuscript is Raṣīd 142 (Pl. 419), in which we can see a master of Egyptian muḥaqqaq at work. Egyptian muḥaqqaq as practiced and taught by Ibn al-‘Afiṭ is seen at its best in Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 59 as well (Pls. 254, 268, 153, 260, and 89 respectively).

The calligrapher Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Kamāl ibn Yahyā al-Anṣārī al-Mutaṭabbib, who was most probably also an illuminator, must have been taught by Ibn

999 Al-Ṣafadī, al-Wāḥī, 1:238.
al-‘Afif. It is most unfortunate that no biographical notice was found for him and that
the sources do not mention him in any capacity. Nevertheless, his work in Rašid 81 from
734/1334 (Pl. 471), CBL 1476 from 732/1332 (Pl. 39), and Rašid 184 from 732/1332 (Pl.
33) tells us that in addition to being a physician, he was an excellent practitioner of the
Egyptian muḥaqqaq. He may have continued working throughout the later decades of
the fourteenth century, but for now we have no way to find out.

As a manuscript from the 1350s, Rašid 147 (Pl. 53) was definitely produced by
someone from this workshop, although we unfortunately do not have his name. Since we
know the calligraphy of Ibn al-‘Afif from his only surviving manuscript, Rašid 142 (Pl.
419), we can compare it to that of Rašid 147 and the resemblances are very clear. The
various ways the letter kāf was penned, the sweeping part of descending letters, and the
proportionate fā’ and ẓā’ (which are relatively large in the hands of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh) are all
elements of this workshop. Differences from the style of Ibn al-‘Afif are minute and are
due to the individual differences between the calligraphers. They can be seen in a
comparison of the closing pages. Sawunju al-Rasūlī and his son Muḥammad, Rašid 62
(c. 1356) (Pls. 199 and 198), were disciples of this workshop but not accomplished ones.
Their muḥaqqaq is not as good as most of the examples studied from this workshop.
This may be because of the thinness of the letters, and their over-elongation and lack of
proportion.

The perfection of the Ibn al-Afīf style was attained in the 1350s, as manifested
in Rašid 8 (Pl. 153). This Qur‘ān manuscript is the only one from the Star Polygon
Group workshop that gives us the name of the calligrapher: Ya‘qūb ibn Khālid ibn
Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafi (Pl. 272). Unfortunately Ya‘qūb is one of the
calligraphers for whom no biographical notice was found—although he must have been a master calligrapher, as is clear from his hand—and either he or one of his disciples might have been responsible for all these manuscripts. Stylistically he must have studied with Ibn al-‘Afif or have at least been taught his methods. Raṣīd 8 was penned by Ya’qūb in a larger muḥaqqaq than the rest.

To identify the relationships among other members of this group (the Star Polygon Group workshop), we compared Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 59 in chapter three; the muḥaqqaq attests to the continuation of the workshop of Ibn al-‘Afif. 1001

A later example in this style, but with some Ilkhanid1002 features, is Raṣīd 76, c. 1380s. The black muḥaqqaq is used not only for the main text but for the sūra titles as well. The Ilkhanid style can be seen in the words al-dhikrā and yalaytānī on folio 26b (Pl. 361) in juz’ 30, and fa idkhūfī and irjiʿī on folio 27a (Pl. 361), also in juz’ 30.

1001 ‘We may take one of the small sūras as an example for comparison, for the sake of clarity. Sūrat al-Masād is a good example. We will begin with Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 261) and Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 267), because in both of them all the letters and words in the two lines of text are exactly the same, with the same placement of vocalization, the same size, and the same treatment of the ḥurūf al-muhmala (the letters that are not dotted) and the ḥurūf al-mu’jama (the letters that are dotted). The only exception in a letter treatment is the ḥāʾ in lahāb. The ‘ayn and ghayn are the same with the same proportion; they are both oversized as compared to the other letters and when compared to their execution in Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 255) and Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 159). The kāf in Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7 is exactly the same, and different from the other two manuscripts. Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 8 show the same kāf. The letters that are identical in all four manuscripts are dhāl, shād, rāʾ, mim, and tāʾ. Raṣīd 6 shares with Raṣīd 54 and Raṣīd 7 the lām, the final ḥāʾ; and the word masād, the last word in the sūra, with the three dots below the sīn in a row. Raṣīd 54 and 7 were composed within the same time frame and thus share many features. Raṣīd 6 strengthens the link of Raṣīd 8 to the group. Ya’qūb would not have maintained the same exact hand over decades. Practice and experience yield minor differences, and if indeed it is he who is responsible for all the manuscripts, he had developed his hand to perfection by the time he completed Raṣīd 7.’ See chapter three, page 186.

1002 ‘Ilkhanid’ here refers to the style of Yāqūt al-Mustaṣimī and his disciples, who produced their work under Ilkhanid rule.
Otherwise the anonymous calligrapher was trained in the Ibn al-‘Afi‘f’s ways, but his hand was not that of a great calligrapher.

Other examples of this workshop can be seen in a rab‘a dispersed among many collections: Raṣīd 122 (ajza‘2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27) (Pls. 472 and 473); BnF 5848 (juz‘29) (Pl. 478); and A12029A in the Library of the Oriental Institute in Chicago (juz‘19) (Pl. 480). The emphasis on the horizontality of the lines and on the sweeping motion of the descending parts of the letters are traits of this workshop. This rab‘a was penned in an excellent hand, that of a master who might have been trained by Ibn al-‘Afi‘f himself.

2. The Ilkhanid Workshop of Muḥaqqaq in Cairo

Raṣīd 60, produced by Mubārak Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh, which may be partly an Ilkhanid production, was penned in an Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq of the highest quality (Pl. 68). Raṣīd 59, 1350s (Pl. 89), also displays an Ilkhanid muḥaqqaq. Its illumination, which connects it to the Star Polygon Group workshop, was done in a hand practicing the Ilkhanid style, either in Cairo or in Ilkhanid Iran. The lower parts of the descending letters do not drop significantly below the line. We are fortunate that the calligrapher left the mistara (ruler lines) showing, so we can see how each letter fits between the two lines. While the kāš are significantly different from the Egyptian style, they are like the Ilkhanid style. Raṣīd 70 (Pl. 42) and Raṣīd 71 (Pl. 481) by al-Qāḍī al-Qumshī al-‘Irāqī, created in 757/1356, are examples of this style in Cairo. As discussed earlier,1003 the yet unknown calligrapher-religious scholar must have been trained in Iraq in the workshop of Yaqūt.

1003 See chapters two and five.
before he settled and worked in Cairo, where he produced these manuscripts for Mamluk dignitaries.

To this style also belongs ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi, the scribe of Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 286). As stated in chapter five, the sources say that he followed the style of Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī, albeit with a twist. The merging of styles can be seen in Raṣīd 10, where the Ilkhanid style (Yāqūt’s style of muḥaqqaq) was spiced with some of the elements of the Ibn al-ʿAfīf style (Egyptian style of muḥaqqaq). Very close to his style is the muḥaqqaq of Aḥmad al-Suhrawardi, a prominent student of Yāqūt’s (Pl. 214).

Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 276 and 281) can also be added to this group, but it is of inferior quality compared to any of the Ilkhanid-style productions of the Yāqūt workshop or to the hand of al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi.

Under the new Circassian regime that style continued. It is clear that it influenced Aḥmad al-ʿIṣfahānī when he was penning Raṣīd 123 (Pl. 359) in 789/1387 and also Raṣīd 79 (Pl. 356) in the madrasa of Sultan Barqūq. It cannot be said that the new regime/dynasty had a significantly different style in calligraphy or illumination. This Mamluk/Circassian distinction simply denotes a chronological spread, not necessarily a dynastic style (they were not, in fact, two different dynasties, but two different regimes). Although disturbances in the social, economic, or political realms might influence artistic productions, this is not necessarily the case here. While al-ʿIṣfahānī alternates the use of muḥaqqaq with naskh in the typical Persian style, it is his muḥaqqaq that we are interested in here. It is done in the Ilkhanid style, as seen in the

---

letter shapes and the lower parts of the descending letters. It is most unfortunate that he has not left us more manuscripts, so that we could understand his style better. As mentioned in chapter four, his naskh is not up to par. This can be explained by the fact that he used one cut of the nib for both muḥaqqaq and naskh. As we have seen, it is best to have a different pen for each script, because the angle at which the nib is cut affects the quality of the script.

Muḥaqqaq loses its exalted place later in the fifteenth century, and naskh replaces it in importance in the Mamluk world. We do, nevertheless, have exceptional muḥaqqaq examples from this period, notably Rašīd 19 (Pl. 482), commissioned by Sultan Qāıytbāy in 1469 immediately after he ascended the throne. This Qur’ān was written in majestic muḥaqqaq, 112x94 cm, by the amīr-calligrapher, who signs his name as Jānim ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Sayfī Jānī Bak al-dawādār al-ṣabīr al-malik al-Zāhiri.\footnote{Given the importance of Qāıytbāy in the world of the arts, it is understandable that he would resurrect the old majestic script and the monumental size that characterized the golden age of Bahri Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts. More on this amīr-calligrapher and why his name contains the name of his previous master/boss may be found in Abou-Khatwa, “Layout in the Service of Textual Studies,” forthcoming.}

3. Al-Maydūmī’s Workshop

Al-Maydūmī’s (d. 754/1354) muḥaqqaq, as seen in the Sofia Op 2707 manuscript (Pl. 23), but especially in QUR 317 (Pl. 13) where his muḥaqqaq became closer to Egyptian muḥaqqaq, can also be seen in Rašīd 58 (Pl. 82), where the anonymous calligrapher shows us that he must have trained with the ḥadīth scholar al-Maydūmī. Their hands are not identical, but the execution of certain letters is a clue to the training. The ‘ayn, tā’, and final kāf are very similar. Al-Maydūmī is also important because he had an impact
on Ibn al-Ṣāyigh (Pls. 395–401). None of the sources mentions that Ibn al-Ṣāyigh was influenced by al-Maydūmī, and in fact Ibn al-Ṣāyigh was born after al-Maydūmī’s death. However, the large size of the beginning ‘ayn, sād, tā, ẓā’, and ẓād is a link that suggests that either Ibn al-Ṣāyigh was influenced by al-Maydūmī’s work, which he must have seen, or that both men copied the same source. This source could not have been Ibn al-ʿAfif, since his execution of these letters is very different.

4. Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s Workshop and the New Regime

The importance of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh (d. 845/1441) cannot be overstated. It is clear from his Qurʾān manuscripts that he introduced a new style of scribing. He was taught the methods of Ibn al-ʿAfif by his master al-Ziftāwī, but then reworked his muḥaqqaq. He deviated from the typical Egyptian straight and rigorous muḥaqqaq seen in many examples, but he did so without lessening its majestic effect or destroying its balance. In his treatise Tuhfāt ʿulū al-ḥalbāb fī ṣināʿat al-khāṭṭ wa-al-kitāb, or Risāla fī al-khāṭṭ wa barī al-qalam, he refers to the technicalities of pen preparation and handling in accordance with the instructions of Ibn al-ʿAfif. Thus his letters and their construction are what sets him apart. His masterful execution was seen in Raṣīd 11 (Pl. 337) and 16 (Pls. 395–401), and even though twelve years separate the two productions, the script is almost identical. As seen in chapter four, his kāf and ʿayn are very characteristic of his

1006 I presented a detailed discussion of Ibn al-Ṣāyigh, his five surviving manuscripts, his theory, and his masters and disciples at the Fourth Biennial Symposium of the Historians of Islamic Art Association: Forms of Knowledge and Cultures of Learning in Islamic Art, held at the Aga Khan Museum in Toronto, October 16–18, 2014, in a paper entitled “A Mamluk Calligrapher’s Tradition of Learning: The Career and Works of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh.”

1007 Raṣīd 11, 13, and 767/17 in the Library of al-Azhar.

1008 Shams al-Dīn al-Ziftāwī was discussed in chapter five.
style, displaying balanced and elaborate lines. In another, smaller Qur’ān manuscript, not a royal production, he remained loyal to his muḥaqqaq. Qur’ān manuscript 767/17 in the Library of al-Azhar produced in 826/1423 still shows the master at work (Pl. 483).

Ibn al-Ṣāyigh is extremely important for the study of the calligraphic world of fifteenth-century Cairo since he taught so many of the leading calligraphers of the fifteenth century and may have contributed to the ascendance of naskh into a leading role throughout fifteenth-century Egypt. Thus a study of his workshop is crucial to the understanding of the subsequent developments of Egyptian muḥaqqaq and naskh. Even though it is beyond the chronological scope of this research, it is important briefly to mention the names of these calligraphers here for the sake of future researchers and research questions on the subject.

He taught in many schools simultaneously and had many students who continued as calligraphers, while others received calligraphy lessons but specialized in other fields.\textsuperscript{1009} He taught the amīr Fāris al-Khāzindār, for whom he also produced a Qur’ān manuscript in naskh (CBL Is 1503, Pl. 466), and the renowned historians and hadith scholars al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, as well as al-Sakhāwī’s father and uncle.\textsuperscript{1010} Other students of his include Muḥammad ibn ʿAḥmad al-Zaʿifrīnī, a Syrian Shafiʿī scholar who later settled in Cairo. He studied Arabic and jurisprudence and specialized in Qur’ān studies, excelling at the various readings of the Qur’ān. Because of his mastery of the various scripts, Ibn al-Ṣāyigh permitted him to teach calligraphy. He died in 856/1452 and was buried not far from his master in Cairo.\textsuperscript{1011} Another student

\textsuperscript{1009} Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, \textit{Inbā‘}, 4:192.
\textsuperscript{1010} Al-Sakhāwī, \textit{al-Ḍaw‘}, 4:162.
\textsuperscript{1011} Al-Sakhāwī, \textit{al-Ḍaw‘}, 7:121.
also permitted by Ibn al-Šāyigh to teach was Muḥammad al-Qālyūbī al-Qāhīrī, who eventually became the teacher of calligraphy in the complex of Sultan Barqūq, one of the most important institutions of the period. This was in addition to being an inshā’ employee and a qaḍī.\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 9:200.} Muḥammad al-Shams ibn Sa‘d al-Dīn (d. after 860/1455), the librarian at the Shaykhu complex, was also a student who became a teacher. He taught calligraphy at al-Azhār after finishing his training with Ibn al-Šāyigh.\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 10:102.} The bibliophile Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Mas‘ūd Ibn al-‘Ilm al-Sunbaṭī (d. 891/1486) was another student.\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 9:272.}

A few illuminators were also Ibn al-Šāyigh’s students. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ibyārī al-Qāhīrī (d. 884/1479) was an illuminator and a binder, renowned as a specialist in making colors, who studied with Ibn al-Šāyigh and became a master calligrapher as well.\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 7:22.} Muḥammad ibn al-Shams al-Azraqī (d. 881/1476) was another famed calligrapher from among his students who was also an illuminator and was given permission by the master to teach.\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 7:228.}

While no signatures from these students from the period under investigation have been found yet, two of rab‘as made waqf by Sultan Barqūq show a hand that is similar to that of Ibn al-Šāyigh, which might suggest that it was produced by a disciple. These rab ‘as are Raṣīd 125 (Pl. 374) and BnF Arabe 5846 (Pl. 484). The kāf and ‘ayn are similar to what Ibn al-Šāyigh produces, the ‘ayn being somewhat smaller than what we are used to from him. The hand is that of a good calligrapher, but not as great as that

\footnote{Al-Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw‘, 9:200.}
of Ibn al-Ṣāyiḥ himself. Some thinning of the ends of the letters suggests that this is not Ibn al-Ṣāyiḥ’s own hand.

