

A STUDY OF THE POLITICO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS
AND ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE MECCAN
EMIRATE DURING THE BURJI PERIOD
(784-923 A.H./1382-1517 A.D.)

by

Mohammed Said Abdullah Al-Siddiqi

Thesis submitted for
the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the
University of London
January 1974



ProQuest Number: 10731261

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731261

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

A B S T R A C T

Paradoxically, the religio-commercial importance of the Meccan region turned out to be little in favour and more against the interest of the Sharifs of Mecca. They had long been compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of various rulers and during the Burjī period have also forfeited much of their revenue as well as their control of ^{the} administration.

The present study deals with various aspects associated with the history of Mecca and shows the effect of the manifold grip of the Burjī Sultans.

The first two chapters concentrate on the manifestation of political activities of local Ashraf. The dependencies of Mecca have also been examined with particular reference to the elevation of certain Sharifs to the exalted position of Nā'ib al-Sultān ^{in the Hijāz} and the nature of relationship between the Sharifs of Mecca and non Egyptian Sultans.

Chapters III-VII of this thesis discuss the general economic condition and various sources of income and expenditures of the Sharifs of Mecca are examined. The survey reveals that the Sharifs obtained a considerable amount of money from tolls, custom dues and other sources not related to trade. These various financial gains of the Sharifs diminished greatly after 828/1425 in consequence of the diversion of most of the revenue to Cairo by the Egyptian Sultans. Their other direct or indirect exploitation had a very detrimental effect on the general prosperity of the region.

The last three chapters are devoted to treat issues relevant to local administration. It shows that almost entire administration was controlled by the Sharifi officials until 828/1425. From that year onwards their authority dwindled and the Sultani officials acquired ever increasing influence and dominance. The simultaneous functioning of these two groups of officials caused occasional friction which were usually resolved in favour of the Sultani officials.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has been a great privilege and also a rewarding challenge to carry out this research under the supervision of Professor Bernard Lewis. His inspiring guidance and continuous encouragement have contributed much in enabling me to complete this rather *lengthy* thesis. It is to him that I offer my sincerest thanks and deepest gratitude.

I am also very grateful to His Excellency al-Shaykh Hasan b. Abdullah Al al-Shaykh, the minister of education of Saudi Arabia, the rector of the University of Riyāḍ, the cultural advisor and other officials in the Saudi Arabian Cultural Bureau for various financial and moral support.

I am also indebted to Professor P.M.Holt, Dr. J.E.Wansbrough, and Mr. V.J.Parry, of the School of Oriental and African Studies for their valuable suggestions.

I should also like to thank the staff of the Department of History, the Library and the Reading room of the School of Oriental and African Studies, the British Museum, and various libraries in Saudi Arabia and Turkey.

Thanks are also due to several friends who have helped me, in one way or another, particularly Mr. A. Al-Ḥassu for lending and allowing me the use of part of Sakhāwī's al-Dhayl which he had edited, Miss Mary Bell, Mrs. Paddy Baker, Dr. Anna Irene Falk for translating some articles and Mrs. Nina Fuller for typing this thesis.

Finally I should like to express my most profound gratitude to my father, Shaykh Abū Said Abdullah, and to other members of the family whose continuous endurance and encouragement made possible the continuation of this research for a rather lengthy period.

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC CHARACTERS

<u>Consonants</u>		<u>Consonants</u>	
ع	• (except when initial)	ض	ḡ
ب	b	ط	t
ت	t	ظ	z
ث	<u>th</u>	ع	'
ج	j	غ	<u>gh</u>
ح	ḥ	ف	f
خ	<u>kh</u>	ق	q
د	d	ك	k
ذ	<u>dh</u>	ل	l
ر	r	م	m
ز	z	ن	n
س	s	ه	h
ش	<u>sh</u>	و	w
ص	ṣ	ي	y
 <u>Long vowels</u>		 <u>Short vowels</u>	
آ and إ	ā	ا	a
و	ū	و	u
ى	ī	ي	i

Diphthongs

اَ و	اِ	aw
اِ و	اِ	ay
اِ و	اِ	iiy (final form ī)
اِ و	اِ	uww (final form ū)

Finally, *al-* at (construct state) and *al-* (article) al- .

ABBREVIATIONS

A.HK	Maktaba 'Ārif Ḥikma, Medina, Saudi Arabia.
AR.	Arabic
art.	article
A.S.	Library of Aya Sofya, Istanbul, Turkey.
B.A.	Library of Besir Aḡa, Istanbul, Turkey.
Ed.	edited or edition.
E.E.	Library of Esat Effendi, Istanbul, Turkey.
<u>E.I.</u> ¹	Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition, Leiden, 1913-42.
<u>E.I.</u> ²	Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd edition, Luzac and Co., London, 1960 - in progress.
Ex.	Extract.
FAT	Library of Fatih, Istanbul, Turkey.
KOP	Library of Köprulu, Istanbul, Turkey.
L.U.I.	Library of the University of Istanbul, Turkey.
M.H.M.	Maktabat al-Ḥaram al-Makki, Mecca.
N.OS.	Library of Nuri Osmaniye, Istanbul, Turkey.
pub.	published or publisher.
T.S.	Library of Topkapi Sarayi Muzesi, Istanbul, Turkey.
U.P.	"Unpublished pages", title given by M. Mustafa to a portion of Ibn I'yās's <u>Badā'i</u> which the former had edited and published.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
System of transliteration of Arabic characters	4
Abbreviations	5
Introduction and some Notes on the Sources	9
Chapter I An account of the successive <u>Sharifs</u> of Mecca against the background of the local history	4 8
Chapter II Exposition of aspects relevant to the political situation in Mecca	1 0 0
a) The dependencies of Mecca	1 0 0
b) Occasional elevation of the <u>Sharif</u> of Mecca to the status of <u>Nā'ib al-Sultan</u> ..	1 1 1
c) Relations of the <u>Sharifs</u> of Mecca with the rulers of Egypt, Irāq and the Yemen ..	1 2 7
Chapter III Illustration of aspects related to trade and commerce in Mecca and Jedda	1 4 7
a) The commercial significance of the pilgrimage	1 4 7
b) Revenue of the <u>Sharifs</u> from the local tolls and occasional dues	1 5 2
Chapter IV Share of the <u>Sharifs</u> in the <u>Ushr</u> obtained in Jedda with particular reference to the Yemānite and the Indian merchants	1 6 2
Chapter V Financial gains of the <u>Sharifs</u> from the sources not related to trade	1 9 2
a) Gifts	1 9 2
b) <u>Sharif's</u> customary claim to one third of the <u>Sadaqāt</u>	1 9 6

c) Sharif's right in al-Mawāriṭh al-Ḥashariyyā
 (escheat) 1 9 8

Chapter VI A brief survey of the Sadaqāt and other contri-
 butions sent to Mecca for charitable works .. 2 0 4

a) Charities of the Egyptian Sultans and digni-
 taries sent, in cash or kind, to assist indi-
 viduals or maintain welfare institutions 2 0 4

b) Contribution of the Ottoman Sultans in the
 material well-being of the Meccans .. 2 1 1

c) Participation of the Indian rulers in the
 works of general welfare 2 1 8

Chapter VII Financial obligations and personal expendi-
 ture of the Sharifs of Mecca 2 2 1

a) Amounts spent to maintain the family, or paid
 as allowances and salaries 2 2 1

b) Sums of money spent by the Sharifs in financ-
 ing benevolent works 2 2 2

c) Voluntary or compulsory payments to the Egyp-
 tian Sultans or their Amirs 2 2 4

Chapter VIII The extent of the Sharifs of Mecca's partici-
 pation in local administration 2 3 4

a) The officials appointed by and responsible to
 the Sharifs of Mecca 2 3 4

b) The influence of the Sharifs over the Sultani
 officials 2 5 0

Chapter IX The posts held by the Sultani officials in Mecca 2 5 5

a) The officials appointed to the posts related to
 the Meccan sanctuary 2 5 5

b) <u>Qādis</u> of four Sunni schools and the dominant position of the <u>Shāfa'ī</u>	2 5 8
c) <u>Muhtasib</u>	2 6 8
d) <u>Bāsh al-Mamālīk</u>	2 6 9
Chapter X The officials sent from Cairo to collect taxes in Jedda	2 8 1
a) Financial obligation of the officials towards the Egyptian Sultans	2 8 4
b) The influence and authority of the principal official in Jedda	2 8 8
c) The problems confronting the last <u>Nā'ib</u> of Jedda and some of his achievements	2 9 3
Conclusion	2 9 8
Bibliography	3 0 6