Illumination

Five main illumination workshops can be seen to be operating throughout the period under study. The first is a workshop that continues the work of Ṣandal and his associates. A second was one named the Star Polygon Group by David James, which continued operating under the new regime of the Circassians. The third is that of Ibrāḥīm al-Āmidī which started in the 1370s and also continued operating under the new Circassian regime. The fourth and fifth, though based on themes of the Bahri Mamluk period, is Circassian in production. They incorporate starting points for two diverging styles that continued throughout the fifteenth century.

1. Ṣandal and His Disciples

To keep to our chronological plan, it is best to begin with the workshop that persisted from the early days of the fourteenth century and continued to operate in the later decades, that of Ṣandal and his disciples. The main themes and design of the workshop survived into the 1340s, as did the details of their designs, even if the overall design was visibly different. The details that they continued to use include the arabesque scroll beneath the text of the opening page, the star pattern for the central fields of the frontispieces, and the arabesque frame on three sides of the frontispiece with a hatched background. All of these features originated with Ṣandal and his disciples and continued to be used. Manuscripts in Dār al-Kutub that show close affiliations to this workshop
and were probably rendered by hands trained by Şandal or his disciples were mostly discussed in chapter two. The Şirghitmith group shows the connection most clearly; Raşid 149 and Raşid 147 are important examples. Which are the manuscripts, primarily in Dār al-Kutub, that most probably belong to this workshop and why?

In Raşid 56 (Pls. 20 and 21) the central fields of the opening pages are adorned with the arabesque scroll characteristic of the Şandal workshop (Pl. 485). The text is also placed in the cloud bands we have seen earlier from this workshop. Thus this codex is proof that after three decades the style of Şandal and his disciple Aydughdı was still in use.

The illuminator of Raşid 147 (Pl. 51), who must have been a disciple of this workshop, might not have reproduced the style exactly but was true to some details. Comparison with the frontispiece of the seventh juz’ of the British Library Baybars al-Jāshnakīr’s Qur’ān manuscript (Pl. 485) shows the elaborate outer border with alternating palmettes in the Baybars Qur’ān and CBL 1479 (Şandal’s production) (Pl. 56) as compared to the alternating trefoil blossoms in Raşid 147 (Pl. 51). These three manuscripts have the outer border on three sides that characterizes the Şandal workshop. The star composition on the frontispiece is also similar to the star composition in the same seventh volume of the Baybars Qur’ān manuscript. A similar frontispiece is TIEM 450, which was illuminated by Şandal’s disciple Aydughdı ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakrī and his student Afrī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Rassām al-A‘sar in
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1017 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 34–72; James, Master Scribes, 152.
1018 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 72.
1019 James, Qur’āns of the Mamlūks, 48.
The red hatching in the backgrounds of the outer border in all these manuscripts is another Şandal trademark that is seen in Raşid 147 and ties them together.

The third group of frontispieces in Raşid 70 discussed in chapter two is composed of the traditional geometric central field inspired by the Şandal workshop (Pls. 115–121). The design is based on a ten-fold rosette, which extends into a ten-fold symmetry where the arcs intersect the invisible radii to make the petals of the rosette. This results in a myriad of five-pointed stars and pentagon-based hexagons that stand out with their varying colors. The color combinations are invariably blue, gold, orange, green, and a little black, but they vary from one frontispiece to another.

This group of frontispieces is also related to a manuscript in the British Library, Or 848, which David James connects to Şandal (Pl. 122). The frontispiece of juz’9 of Or 848 is also based on a ten-fold rosette/star.

The fifth group of frontispieces from Raşid 70 includes volumes 27, 28, and 29 (Pls. 126–128). They show similarities with a frontispiece produced earlier in Cairo, juz’27 of a Qur’an manuscript in the CBL, 1476, calligraphed by Aḥmad ibn Kamāl al-Muṭaṭabbib, who worked in Cairo in the 1330s. It has a frontispiece with a very similar composition (Pl. 129). There is an uncanny resemblance between juz’2 of the Baybars Qur’an by Muḥammad ibn Mubādir (Pl. 334) and this group of frontispieces.
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1020 James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, 58, 222.
1021 Volumes 2, 4, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.
1022 James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, 211.
1023 James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, cat. 18.
1024 James, Qur’āns of the Mamluks, 226.
1025 Figure 22 in Qur’āns of the Mamluks.
A Qur’ān manuscript, 138.M5 in the Topkapi Sarayi (Pl. 34), dated to 741/1341 and produced by Aḥmad ibn Abī ʿĪbrāḥīm Muḥammad al-Shāfiʿī al-Qurashī al-Kātib al-Dimashqī,1026 shows the continuation of the work of Ṣandal. The central field of the frontispiece is composed of four eight-pointed stars in blue and gold. The outer border of the frontispiece is like the Ṣandal style in overall design and size, but also in the red hatching that fills the background. Thus the style of this workshop was still thriving in the 1340s. If Aḥmad ibn Abī ʿĪbrāḥīm Muḥammad al-Shāfiʿī al-Qurashī al-Kātib al-Dimashqī was the illuminator, he was trained in this style by one of the disciples of Ṣandal. It is indeed most unfortunate that no biographical notice on al-Dimashqī is found in the sources.

2. The Star Polygon Group Workshop

The earliest surviving work from this workshop is the Iran Bastan Qur’ān manuscript produced in 739/1339 by Aḥmad al-Muḥsini (d. 754/1353) (Pl. 155), one of the literati and religious scholars from among the awlād al-nās. It seems probable that he produced the manuscript for the great patron of the arts Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn. Raṣīd 8 (produced by Yaʿqūb ibn Muḥammad ibn Khafīl ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafī) (Pl. 154) is the second-earliest surviving sample from this workshop, and was most probably made for Sultan al-Nāṣir’s son, Sultan Ḥasan, in 757/1356. It provides the link to the greatest productions of this workshop in 1369-70 under al-Nāṣir’s grandson, Sultan Shaʿbān, Shaʿbān’s mother, Khawand Baraka, and their entourage (Raṣīds 6, 54, and 7: Pls. 248, 258, and 264), especially since Sultan Shaʿbān did not efface the year of

1026 Calligrapher and (according to David James) assumed illuminator, as mentioned in chapter two.
production inscribed in the original colophon when Raṣīd 8 was re-endowed in 769/1367. Thus Sultan Sha'bān continued supporting the workshop his uncle, Sultan Ḥasan, has also sponsored earlier. Raṣīd 59, endowed by Sultan Ḥasan in 757/1356, is another early production of the workshop.

The early productions of the workshop include the Iran Bastan Qur’ān manuscript, Raṣīd 8, and Raṣīd 59. The frontispieces of the Iran Bastan manuscript and Raṣīd 8 (compare Pls. 155 and 154) are masterpieces of design and execution. The central field is now a square instead of a rectangle, which is one of the most important features of this workshop. The design is always a central star that expands infinitely. The focus is always the center of the central field, the nucleus of the design or the heart from which it expands. The abundance of gold is another characteristic of their work. Raṣīd 8 especially flaunts this feature. Chinoiserie elements in the form of lotuses are another novelty of this workshop and an important link to the Ilkhanid world. Raṣīd 8’s and Raṣīd 59’s lotuses (Pl. 157) in the marginal medallions and spandrels of sūra titles are rendered in the same way as the lotuses in the golden border around the central field of the Iran Bastan manuscript. The lotuses in the Iran Bastan manuscript can be seen in the frontispiece; this was their earliest occurrence in Mamluk Qur’ān manuscripts, or at least the earliest that survived.

Later in the 1360s and 1370s we see Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 7. The marginal medallions adorning the frontispieces of Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, and Raṣīd 7 (Pls. 154, 248, 258, and 264) are almost the same and bind them all together, proving that they are indeed drawn by the same hand. The only differences are minor changes to the arabesque scroll inside the medallions and the way the flower buds are oriented. The
Iran Bastan manuscript (Pl. 155) differs greatly, since it is not contained in a circle and is closer to Ilkhanid examples. This can be explained by the fact that it is much earlier than the rest of the manuscripts.

A very important characteristic of this workshop after further development during the rule of Sultan Sha‘bān is the border of lotuses and/or peonies, which is lacking in Raṣīd 8. The other innovation is the peony, which was seen earlier on architecture in the mosque-madrassa complex of Sultan Ḥasan. Here the peony plays as important a role as the lotus. These rows of lotuses and peonies around the central fields make the manuscripts stand out and tie them together to the same hand.

The development in the illumination productions of the workshop is clear in the opening pages of Raṣīd 8 (Pl. 156) when compared to Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 265), and Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259). The illumination program immediately recalls juz‘1 of Raṣīd 59 (Pl. 86).

Marginal medallions (Pl. 486) of the inner pages have gone through a transformation if chronological sequence is observed. The medallions inside Raṣīd 8 and Raṣīd 59 are like the medallions of the 1350s, but differ in that some of them have a lotus, gold on orange or blue on orange. Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54 have larger medallions, still with a golden lotus on an orange background. There are also more frames adorning each medallion. The best example of these frames is in Raṣīd 7, where the Ilkhanid colored-petal border makes for a perfect finale.
The Workshop and the New Circassian Regime

The Star Polygon Group workshop’s productions persisted after the advent of the Circassian rule in 1382. This workshop produced the most monumental and successful illumination program, one that aptly highlighted the sacred script (muḥaqqaq). As discussed earlier, Barqūq wanted to continue established traditions, and so he sponsored the artistic milieu of the great Qalawūnids. Early in the first few years of Sultan Barqūq’s rule we find Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 321) and QUR 595 in the Nasser Khalīlī Collection (Pl. 330), both produced for the sultan, that show how the workshop continued. QUR 595 (784/1382–83) is especially interesting because it gives us the name of the calligrapher, whose nisba stresses his skill in illumination: Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-ʿAjami al-Mudḥahhib (d. 817/1414).

Raṣīd 13 (Pl. 371, 428, and 429) and Raṣīd 16 (Pl. 391) (penned by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh), endowed by Barqūq’s son Sultan Faraj, are a natural development of the works of this workshop, although with some changes introduced to their artistic vocabulary.

QUR 595 in the Nasser Khalili collection, produced in 784/1382–83 by ibn ‘Alī al-ʿAjami al-Mudḥahhib, represents the persistence of the workshop. Al-ʿAjami was most certainly a disciple of this workshop. The frontispiece of this manuscript has a central field (Pl. 330) that copies the central field of Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 258). Several changes have already occurred, attesting to the emerging tastes observed in manuscripts from the 1380s. The lotus-peony border is missing from this frontispiece. The marginal medallions adorning the frontispiece are not limited to two; in this case there are many
of them placed throughout the marginal space. The āya markers in cartouches adorning the top and bottom areas of the frontispiece are now made entirely of a scroll.

Sultan Barquq’s Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 321) is a beautiful example of the workshop’s productions. It displays their main characteristics with some minor alterations. The square central field in the frontispiece, typical of the workshop, contains a twelve-pointed star like the frontispiece of Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 248). It also has a very similar frit pattern in the middle. The lotus is used as filler in the geometric elements of the central field. This is actually a reintroduced element, since the lotus was seen earlier at the corners of the central field of the Iran Bastan manuscript (Pl. 155). The border of peonies and lotuses around the central field is inherited from Raṣīd 6 and Raṣīd 54. The medallions are different only in having less undulating scrolls and in the fact that the circle of the medallion is framed in gold.

Barquq’s son Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq left us Raṣīd 16 (Pl. 391) which has strong connections to the Star Polygon Group workshop, suggesting that they were produced by the same workshop or illuminators who were greatly influenced by the workshop, but manifesting Persian influence centering around the Shirazi style of illumination of the late fourteenth century.

Raṣīd 16 (Pl. 391) was penned by the great calligrapher of the fifteenth century, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh. While we do not know the illuminator’s name, the illumination program reflects the Star Polygon Group workshop or an imitation of their work, although it is of a lesser quality as far as the overall geometric design is concerned. The finesse of the production is of the same quality as the original workshop. In spite of the lesser quality of the design, the manuscript is still a magnificent work.
The use of gold, the square central field of the frontispiece, and the peony-and-lotus band are all trademarks of the workshop. The peonies are orange, purple, and gold, alternating with blue and white lotuses on a very dark blue-black background. This background was not very successful and does not have the same effect as the earlier productions of the workshop.

In Rašīd 13 (Pl. 371, 428, and 429), the absence of the frontispieces and the details of the inner pages, especially the opening pages, are the clues leading to the placement of this manuscript in this workshop. The rectangular panels carrying the sûra titles show the details and the finesse employed by this workshop. The cartouches surrounding the text of the titles has of a multi-lobed concave end, the spandrels of which are filled with a concave-ended octagon like the one in the closing pages of Rašīd 6 (Pl. 256). The interesting development in this manuscript is the amazing peonies with the blue notching in the background of sûrat al-Baqara. Āya markers throughout the manuscript are exactly like those employed in Rašīd 12, providing a further link to the workshop.