INTRODUCTION

AND SOME NOTES ON THE SOURCES

Introduction

The region of Mecca - which is the focal point of all the aspects dealt with in this thesis - lies, as is well known, within the region of the Ḥijāz,¹ once the keystone of the political structure of the Muslim empire. But before the end of the first century of the Hijra/8th century of the Christian era, the Ḥijāz found itself without real political influence and importance. Events in and around the region had reduced its status from that of an imperial province to that of a dependency of one or the other of the new centres of gravity of the Islamic world such as Syria, Irāq, Egypt, and even the Yemen. But this did not and could not deprive the region of its great and unique religious significance as the region was the cradle of Islam and contained al-Ḥaramayn.² It was this very advantage of the region which, somewhat ironically, caused its

¹The Arab geographers as well as the historians differ from each other in their definitions of this region and none of their conflicting views seems to be conclusive and satisfactory. How confusing some of these definitions are is well illustrated in a thesis entitled The Hijaz as defined by the Arab geographers submitted for the degree of Ph.D. by Mr. A. Al-Wahaibi, now Dr., in the University of London in 1969. Obviously it is not possible to go through all the complicated details concerning the definition of the Ḥijāz, as this would be feasible only at the expense of other more relevant and important topics in connection with this thesis. This region, as is well known, lies in the north-western part of the Arabian peninsula and at present it is well defined. Much of what is known now as Tihāmat al-Shām and Tihāmat 'Asīr was during the Burjī period, as will be seen, among the dependencies of Mecca. For several useful details about the Ḥijāz, see B. Lewis, The Arabs in History (Hutchinson University Library, London, 1960), pp. 21-22; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Al-Ḥidjāz", pp. 362-64; idem, E.I.², art. "Djazirat Al-Arab", pp. 533-56 and works cited in its bibliography.

²Two holy places, usually meaning Mecca and Medina, but occasionally Jerusalem and Hebron. B. Lewis, E.I.², art. "Al-Ḥaramayn", pp. 175-76. See also: O. Grapar, E.I.², art. "Al-Ḥaram al-Sharif", pp. 173-75.

domination by various rival Muslim rulers. In the ^{Mamlūk} period eventually the issue was settled, and for good, in favour of the late Bahrī Sultans and their hegemony over the Ḥijāz was consolidated further by the Burjī Sultans.¹

There can be little, if any, doubt that the importance of the area rested on its unique religious significance and that the greatest reason behind the desire and competition of several rulers for its domination was to acquire prestige and an enviable position. But this was not the only reason and other considerations, especially commercial, must also have been present in the minds of these contenders, who were more than willing to derive material benefit through control of the Ḥijāz.

The geographical location of the Ḥijāz, with its long coast and several sea ports, and the annual ceremony of the pilgrimage, had made it eminently suitable as a transit route for the east-west trade and had made Mecca a centre of the overland commercial transaction with the Yemen, ʿIrāq, Syria, Egypt, and figured as one or the other, or both simultaneously, at various times in its history.

¹The Mamlūk Sultans (655-923/1257-1517) are usually divided into two groups: Bahrī and Burjī, after the location of their regimental residence. The former were usually stationed on the isle of al-Rawḍa - in the River Nile (Bahr al-Nīl) and the latter in the tower (Abrāj, sing. Burj) of Cairo citadel. Both groups, or the majority, to be more exact, differed from each other on ethnical grounds too. The Bahrīs were Qipčaq Turks and the Burjīs Circassians, known also as Jarakisa (sing. Jarkas). The rule of the Bahrī Sultans practically ended in 784/1382 and the Burjī rule lasted until 923/1517. For the points mentioned and further details, see B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, London, 1970), vol. I, p. 209-219; D. Ayalon, E.I.², art. "Bahriyya", pp. 944-45; idem, E.I.², art. "Burdjiyya", pp. 1324-25; idem, Halil Inalcik and others, E.I.², art. "Cerkes", pp. 21-25; G. Wiet, E.I.², art. "Barḳuḳ", pp. 1050-51.

Though most of the Burjī Sultans were Circassians, there were among them Sultans of other ethnical origin. For instance, Sultan Khushqadam (865-72/1460-67) and Sultan Tamarbugha (Jumādā I, 872/

"From very early times Arabia has formed a transit area between the Mediterranean countries and the further east, and its history has to a large extent been determined by the vicissitudes of east-west traffic communication both within Arabia and through Arabia have been directed by the geographical configuration of the peninsula into certain well defined lines. The first of these is the Ḥijāz route, running from the Red Sea ports and the border ports of Palestine and Transjordan along the inner flank of the Red Sea coastal range and onwards to the Yemen..."¹

This commercial significance of the region and the resulting financial gains were not confined to any specific period but increased tremendously during the Burjī period and, with this, the grip of the Egyptian Sultan over the area.

Long before the period under examination the Ḥijāz had been politically in a state of fragmentation and had come to consist of several small principalities ruled usually by a Sharif.² The most

Rajab 872/Dec. 1467-Feb.1468) were of Rūmi origin. See: Yūsuf b. Taghri Birdi, al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fi Mulūk Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira (Ms. A.S. No. 3499), vol. VII, fol. 310; idem, Ḥawādith al-Duhūr fi madā' al-Ayyām wa'l-Shuhūr (Ex. ed. by W. Popper in three parts, California, 1930-32), part III, p.657; Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Iyās, Bada'i' al-Zuhūr fi waqā'i' al-Duhūr, 2 vols. (Bulaq, 1311/1893), vol. II, pp.70 and 87-89; idem, Bada'i' (a portion dealing with the events between 857-72/1453-67 which was left out of Istanbul's edition (vols. III-V, 1931-36 A.D.), is ed. and pub. under the title Ṣafḥat lam tunshar (i.e. Unpublished pages) by M. Muṣṭafa (Cairo, 1951), p.195; see also: 'Abd al-Ḥayy b. Aḥmad b. al-'Imād, Shadharāt al-Dhahab fi akhbār man Dhahab, 8 vols. (Cairo, 1350-51/1931-32), vol. VII, pp. 315 and 326.

¹B.Lewis, The Arabs in History, p.22. See also: idem, "The Fatimids and the route to India" in Revue de la Faculté des Sciences économiques de l'Université d'Istanbul, XI (1949-50), pp. 50-54; H.Lammens, E.I.¹, art. "Mecca", pp. 437-42; Map of "Trade routes and main products", Atlas of the Arab world and the Middle East (Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1960).

²The term Sharif (plur. Ashraf, Shurafa'), "noble, exalted", the root of which expresses the idea of elevation and prominence, means primarily a freeman, who can claim a distinguished position because of his descent from illustrious ancestors. This term is generally used in the Ḥijāz to signify a descendant of the Prophet Muḥammad through his grandsons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, sons of the Prophet's daughter Faṭima and son-in-law 'Ali. This term is frequently used to denote the Amirs of the local principalities but has no exclusive connection with the

prominent of these local emirates were those of Mecca, Medina, and Yanbu'. The Sharifs of Mecca and Yanbu' belonged to the Hasani branch and those of Medina to the Husayni. Both these groups were divided into several sub-groups on the basis of their immediate family ties. In addition to the three above stated main emirates, there were other less important small principalities such as the emirates of Khulays, Haly, al-Qunfudha, which were on the whole under the control of the Sharifs of Mecca. The latter also enjoyed, intermittently, authority over the Sharifs of Medina and Yanbu' when elevated to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān (deputy of the Sultan) in the Hijāz.

In view of what has been said, it is evident that the Sharifs of Mecca were the most influential and strongest in the region and it is therefore by no means surprising that the Egyptian Sultans as well as other rulers considered their relationship with the Sharifs of Mecca far more important than those with any other Amir in the region. The Sharifs of Mecca were undoubtedly the richest and most powerful among the local Amirs but this should not be over-estimated, as their power was confined within the region and was far from being unchallenged. The elevation of the Sharif of Mecca to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān was bound to give him considerable authority but, to judge by the information available, it could be said with certainty that the actual authority of Nā'ib al-Sultān was far less than that which the title

emirate itself, as many non-Sharifs were in control of these principalities and particularly Mecca. But from the later part of the Bahri period all the Amirs appointed were and had to be Sharifs. For the points mentioned and further details, see B. Lewis, E.I.², art. "Alids", pp. 400-403 and the genealogical table; C. van Arendonk, E.I.¹, art. "Sharif", pp. 324-29; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Hashimids, Al-Hawāshim", pp. 262-63; A. J. Wensinck, E.I.¹, art. "Mecca", pp. 437-48; Fr. Buhl, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Madina", pp. 83-92; Adolf Grohmann, E.I.¹, art. "Yanbu", pp. 1158-59.

indicates. It implies, in theory, that the whole region of the Higaz was placed under the control of Na'ib al-Sultān but in fact it was seldom more than a symbolic change in his status. True that the Sharifs of Medina and Yanbu usually acknowledged the formal superiority of Na'ib al-Sultān but without surrendering much of their own authority and control of their respective areas.

The Sharifs of Mecca have established friendly relationship with non Egyptian Muslim rulers. The former, however, could no longer play off one Sultan against another for their political or financial gains. The Burjī Sultans have consolidated their hegemony to such an extent that it could not be opposed or altered by local or other forces. The Sharifs often received envoys and gifts from various Muslim rulers. The sender may or may not have entertained some political design but there is nothing to suggest that the Sharifs of Mecca made such contact on the basis of a politically motivated external policy directed against the hegemony of their Mamlūk overlords. Occasionally some of the 'Irāqī or the Yemenite rulers enjoyed minor privileges. But this was never without the approval of, or at the expense of, the Burjī Sultans.

The financial position and the administrative ability of the Sharifs of Mecca were relatively stronger than other local Amirs. But their Egyptian overlords not only diverted most of the revenue to Cairo but also, by their ever increasing interference in local administration, deprived the Sharifs from much of their wealth and authority.

It is worth pointing out that the extension of the Sharifs of Mecca's influence over the local chiefs-particularly those between Jedda and the Yemen-seems to have had the blessing of the Egyptian Sultans to ensure the safety of the merchants heading for Mecca or Jedda or further north, by land or by sea, from or across the Yemen and were a great source of the revenue. It

can even be assumed that the occasional elevation of some of the Meccan Sharifs to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān was motivated by reasons of security as the latter was, at least supposedly, in control of the eastern coast of the Red Sea with its adjoining areas towards the hinterlands from Jazān onwards up to almost its northernmost limit.

In connection with this official or de facto influence of the Meccan Sharifs it is worth mentioning that neither they nor their Egyptian overlords ever tried seriously to make the region a single political entity. In fact, all the factual evidence, local events, the desire of the local Amirs to retain their principalities as separate entities, and the policies of the Egyptian Sultans, point to the contrary. Obviously it was in the interest of the Sultans to keep the region as it was, in political fragmentation and therefore powerless.

Charities sent to or distributed in Mecca by Muslim rulers, officials and pilgrims played a considerable part in the economic life of the city in that they accounted for a very substantial part of its total influx of money as well as a huge quantity of grain and other foodstuffs. Obviously its ostensible aim was to benefit the poor and needy, but in actual fact they were rarely the main beneficiaries. The religio-commercial importance of the region brought, before and during the period under examination, a large number of multi-national Muslim merchants with various merchandise. Some of these items - such as grain and other foodstuff - were for local need, while others, especially spices, were in international demand and were of great value in the east-west trade. This commercial activity in Jēdda and Mecca and subsequently the revenue of the Sharif increased tremendously around 827/1424 when the Indian merchants made Jēdda, at the expense

of Aden, centre of their trade. The change brought to the economic life of Mecca by the arrival of the Indian merchants had far reaching political, economic and administrative consequences for the Sharifs of Mecca. Trade blossomed so rapidly and the revenue from it shot up so dramatically that it awakened the greed of the Egyptian Sultans who suddenly felt unwilling to leave most of the benefit to the Sharifs of Mecca. The Sharifs were not allowed to keep this substantial income, most of which was reserved for the treasury in Cairo, and only a portion was granted to them. The Sharifs, however, were entitled to other incomes derived from tolls, escheat, and their customary share in charities.

Paradoxically enough, this economic growth of the area turned out to be little in favour and more against the financial interest of the Sharifs of Mecca. They forfeited, in one way or the other, a considerable part of their reduced revenue to the Egyptian Sultans or dignitaries. In addition, the political hegemony of the Egyptian Sultans was strengthened further as they tightened their grip on the administration to such an extent that it amounted to their virtual take over of the local administration. All the key officials were directly appointed by the Sultans in Cairo, a fact which dwarfed the stature of the officials of the Sharif to such a degree that they appeared insignificant by comparison. The stationing of a permanent Mamlūk garrison in Mecca could be interpreted as a final seal on the subordination of the local Amirs. Politically the Sharifs of Mecca had for centuries never enjoyed complete freedom, but now they found themselves hampered right and left in their relations with their equals as well as with their subordinates. They found greater difficulty in dealing with rebellious Ashrāf and Quwwād, if only because

because the funds on which they drew to settle sporadic frictions had dwindled.

The frequent internal strife in the region was also indirectly connected with the arrival of a large number of foreign merchants in the region as well as with the reduced strength of the Sharifs. The opponents of the ruling Sharifs of Mecca often chose these merchants as their target to secure material gains. Thus, not only were commercial activities in the area reduced, and subsequently the revenue, but also the ruling Sharif was caused additional material loss and was often compelled to appease his antagonists by payment of a substantial amount of money to stabilize the situation.

Evidently the reduction of the Sharif's share in the revenue and his various financial obligations and usual expenditure made him live under continuous material pressure from one quarter or the other. This may explain, though in no way justify, why the Sharifs of Mecca often resorted to the acquisition of money by illegal channels.

This very financial pressure, together with the personal greed and need, may account for the reprehensible conduct of many Sultani officials in pursuit of material profit during the term of their office. Many of them, especially those sent to Jeddah as tax collectors, secured their appointments in return for considerable amounts of money - already paid or deferred until the return of the official in question to Cairo - and did their best to increase their personal gains regardless of the method. Various examples testify to the ill-treatment meted out to merchants and other citizens by these officials to secure their ill-gotten fortune.

Some Notes on the Sources¹

Almost all the principal Arabic sources used in this thesis are well known and hardly require more than a few essential points concerning their reliability in general and their contribution to this thesis in particular.² Some biographical details of certain historians which were helpful in realizing the value of their works have also been mentioned. Before we evaluate each primary source

¹In the period under examination a large number of prolific historians and other scholars lived and wrote several valuable works. In view of the religious significance of the holy cities almost all the historians refer to some event in the Ḥijāz and thus it was possible to increase the number of sources by including those who have made no real contribution, but this was avoided. On the other hand, some useful source may have been unintentionally omitted. In fact, a research which deals with so many aspects of the history of a region over a rather lengthy period is bound to have some deficiency.

²Several indispensable works contain valuable information about certain historians, including some of those used in this research, or the general trend in the Muslim historiography. The following works are particularly useful: B.Lewis and P.M.Holt, Historians of the Middle East (London, 1962); F.Rosenthal, Technique and approach of the Muslim Scholarship (Rome, 1947); idem, A History of Muslim Historiography, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1968); Jean Sauvaget, Introduction to the History of the Muslim East (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965); Carl Brockelmann, Geschichte Der Arabischen Litterature with its supplements (Leiden, 1898-1942); D.S.Margolioth, Lectures on Arabic Historians (Calcutta, 1930); Ḥajji Khalifa, Kashf al-Zunūn 'An Asma' al-Kutub wa'l-Funūn, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1340/1921); Isma'il Pasha, I'qāḥ al-Maknūn fi al-Dhayl 'Ala Kashf al-Zunūn, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1364/1945).

A number of articles in E.I.¹ and E.I.² provide a fair amount of information about most of the contemporary sources used in this thesis and are referred to in appropriate places. However, as a number of pre-Burjī and late sources have been marginally used but are not discussed individually the following articles are mentioned (in the chronological order of the historians) as token reference to some useful sources of information: C.H.Pellat, E.I.², art. "Ibn Djubayr", p.755; M. Miquel, E.I.², art. "Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", pp. 735-36; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Ibn al-Mudjawir", pp. 880-81; C.Brockelmann, E.I.², art. "Al-Nahrawāli", pp. 835-36; J.Shaw, E.I.², art. "Al-Bakri", p.965; F.Rosenthal, E.I.², art. "Ibn al-'Amād", p.807; J. Schacht, E.I.², art. "Daḥlān", p.91.

individually, the following points are given as general remarks about the nature of information, method of use and reference, together with other relevant details and are worth our special consideration.

The sources are not used in connection with a subject confined to a specific issue or to theme- which is often the case in research - but in relation to a study dealing with the several aspects relevant to the history of Mecca over a rather lengthy period. Therefore, it was very difficult, and at times practically unattainable, to pinpoint the contribution of each source or to single out its version in relation to each issue discussed. This was not only due to the numerous topics but also to the similarity of essential points in the information of various sources concerning most of the aspects dealt with in this thesis. Because of this, the sources referring to a certain issue or situation are often given collectively in the relevant footnote.