The most important conclusion to be drawn is that the work of the Star Polygon Group workshop continued into the early days of the fifteenth century. The square central field, based on a star, the lotus-peony borders, and the spandrels of the sûra titles based on the star patterns are three main characteristics of this workshop. The names associated with this workshop are Aḥmad ibn Bayāfik al-Muḥsini, Yaʿqūb ibn Muhammad ibn Khalīl ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Ḥanafi, Aḥmad ibn ʿAflī al-ʿAjamī al-Mudhahhib, and ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyīgh. ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyīgh’s manuscripts might have been illuminated by his illuminator apprentices, who were
training with him as calligraphers but who apparently also trained in illumination with illuminators of the Star Polygon Group workshop.

3. Ibrahîm al-Amîdî’s Workshop

The other famous workshop of the 1370s is that of al-Āmidî, which produced Raqîd 9 (Pl. 277), Raqîd 10 (Pl. 288), and Raqîd 15 (Pls. 309 and 310). While he only signed Raqîd 10, Martin Lings has successfully argued that he produced the other two as well, and of this there is no doubt. Al-Āmidî emphasizes the outermost border of his frontispieces and he does it spectacularly. Since this border has grown in size and is now very wide, it leaves no room for marginal medallions. Marginal medallions can be seen in the inner pages, and they are very similar in technique in the three manuscripts (Pl. 487). The emphasis in the medallions is on their multicolored petal border, which was very popular with al-Āmidî and is the most important characteristic of his workshop. This Iraqi border was continued by the artists under the Ilkhanids from the outset of their rule. It appears here colored in the same manner as in Shirazi manuscripts. This is not the only early Ilkhanid element. Eight-petaled rosettes arranged in rows (Pl. 277), as seen in Raqîd 9, were used in the Uljâytû Mosul Qur’ân manuscript (Pl. 167). Of course the lotuses and the peonies used as fillers of geometric elements or in bands are present. Although they have Ilkhanid roots, they have now become part of the Mamluk repertoire in Qur’ân manuscript illumination. Al-Āmidî’s color palette is a very bright one that is a reminder of the Uljâytû Mosul Qur’ân manuscript, but he does not use as much orange as his predecessors.

1027 TIEM 541. James, Qur’âns of the Mamlûks, fig. 69.
Another important feature of this workshop is the arrangement of the geometric elements in the frontispieces around many centers and not just one central star as in the Star Polygon Group workshop. The fillers stand out more in this case, and the impression is of a garden rather than a complex geometric pattern, even though it is indeed a geometric pattern.

Al-Āmidī’s fascination with Chinese elements is seen in his opening pages (Pls. 279 and 289). Cloud bands inserted between the text in the opening of Raṣīd 10 (Pl. 289) are the most elaborate example of Chinese influence. In the opening pages we also see the use of the blossom on top of the basmala, which seems to be an Āmidī trademark during that time. It had been previously used in the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscript tradition, and as seen in chapters two and three, the Mamluk Qur’ān manuscript dated 744/1344, now kept in the Topkapi Sarayi Museum Library (Y. 365), employs it (Pl. 15). In chapter three we saw that James argued that the Topkapi manuscript is an al-Āmidī production. A closer look at the manuscript suggests that al-Āmidī might have been a disciple of the workshop producing this manuscript, but that he did not do it himself. The marginal medallions in the inner pages and the suṣra titles are very different from his style (Pls. 488–489). But it seems that whoever worked with Mubārak Shāh al-Suyūfī on illuminating the Topkapi manuscript did teach al-Āmidī.

The workshop continued under the new regime of the Circassians and after the death of al-Āmidī in 797/1394, because his disciples worked with the calligrapher ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh to produce Raṣīd 11 in 801/1398 for Sultan Barqūq (Pl. 336).

---

1028 Cloud bands and dragons are discussed in chapter three and many examples of the Ilkhanid role as the intermediary of Chinese motifs are given there.
1029 Calligrapher of the Topkapi Sarayi Museum Library (Y. 365).
The marginal medallions, the focus on the compartments rather than a central star, and squares to define the spandrels of sura titles are all characteristics of the workshop seen in Raṣīd 11. The opening pages of Raṣīd 11 show how the blossoms used on top of the basmala and sparingly in the Topkapi Y. 365 now appear all over the interlinear space. Unfortunately, this was not done very beautifully in Raṣīd 11, and in spite of the monumentality and the definite majestic feel of the manuscript, it is of lesser quality than the earlier productions of the workshop. The opening pages of volume 2 in Raṣīd 9 (Pl. 284) show these blossoms and heart/cloud motifs in the interlinear spaces, similar to Raṣīd 11. Again the quality of placement in Raṣīd 9 is superior to that of Raṣīd 11. One of the early examples of such ornamentation in an opening is in Qur‘ān manuscript 430 in the TIEM (739/1338) (Pl. 221).1030

4. ʿAḥmad al-ʿIsfahānī and the New Regime

Raṣīd 123 (Pls. 345–349) and Raṣīd 79 (Pl. 350) represent the work of the first new workshop of the Circassian period. Even if Raṣīd 79 is not from the same rabʿa as Raṣīd 123, it is still the production of ʿAḥmad al-Isfahānī, whose name we know from the colophon in Raṣīd 123 and who must have been the illuminator as well. It was also produced in the madrasa of Sultan Barquq in 789/1387.1031 The frontispiece shows a large medallion-rosette, reviving an early Ilkhanid tradition seen in the frontispiece and opening pages of a Qur‘ān manuscript in one codex (not a rabʿa) in the Topkapi Sarayi K.3 dated to 709/1309 (Pl. 490). The Topkapi manuscript has a simple lobed rosette, not

---

1030 Lings, Splendours, pl. 48.
1031 There is another volume, juʿz’ 10, from this rabʿa recently acquired by the Louvre, signed and dated by al-Isfahānī.
an interlocked rosette combination. The spandrels of the rosette are filled with a fine and intricate arabesque rather than the blossoms seen in any of the volumes of Raṣīd 123 or Raṣīd 79. These blossoms characterize this work because they are part of the repertoire of the late fourteenth century, as explained in chapter four. These blossoms, which appear to be another simplification of a palmette, were done, albeit in a different manner, in the early days of the fourteenth century. The example that stands out is the Sofia manuscript of al-Maydūmī, where they surrounded the text of the first sūra and the colophon (Pls. 23 and 24). To avoid repetition, our illuminator changed the colors of the backgrounds of the intersecting areas of the rosettes. We end up with a slightly varied frontispiece for each volume.

5. Second New Workshop for the New Regime

Al-Īṣfahānī’s manuscript seems very different from that of Raṣīd 125, the rabʿa whose parts are divided between Cairo and Paris and which represents the second workshop. In Cairo we have volumes/ajzāʾ: 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 20, 25, and 27 (Pls. 369, 370, and 491). In the BnF we have Arabe 5841, 5844, and 5845 (Pls. 493–494). In a few of its details this unsigned rabʿa shows some influences from the Star Polygon Group workshop. Could it have been executed by a disciple who wanted to have his own stamp?

The text of the opening pages is enclosed in clouds. The ground around the clouds consists of fine red lines in parallel hatching scrolls and sprays, as seen in Raṣīd 13 (Pl. 371) and Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251). Here they are less crowded than in both these

1032 Possibly also Arabe 5840, 5839, and 5850, but since there are no images available for them it is difficult to decide whether they are part of the same rabʿa.
manuscripts; it is a rab’a and not a monumental production, after all. The peonies that flank the sūra/juz’ titles are also like those seen in Raṣīd 13, but are placed and executed almost exactly like those in QUR 187 in the Nasser Khalili Collection (Pl. 372). The outermost border of the opening pages is like that in the opening pages of Raṣīd 6 (Pl. 251), Raṣīd 54 (Pl. 259), Raṣīd 7 (Pl. 264), and Raṣīd 12 (Pl. 322). The marginal medallions are a simplified version of those in the Star Polygon Group and the later al-Āmidī work.

A Qur’ān manuscript that belongs to the same workshop as Raṣīd 125 is also found in the BnF: Arabe 5846 (Pl. 495). It is definitely not from the same rab’a; it is juz’ 25 of a different rab ‘a that was most certainly produced by the same workshop, also for Sultan Barqūq (it carries his waqf). It bears the same outer border as Raṣīd 125, which was seen earlier in Raṣīd 6, and the overall design proportion and conception is the same as Raṣīd 125. The size is also almost exactly the same: 37.4x26.2 cm for Arabe 5846 and 38x27 cm for Raṣīd 125. The scroll around the clouds in which the text is contained is also identical. Very similar calligraphy also argues for the same hand. A calligrapher-illuminator produced them just as al-Isfahānī produced his rab ‘a in full. This artist, however, is a disciple of the Star Polygon Group workshop.

**Patron and Artist: A Summary (Table 7.1)**

The connection between our patrons and the producers of the manuscripts is occasionally clear. The focus here is royal and ruling elite patronage. The connection is especially apparent when the calligrapher or illuminator in question is a mamlūk. This

---

must have been the case with the great illuminator Şandal, whose name suggests that he was a eunuch. Another early example is Ayduhdī ibn ‘Abdallāh, who worked with Şandal. Both served amīr and later Sultan Baybars al-Jāshnakīr and Sultan al-Nāṣīr Muḥammad. Sawunju al-Rasūfī al-Nāṣīrī was a mamlūk of Sultan Ḥasan and the nisba he uses in his signature confirms the connection. Sawunju’s multi-volume Qur’ān manuscript (Raḥīd 62) is one of the best productions of the period. We find fewer mamlūk names from the 1360s onwards, but mamlūks who excelled in calligraphy continued producing manuscripts for their masters. A much later example is the important amīr Jānim ibn ‘Abdallāh, whose royal commissions came from Sultan Khushqadam (r. 865–72/1461–67) and Sultan Qāyütbāy (r. 873–901/1468–95).

Thanks to their position within Mamluk society, awlād al-nās, the offspring of mamlūks, had access to important patrons. Muḥammad ibn Baylīk al-Muḥṣini and his brother Aḥmad produced manuscripts for Sultan al-Nāṣīr Muḥammad. Muḥammad ibn Baylīk al-Muḥṣini became extremely close to Sultan Ḥasan and chivalrously defended the sultan to the very end. While we do not have any surviving manuscripts penned by Muḥammad for Sultan Ḥasan, he must have produced Qur’ān manuscripts for him. After all, he was the designer and calligrapher of the sultan’s great architectural complex (Pl. 436). Muḥammad ibn Sawunju al-Rasūfī helped his father with the manuscript produced for Sultan Ḥasan and may have produced others for the sultan.

Scholar-artists and artists are the most important category to receive support for the production of Qur’ān manuscripts. In the early days of the fourteenth century the fabled Ibn al-Wāḥid, who was originally a Friday preacher in the mosques of Aleppo, penned his magnificent seven-volume Qur’ān manuscript for his patron amīr Baybars al-
Jāshnakīr in the *diwān al-inshāʾ* in the Citadel, where he became an employee. The *muhaddith* al-Maydūmī does not give us the names of his patrons, but his manuscripts are embellished enough to indicate a wealthy or royal patron. The sources do not tell of his connection to any member of the ruling elite, but given his scholarly and religious status, we can assume that he crossed their paths and lived under the reign of a few Bahri sultans. Al-Qāḍī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī, Yahyā, worked for a high-ranking *āmīr* and might have also produced manuscripts for the reigning sultan, Sultan Ḥasan. The calligraphers ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ḥashafī and Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihaḥī, and the illuminator Ibrāhīm al-ʿĀmidī, were commissioned by Sultan Shaʿbān, his mother, and his closest *āmīr*. Sultan Barqūq’s relation to the scholar-calligrapher Aḥmad al-ʿIsfahānī was detailed in chapter five, and it is understandable that he would produce his manuscripts in the complex of the sultan. The master calligrapher ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh was commissioned by Sultan Barqūq, his son Sultan Faraj, and their entourage. His connection to royalty continued and he worked under later sultans until his death in 845/1441. He might even have given Sultan Barsbāy a manuscript of a panegyric written for the Prophet that he had penned earlier.

**Stylistic Changes**

It is interesting to see how, over the decades of the fourteenth century leading into the first decade of the fifteenth century, the various elements of illumination were maintained or changed. Did each decade or couple of decades have its own significant changes? To answer this question, each of the illumination elements will be traced throughout the decades under study and earlier. This does not deny the existence of
workshops, but focuses instead on the trends of the period. It asks the question of “What was preferred when?” as opposed to “Who produced what?” It is difficult and potentially inaccurate to do the same with calligraphy, and a discussion of the main workshop and styles must suffice. The illumination elements to be traced are frontispiece, opening pages, and sūra titles.

The Frontispiece

Over the course of the century many changes occurred in the frontispiece, including variations in the details as well as in the overall design. The earliest surviving Qurʾān manuscripts from the Bahri Mamluk period show a persisting rectangular central field filled with polygons. The earliest dated surviving Qurʾān manuscript with a frontispiece is preserved in the National Library in Sophia (OP2707), penned and most probably illuminated by the muḥaddith al-Maydūmī in 701/1302. The focus of the frontispiece (Pl. 26) is the rectangular central field, but the surrounding borders are equally important in terms of the size and abundant use of gold. This would gradually change by the end of the century, when the borders around the central field would become narrow and colorful. The outermost border is a huge golden scroll with a hatched background on the paper ground. This too will change.

The Şandal workshop, which was operating during the same time, later also produced frontispieces with a rectangular central field (Pl. 485). In their work the big bands between the central field and the outermost band are now smaller. More colors are

---

1034 The earliest surviving Mamluk Qurʾān manuscript to our knowledge is the one mentioned in the Introduction; it is also kept in the National Library in Sophia (OP 2708). It was produced in 669/1271 but unfortunately is missing a few pages from the beginning, including the frontispiece.
added to the palette besides the overabundance of gold; we see more orange and red in *juz’* 3, *juz’* 4, and *juz’* 7 of Baybars al-Jāshnakīr’s Qurʾān manuscript in the British Library. The outermost border is still of paper ground or pink ground and hatched. These characteristics are continued by the disciples of Șandal, and a decade later they are still found in the work of Șandal’s pupils Aydughdí ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Badrī and ʿAfi ibn Muḥammad al-Rassām for the great patron of the arts Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (Pl. 57). Their Qurʾān manuscript (TIEM 450), produced in 713/1313, shows the trend. This design continues through the 1320s to the 1340s but starts to become more square. The remaining part of the finispiece of Rašīd 184 (Pl. 84) from 732/1332 and the frontispiece of Rašīd 81 (Pl. 83) from 734/1334, both by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Kamāl ibn Yaḥyā al-Anṣārī al-Muṭṭābbib, have a rectangular central field filled with polygons, much narrower inner frames, and an outermost band on paper ground, hatched and with a clear and well-proportioned arabesque. Manuscript 138.M5 in the Topkapı, produced in 741/1340, shows this famous trend (Pl. 63).