The data concerning the events and institution in Mecca, both in quantity and quality, usually do not admit of logical analysis of the majority of the topics discussed. The prevailing informative and descriptive treatment of various aspects may not appear too scholarly and attractive, but the nature of the evidence often left no choice in this respect. The relative lack of argument has resulted also from the almost undisputed nature of the topics discussed. What records can be found are not pragmatic, and the accounts of events make relationship of cause and effect often difficult to establish. Most of the available information is of socio-religious nature, and there is relative dearth of useful information concerning the politico-economic and administrative aspects.

Considering these points, it is by no means surprising that this period of Meccan history has found so little favour with scholars.

The lack of controversial issues, spectacular upheavals, and dramatic events may have made it appear singularly drab and unattractive.¹

Discussion of all the aspects is strictly from the Meccan point of view and does not go into other details relevant to other countries or even to other parts of the Ḥijāz.² This limitation was due partly to the inadequate information and partly to the fact that many aspects dealt with in this thesis, such as charities, the spice trade, and the expedition of Amir Ḥusayn al-Kurḍī against the Portuguese are topics with so many international connectinms and developments that their proper examination was not possible in a few pages / this

¹This should not be taken to mean that modern ~~scholars~~ ^{writers} have not made any contribution. The following are token references to such works: Gerald de Gaury, Rulers of Mecca (London, 1951); C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka (The Hague, 1888-89); and various valuable articles in E.I.¹ and E.I.² which have been used in different parts of this thesis in connection with specific points.

Arab scholars and especially those of Saudi Arabia have begun making valuable contributions. The following are again a token reference: 'Abd al-Quddūs al-Anṣārī, Ta'rikh Madinat Judda (Judda, 1383/1963); Aḥmad al-Sibā'ī, Ta'rikh Makka (Cairo, 1372/1952), and various treatises by Ḥamad al-Jasir.

Though all have their value and usefulness they were neither intended as nor are a detailed examination, and are more useful for the post-Burjī period.

²It will not be amiss to state that the present work was initially intended to cover a longer period and to provide inclusive treatment of the whole region of the Ḥijāz. However, after years of research in the sources, collecting and assembling data up to the stage of a first draft, it became evident that to deal with the three main principalities in the region (Mecca, Medina and Yanbu), each of which has its own character, was not possible with a reasonable degree of cohesion and, moreover, that it would exceed, in volume, the admissible limits of a thesis, and the original plan was abandoned and confined to the present form.

thesis, and there was no other alternative but to refer to these and other similar issues briefly and only from the angle of their effect on or relationship with the situation in Mecca.

The sources often either differ slightly from each other or fail to record the exact date of certain events. Usually such discrepancies are due to the difference in the residential area of the historians and the place where the event occurred. In such cases the dates accepted are those mentioned by the sources whose authors were nearest, in time and space, to the scene of the event. Should there be too many variations in the date concerning an event and the exactness of the date was of no great significance, only the month and year usually agreed upon are mentioned in relation to that event.

Arabic sources usually refer to the location of places in relation to Mecca, with terms indicating only the general direction, (towards Syria) and Jihat al-Yaman such as Jihat al-Shām/(towards the Yemen). These simply indicate north or south of Mecca and not the actual geo-political entity. Such references seldom stress the proximity or distance of the place in question from Mecca. But the distance of certain places is occasionally mentioned in relation to other places in vague terms, such as "A" lies in the east of "B" at the distance of two days' journey. Such definition is hardly useful, as the place in question may be north-east or south-east, and the distance given may have been that covered by foot or mounted. Moreover, certain names of the places in the sources are no longer used and subsequently do not exist on modern maps. This, in addition to the general negligence by the sources to define the areas under the control of the local Amirs, made the determination of the territories of the local emirates very difficult indeed. Obviously, the positions of main cities with the adjoining

areas, the main ports, and some well known valleys poses no problem and their relation with these emirates is easily recognizable. But the main problem lies in determining the position of the areas in between or around the centres of these emirates - Mecca, Medina, and Yanbu' - as well as about the areas between them and some of their known dependencies. For instance, Jazān was among the dependencies of Mecca but it cannot be established that the area between Mecca and Jazān was also controlled by the Sharifs of Mecca. Likewise, when a Sharif of Mecca was elevated to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān he enjoyed, at least supposedly, influence and authority over the Amirs of Medina and Yanbu' and other local chiefs. But to what extent his authority was recognized, especially by the local chiefs in between Mecca and the two above mentioned cities, is not clear. This lack of information and the vagueness in the available data were the main reasons for not appending the maps showing the territories of these local principalities.

To conclude these general remarks, the following points are given in connection with the footnotes and some other relevant information.

At the end of the following discussion concerning the primary sources reference is made to a number of works which contain information about the source in question. This somewhat "unorthodox" reference is by no means inclusive of all the sources and is intended primarily to point to some of the relevant sources for further information.

In the footnotes relevant to certain institutions, practices, or general situations discussed in the thesis, the primary sources are cited in chronological order and those which were late or not too

important have been mentioned separately, usually with their short titles, after the term 'See also'; the full titles of these works are given in the bibliography. It is also worth mentioning that certain footnotes contain sources of different periods. This is due to the fact that the institution or situation in question continued to be almost the same and subsequently the nature of evidence did not change with the difference of time.

The pagination in certain manuscripts was found to be similar to that of printed books. This has not been altered to avoid confusion.

Certain sources have not been published except in part, or had not been at the time when the author consulted them. The unpublished parts of such sources were used in manuscript and the parts were often in different libraries. Though the relevant details are provided in the first mention of these sources, should there be any confusion the details given in the bibliography will suffice to clarify any such vagueness.

Ḥajji Khalifa and Ismā'il Pasha, the authors of Kashf and I'dāh respectively, use the word 'Amūd' (column) as numbers in their reference to works. These 'Amūd' have been mentioned in this thesis as they were usual Arabic numerals.

The following discussion concerning the sources, extensively or marginally used, is arranged in the order given below:

1. The contemporary Ḥijāzī sources.
2. The contemporary Egyptian sources.
3. The contemporary Yemenite sources.
4. The contemporary Travellers.
5. The sources written before or after the Burjī period.
6. Modern works and articles.

1. The contemporary Hijāzī sources

Fāṣī (775-832/1373-1429), a Sharif of the Ḥasanī branch, was undoubtedly the pioneer of historiography in Mecca. He was the first, after centuries of negligence by other scholars, who paid proper attention to recording the events related to Mecca and other parts of the region. His two works, Shifā' and al-'Iqd,¹ have been used and both are most useful, reliable, and indeed indispensable sources. Fāṣī, like other contemporary historians, recorded most of the events of his time on the basis of his personal knowledge but he had to trace back the history of Mecca for several centuries. This was not an easy task but Fāṣī did his best to bridge some of the gaps between his own time and the distant past. Obviously he did so by using the works of earlier historians of Mecca such as Azraqī² and Fākihi³ and added valuable information from other sources in order to give the narratives in his own work some continuity. Among other earlier works used marginally by Fāṣī was a local history of Mecca by Muḥammad b. Maḥfūz al-Juhānī (d. around 770/1368).⁴ Fāṣī refers to another local history, written about 676/1277 by a Sharif named Zayd b. Ḥashim, but this seems to have been lost and was not used by Fāṣī.⁵ The latter's father, also a notable scholar, provided his son with valuable information about certain events which took place in his time.⁶ Fāṣī used inscriptions

¹Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Fāṣī, i) Shifā' al-Gharām bi Akhbār al-Balad al-Ḥarām, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1375/1956); ii) Al-'Iqd al-Thamin fi Ta'rikh al-Balad al-Amin, 2 vols., each consists of two parts (Ms., KOP. No. 247-48).

²Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Azraqī (d. 223/838).

³Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq al-Fākihi (d. 272/885).

⁴Fāṣī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 245b-46a.

⁵Fāṣī, Shifā', vol. I, p.5.

⁶Fāṣī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 103a.

and epigraphs which he found on tomb-stones or buildings to check dates and gather information.¹ He used Ibn Farhūn's work Nasihat al-Mushāwir which deals with the history of Medina.²

Fāsi's relationship with prominent Egyptian scholars and historians was cordial and they seem to have exchanged information or to have used each other's works. Fāsi, for instance, used the works of Ibn al-Furāt³ and Ibn Khaldūn.⁴ Ibn Ḥajar refers to Fāsi as one of his sources⁵ and was among those whose efforts led to the appointment of Fāsi in 807/1405 as the first independent Qādi Mālikī in Mecca.⁶ Ibn Taghrī Birdī refers to Fāsi with great respect,⁷ and Sakhāwī regards Fāsi among the greatest scholars of the Ḥijāz.⁸

In view of such cordiality, it is by no means surprising that Ibn Ḥajar, following the deposition of Fāsi from Qadā', is reported to have written to Sultan Barsbāy stating that the assigning of this post, at the expense of Fāsi, to anyone else was a sinful act. Sakhāwī too describes the replacement of Fāsi by another official as a calamity.⁹

¹ Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 2-4; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 220b; Part II, fols. 347b-48a and 372b-73a.

² Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 277a-77b.

³ Ibid., vol. I, part I, fol. 150a.

⁴ Ibid., vol. I, part II, fol. 377b.

⁵ Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Ḥajar, Inbā' al-Ghumr bi abnā' al-'Umr, 2 vols. (Ms., FAT. No. 4190-91), vol. I, fols. 1b-2a.

⁶ Ibid., fol. 216b.

⁷ Yūsuf b. Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa'l-Mustawfā ba'd al-Wāfi, 2 vols. (Ms., N.OS. Nos. 3428-29), vol. II, fols. 249b-50b.

⁸ Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl al-Tamm 'ala Duwal al-Islām (Ms. KOP. No. 1189), fol. 94b; idem, al-Daw' al-Lami li ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1353-55/1934-36), vol. VII, pp. 18-20.

⁹ Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IX, pp. 4-5.

Obviously, such cordial relationships with great historians of his time, his high education, his several journeys within the Arabian peninsula, Egypt, Syria and Palestine in search of knowledge must have contributed a great deal in his scholarly achievements. In Mecca too he enjoyed great respect, not only as a historian or Qādi but on the basis of his high social status. He was a Sharif and his sister was married to the Amir of Mecca, Sharif Ḥasan. Though this marriage did not last long, Fāsi's personal relationships with the Amir of Mecca, as well as with other Ashrāf, remained friendly, which was apparently the reason for his being able to record several events related to the family quarrels or alliances.

Fāsi's Shifā', a general history of Mecca, contains valuable information on several aspects of Meccan history but al-'Iqd, a biographical dictionary, is far richer in the quantity and variety of the information which was required in this thesis. Al-'Iqd begins with the biographies of those whose first name was Muḥammad and continues with those named Aḥmad, as respect for the name of the Prophet Muḥammad, and then goes on in alphabetical order. It was completed around Shawwāl 828/August 1425.¹ There are several abridgments of Shifā',² and one of al-'Iqd³ and both these works, with their abridgments, have made Fāsi an outstanding historian of his time. His accuracy is great and it is to his credit that whenever in doubt he made this clear. In 801/1398, for instance, reporting the construction of an arch in connection with a building in Mecca, he points out that owing

¹Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 66a.

²These are - short titles - Tuhfat al-Kirām, Tahsīl al-Marām, Hādī Dhawī al-Ifhām, and al-Zuhūr al-Muḥtatafa.

³Entitled 'Ijālat al-Qira li'l-Rāghib fi Umm al-Qurā.

to his absence at the time of construction, he is not sure whether it was newly built or repaired.¹ Fāsi, when anticipating a possible confusion about a certain point, took precautions to clarify the basis of his information. Thus, for instance, reporting the total period of the rule of Sharif Ḥasan, he states that this is given on the basis of the date on which Sharif Ḥasan was appointed in Cairo and not on the basis of the date on which the news reached Mecca and was acted upon.² This clarification by Fāsi provides incidentally a reason for the frequent differences between the Egyptian and Meccan sources about the date of a certain event in Mecca or Cairo. The reason for such difference is obvious and other historians must have been aware of this but they seldom point out which of the two (i.e. the decision in Cairo or its implementation in Mecca) was the basis of the date given.

Fāsi's contribution in various aspects dealt with in this thesis hardly need any particular reference. In fact, no research work about Mecca in the late Bahri and early Burji periods is possible without resorting to Fāsi's indispensable works.³

The most important historian of Mecca, after Fāsi, during the Burji period was Al-Najm Ibn Fahd (812-85/1409-80), whose work Ithāf al-Warā⁴ is extensively used in various sections of this thesis.

¹Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, p.315.

²Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 399a.

³For further details concerning Fāsi and his work; see: Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 1b-10a, 66b, 70b and 107b-8b: part II, fol. 377b; idem, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 2-9, 65, 206 and 315; Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Maqrizi, al-Sulūk li Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk, vol. III (Ms. A.S. No. 3371), fol. 250a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 1b-2a and 216b; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 249b-50b; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 84a and 94b; idem, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 35-36, vol. VII, pp. 18-20, vol. VIII, p.41, Vol. IX, pp. 4-5; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 134-35, 156 and 199; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, pp. 306-7: vol. II, pp. 1051-52, 1125 and 1150; F. Rosenthal, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Fāsi", pp. 828-29 and the works cited in its bibliography.

⁴Al-Najm (Najm al-Din) 'Umar (also Muḥammad but 'Umar is most used) b.

He belonged to a prominent Meccan family whose several members were well known scholars and historians and are known as Ibn Fahd.¹

Al-Najm's Ithāf covers the period from the birth of the Prophet Muḥammad up to the early days of Sha'bān 885/November 1480. He is an annalist and gives a brief account of the events of each year with particular reference to those related to Mecca and, at the end, gives a list of those who died in that year and were regarded by him as worth mentioning. Needless to say, the real value and contribution of this source is for the period after the death of Fāsi. Al-Najm's account is particularly useful in relation to matters connected with trade, taxation and other financial aspects. He also provides valuable information about local administration. The details relevant to events in Mecca are reasonably sufficient but his reports concerning the deceased, including prominent dignitaries, are amazingly brief. For instance, the death of Fāsi, the famous historian of Mecca, and of Sultan Bārsbāy are reported so briefly that information hardly exceeds the mere dates.²

Muḥammad b. Fahd, Ithāf al-Warā' bi al-Khbar Umm al-Qurā', 2 vols. (Ms., M.H.M. No. 2, Ta'rikh).

¹F. Rosenthal, E.I.², art. "Ibn Fahd", pp. 759-60. Owing to the fact that Ibn Fahd, as well as his son and grandson, is usually known by the common title "Ibn Fahd", it was imperative to mention them in this thesis with separate distinctive forms to avoid confusion. Therefore, "Al-Najm" has been added as prefix to the title of the above mentioned historian, and "Al-'Izz" and "Jar Allah" respectively to his son and grandson. As the actual title of all these three historians is Ibn Fahd and the additions, mentioned above, are simply to distinguish them from each other, the first letter of both the prefix and the actual surname is mentioned throughout in capitals.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 209 and 229 respectively.

Fortunately, Al-Najm's son Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd (Shawwāl 850/
Jumādā I 922/January 1447-July 1516) wrote, after his father's death,
Bulūgh al-Qira¹ as continuation of his father's work and on the same
pattern, and recorded the events in Mecca until almost the end of the
Burjī period.

Both these historians visited Egypt, among other places, and
were on friendly terms with their contemporary Egyptian historians
and particularly with Sakhāwī and seems to have exchanged information.²

Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, like any other local historian, was obviously
not too keen to antagonize the authorities but at times he criticises
outspokenly some unjust acts of the officials and even of the ruling
Sharif of Mecca. For example, he criticised the behaviour of Meccan
Qādis for their failure to do justice to a man of humble origin against
his influential opponent in Shawwāl 888/December 1483.³ He did not
hide his disapproval of the conduct of these Meccan Qādis during a
dispute between a Qādi Mālikī and a Shaybī⁴ in Muḥarram 901/September

¹Al-'Izz ('Abd al-'Azīz) Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Fahd, Bulūgh al-Qira fi
Dhayl Ithāf al-Warā bi Akhbār Umm al-Qurā', 2 vols. (Ms., M.H.M. No.1,
Ta'rikh).

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, part III (ed. W. Popper), p.595; Sakhāwī,
al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 126-31; idem, al-Dhayl al-Tāmm 'ala Duwal al-
Islām (a portion of this work up to 850/1446 has been used, as re-
ferred to earlier, from the Ms. of Kop., but the portion covering the
period between 850-98/1446-92, which has been edited by Mr. A.A.Al-Ḥassu
and submitted in August 1968 in the University of 'Ayn Shamsh (Egypt)
for the degree of M.A., has been used with the kind permission of the
editor), p.123; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 22, 165 and
211-13.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 43-44.

⁴The historical and official significance of this term is explained in
detail later. Here it may suffice to say that a Shaybī is a member of
the family known as Banū Shayhā who are entrusted with the key of the
door of the Ka'ba.

or October 1495. The Qādis seem to have closed ranks against the Shayhī.¹ Al-'Izz, reporting the distribution of certain charities in Mecca by the Qādi Shāfa'i, which was usually the case in relation to most charities, uses phrases which indicate that the Qādi was unfair in distribution.² This should not be taken to mean ^{that} the conduct of the Meccan Qādis with the exception of the few above mentioned cases was exemplary. Similarly, the behaviour of other officials was not ideal. In fact, frequent references, in both Ithāf and Bulūgh, show the deplorable acts of several Sulṭani and Sharifi officials in both Mecca and Jidda but none of these appear to have been expected to be as fair as the Qādis and thus the wrongs of the latter seem to have been regarded by Al-'Izz as more unacceptable than those of other officials.