In the 1350s the remnants of this style are still seen in Rašīd 147 (Pl. 51), but here the pink hatching stands out and a striking blue has been added to the outermost border. That outermost border is sometimes omitted altogether in *rab’as*, as in Rašīd 149 (Pls. 29 and 30) from the 1350s. This is a feature that seems to appear for the first time in the 1350s and was special to *rab’as*, as opposed to one-volume manuscripts.

The inclination towards the squarish central field is seen in the work of Aḥmad al-Muḥṣini in 739/1339 (Pl. 155), who initiated the work of the Star Polygon Group workshop. Al-Muḥṣini began using this style before it became more popular within the workshop. The transformation to the squarish central field, the very colorful palette, and
the outermost border with a blue background takes place in the late 1350s, as in Raṣīd 62 (Pl. 165) and Raṣīd 70 (Pls. 113–121). Both were in rabʿa forms and both were royal commissions: Raṣīd 62 was made for Sultan Ḥasan and Raṣīd 70 was produced for a high Mamluk dignitary. This trend becomes well established in the 1360s and 1370s with the commissions of Sultan Shaʿbān, his mother, and his entourage, as in Raṣīds 6, 7, 54 (Pls. 248, 258, and 264), and it marks the triumph of this border with the square or rectangular central field. The 1380s–1400s show only the outermost border with the blue background and the complex arabesque full of colors, and not the outermost border on paper ground (Pls. 321 and 496). The hatching in the outermost border starts to disappear in the 1360s, and by the early fifteenth century it is completely gone, not to be revived again. By now the central field is in most cases a square focusing on a star polygon.

The details adorning the different parts of the frontispieces are no longer only arabesques and palmettes. Starting in the 1350s the chinoiserie makes an appearance, and by the 1360s the lotus and peonies are highlights that are used ubiquitously until 1411, especially in borders surrounding central fields.

The Opening Pages

Opening pages were often elaborate. We can see this elaboration in the earliest surviving manuscripts. The Baybars Qurʾān manuscript is a great example (Pl. 497). By the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth century the detailing of the opening page had become very different. The early years of the fourteenth century feature a rectangular central field with light framing. The knotted border in its
variations continues throughout the decades and, as discussed earlier, goes back to the beginnings of manuscript illumination centuries earlier. The text has a patterned background, a geometric pattern of inverted Ys, or an elaborate arabesque. The geometric background disappears after the first two decades of the fourteenth century and is no longer seen. By the 1330s and 1340s the arabesque background triumphs over it (Pl. 498). Most of the manuscripts dating from 1341 to 1412 and featuring an elaborate opening page show an arabesque background to the text. In the case of the arabesque the half palmettes are filled in with brown or orange, especially in the 1330s, and continue into the early 1350s (Raşid 56, Pls. 20 and 21). In the late 1350s the arabesque background continues, as in Raşid 62 (Pl. 192) and Raşid 71 (Pl. 205), but the striking brown and red filling is gone. Some other examples, such as Raşid 59 (Pl. 86) and Raşid 8 (Pl. 156), lack decoration in the background of the text. In Raşid 59 we have very fine parallel lines in the background. By the late 1360s the arabesque was sometimes rendered in the form of a Chinese scroll and flowers, as in Raşid 6 (Pl. 251). In the 1370s the filling of the palmettes is revived, but in a different style, and the arabesque is finer, as in Raşid 9 (Pl. 279) and Raşid 10 (Pl. 289). In 1387 Raşid 75 (Pl. 340) uses a simple flower band instead of the arabesque scroll in the interlinear spaces and not as a background. The arabesque background still survives, and in Raşid 16 (1411) (Pl. 393) it appears with very colorful fillings for the half palmettes, a new feature of the fifteenth century which does not work as well as the earlier choices with respect to color.

A type of background that is not an arabesque is the Ilkhanid semicircles featuring tiny adjacent hills, as in Y365 in the Topkapi (744/1344) (Pl. 15) and Raşid 7
Hatching is often encountered as well, as a background to the arabesque or as a stand-alone mode of decoration. Sometimes stylized blossoms are used to decorate the hatching and especially to adorn the *basmala*. The earliest appearance of such a blossom on the *basmala* is seen in 1343 in Y365 in the Topkapi. In 1357 Rashid 71 (Pl. 499) features a roundel but not the blossom, while in the 1370s the blossom is executed differently, as in Rashid 9 (Pl. 279) and Rashid 10 (Pl. 289). Many stylized chandelier-blossoms on top of the *basmala* and in the interlinear spaces are used in the 1390s in Rashid 11 (1398) (Pl. 336). Much closer to the original use is its glorious manifestation in Rashid 16 (1411) (Pl. 393).

These interspersed blossoms in the opening pages are seen in Y365 in the Topkapi (1343) (Pl. 15), and in Rashid 10 (dated 1372) where they consist of Chinese clouds and blossoms with tails) (Pl. 289). In the opening pages of volume 2 in Rashid 9 (not the Fatiha) (1369) (Pl. 284) they appear in the interlinear spaces as compound blossoms and clouds. Finally, in Rashid 11 in 1398 (Pl. 336), they are overdone and crowd the space. We might not have seen them in manuscripts from the 1400s or 1410s, but they do survive in the later years of the fifteenth century, especially towards the last years of the century.

The outermost arabesque scroll band of the opening pages also goes through changes. It did not exist before the 1340s. In 1343 a narrow stylized floral band appears in Y365 in the Topkapi manuscript (Pl. 15). It reappears in the late 1360s and early 1370s in Rashid 6 (Pl. 251), Rashid 7 (Pl. 265), and Rashid 54 (Pl. 259). Its introduction in the opening pages was indeed an innovation when it first appeared in the 1340s. Its apex was reached in the late 1350s, when in Rashid 62 it appears wide, multilayered, and with
a blue background (Pl. 192). Finally, the opening pages borrowed the border from frontispieces. The outermost arabesque border continues in the 1360s and the 1370s, as seen in Rašīd 10 and Rašīd 9, and on into the 1380s, albeit in a different color palette using little gold, as seen in Rašīd 75. In the 1390s it continues in a narrower fashion, but not as narrow as when it was first introduced in the 1340s in Rašīd 11, or as narrow as in 1411, as seen in Rašīd 16.

The Sūra Titles

On the inner pages of the Qurʿān manuscripts, as distinct from the opening pages, the sūra titles are sometimes very different from one manuscript to another. The show that there was no fashion specific to certain decades (Pls. 500–501), or at least that the sūra titles did not necessarily have to be adorned in the royal commissions. Thuluth, tawqiʿ, and kūfī were the three favorite scripts for the sūra titles used in the inner pages of the Qurʿān manuscripts. They were mostly unadorned in the early years of the fourteenth century. By 1320 the golden thuluth was framed and had a beautiful arabesque as its background. By 1330 the white kūfī was framed and the background was set in blue with a golden arabesque scroll, as seen in Rašīd 81 (1334) and Rašīd 184 (1332). In the 1340s the frame was emphasized, layered with gold-pearl-blue bands and with the text inscribed on a hatched background (hatching could be parallel lines, inverted Ys, or semicircles), as in M5 in the Topkapi. Manuscript Y365 (1343) features a white thuluth inscription on a blue background adorned with a golden arabesque and framed with a knotted border. Rašīd 111 (1340s) and Rašīd 57 (1350s) show the same features with variations in background colors. This composition was borrowed from the opening
pages, which showed the same features for the sūra title with an inscription in tawqī‘ or kūfī. By the late 1350s the sūra title became more and more like the inscriptions on walls of Mamluk buildings, contained in cartouches with rounded ends and flanked by geometric elements containing flowers or scrolls, as seen in Raṣīd 62. The script was either thulūth or kūfī and continued as such for the rest of the fourteenth century. This did not prevent the artists from using the simple, unadorned golden or red tawqī‘/thulūth in parallel with the adorned and embellished styles, as in Raṣīd 97 (1360) or Raṣīd 123 (1398).

The Qur’ān Manuscripts in the Context of Luxury Manuscript Production of the Period

Compared to other manuscripts, the Qur’ān, as the Word of God, was the most embellished. Other manuscripts were also beautifully illuminated and calligraphed, but only a few of them were as glorious as the Qur’ān manuscripts. The one other genre that received comparable attention was the panegyrics written for the Prophet, specifically the Qaṣīdat al-Burda (al-kawākīb al-durriyya fī madhī khayr al-bariyya) of the Shādhilí imām Muḥammad ibn Sa‘īd al-Buṣīrī (d. 696/1297). Given the importance of this genre in Mamluk religious, spiritual, social, and intellectual life, especially since it was conceived in Mamluk Egypt in the late thirteenth century and was dedicated to the Prophet, it is understandable that its visual manifestation would receive such special attention. A few examples survive from our period, and all were executed by master

---

1035 For more on this and on the importance of the Prophet and his relics, see Abdulfattah, “Relics of the Prophet.”
calligraphers. ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyigh produced a beautiful manuscript\textsuperscript{1036} of the renowned panegyrical in 805/1402. At a later date it came into the possession of Sultan al-Ashraf Barsbāy (r. 825–42/1422–38). It may have originally been produced by the calligrapher for himself, for the young Sultan Faraj, or for one of his prominent amīrs. The illumination details fit in its period and show the floral chandelier-like elements prominently displayed in Raṣīd 11 (compare Pl. 502 and Pl. 336). Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s Burda is actually an expansion of the poem in the form of a takhmās. He shows off his skill by displaying three different scripts per page: naskh, thuluth, and rayḥān. He is probably imitating his master, Shams al-Dīn al-Ziftāwī, whose only surviving manuscript is a takhmās (expansion) of the Burda penned in 783/1381 and kept at the Special Collections Library at the University of Michigan (Ms. 228). Ziftāwī’s Burda uses naskh, thuluth, and tawqī‘ but no rayḥān (Pl. 503). Its first page shows illumination that is typical of the period of Sultan Barquq and similar to what we have seen in the works of Ahmād al-Īṣfahānī, such as Raṣīd 79 and Raṣīd 123 (compare Pl. 496 and Pls. 345–350). Unlike Qurʾān manuscripts, neither of these renditions of the Burda was illuminated in the interior except for verse markers similar to the āya markers in the Qurʾān manuscripts.

Another interesting manuscript of the Burda is one in the Austrian National Library, dated in their catalogue to 1330–40 on the basis of the dedication on fol. 1a to “al-sultān al-malik al-Nāṣir” (assumed to be al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalaūn, d. 741/1341).\textsuperscript{1037} This manuscript is a very elaborate production, and like Qurʾān

\textsuperscript{1036} Adab 455 in the National Library of Egypt.

manuscripts was also embellished in its interior. The illumination details are very similar to those of Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī’s workshop. The calligrapher, who signed as “Aqḇāy from the brotherhood of al-muqaddam Shankal al-malikī al-Nāṣirī,” seems to be a mamlūk who lived in the late fourteenth to the early fifteenth century. Thus it seems that the nisba, ‘al-Nāṣirī,’ of the muqaddam refers to al-Nāṣir Faraj and not al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.1038

These three manuscripts are prominent examples from a plethora of manuscripts of the Burda that have survived. The most important conclusion to be drawn from them is that the same illumination details and masterful calligraphy were sometimes used in the manuscripts dedicated to the Word and those to the Prophet, who is the one who channeled the Word. It is not easy to find other manuscripts that are comparable to the Qurʾān. A quick survey of other manuscripts of a religious nature show that elaborate illumination and calligraphy were reserved for the “twin sources” of Islam as a religion and as a spiritual path: the Qurʾān and the Sunna.1039 The same workshops produced both, and the same illuminators and calligraphers worked together or independently. However, the Qurʾān manuscripts were given a monumentality that cannot be compared to any other manuscripts. The Word of God in material form is seen as Divine presence, and thus it is the greatest blessing to scribe It.

---

1038 The earlier fourteenth-century sources do not mention any Aqḇāy or Shankal. However, both names come up in the later sources. Muqaddam Shankal is the eunuch Shams al-Dīn Ṣawāb al-Sa’dī, known as Shankal al-Aswād, who became a muqaddam in 790/1388, and Aqḇāy was a mamlūk of Barquq who eventually served his son Faraj. See Ibn Tāghrī Birdī, al-Manḥal, 2:465–66.

1039 Nasr, Islamic Art, 6.
Table 7.1: Patron and Artist: A Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Şandal al-Mudhahhib</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aydughdi ibn ‘Abdallāh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad al-Muḥsīnī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhumd al-Muḥsīnī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhumd ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Shāfī‘i al-Qūrāshī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubārak Shāh al-Suyūfī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Abū al-Qāsim al-Maydūmī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya‘qūb ibn Muḥammad ibn Khafīl ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Hanafī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahyā ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Alhmad al-Qādī al-Qūmshī al-‘Irāqī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Naṣīrī Sawunju al-Rāṣūfī</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td><strong>Artist</strong></td>
<td>Amir/Sultan Baybars al-Jāshīnḵūr</td>
<td>Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad</td>
<td>Ṣirghītmish al-Nāṣirī</td>
<td>Sultan Ḥasan</td>
<td>Ṣirghītmish al-Hijāzīyya</td>
<td>Sultan Sha ‘bān</td>
<td>Ṣirghītmish al-Sha’bān</td>
<td>Arghūn al-Ashrafi</td>
<td>Sultan Barquq</td>
<td>Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq</td>
<td>Fāris al-Sāqī al-Khāzīndār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Ṣawunju al-Rašūlī</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdallāh al-Shāfī’ī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Nakhjāwānī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Tūrī al-Tunūkhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shīhābī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm al-Āmīdī</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad ibn ‘Alī al-Ajami al-Mudḥahhīb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ṣāyīgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-Dāshī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad al-Īṣfahānī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

Working with these Qur’ān manuscripts has been an utter delight. Turning their pages leaves one with a deep appreciation of the skill of their makers. The magnificence of the ornamentation and calligraphy are both contemplative and uplifting. If merely viewing them has this effect, then crafting them must have generated a thousand times more joy. The workshops identified in this research must have passed their craft onwards with that same sense of elation.