Al-'Izz, referring to a raid of Sharif Muḥammad against a group of Arabs in Rabi' I 887/May or June 1482, comments that these Arabs have committed no offence and that the reason was simply to secure booty. Al-'Izz even indicates his joy on the escape of would-be victims and the failure of the Sharif's raid.³

The reliability and usefulness of both these Meccan sources is almost undisputed but occasional errors are found which may have resulted from the mistake of the copyist and not of the historian himself. For instance, the date of Ibn Taghrī Birdī's death is given wrongly as being around Jumādā I 899/March 1494.⁴ But this is the

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 186-87.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 44, 51 and 186.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 19.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 165.

only serious mistake found and this most likely occurred as a result of a copyist's carelessness. It is very unlikely that Al-'Izz, who, referring to a local dispute in Dhu'l-Qa da 903/August 1498, refrained from giving details on the basis of his uncertainty,¹ would have reported the death of Ibn Taghrī Birdī on the date given above.

The contribution of the data provided by these historians to various aspects discussed is self-evident throughout the thesis and particularly in the sections relevant to local events, dependencies of Mecca, local tolls and taxes, distribution of charities, and local administration.²

The remaining contemporary sources, though useful and reliable, have made little contribution to this thesis, as much of their information is related to Medina and only occasional references are found to the matters related to Mecca. Therefore no detailed examination of these sources is necessary.

Marāghī (d. 816/1413) - his work Tahqīq al-Nusra³ is marginally used.⁴

Ibn 'Uqba (d. 828/1425) - his work 'Umdat al-Talib⁵ provides useful information but only in relation to some minor points. He was a Sharif of Ḥijāzi origin but not a permanent resident of the area and his work is mentioned here for its close connection with the aspects

¹ Ibid., fol. 230.

² For some additional useful information concerning these historians and their works, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, part III (ed. W. Popper), pp. 595-96; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 126-31; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 123 and 270; idem, al-Tibr al-Masbūk fi Dhayl al-Sulūk (Bulāq, 1315/1896), p.146; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. I, fols. 1-2, 22, 35, 37-38, 132-33 and 135-37; Jar Allah (Muḥammad) b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Fahd, Tuḥfat al-Laṭā'if fi faḍā'il al-Ḥibr Ibn 'Abbās wa Masjid al-Ta'rif (Ms. M.H.M. No. 15 - Ta'rikh), fols. 37-38; Ḥajjī Khalifa, op. cit., vol. I, p.7; Ismā'il Pasha, op. cit., vol. I, p.21; F. Rosenthal, E.I.², art. "Ibn Fahd", pp. 759-60 and the works cited in its bibliography.

³ Abī Bakr b. al-Ḥusayn al-Marāghī, Tahqīq al-Nusra bi Talkhis Ma'ālim

relevant to the Ashrāf.¹

Samhūdī (844-911/1440-1505), the famous historian of Medina, - his work Wafā' and its abridgement Khulāṣa have been used.² The work deals mainly with the local topography, matters related to some religious rules and the virtues of certain pious performances, and thus contributes little to the history of Medina itself and far less to that of Mecca from the politico-economic point of view.³

2. The contemporary Egyptian⁴ sources

Fortunately, several historians beginning with Ibn al-Furāt and ending with Ibn Iyās form a neatly linked chain of the sources covering the entire Burjī period. This was particularly useful in furthering this research as a similar continuous chain of Meccan historians made it possible to look at a certain issue from both the Egyptian and Meccan points of view. However, the versions of the Egyptian and the Ḥijāzī sources, as already mentioned, seldom differ from each other in their reports concerning events in Mecca, which is the main reason for citing them frequently together in reference to certain issues, institutions, or general situations.

Dār al-Ḥijra (Cairo, 1374/1955).

⁴For information relevant to this historian or his work, see: Marāghī's introduction to his work and pp. 145-46 and 210-11; Maqrizi, Sulūk (Ms. M.H.M. No. 6, Ta'rikh), vol. II, fol. 260; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 246a; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 81a; idem, al-Daw', vol. XI, pp. 28-31; idem, al-Tuhfa al-Laṭifa fi Ta'rikh Fuḍalā' al-Madina al-Sharifa, 2 vols. (Ms. Top. Nos. 6481-82 (also M.527 and M.512 respectively)), vol. II, fols. 267-70; Hajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, p.378.

⁵Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Ḥasanī b. 'Uqba (mentioned also as Ibn 'Utba), 'Umdat al-Ṭalib fi Ansāb Al Abī Ṭalib (Beirut, undated).

¹For some useful details about Ibn 'Uqba and his work, see: Ibn 'Uqba, op.cit., pp. 5-7, 123 and 279; Hajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, p.1161.

²'Alī b. 'Abdullah al-Samhūdī, i) Wafa al-Wafā' bi akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafa, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1326/1908); ii) Khulāṣat al-wafā' bi akhbār Dar al-Muṣṭafa (Mecca, 1316/1898).

³For some information relevant to Samhūdī and his works, see: Samhūdī,

Both the local and Egyptian historians were not only aware of the important happenings in Mecca but their information was often complementary to one another. This, to a large extent, must have resulted from the simplicity and similarity of issues and occurrences and lack of arguable points but was due also to the fact that almost all the Egyptian historians visited Mecca and seem to have exchanged information with the local historians. Yet slight variations and minor differences were inevitable. These are usually overlooked unless they were of any significance and in these cases preference has been always given to the historian who was closest to the event in question from the viewpoint of either time or space, or both.

Ibn al-Furāt (735-807/1334-1404) - his universal history, only the later part of which is published, entitled Tā'rikh,¹ - has been used. This work is the earliest and among the most important Egyptian sources and, despite its being relatively of poor standard from the linguistic point of view it is the most reliable and useful source and the data available in this work was of great value in various

Wafā', pp. 2-4, 457 and 461; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 245-47; Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 50-51; Hajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 2016-17; F. Krenkow, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Samhūdi", pp. 134-35 and works cited in its bibliography.

⁴This regional term is used here rather loosely without much attention to ethnical origin and thus is applied to all those historians who were born in Egypt, lived and worked there permanently, or chose Egypt for their permanent residence in the later part of their life. This latter phrase permits the inclusion of historians like Ibn Khalidūn and Aynī who reached Cairo only in the later part of their lives and entered the service of the Mamlūk Sultans.

¹Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahīm b. al-Furāt, Tā'rikh Ibn al-Furāt, 3 vols. (ed. Q. Zurayq and Najlā' 'Izz al-Dīn, Beirut, 1936-42 A.D.). This title is that ascribed by the editors to this work and is generally accepted. However the title - which actually amounts to Tā'rikh - is far from being a complete title. Hajji Khalifa seems to mention this work with the title Al-Tarīq al-Wādīh al-Maslūk (Kashf, vol. I, p.279). But this too is not complete and must have been part of the original title. Cl. Cahen refers to this work with the title Tā'rikh al-duwal wa'l-mulūk (E.I.², art. "Ibn al-Furat", p.768).

sections of this thesis and is used by the later historians.¹

Ibn Khaldūn (732-808/1332-1406) - his universal history al-'Ibar² is marginally used. He was a genius and enjoys almost universal fame as historian, sociologist and philosopher. Among the Arab historians only Ibn Ḥajar, on the basis of an alleged anti-Husayn remark by Ibn Khaldūn, and Sakhāwī, because of Ibn Khaldūn's belief in the authenticity of Faḥimids' claim concerning their descent, were somewhat critical of Ibn Khaldūn.³ But their criticism was on the basis of Ibn Khaldūn's view and not against his high qualities and reliability as a historian. Ibn Khaldūn, despite his arrival in Cairo at the beginning of the Burjī period and the posts he held there, his pilgrimage to Mecca and his apparent contacts with Meccan and other scholars, provides surprisingly little data relevant to the history of Mecca or other parts of the Ḥijāz.⁴

Qalqashandī (756-821/1355-1418) - his two works, Ṣubḥ and Ma'āthir,⁵ written in the order of mentioning, have been used. The first of these two works contains a variety of information and is correctly described by Professor B. Lewis as "the encyclopaedia of administrative practice

¹For some useful information about Ibn al-Furāt and his work, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 72a; idem, al-Daw', vol. VIII, p.51; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.72; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, p.279; Cl. Cahen, E.I.², art. "Ibn al-Furat", pp. 768-69 and the works cited in its bibliography.

²Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Khaldūn, Kitāb al-'Ibar wa Diwān al-Mubtadā' wa'l-Khabar fi ayyām al-'Arab wa'l-'Ajam wa'l-Barbar wa man 'asarahum min Dhawī al-Sultan al-Akbar, 7 vols. (Bulāq, 1284/1867).

³Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, pp. 147-48.

⁴Any detailed examination of Ibn Khaldūn's work is impossible in a brief note. For some useful information, see: Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 113a, 115a and 259a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 71b; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, pp. 145-49; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 76-77; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, p.1124; M. Talbi, E.I.², art. "Ibn Khaldūn", pp. 825-31 and many works cited in its bibliography.

⁵Ḥamad b. 'Alī al-Qalqashandī: i) Ṣubḥ al-A'sha fi Ṣinā'at al-Inshā',

of Qalqashandī".¹ Though both these works contain some useful information their data have made no significant contribution to the aspects dealt with in this thesis. Subh's data are comparatively richer than Ma'āthir's and provide more useful information.²

Maqrīzī (766-845/1374-1442) - his two works, Sulūk and Nubdha³ have been used. The latter is a short numismatic treatise and its data regarding local coins were not found of great value. Sulūk, on the other hand, is greatly useful for various topics and particularly those related to commercial activities and local administration. Maqrīzī's several pilgrimages to Mecca, his friendly relationship with several Egyptian as well as Meccan scholars and historians, his cordial relationship with many dignitaries in Cairo and his easy access to some official records, especially in his capacity of Muhtasib of Cairo which he held several times, all this must have contributed in enriching the data, both in quantity and variety, in his works.

Maqrīzī's relationship with his Egyptian contemporaries was, on the whole, good but with 'Aynī, on the basis of their rivalry over the post of Hisba, was rather unfriendly. This animosity between 'Aynī

14 vols. (Cairo, 1332-38/1913-19); ii) Ma'āthir al-Inafā fi Ma'ālim al-Khilafā, 3 vols. (Kuwait, 1964).

¹B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islām, vol. I, p.224.

²For some useful information concerning Qalqashandī and his works, see: Qalqashandī's introduction to his work Ma'āthir, and vol. II, p.211; idem, Subh, vol. IV, p.301; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayr, fol. 85a; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.149; Hajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 1070 and 1573; C.Brockelmann, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Qalqashandī", pp. 699-700.

³Details concerning Sulūk have already been given. The other work is: Nubdha Laḥifa fi Umūr al-Nuqūd al-Islāmiyya (Ms. A.HK. No. 264).

and Maqrīzī seems to have been also on the basis of their different madhhab (creed; belief). Maqrīzī was initially Ḥanafī but then became Shāfa'i and rather unfriendly critical of the Ḥanafī school. This was criticised by Ibn Taghrī Birdī who was, like 'Aynī, a Ḥanafī. However, Maqrīzī's greatness as a historian was not to be damaged by such criticism or animosity. The fact that Ibn Taghrī Birdī and Sakhāwī wrote Ḥawādith and al-Tibr respectively as continuations of Maqrīzī's Sulūk reflects clearly their great respect for him.¹

Ibn Ḥajar (773-852/1372-1449) is among the most prolific and important scholars of 'Ilm al-Ḥadīth (i.e. the science developed in relation to and about the tradition of the Prophet Muḥammad) and historians of Egypt. His two works, Inbā'² and al-Durar³ have been used. The first is an annual account of the events, particularly those related to Egypt, and a list of those who died in each year and were regarded by Ibn Ḥajar as worthy of mention. Al-Durar is a biographical dictionary of the notables of the 8th century of the Hijra/14th century of the Christian era. Though both these works contain useful information the data in Inbā' is far more relevant and useful from the viewpoint of the topics discussed in this thesis.

Ibn Ḥajar's journeys to various parts of the Egyptian domain, including the Ḥijāz, and his cordial relations with many scholars and historians, his official responsibilities in Cairo and particularly as

¹For details relevant to Maqrizi and his works, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith al-Duhūr (Ms. A.S. No. 3185), vol. I, fols. 2 and 8-9; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 210; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 21-25, vol. IV, pp. 147-48, vol. VIII, pp. 71-72; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 21-24; Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Iyās, Uqūd al-Jumān fi Waqā'i' al-Zamān (Ms. A.S. No. 3311), vol. II, p.178; Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 254-55; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, p.1000; C. Brockelmann, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Maqrizi", pp. 175-76 and works cited in its bibliography.

²Details relevant to Inbā' have already been given.

³The full title is: al-Durar al-Kāmina fi A'yān al-Mi'at al-Thāminā', 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1348-50/1929-31).

Qādi had kept him in close contact with the official circle and above all with the Egyptian Sultans. This must have enabled Ibn Ḥajar to remain aware and record accurately and in detail the Sulṭani decisions in relation to events in the Ḥijāz as well as the main occurrences there.¹

'Aynī (762-855/1361-1451) - his general history 'Iqd al-Jumān² is used in this thesis but on a modest scale. 'Aynī was born in 'Ayntāb and visited Cairo in 788/1386 and was well received there. His high education and knowledge of both Arabic and Turkish enabled him to gain popularity in Mamlūk circles and he enjoyed particularly the favour of Sultan Bārsbāy and his Amirs. He held several posts simultaneously or at different times, in Cairo. The post of Hisba was assigned to him for the first time in 801/1399, at the expense of Maqrīzī, but the latter regained this post shortly after. This seems to have been the beginning of animosity between 'Aynī and Maqrīzī and several remarks of the former reflect clearly his grudge against Maqrīzī.³

The accuracy of 'Aynī's history, especially in the later part of his life, is suspected, and particularly by Ibn Ḥajar⁴ and Ibn Taghrī Birdī.⁵ Sakhāwī, however, gives a fairly detailed biography of 'Aynī and does not seem to question his reliability.⁶

¹For some useful information related to Ibn Ḥajar or his works, see: Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 1b-2a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 349; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 14-15, 60, 70, 77 and 84; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 36-40; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 140 and 230-36; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 1 and 17-18; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 267, 270-73 and 279; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, p. 748; F. Rosenthal and C. van Azendonk /J. Schacht/, E.I.², art. "Ibn Ḥadjar al-'Asḳalani", pp. 776-79.

²Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad al-'Aynī, 'Iqd al-Jumān fi Ta'rikh ahl al-Zamān, 4 vols. (Ms., B.A. Nos. 454-57).

³'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 506b-7a and 687a.

⁴Inbā', vol. I, fols. 1b-2a.

⁵Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 2.

⁶Al-Daw', vol. X, pp. 131-35; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 375-80; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 8.

'Aynī's contribution in the history of Mecca is rather insignificant, but at times at least, thanks to his favourable position with the Egyptian Sultan, he was the first among the Egyptian historians to learn and report certain happenings in the Ḥijāz. In 830/1426, for instance, 'Aynī read in person to Sultan Bārsbāy a letter from the Sharif of Medina concerning details of an internal dispute there.¹ Obviously, 'Aynī's recording must have been the first and other Egyptian historians became aware of this occurrence later, and probably through 'Aynī himself.²

Ibn Taghrī Birdī (812-74/1410-70) is among the outstanding historians of Egypt. His three works, al-Nujūm, al-Manhal, and Ḥawādith³ contain valuable information and have been extensively used in various sections of this thesis.

He is reported to have turned to the writing of history after he had heard that 'Aynī's history was read to Sultan Bārsbāy. His first work was al-Manhal, a biographical dictionary, then al-Nujūm, a general history of Egypt, and finally Ḥawādith to continue Maqrīzī's Sulūk.⁴

Ibn Taghrī Birdī was the greatest historian of Rūmi origin during the Burjī period and is described by Ibn Iyās as "unique" among his race.⁵

¹'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol.654b.

²For further useful information concerning 'Aynī and his work, see: 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 67b-68a; vol. IV, fols. 506b-7a, 519a-19b, 668a, 687a and 691a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 1b-2a, 65a, 72a, 169b and 171b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 2, 8, 14 and 195; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 1 and 55; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 140 and 375-80; idem, al-Daw', vol. X, pp. 131-35; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 286-88; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 1000 and 1150; W. Marçais, E.I.², art. "Al-'Aynī", pp. 790-91.

³The titles of these works and other relevant information have already been mentioned.

⁴W. Popper, E.I.², art. "Abu'l-Maḥasin Yusuf b. Taghrībirdī", p.138.