Methodical analysis of the Qur’ān manuscripts successfully identified calligraphy and illumination workshops. The chronological spread of over sixty years was one of the main reasons this identification was achieved. Calligraphers and illuminators need years for training and mastering their crafts. The most successful illumination workshop of the first half of the fourteenth century, that of Şandal and his disciples, continued successfully. Raṣīd 149 and Raṣīd 147 are important examples connected to the Şandal workshop; the third group of frontispieces in Raṣīd 70\textsuperscript{1033} also manifest this style, and Raṣīd 56 shows similar hands. The Star Polygon Group workshop, which started under al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, also continued successfully to the end of our period and thus extended into the fifteenth century. Raṣīd 8, Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 54, Raṣīd 7, Raṣīd 12, Raṣīd 13, and Raṣīd 16 show the fluid continuation and transformation of the overall geometric designs, motifs, and colors, all clearly in the same spirit. Al-Āmidī’s workshop was born in the second half of the fourteenth century, produced Raṣīd 9, Raṣīd 10, and Raṣīd 15; it flowered and continued to grow in the

\textsuperscript{1033} Volumes 2, 4, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.
fifteenth century, as seen in Raṣīd 11. The workshop associated with Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī and the new regime of the Circassians might not have been as impressive, but the beauty of its productions cannot be underestimated. Raṣīd 123 and Raṣīd 79 manifest the simple beauty of the work that this workshop produced.

Calligraphy workshops, of course, continued throughout the period under study, with the Egyptian school of muḥaqqaq being the most prevalent. Ibn al-‘Afīf’s methods and the teachings of the Egyptian school of muḥaqqaq were the most widespread. The calligraphy workshop of Ibn al-‘Afīf was strongly connected to the illumination workshop of the Star Polygon Group; the connection is most evident in Raṣīd 6, Raṣīd 7, and Raṣīd 54. The persistence of the Ibn al-‘Afīf workshop in the fifteenth century is seen in Raṣīd 122 and Raṣīd 76. The Ilkhanid-influenced school of calligraphy was associated with the illumination workshop of al-Āmîdî, as seen in Raṣīd 9 and Raṣīd 10. This is primarily due to the fact that Aḥī ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Aṣḥafī followed the techniques of Yaḥūq al-Mustaṣimī. Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī was also trained in this style, and his script proves it. The other two workshops were associated with the great muḥaddith al-Maydūmī and the master calligrapher Ibn al-Ṣāyīgh. Al-Maydūmī had a great impact on Ibn al-Ṣāyīgh, and in turn Ibn al-Ṣāyīgh, the master of the fifteenth century, integrates the styles of the other two workshops into his work. Ibn al-Ṣāyīgh, who was taught in the ways of Ibn al-‘Afīf, was influenced by al-Maydūmī; he then added a few twists from the Ilkhanid school and came up with his own style. For this reason he is in essence the most important and the most suitable calligrapher with whom to end the study. In him culminate the main styles of calligraphy of the period.
The prevalent styles in calligraphy and illumination highlight the *dhawq* (taste) of the period. They reflect on the elite and the educated class who produced these precious manuscripts for us to see today. Knowing the styles that the makers and patrons of manuscripts preferred adds pieces to the images that the modern historian and art historian try to construct of the personas of the patrons and the artists.

Identifying our artists in the sources is often difficult. However, the rich contemporary and near-contemporary Mamluk sources provide the data that help in stitching together biographical sketches that were previously unavailable. The signatures of those who are not mentioned by the sources are of paramount historical value. In these cases the Qurʾān manuscripts are the foundation stone in the art-historical narrative, since they reveal names of people otherwise unknown. The signatures of Sawunju al-Rasūfī and his son Muḥammad confirm the picture painted by the narrative sources that Sultan Ḥasan supported *awlād al-nās*, for instance. The names we can gather from outside the sources also allow us to reconstruct the social identities and the various connections of these individuals. These connections can be established through the methodical analysis of the Qurʾān manuscripts, thus relating the artists through their artistic productions.

The names mentioned in the sources suggest some interesting conclusions. In some cases the sources do not mention that our artists were calligraphers, but mention only their religious education and vocation, especially if they were hadith scholars. All of them were religiously educated, and many had religious positions. Some were even mighty scholars of the period. The Qurʾān was thus heavily interwoven into their

---

1034 Al-Maydūmī and Zaynab al-Maqdisiyya are the most important examples in this context.
being and their daily life. Even from among those in the *awlād al-nās* category we see someone like Aḥmad al-Muḥsinī, who is considered one of the scholars of the period.

Most importantly, most of them were *mutasawwīfūn* (Sufis) and probably operated from the *khanqāhs* and mosques with which they were associated. The first Sufi calligrapher we encountered in this research was ʿAbdallāh ibn Ḥabīb, the Sufi shaykh of Ribāt al-Aṣḥāb and the master of Yāqūt al-Mustaʿsimī. Other examples from the Mamluk realm included the master Ibn al-ʿAfīf, who was the shaykh of the *khanqāh* of amīr Aqbughā ʿAbd al-Wāḥid, Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī, who was the shaykh of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s *khanqāh* in Siryāqūs, and Ibn al-Ṣāyīgh, who was a Sufi associated with the *khanqāh* of Saʿīd al-Suʿadāʾ.

The Qurʾān manuscripts that they penned, especially the *rabʿās*, were, for the most part, used by Sufis in the buildings to which they were endowed. Those in charge of caring for these manuscripts in the buildings were also Sufis. The *mināwil* (*khādim al-rabʿa al-sharīʿa* or the *ḥāmil al-muṣḥaf*) and the *khāzin al-kutub* were also Sufis. Sufi ḥadras and gatherings were instrumental for the production of the *rabʿās*, and it was mostly for their purposes that the *rabʿās* were commissioned.

The patrons were clearly aware of this fact, and if they did not commission *khanqāhs*, they had rooms in their buildings, like the room in the *madrasa* of Khawand Baraka, for these Sufi ḥadras. The patrons we encountered were all royalty or elite. The sources described most of them as generous with the ʿulamāʾ and Sufis. They had the will, the resources, and the interest to commission the manuscripts. They also had an entourage that followed suit. Thus, Sufi piety appears to have played a very important role in generating Qurʾān manuscript production of the period.
Many conclusions can be drawn regarding our patrons. Şirghitmish’s love of the Persians was confirmed. Sultan Hasan’s intellectual caliber and his patronage of awlād al-nās were verified. The resourcefulness of Sultan Sha‘bān and his mother Khawand Baraka in funding their projects displays their economic astuteness. Sultan Barquq’s cunning and shrewd nature allowed him to link himself culturally to the Qalawunid lineage, thus give his son the chance to succeed artistically in spite of his lack of promise. The manuscripts also reveal the connections between the rulers and their entourages. The closeness of amīr Arghūn al-Ashrafī and amīr Şurghatmish al-Ashrafī¹⁰³⁵ to Sultan Sha‘bān is validated by the fact that they commissioned their work from the same workshops as the sultan. Fāris al-Sāqi al-Khāzindār befriended, patronized, and studied with the artist (Ibn al-Ṣāyigh) who produced Qur’ān manuscripts for his master, Sultan Faraj, and his master’s father, Sultan Barquq.

On the sociopolitical front, the disturbances that characterized this century did not affect the production of Qur’ān manuscripts. The quantity and quality of Qur’ān manuscripts from this era speak of the resilience of the crafts involved. The political and socioeconomic distress of the period was counteracted by a thriving intellectual life that was for the most part not disturbed by events. Artists and ‘ulamā’ were sponsored to produce works of art. There are several reasons for this resilience, as we have seen.

First, despite the political weakness of the descendants of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, they managed to follow his artistic ambitions. His son, Sultan Ḥasan, and his grandson, Sultan Sha‘bān, were adamant in their support of intellectual pursuits, and believed in the necessity and importance of their patronage of sacred art. Amīrs of al-Nāṣir

¹⁰³⁵ A quick reminder that the ‘damma’ on the ‘sād’ and the ‘fātiha’ on the ‘ghayn’ in his name are from the colophon of Rašid 15, thus his name spells differently from Şirghitmish al-Nāṣiri.
Muḥammad, such as Širghitmish for instance, were part of an entourage who participated in and supported the artistic language identified with the elite even after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad’s death. Those who came after al-Nāṣir Muḥammad patronized the workshops he had supported. This ongoing support continued in the Circassian period, when Sultan Barqūq’s efforts to link himself to the Qalawunid lineage led him to support the same intellectual and artistic activities. In turn, his son, Sultan Faraj, continued the same pattern of patronage. The best example of this is the flourishing of the Star Polygon Group workshop, which started towards the end of the rule of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, developed under Sultan Ḥasan, flourished under Sultan Shaʻbān and persisted under Sultan Barqūq and his son Sultan Faraj. It was much easier and more successful for the patrons to support an already established artistic tradition than to invent something new, because the process of becoming a master calligrapher or illuminator was laborious and required time and dedication. To acquire mastery in such a craft, one had to work for years, and patronage by the elite certainly facilitated that.

Second, there was a realization that the patronage of the sacred, especially in times of hardship, was important for the spiritual and social well-being of the people. Thus, political struggles and epidemics tended to produce increased religiosity and piety. It is in bad times that the ‘ulamā’ are needed the most, for they are the ones who will interpret and explain to the people and the ruling elite what God wants them to do. This is very clear in the example of Sultan Barqūq’s reaction to the ‘ulamā’ who passed a death sentence on him when he was in hiding, as we have seen in chapter six. Some of these ‘ulamā’ were imprisoned, but none were killed and most of them were pardoned.
The third reason behind the resilience of the intellectual life of the period was the plethora of religious institutions to which the Qurʾān manuscripts were endowed. The libraries of these institutions needed to be filled with manuscripts. Most important are the manuscripts of the Qurʾān carrying the word of God, which has the “sacramental status of divine speech.”

1036 These manuscripts were made for the benefit (ifāda) of the students and others in the buildings, as mentioned in their waqf statements. However, they also possessed the talismanic power of baraka—a baraka that was extended to the patron, the maker, and the user of the manuscript as well as to the building in which it is kept. The ‘ulamāʾ, the buildings, and the manuscripts are all important spokes in the intellectual wheel; the more one flourishes, the more the others are bound to flourish as well. As long as royal patronage of manuscript production continued, opportunities opened for everyone involved to work and generate an income, which created a bright spot in the economic situation in the midst of turbulent times.

Future Research

This research has raised many questions, and further research will be necessary to gain a fuller picture and a deeper understanding of this art under the rule of the Mamluks. A thorough study is needed of Qurʾān manuscript production during the rest of the fifteenth century. In particular, the period from 1412 to 1517 requires analysis. A full investigation of the work and biographies of the disciples of the master calligrapher Ibn al-Ṣāyigh is also necessary, for they hold the key to the overwhelming success of naskh in the fifteenth century. This leads us to the next research question that ought to be

1036 Lings and Safadi, The Qurʾān: Catalogue of an Exhibition, 11.
answered: what is the exact connection between the Turkish (Ottoman) *silsila* and the Mamluk one, and what is Ibn al-Ṣāyigh’s role in it? An evaluation of the Persian connection in the fifteenth century is also essential. Based on the preliminary evaluation of manuscripts produced after the period of this research, the Persian influence appears to subside, but a thorough investigation is needed to judge the validity of this impression.

An important research consideration that is not limited to the fifteenth century is tying the details of Qur’ān illumination to the architectural decoration of the period. Comparison of Qur’ān illumination to stucco work and stone carved surfaces will be both very interesting and very revealing with regard to how the two monumental arts of the Mamluks overlapped and how the art of the Qur’ān could have been the source of most designs on other media. We have seen that the *amīr* Muḥammad ibn Baylík al-Muḥsinī was a calligrapher on both stucco and paper, possibly an illuminator, and an architect. More examples like him need to be found and studied in order to convincingly tie both forms of this sacred art together.
Bibliography

**Waqt Documents**

*Waqfiyyat Barquq*, Dār al-Wathāʾiq al-Qawmiyya No. 51/9, 6 Shaʿbān 788, 28 Ṣafar 794, 10 Jumādāʾ al-thawrī 795, and 6 Jumādāʾ al-thani 797 A.H.


*Waqfiyyat ʿSirghitmish*, Wizārat al-Awqāf No. 3195, 27 Ramaḍān 757 A.H.

*Waqfiyyat Sulṭān Ḥasan*, Wizārat al-Awqāf No. 881, 15 Rabiʿ al-Thānī 760 A.H.

**Primary Sources**


**Secondary Sources**


Herz, Max. La mosquée du sultan Hassan au Caire. Cairo: Imprimerie de l’institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1899.


Lane-Poole, Stanley. *The Art of the Saracens in Egypt*. Beirut: Librairie Byblos, 1971


Moritz, Bernhard. *Arabic Palaeography, a Collection of Arabic Texts from the First Century of the Hidjra till the Year 1000.* Cairo: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1905.


O’Kane, Bernard. “Medium and Message in the Monumental Epigraphy of Medieval Cairo.” In *Calligraphy and Islamic Architecture in the Muslim World,* edited by


APPENDIX: CATALOGUE

Qurʾān manuscripts arranged by chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 2</th>
<th>Chapter 3</th>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 162</td>
<td>Raṣīd 97</td>
<td>Raṣīd 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 56</td>
<td>Raṣīd 372</td>
<td>Raṣīd 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 149</td>
<td>Raṣīd 80</td>
<td>Raṣīd 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 148</td>
<td>Raṣīd 6</td>
<td>Raṣīd 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 147</td>
<td>Raṣīd 54</td>
<td>Raṣīd 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 150</td>
<td>Raṣīd 7</td>
<td>Raṣīd 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 60</td>
<td>Raṣīd 9</td>
<td>Raṣīd 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 61</td>
<td>Raṣīd 10</td>
<td>Raṣīd 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 8</td>
<td>Raṣīd 15</td>
<td>Raṣīd 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 62</td>
<td>Raṣīd 141</td>
<td>Raṣīd 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raṣīd 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raṣīd 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raṣīd 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raṣīd 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 111</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raṣīd 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Qurʾān manuscripts from Dār al-Kutub that are mentioned in the research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṣīd 184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manuscripts in Dār al-Kutub that are the focus of the study and date from the period under investigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Calligrapher | |
| Illuminator | Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn |
| Patron | |

| Waqf | اوﻗﻒ ﻫﺬا اﳌﺼﺤﻒ اﻟﴩﻳﻒ ﻣﻮﻻﻧﺎ اﻟﺴﻠﻄﺎن اﳌﺎﻟﻚ اﳌﻠﻚ اﻟﻨﺎﴏ ﻣﺤﻤﺪ ﺑﻦ ﻣﻮﻻﻧﺎ اﻟﺴﻠﻄﺎن ﺳﻴﻒ اﻟﺪﻳﻦ ﻗﻼوون ﺳﻘﻲ اﻟﻠﻪ ﻋﻬﺪﻫﻤﺎ وﺟﻌﻞ ﻣﻘﺮه ﺑﺎﻟﺠﺎﻣﻊ اﻟﻜﺒﻴﺮ ﺑﺎﻟﻘﻠﻌﺔ اﳌﻨﺼﻮرة وﴏط الا ﻳﺨﺮج ﻣﻦ اﳌﺴﺠﺪ اﳌﺬﻛﻮر ﺑﻮﺟﻪ ﻣﺎ وﻗﻔﺎ ﻓﻌﻴﺎ ﻓﻤﻦ ﺑﺪﻟﻪ ﺑﻌﺪ ﻣﺎ ﺳﻤﻌﻪ ﻓﺎﻧﻤﺎ ﻋﲆ اﻟﺬﻳﻦ ﻳﺒﺪلوﻧﻪ ﺑﺘﺎرﻳﺦ ﺳﻨﺔ ﺛﻼﺛﻴﻦ و ﺳﺒﻌﻤﺎﺋﺔ |

| Volumes | 1 |
| Old Number | 9986 |
| Folios | 729 |
| Binding | Leather, not original and with blind tooled decoration |
| Lines per Page | 8 |
| Size (cm) | 54.8x38 |
| Chapter | |
| Script | Muḥaqqaq |
| Text Block Size (cm) | 43.5x26.5 |
| Mini Compendium | None |
| Colophon | |
Collection: Rasid
Manuscript Number: 5
Date_AH: c. 757-762
Date_AD: c. 1356-1361
Comments: Incomplete decoration program or restoration

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron: Sultan Hasan (by waqf - Khedivial catalogue)
Waqf

Volumes: 1
Old Number: 9987
Folios: 374
Binding
Lines per Page: 11
Size (cm): 77x45
Chapter: Two
Script: Muḥaqqaq
Text Block Size (cm): 47x33
Mini Compendium: None
Colophon
هذا ما وقفت الدار العالية المصنفة المنذورة المنجي خوند بركة
والده المنقم الشريف الأعظم السلطان الملك الأشرف أبو المظفر شعبان خليد الله
ملكه و صاحب حجابه جميع هذا المصحف الكريم وفقًا صحيحاً فرعياً لتنفخ به سائر المسلمين في القراءة
و غير ذلك من وجه الانتفاغات الشرعية و شرطت أن يكون مقر ذلك بالدرسة المعروفة
إيالاتها و عمليتها، يظهر القاهرة المعروسة بخط النشأة و شرطت أن لا يخرج من مكان الذكور
الأربعة يحرزهم و شرطت النظر في ذلك لنفسها أيام حياتها و من بعد وفاتها من شرطت النظر
عليه من بعدها و اشهدت عليها بذلك كله اليوم الأول برك يوم الاثنين الثالث
من شهر ذي القعدة الحرام سنة ثامنة و سبعة و سبعينية هجرة نبوية

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron Khawand Baraka (by waqf)
Waqf

Volumes 1
Old Number 9988
Folios 320
Binding Later binding
Lines per Page 11
Size (cm) 71x50
Chapter Three
Script Muḥāqqaq
Text Block Size (cm) None
Mini Compendium None
Colophon

491
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 7
Date_AH: 15 Sha'bān 770
Date_AD: 25 March 1369
Comments

Calligrapher
Illuminator: Sultan Sha'bān (by waqf)
Patron
Waqf

Volumes: 1
Old Number
Folios: 409
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 11
Size (cm): 83x54
Chapter: Three
Script: Muḥaqqaq

Text Block Size (cm)
Mini Compendium: None
Colophon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣîd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Later is in 769/1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Ya‘qūb ibn Khafīl ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td>Ya‘qūb ibn Khafīl ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥanafī ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Ḥasan (by date in colophon) and endowed later by his nephew Sultan Sha’bān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>73x51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td>ﻟلﻪ ﻛﺘﺐ ﻫﺬا اﳌﺠﺎﻣﻊ ﺑﻌﻮن اﻟﻠﻪ ﺗﻌﺎﱄ وﻋﻨﺎﻳﺘﻪ ﻳﻌﻘﻮب اﺑﻦ ﺧﻠﻴﻞ اﺑﻦ ﻣﺤﻤﺪ ﺑﻦ ﻋﺒﺪ اﻟﺮﺣﻤﻦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waqf in first volume:
وقف مولانا المقام الشريف العالي المولوي السلطاني الامامي المجاهدي المرابطي المثاغري الحصني الملاذي المالكي الملكي
الأماني المخصوص بالقرآن الكريم الذي كان يقرأه في كل يوم من أمام جماهير المسلمين.

Waqf in second volume:
وقف مولانا المقام الشريف العالي المولوي السلطاني الامامي المجاهدي المرابطي المثاغري الحصني الملاذي المالكي
الملك الأماني المخصوص بالقرآن الكريم الذي كان يقرأه في كل يوم من أمام جماهير المسلمين.

Collection: Ras\l
Manuscript Number: 9
Date_AH: 15 Sha\ban 770
Date_AD: 25 March 1369
Comments:

Calligrapher: Sultan Sha\ban (by waqf)
Illuminator: Sultan Sha\ban (by waqf)
Patron: Sultan Sha\ban (by waqf)

Waqf: Waqf in first volume:
وقف مولانا المقام الشريف العالي المولوي السلطاني الامامي المجاهدي المرابطي المثاغري الحصني الملاذي المالكي الملكي
الأماني المخصوص بالقرآن الكريم الذي كان يقرأه في كل يوم من أمام جماهير المسلمين.

Waqf in second volume:
وقف مولانا المقام الشريف العالي المولوي السلطاني الامامي المجاهدي المرابطي المثاغري الحصني الملاذي المالكي الملكي
الأماني المخصوص بالقرآن الكريم الذي كان يقرأه في كل يوم من أمام جماهير المسلمين.

Volumes: 2
Old Number:
Folios: ?
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 7
Size (cm): 75x51
Chapter: Three
Script: Muh\aqqaq
Text Block Size (cm):
Mini Compendium: None
Colophon:

Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 10
Date_AH: Muḥarram 774
Date_AD: July 1372
Comments: Waqf in Muḥarram 778/May-June 1376

Calligrapher: ‘Aḥi ibn Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Ashrafi
Illuminator: Ibrahīm al-Anīdī
Patron: Sultan Sha’bān (by waqf)

Waqf: وقف مولانا اعظم الشريف السلطان الملكي الملكي الارشيف الارشيف الشريف الشهيد المرحوم مولانا السلطان الملك الامام محمد بن مولانا الملك المنصور قلاة بسران الصلاحي تقدمهما الله برحمته جميع هذا المصحف الكريم وفقاً صحيحاً شرعياً تقريراً إلى ربي عز وجل وشرط ان يكون مقره والقراءة فيه بالخانقاه والمدرسة والجامع الارشيف في المعروف بانشا المقام الشريف بالمية تناج القلمة المنورة بالقاهرة المنورة وشرط في ذلك النظر لنفسه اياً حالته ثم بعده للناظر في امر الخانقاه بتاريخ شهر الله المحرم من سنة ثمان وسبعين وسبعين

Volumes: 1
Old Number: 217
Folios: 217
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 13
Size (cm): 73x51
Chapter: Three
Script: Muḥaqqaq

Text Block Size (cm): None
Mini Compendium: None

Colophon: Calligrapher’s:
نجز هذا المصحف الشريف خمس عشر شهر الله المحرم سنة اربع وسبعين وسبعيناًً على محمد بن محمد المنصور قلاة بسران الصلاحي في يد افراد عبادة الله وحاجتهم الى مغفرته علي

Illuminator’s:
عدد ايات الكتاب العزيز ستة آلاف وسبع ثمانون وست منها الف أم ولف نهی ولف ولف فصص واخير الف... وامثال وخمسجاه جلال المطلب وجميلة دعاء ونسبة وبالنسبة قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من اكرم عالياً كأنا أكرم سبعين نبياً نجز تزهيب هذا المصحف الشريف عليه أكرم عبادة الله الكريم ابراهيم الامدي عقا الله عنه حامداً وصلياً ومسلياً
تشرف الكتابة هذا المصحف الكريم العبد الفقير إله تعالى عبد الرحمن بن الصائغ حامداً الله علي نعمة مؤمناً به مصلياً علي رسوله سيدي محمد وأله وصحبه وعشرته الطيبين الطاهرين ومسلمياً تسيماً كثيراً وعلم الواقف علي هذا المصحف الشريف أن الله تعالى أعانني علي كتابته بالقلم واحد في مدة سبعين يوما في بها دونها قلله ومنها وأفا فراعته يوم وفا النيل المبارك السادس من ذي الحجة الحرام عام أحادي وفائرما وكأن السبب في إنشاء هذا المصحف الشريف العبد الفقير إله رحمة ربي الكريم محمد بن محمد الشهر براين البنت الدمشقي أصلا صالحاً بلد غفر الله له ولوالديه وجميع المسلمين
الحمد لله الذي نزل القرآن على سبعة أحرف متوارث البيان عن رسول الله عن جريج عن النبي الذي علم الإنسان نجده على تفضيله على الكتب

هذين فطا وثنا تراها ودرسه من الأزمان ونشهد أن الله هو واحدبا لاشريك له الذي جعله علامة في الشواطئ فراها وإلقاء الاختاب لنا

فسمح مسلم صلى الله عليه وسلم وصحابته الذين جمعوا القرآن وأصلحوا ولايم يقول واتيان فسمت في هذا المصحف

الشرم بعض رسومه تراكذا تعرفه غالب اهل هذا الزمان وأبا الوليد المتناني، واجوزه ولو رسمه بأي رسوم كان ينام يعرفها ليودي

حقوق الحروف من مخارج الحق واللاسن وجعل كانا أجر جاري في صفايف...مع...عيد فراً كل سورة منه ختمة كاملة محصنة ما من كل

الشي ون熳 ذلك يحمله به ويكت اعداء ويعمده...مادا الملوان...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Rashid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Barqūq (stylistically - Khedivial Catalogue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>New binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>105x79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>Late 750s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>Late 1350s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Sultan Ḥasan? (stylistically)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td>9996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>Alternating 1 line muḥaqqaq and 5 lines naskh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>55x36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Naskh and muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>42x23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>17 Dhī al-Qi‘da 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>19 April 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Muḥṣaf al-kāf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td>Muḥammad al-Mukattib al-Shihābī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Al-Mu‘izz al-Ashraf Ṣūrghatmish (by dedication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td>9997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>New binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>108.3x77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>75x54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colophon

رسم بكتابة هذه الختمة الشريفة المباركة المعظمة نفعه الله بها في الدنيا والاخرة العبد الفقير اي الله تعالى المقر الاشرف العاني السيفي ضعتمه عز نصره علي بد علي وفقره محمد المكتب الشهابي عفا الله عنه ثم في سبع عشرين ذي القعدة سنة ست وسبعين وسبعين وسنين وهذا المصحف عرف مصحف الكاف
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>Ramadan 814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>December 1411-January 1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Šāyīgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (by dedication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td>Later waqf by Sultan al-Mūʾayyad Abū al-Naṣr Shaykh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td>9998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>New binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>95x73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>67.5x54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وكان القراء من كتابة هذا المصحف الشريف الجليل المعظم في شهر رمضان المعظم ففترة سنة أربع عشرة وثمانية مائة * عمل ورسم مولانا السلطان الشهير ذلك الملك الظاهر الشهيد برقوخ خليد الله ملكه واعاد عليه من بركات القرآن العظيم أمين على يد العبد الفقير علي الله تعالى عبد الرحمن بن الصايغ وصلي الله علي سيدنا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>1469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

**Calligrapher**  
Jānim al-Sayfī Jānī Bik al-Dawādār

**Illuminator**

**Patron**  
Sultan al-Ashraf Abū al-Naṣr Qāytbāy

**Waqf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Volumes</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td>10001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Binding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lines per Page</strong></th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>114.5x89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter**

**Script**  
Muḥaqqaq

**Text Block Size (cm)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 54
Date_AH: c. 770s
Date_AD: c. 1370s

Comments

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron: Arghūn Shāh al-Malākī al-Ashrafi
Waqf

Volumes: 1
Old Number
Folios: 388
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 11
Size (cm): 69x51
Chapter: Three
Script: Muḥaqqaq

Colophon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Not the whole Qur‘ān as it is missing a part from the end. Ends in juz’ 29.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron** | Tatar al-Ḥijāziyya (by waqf) |

**Waqf**

**Volumes** | 1 |
| **Old Number** | 10062 |
| **Folios** | 291 |
| **Binding** | Later binding |
| **Lines per Page** | 13 |
| **Size (cm)** | 51.8x34.5 |
| **Chapter** | Two |
| **Script** | |
| **Text Block Size (cm)** | 40.5x24 |
| **Mini Compendium** | Has a tafsīr and lexicon in red. |
| **Colophon** | |
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The manuscript is not a thirty part Qur‘ān but rather a twenty-part Qur‘ān.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 757-762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 756-1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Juz’ 12 is missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Calligrapher | |
| Illuminator | |
| **Patron** | Sultan Ḥasan (by waqf) |
| **Waqf** | |

| **Volumes** | 29 out of a set of 30 |
| **Old Number** | 10065 |
| **Folios** | |
| **Binding** | |
| **Lines per Page** | 5 |
| **Size (cm)** | 46.2x34.2 |
| **Chapter** | Two |
| **Script** | Muḥaqqaq |
| **Text Block Size (cm)** | 26.1x18.8 |
| **Mini Compendium** | None |
| **Colophon** | وَقَفَ ﻟِلِلَّهِ ﻣَعَالِي
السُّلَطَانُ النَّاصِرُ ﺑِنَ ﻗَﻼَوْنٍ | 506 |
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 60
Date_AH: c. 757-759
Date_AD: c. 1356-1358
Comments: Missing juz’ is 14. An Ilkhanid production that was finished in Cairo?

Calligrapher: Mubārak Shāh ibn ‘Abdallāh
Illuminator: Shirghitimish al-Nāsirī (by waqf)
Patron: Shirghitimish al-Nāsirī (by waqf)

Waqf:

اوقف وحس وسبل وصدق اليد الفقير الى الله تعالى وسعت وسعت جميع الجزء المبارك على المشتقين بالعلم الشرف وعلى المقتني بالفترة الحفظة المجاورة لجامع طولون ليستفروا بذلك في الاستغلال والكتابة منه ليلات وأيام يخرج من المدرسة المذكورة ولا يغيب ولا يذهب ولا يغير وقفا صحيحا شرعيا قصد الوقف وهذا الوقف يثبت، وجه الله العظيم تقبل الله منه فمن بده في منه بعد بما سمعه فان الله علما
ما الذين يبدونه ان الله سميع عليم

Volumes: 29 ajzā’ out of a set 30
Old Number: 10066
Folios:
Binding: Original binding
Lines per Page:
Size (cm): 39.2x27.1
Chapter: Two
Script: Muḥaqqaq
Text Block Size (cm): 23.9x14.7
Mini Compendium:
Colophon: مبَّارِكُ ٍعِلِيّاً ٍمَشْتَغِلِيْنَ ٍبِالْعُلْمِ ٍالْرَّشِّيِّف َوَمَشْتَغِلِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدرَسَةِ ٍوَقَّفٌ َوَحُبْسٌ َو سبْلٌ َوْتَصِدَقٌ ٍعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُبِيدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ أَلْ-ْعُلَّمِ ٍوَمَخْتَاصِرِيْنَ ٍبِالْمَدْرَسَةِ َوَلَا يُغَيْرُ وَلَا يَبْدِلُ وَلَا يُغيَر َوْقَفُ َصَحِيحٌ َعِلَّمٌ َقَصْدَ ْعِلَّدِيْنَ َبِإِلَهِهِ َتَغْلِبْهُمْ ٍجَمِيِّعُ َجُزِيَّةَ َالْحَنْفِيَّةِ َالْمُجَابِرَةِ َلِجَامِعِ ْتَاَمِّ ْمِهْلِيْْ ٍأَوْلَىٍّ ٍأَوْلِيَّ ْبِنِّ A
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Collection  Raṣîd
Manuscript Number  61
Date_AH  c. 757-759
Date_AD  c. 1356-1358
Comments

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron  Şirghitmis al-Nâşirî (by waqf)
Waqf

Volumes  30
Old Number  10067
Folios
Binding  Original binding
Lines per Page  7
Size (cm)  38.4x29.3
Chapter  Two
Script  Thuluth
Text Block Size (cm)  27x18.6
Mini Compendium  None
Colophon

اوقة وحسى وسلي وصدق العبد الفقير الى الله تعالى صرفتم جميع الجزء المبارك على المشغلين بالعلم الشريف وعلى المقيم بالمدرسة الحنفية المجاوره لجامع طولون ليستشفوا بذلك في الاستغفار والكتابه منه ليلا ونهارا بحيث لا يخرج من المدرسه المذكورة ولا يبايع ولا يرهن ولا يوهب ولا يبدل ولا ي취 وفقا صحيحا شرعا قصد الوقف هذا الوقف اتباعا وجه الله العظيم تقبل الله منه ومن بده بعدما سمعه فانا اله على الذين يبدلون ان الله سميع علم
Collection  Raṣīd
Manuscript Number 62
Date_AH c. 757-762
Date_AD c. 1356-1361
Comments Juz’. 30: has a wonderful opening. Juz’ 26: Ottoman 1178 (only this one). Was found in the mosque of Uljāy al-Yūsufī. Juz’ 11 is in the hands of the son of Sawunju, Muḥammad. Juz’17 has been plasticised. Waqf by al-Sayfī al-Jāmī
Calligrapher Sawunju al-Rasūlī al-Silāhdaṟ al-Malakī al-Nāṣiri and Muḥammad ibn Sawunju
Illuminator Same?
Patron Sultan Ḥasan
Waqf Later waqf of Uljāy al-Yūsufī:
الحمد لله الذي ينميته تتم الصالحات اللهم صلى وسلم على سيدنا محمد والسيدان محمد والتابعين هذا وما عده من الأجزاء واعتدتها ثوابون جز أوافقه المقر السيفي الجاي تقبل الله منه وحرصه ان تكون مقرها بالخزانة قدرة التي انشأها بخط صوفي الفمي وان لاتخرج من المدرسة المذكورة الا برهن يحفظ القيم وقف صححا شرعيا من بناه بعدما سمعه فادا الله علی الدين يبيانه ان الله سمع عليه
Volumes 30
Old Number 10076
Folios
Binding Original binding
Lines per Page 7
Size (cm) 52.6x36.2
Chapter Two
Script Muḥaqqaq
Text Block Size (cm) 36.5x27.5
Mini Compendium None
Colophon
The surviving ajza’ are: 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29 and 30. Later waqf in the name of the late 15th century amir Qijmas al-Ishaqi.

Yahyā ibn al-Hasan ibn Ahmad al-Qādī al-Qūsimḥī al ‘Irāqī

Yahyā ibn al-Hasan ibn Ahmad al-Qādī al-Qūsimḥī al ‘Irāqī

A high ranking mamlıük amir
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Same production as Raṣīd 70. Same later endowment as Raṣīd 70 by Qijmas al-Iṣḥāqī. Surviving ajzā‘: 1, 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Yahyā ibn al-Hasan ibn Aḥmad al-Qāḍī al-Qūṣmī al ‘Īraqī ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td>Yahyā ibn al-Hasan ibn Aḥmad al-Qāḍī al-Qūṣmī al ‘Īraqī ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Waqf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>3 out of a set of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td>15615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>original binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>36.7x26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>26.9x18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 72
Date_AH: Jumādā the first 713
Date_AD: August 1313
Comments: Waqf by Baktimur al-Sāqī in the year 726 AH

Calligrapher: ‘Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Hamadānī
Illuminator: ‘Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Hamadānī
Patron: Sultan Uljāytū
Waqf: 

Volumes: 30
Old Number: 15640
Folios Binding
Lines per Page
Size (cm) V.1: 56x39.5
Chapter
Script
Text Block Size (cm) V.1: 32.3x22.4
Mini Compendium

Colophon: 
كتب وذبهbin ممتلاً للامير المخلص الداعي لدولته من سليم قلبه وخلاص نيته الراجح العفو الصمادني اصغر عياده عبد الله بن محمد بن محمود الهمداني فقر الله له في جمادي الأول من شهر شعبان سنة ثلث عشرة وسبعية هجرية يدربها الصلاوات بدار الخيرات الشديدة بهمدان حرسها الله عن الحداثان
Collection  Raṣīd
Manuscript Number  74
Date_AH  c. 803-814
Date_AD  c. 1400-1411
Comments  Surviving juz’ is 15

Calligrapher

Illuminator

Patron  Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (by waqf)
Waqf

Volumes  1 juz’ out of a set of 30
Old Number  16226
Folios  39
Binding

Lines per Page  5
Size (cm)  28.1x20.2
Chapter  Four
Script  Muḥaqqaq
Text Block Size (cm)  20.2x11
Mini Compendium  None
Colophon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>Jumādā 2 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>June 1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td>Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Dashi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td>Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Dashi...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Sultan Barqūq (by date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td>16257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>55x39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq and rayḥān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>44x24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

کتب...اضعف عبا(د) ...احمد بن محمود الدني...جمادي الثاني...تسع وفیان وسیعیة
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Missing ajzā’: 1, 4, 28 and 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Calligrapher** |  |
| **Illuminator** |  |
| **Patron** | Sultan Barquq (by waqf) |
| **Waqf** | وﻗﻒ ﺟﻤﻴﻊ ﻫﺬه اﻟﺨﺘﻤﺔ اﻟﴩﻳﻔﺔ وﻫﻲ ﺛﻠﺜﻮن ﺟﺰا ﻣﻮﻻﻧﺎ اﻟﺴﻠﻄﺎن اﳌﻠﻚ اﳌﻈﺎﻫر ابو سﻌﻴﺪ برﻗﻮق اﻋﺰ اﻟﻠّﻪ اﻧﺼﺎره علي خانقائه التي
اﻧﺸﺎها ب**) بين القصرين وشرط ان لا تخرج منها فمن بداءه بعدما سمعه فما اﷲ علي الذين يبدلونه ان الله سميع علم
<p>|
| <strong>Volumes</strong> | 24 ajzā’ out of a set of 30 |
| <strong>Old Number</strong> | 16258 |
| <strong>Folios</strong> |  |
| <strong>Binding</strong> | Original binding |
| <strong>Lines per Page</strong> | 5 |
| <strong>Size (cm)</strong> | 32.8x23.8 |
| <strong>Chapter</strong> | Four |
| <strong>Script</strong> | Muḥaqqaq |
| <strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong> | 23x14.2 |
| <strong>Mini Compendium</strong> | None |
| <strong>Colophon</strong> |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>c. 803-814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>c. 1400-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Surviving juz’ is 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron** Sultan Faraj ibn Barqūq (by waqf)

**Waqf**

**Volumes** 1 juz’ of a set of 30

**Old Number**

**Folios** 41

**Binding** Later binding

**Lines per Page** 5

**Size (cm)** 30.4x21.6

**Chapter** Four

**Script** Muḥaqqaq

**Text Block Size (cm)** 22x12.5

**Mini Compendium** None

**Colophon** 

وَقَفَ الْمَلِكُ النَّاصرِ بِالخَانِقَةِ الرَّقُوْقِيةِ بِالْتَّرْيِئةٍ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Surviving juz’ is 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron** Sultan Barqūq (by location)

**Waqf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Volumes</strong></th>
<th>1 juz’ out of a set of 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td>16261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>18.5x12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Naskh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>11.4x7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Surviving juz’ is 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Calligrapher** | Most definitely ʿĀḥmad al-Īṣfahānī |
| **Illuminator** | ʿĀḥmad al-Īṣfahānī? |
| **Patron** | Sultan Barqūq (stylistically) |
| **Waqf** |  |

| **Volumes** | 1 juz’ out of a set of 30 |
| **Old Number** | 16262 |
| **Folios** | 16 |
| **Binding** | Original binding |
| **Lines per Page** | 11 |
| **Size (cm)** | 43x32 |
| **Chapter** | Four |
| **Script** | Muḥaqqaq and naskh |
| **Text Block Size (cm)** | 29.5x21 |
| **Mini Compendium** |  |
| **Colophon** |  |

518
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raşid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>15 Sha‘bān 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>25 March 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Surviving ajzā’: 1, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Calligrapher**   |                        |
| **Illuminator**    |                        |
| **Patron**         | Khawand Baraka (by waqf) |
| **Waqf**           |                        |

هذا ما وقفت الدار العالية المصنعة المختصرة المحفوظة خوند بركة والدة القدر الشريف الأعظم السلطان الملك الأشرف أبو المظفر شعبان خلد الله ملكه و صان حجابه جميع هذا المصحف الكريم وفقاً صحيحاً شرعياً ليثبته به سائر المسلمين في القراءة و غر ذلك من وجه الانفعالات الشرعية و شرطت أن يكون مقر ذلك بالمدرسة المعروفة بانشائها و عمارتها باظهار القاهرة الحريسة بخط التبانة و شرطت ان لا يخرج من المكان الذكر إلا برغم يحرز قيمته و شرطت النظر في ذلك لنفسها أيام حياتها و من بعد وفاتها لشريعت النظر إليها من بعدها و اشهدت عليها بذلك كله اليوم الأول يوم الاثنين الثالث من شهر ذي القعدة الحرام سنة ثمان و ثمانية و سبعماية هجرية نبوية

<p>| <strong>Volumes</strong>       | 13 juz’ out of a set of 30 |
| <strong>Old Number</strong>    |                        |
| <strong>Folios</strong>        |                        |
| <strong>Binding</strong>       | Original binding       |
| <strong>Lines per Page</strong>| 7                      |
| <strong>Size (cm)</strong>     | 24.2x16                |
| <strong>Chapter</strong>       | Three                  |
| <strong>Script</strong>        | Muḥaqqaq              |
| <strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong> | 18x10.5               |
| <strong>Mini Compendium</strong> | None                  |
| <strong>Colophon</strong>      |                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>Sha‘bān 734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>April 1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Very much like Raṣīd 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Kamāl ibn Yaḥyā al-Anšārī al-Muṭṭālib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Volumes** | 1 |
| **Old Number** | 16742 |
| **Folios** | 381 |
| **Binding** | Later binding |
| **Lines per Page** | 11 |
| **Size (cm)** | 51.5x37 |
| **Chapter** | |
| **Script** | Muḥaqqaq |
| **Text Block Size (cm)** | 38.8x25 |
| **Mini Compendium** | None |

Colophon

 كامل المصحف المبارك بحمد الله وعونه وصلى علي سيدينا محمد واله وصحيه وسلم علي يدي العبد الفقير إل الله تعالى أحمد بن محمد بن كمال ابن يحيى الأنصاري المنشطب بمدينة القاهرة المعزبة حرسها الله تعالى في شهر شعبان المبارك سنة أربع وثلاثين وسبعمائة وخمسمائة رحم الله كاتبه وقارئه وجميع المسلمين يأري بالله تعالى أمن أمين
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date AH</td>
<td>c. 757-762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date AD</td>
<td>c. 1356-1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Sultan Ḥasan (by location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>Juz’ 9 out of a 30 set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td>16820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>New binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>30.2x20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>20.2x13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date AH</td>
<td>Sha‘bān 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date AD</td>
<td>June 1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td>Maḥmūd ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Nakhjawānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td>Maḥmūd ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Nakhjawānī?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Waqf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>49x38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td>﴾ṣﺪق اﻟﻠﻪ اﻛﺮم اﻟﺼﺎدﻗﻴﻦ واﺻﺪق اﻟﻘﺎﺋﻠﻴﻦ وﺑﻠﻎ رﺳﻮﻟﻪ اﻻﻣﻴﻦ ﻣﺎ ﺣﻤﻞ ﻣﻦ اﻟﺮﺳﺎﻟﺔ وواﺿﺢ اﻟﺪﻻﻟﺔ واﻧﺎ ﻋﲇ ذﻟﻚ ﻣﻦ اﻟﺸﺎﻫﺪﻳﻦ وﺻﲇ اﻟﻠﻪ ﻋﲇ انصار والمهاجرين صلاة داﻳﻤﺎ على ﺷﻴﻤﻦ ورواية ﻣﻦ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻹع看著 ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎن ﻓﺎن ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻﻧﺼﺎر واﻟﻼحظ ﺷ兵马 ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻲ وواﻻnan ﻓﺎn ﻓﺎn ﺑﻲ ﻏﻨﻴ…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 111
Date_AH: Shawwāl 74x
Date_AD: 134x
Comments: Corrections and revisions made in 760/1358

Calligrapher: ‘Abdallāh al-Shāfi‘ī
Illuminator:  
Patron:  
Waqf:  

Volumes
Old Number
Folios: 248
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 13
Size (cm): 59x43
Chapter: Two
Script: Muḥaqqaq

Text Block Size (cm):  
Mini Compendium: None

Colophon: واربعتويسبعماياة

كتبه عبد الفقير الله تعالى عبد الله الشافعي الراحي غفر رباه وكان الفراغ منها في شهر شوال سنة واربعين وسبعية
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Rasid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Surviving ajzā’: 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron** Sultan Barqūq (by location)

**Waqf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>10 ajzā’ out of a set of 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Original binding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>30x27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Surviving juz’is 24. Same as Raṣīd 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Calligrapher | |
| Illuminator | |
| Patron | Sultan Barqūq (by location) |
| Waqf | |

<p>| Volumes | 1 juz’ out of a set of 30 |
| Old Number | | |
| Folios | 40 |
| Binding | Original binding? |
| Lines per Page | 5 |
| Size (cm) | 30x27 |
| Chapter | Four |
| Script | Muḥaqqaq |
| Text Block Size (cm) | |
| Mini Compendium | |
| Colophon | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>10th Dhī al-Ḥījja 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>13 December 1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Surviving ajzā': 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 19 and 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td>Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td>Aḥmad al-Iṣfahānī?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Sultan Barquq (by dedication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>7 ajzā’ out of a set of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Original binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>43x32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq and naskh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon</td>
<td>اﻟﻌﺒﺪ ﺑﻌﻮن اﻟﻠّﻪ ﺗﻌﺎﱄ وﺣﺴﻦ ﺗﻮﻓﻴﻘﻪ ﰲ اﳌﺪرﺳﺔ اﳌﺒﺎرﻛﺔ اﻟﺘﻲ اﻧﺸﺎﻬﺎ اﻟﺴﻠﻄﺎن اﳌﻠﻜ ﺑﻊ ﻣﺎﺋﺔ اﳌﻔﻘﻴﺮ اﱄ رﺑﻪ اﻟﻜﺒﻴﺮ أﺣﻤﺪ اﻻﺻﻔﻬﺎﻧﻲ ﰲ ﻋﴩ ذي اﻟﺤﺠﺔ ﺳﻨﺔ ﺗﺴﻊ و ﺛﻤﺎنﻴﻦ و س</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Raşid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 786-801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1384-1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Surviving ajzā’: 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 20, 25 and 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Calligrapher** | |
| **Illuminator** | |
| **Patron** | Sultan Barqūq (by waqf) |
| **Waqf** | |

<p>| <strong>Volumes</strong> | 12 ajzā’ out of a set of 30 |
| <strong>Old Number</strong> | |
| <strong>Folios</strong> | |
| <strong>Binding</strong> | Original binding |
| <strong>Lines per Page</strong> | 5 |
| <strong>Size (cm)</strong> | 38x27 |
| <strong>Chapter</strong> | Four |
| <strong>Script</strong> | Muḥaqqaq |
| <strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong> | |
| <strong>Mini Compendium</strong> | None |
| <strong>Colophon</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>Rabi‘ al-Ākhar 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>September 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Later waqf: Sīdī Muḥammad ibn Idrīs dedicated it to the mausoleum of Imām al-Shāfī‘ī in 1060/1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṭūrī al-Tunjūkhī al-Malakī al-Ashrafi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Sha‘bān?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Sha‘bān?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>54x40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Rayḥān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colophon**

> كتاب هذه الخاتمة الشفيفة العبد الفقير أي سبجان وعذال رائع غفو ه وعفرتة موسى بن محمد بن الحسن ابن الطوسي المتوفي الملكي... الإشرفي بالقاهرة ... سنة في التاريخ العشرين الأوسط من شهر ربيع الآخر من سنة سنت وسبعين وسبع...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Ras'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date.AD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td>Ibn al-‘Afif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folios</strong></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>Later binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per Page</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td>49x38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script</strong></td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Compendium</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophon</strong></td>
<td>كتبه الفقير الضعيف المدعو بن العقيق حامداً لله تعالى ومصلياً على نبيه والله وصحبه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Raṣīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>c. 757-759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>c. 1356-1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calligrapher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illuminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>Şirghitmish al-Nāʿīrī (by waqf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

اوقف وحسى وسب وصدقي العبد القليل في الله تعالى صرفتم جميع الجزء المبارك على مشغلي العلم الفقيه والمؤمنين بالله الحكيم الحكيم الماهر بالعلوم المجاورة لجامع طولون ليستفزوا بذلك في الطاعة والصبر والصبر عن يده [ولا يخرج من المدرسة المذكورة ولا يباع ولا يقام ولا يلد ولا يدلون] ولا يذهب ولا يذهب ولا يغيب وفقا صحيحا شرعا قسما الوقفا هذا الوقفا ابتعدا وجه الله العظيم تقبل الله منه فمن بدله بعدما سمعه فابدء الله على الذين يبدلونه أن الله سميع عليم وهو حسي ونعم الوكيل

<p>| Volumes            | 1                          |
| Old Number         |                            |
| Folios             | 351                        |
| Binding            | New binding                |
| Lines per Page     | 11                         |
| Size (cm)          | 58x42                      |
| Chapter            | Two                        |
| Script             | Muḥaqqaq                   |
| Text Block Size (cm)|                            |
| Mini Compendium    | None                       |
| Colophon           |                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Number</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AH</td>
<td>c. 757-759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_AD</td>
<td>c. 1356-1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Surviving ajzā’ are 4, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron**  Şirgħimish al-Nāṣirī (by waqf)

**Waqf**

اوقف وحس وسیل وصدق العبد الفقیر إلی الله تعالى صرفتمش جميع الجزء المبارك على المشتفی بالعلم الشریف وعی المقيم باللدرسة الح-girl لجامع طالون ليستفروا بذلك في الاتشغال والکتابة منه لیا وتهارا بحیث لا يخرج من الدروسة المذکورة ولا يبای ولأرئه ولا يوهب ولا يبدل ولا يغیر وفقا صحبة شرعیا قصد الوقف هذی الوقف ابتداء ووجه الله العظیم تقبل الله منه فمن بدله بعدما سمعه فابه الفهی على الذين يبدلونه ان الله سمیع علیم وهو حسی ونعم الوکیل

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>11 ajzā’ out of a set of 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Number</td>
<td>19203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Original binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per Page</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (cm)</td>
<td>27x19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Muḥaqqaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Block Size (cm)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Compendium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection: Rašīd
Manuscript Number: 149
Date_AH: c. 757-759
Date_AD: c. 1356-1358

Comments

Calligrapher
Illuminator: Širghitmish al-Nāṣirī (by waqf)
Patron: Širghitmish al-Nāṣirī (by waqf)
Waqf

Waqf

Volumes: 2 ajzāʾ out of a set of 30
Old Number
Folios
Binding: Original binding
Lines per Page: 5
Size (cm): 26x19
Chapter: Two
Script: Naskh

Mini Compendium: None
Colophon

اﳌﺒﺎرك ﻋﲇ اﳌﺸﺘﻐﻠﻴﻦ ﺑﺎﻟﻌﻠﻢ اﻟﴩﻳﻒ وﻋﲇ اﳌﻘﻴﻤﻴﻦ ﺑﺎﳌﺪرﺳﺔ الحنفيّة المجاورة لجامع طولون ليستففوا بذلك في الاشتغال والكتابة منه ليلاً ونهاراً بحيث لا يخرج من المدرسة المذكورة ولا يبيع ولايرهن ولا يوهب ولايدعل ولا يُغيّر وقفاً صحيحاً شرعياً قصد الوقف بهذا الوقف يتفا ووجه الله العظيم تقبل الله منه فمن بدله بعدما سمعه فاذا ابهج
علي الذين يبدلونه ان الله سمع عليم

532
Collection  Raṣīd
Manuscript Number  150
Date_AH  c. 757-759
Date_AD  c. 1356-1358
Comments  Surviving ajza’: 10, 12, 18, 20 and 28

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron  Şirghitmish al-Nāṣirî (by waqf)
Waqf

Volumes  5 ajza’ out of a set of 30
Old Number
Folios
Binding

Text Block Size (cm)  None
Mini Compendium

Colophon

اووقف وحس وسبل وتصدق العباد القبار إلى الله تعالى صرفتم على الجزء المبارك على المشرق وإلي المقيم بالمدرسة الحفيدة المجاورة لجامع طروان ليستفزوها بذلك في الافتتاح والكتابة منها لولا وفدا بحث لا يخرج من المدرسة المذكورة ولا يباع ولا يفهم ولا يوهب ولا يبدل ولا يغيروا صبيحا شرعا قصد الوقف بهذا الوقف ابتغاء وجه الله العظيم تقبل الله منه فمن بدله بعدها عامة الله على الذين يبدلونه أن الله سبحانه وتعالى هو حسب ونعم الوكيل وصل الله علي محمد وعليه وصحبه وسلم

Volumes  5 ajza’ out of a set of 30
Old Number
Folios
Binding

Lines per Page
Size (cm)  18x13
Chapter  Two
Script  Naskh

Colophon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>c. 803-814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>c. 1400-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Found later in the mosque of Jawhar Lala. Surviving ajzā’: 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stylistically it belongs to the 14th century. Endowed to the khānqā/madrasa of Jamāl</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calligrapher</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illuminator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron</strong></td>
<td>Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq (by waqf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waqf</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وقف مولانا المقام الأعظم الشريف السلطان الملك الناصر أبو السعادات فرج بن السلطان العبد الشهيد الملك الظاهر برقوق

وكتبه الله برحمة جمعه هذا الجزء وما بعده من تجزيه ثلاثين جزء من الربعة الشريفة على جميع القراء وافقوا الذي بخانقات

الكتابة بخط رفيع باب العيد بقرب خانقات سعيد السعدا ينتفعون به وجعل مقره بالخانقات المذكورة وشرط الوقف المذكور ان

لا يخرج من المكان المذكور لا برته ولا بغيره وجعل النظر في ذلك من يكون ناظرا على الخانقات المذكورة

<p>| <strong>Volumes</strong>   | 11 juz’ out of a set of 30 |
| <strong>Old Number</strong> |                           |
| <strong>Folios</strong>    |                           |
| <strong>Binding</strong>   | Original binding          |
| <strong>Lines per Page</strong> | 5                         |
| <strong>Size (cm)</strong> | 30x22                     |
| <strong>Chapter</strong>   | Four                      |
| <strong>Script</strong>    | Muḥaqqaq                  |
| <strong>Text Block Size (cm)</strong> | None                     |
| <strong>Mini Compendium</strong> | None                     |
| <strong>Colophon</strong>  |                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Raṣīd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscript Number</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AH</strong></td>
<td>22 Safar 743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date_AD</strong></td>
<td>27 July 1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>[535]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calligrapher**

**Illuminator**

**Patron**

**Waqf**

**Volumes** | 1 |
| **Old Number** | 19544 |
| **Folios** | 249 |
| **Binding** | Later binding |
| **Lines per Page** | 17 |
| **Size (cm)** | 51.8x34.5 |
| **Chapter** | Two |
| **Script** | Muḥaqqaq |
| **Text Block Size (cm)** | 40.5x24 |
| **Mini Compendium** | None |

Colophon:

صدق الله العظيم وصدق رسوله الكريم وصدق ملاكائه المقربين ونحن على ذلك من الشاهدين نحرت كتابته يوم الجمعة ثاني عشرين سفر سنة ثلاث واربعين وسبعونيا وصلوته علي خيره من خلفه محمد النبي وآله الطاهرين وصحابته المنتجين وسلمه
Comments: Very much like 81. First few folios were added in the 19th century.

Calligrapher: Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Kamal ibn Yahya al-Ansari al-Muta'abib
Illuminator: Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Kamal ibn Yahya al-Ansari al-Muta'abib?

Patron: Waqf

Volumes: Old Number
Folios: 430
Binding: Later binding
Lines per Page: 11
Size (cm): 53x36
Chapter
Script: Muhaqqaq

Colophon:
كامل المصحف المبارك بحمد الله وعونه وصلى الله علي محمد ثنيه وعلى الله وسلم علي يد السيد الفقيه الي ربي تعالى أحمد بن محمد بن كمال بن يحيى الأنصاري المتسبب مدينة القاهرة المعززة حرسها الله تعالى في شهر رمضان لعشرين سنة الثانى وثلاثين وسبعمائة ... الله كاتبه
Collection: Raṣīd
Manuscript Number: 372
Date_AH: 15 Shaʿbān 770
Date_AD: 25 March 1369
Comments: Surviving juz’ is 17

Calligrapher
Illuminator
Patron: Khawand Baraka (by waqf)

Waqf

Volumes: 1 out of a set of 30
Old Number
Folios: 41
Binding: Original binding
Lines per Page: 5
Size (cm): 18x13
Chapter: Three
Script: Naskh

Text Block Size (cm): None
Mini Compendium: None
Colophon

ووقفت الدار العالية المصونة الحجية الخنثرة خوندركة
الله حجابها والدة مولانا السلطان الملك الاعرف شعبان
خلي الاله ملكه و حجابها جميع هذه الريعة الشريفة وقناً
صحيحًا شرعية لينفع به سائر المسلمين في القراءة و غير ذلك
من سائر وجه الانتفاعات الشرعية و شرطتنا أن يكون مقرها
بالمدرسة المعروفة بنشائتها خط البليدة يظاهر القاهرة المحرسة
شرطت النظر في ذلك لنفسها ايام حياتها و من بعدها لم تشرفت
اليه في ذلك كله في خمس عشر شعبان الكرم سنة سبعين و سبعمئة