⁵Ibn Iyās, Badā'i' al-Zuhūr, 3 vols. (Parts III-V Istanbul, 1931-36),

His father was among the Mamlūk dignitaries and was the son-in-law of the last Bahri Sultan, al-Ṣāliḥ (or al-Manṣūr), Ḥajjī, and later married an ex-wife of Sultan Barqūq and gave his daughter in marriage to Sultan Faraj b. Barqūq.¹ In view of such connections, it is no wonder that Ibn Taghrī Birdī himself was respected by many Mamlūk officers and Amirs and enjoyed the favour of the Egyptian Sultans and especially Bārsbāy, but he showed no interest in entering the service. His being free of official responsibilities must have been a reason for his unbiased account of the events and his boldness in criticising those whom he regarded as unjust or not fulfilling their responsibilities. Thus, for instance, he criticised strongly the conduct of 'Alī b. Ramaḡān (d. 871/1466), a Sultani tax collector in Jēdda, for his exploitation and unjust treatment of the merchants and went as far as to describe the said official as being a "disgrace to the human race".² He even criticised in moderate phrases the Egyptian Sultans for their failure to provide the pilgrims and other travellers to Mecca with sufficient supplies of water.³

Ibn Taghrī Birdī performed several pilgrimages between 826-63/1423-59 and had established friendly relationships with local historians and the officials in the Ḥijāz. This, in addition to his being on cordial terms with many of the Egyptian historians and dignitaries, must have been of great help for him to obtain details of many events and institutions relevant to Mecca, among other places, and indeed the data

vol. III, p.43.

¹Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādiṭh, vol. I, fol. 127.

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādiṭh, part III (ed. W. Popper), pp. 534-36.

³Ibid., Part II, pp. 306-7.

available is of significant value.¹

Sakhāwī (831-902/1427-97) - his four works:² al-Dhayl, al-Daw', al-Tibr and al-Tuhfa have been used and were very useful in furthering this research. Al-Dhayl was written as a continuation of Dhahabi's Tā'rikh al-Islām and covers the period between 745-898/1344-1493. Al-Daw' is a biographical dictionary covering the 9th century of the Hijra/15th century of the Christian era. Al-Tibr, an annal of Egypt, was written as a continuation to Maqrīzī's Sulūk up to Rabi' I 857/March 1452. Al-Tuhfa is a history of Medina in the form of a biographical dictionary.

The data available in these works of Sakhāwī about the events and institutions in the Ḥijāz is far richer than that provided by any other Egyptian source within the period under examination. Sakhāwī and his works are usually held in great respect by his contemporaries but Suyūṭī's attitude towards Sakhāwī seems to have been unfriendly as he is reported to have written "al-Kāwī fi Tā'rikh al-Sakhāwī" to undermine the value of Sakhāwī's al-Daw'.³ Ibn Iyās too was somewhat critical of Sakhāwī on the basis of his tendency to disclose weak points of certain individuals.⁴

¹For information concerning Ibn Taghrī Birdī and his works, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 45; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 1b-2a; vol. II, fols. 251a-51b; idem, Ḥawādith, part III (ed. W. Popper), pp. 297-98 and 343; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.195; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 42-43; idem, Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 243; Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 109-110 and 317-18; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 1000, 1932-33 and 1884-85; W. Popper, E.I.², art. "Abu'l-Maḥasin Yusuf b. Taghrī Birdī", p.138.

²Full titles of these works, with other relevant details, have been mentioned earlier.

³Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, p.1089.

⁴Badā'i', vol. III, p.352.

Despite such minor criticism the greatness and reliability of Sakhāwī were recognised by almost all the scholars and historians both in Egypt and the Ḥijāz. Sakhāwī, like any other historian, criticised or praised certain officials or rulers but his criticism was not excessive nor based on personal grudge, but was directed against the general conduct or certain practices. Sakhāwī, for instance, shows his disapproval of the practice of selling offices and of the spread of bribery in Cairo but does not single out individuals for blame.¹ He, when reporting the death of Wālī Mecca, 'Alī b. Qarqmaṣ-b.Ḥalima in Rabi' I 893/March 1488, does not hide his disregard for the deceased but does not show any personal hatred.² Several references in the works of Sakhāwī and others show that his relationships with his contemporaries were cordial and that they exchanged information. Sakhāwī's several pilgrimages and his lengthy stay in the Ḥijāz, the longest of which was in the closing years of his life, mostly in Medina where he died, had made him much respected in the Ḥijāz and led to very cordial relationships between him and several notable Ḥijāzi historians such as Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, his son Al-'Izz, and Sambūdi. It is not therefore surprising that the data available in Sakhāwī's works contains an abundant amount, both in quantity and variety, of valuable information relevant to the events or institutions in the Ḥijāz.³

¹Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 103b.

²Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.410.

³Any detailed examination of Sakhāwī's works and their share in this research needs far lengthier discussion, which is not possible for reasons of space. For useful information about Sakhāwī and his works, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 3a, 63b, 69b, 74b, 93b, 103b and 108a; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 8, 123, 156, 270, 277, 287, 295, 376-77, 393-94, 410, 413, 425-26, 447, 502, 521 and 534; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 4-6; vol. VI, pp. 201-11; vol. VIII, pp. 7-14 and 20; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 1a-2a; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 2-5, 146 and 386; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 114, 132-33, 135-37, 159 and 185; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i, vol. III, p.352; Ibn al-'Imād,

Suyūṭī (849-911/1445-1505) is among the most prolific scholars of Egypt and by his own account the number of his works has exceeded three hundred, excluding many others which he had discarded.¹ Thus, supposing that he began writing at the age of twenty, his average annual contribution in various fields was seven works before his death in 911/1505.² But surprisingly Suyūṭī's contribution in the field of history is rather trivial. In addition to Husn al-Muhādara his two other works Ta'rikh al-Khulafā'³ and Badā'i' al-Zuhūr⁴ are relevant to history and in this work only the first two named have been marginally used;⁵ the third - being the history of the ancient world - was of no use for this thesis.⁶

op.cit., vol. VII, p.196: vol. VIII, pp. 15-17; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 762 and 1089; Ismā'il Pasha, op.cit., vol. I, p.217. See also: M.H.Faqi's introduction to the published portion of al-Tuhfa, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1376-77/1956-57), vol. I, pp. 9-14.

¹ Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr al-Suyūṭī, Husn al-Muhādara fi Akhbār Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira, 2 vols. (Idarat al-Waṣṣan Press, Egypt, 1299/1881 or 1882), vol. I, p.190.

² This is generally accepted as being the year in which he died. But in his Husn al-Muhādara references are made to the events around 928/1522 which seem to be inserted by the copyist.

³ Full name of Suyūṭī and title of Husn with relevant details have already been mentioned. His second work is: Ta'rikh al-Khulafā' al-'Abbāsiyya (3rd ed. Cairo, 1383/1963).

⁴ Badā'i' al-Zuhūr fi waqā'i' al-Duhūr (4th ed., Singapore, 1374/1954). In this edition the work is ascribed erroneously to Ibn Iyās but in fact is the work of Suyūṭī and is mentioned as such by Brockelmann in his art. "Al-Suyuti", E.I.¹, p.574.

⁵ In the text, however, when a reference to Suyūṭī is made it is his Ta'rikh al-Khalafā' which is meant and referred to, as Husn al-Muhādara is occasionally used in footnotes only.

⁶ For some further information about Suyūṭī and his works, see: Suyūṭī, Husn al-Muhādara, vol. I, pp. 2-3 and 188-95; idem, Ta'rikh al-Khulafā', pp. 516-17; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, p.229; vol. II, p.667; Brockelmann, E.I.¹, art. "Al-Suyuti", pp. 573-75 and works cited in its bibliography.

Ibn Iyās (852-930/1448-1524) - his two works Badā'i' and 'Uqūd'¹ have been used. He is among the most important historians of Egypt and almost the only one in the closing years of the Burjī period and the beginning of the Ottoman period. Ibn Iyās is, on the whole, fairly accurate in his details but some mistakes or peculiarities are observable. Thus, for instance, he gives the years 846/1442 and 854/1450, contrary to other sources, as being the years in which Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥajar died.² This may have been a mistake on the part of the copyist or of an earlier source which he had used, but what is more surprising is his description of the isle of Kamrān and Zabid (in the Yemen) as "ḡay'a" (estate) of India in 922/1516.³

Though he, like other Egyptian sources, was mainly concerned with the events within or related to Egypt and there was much to record in that eventful period, he provides also a fair amount of information about the events in Mecca or other parts of the Ḥijāz. He performed the pilgrimage in 883/1478 and was present in Medina when a local Qāḡi was killed at the hand of a Shi'i' who had a personal grudge against the / ^{former} who had demolished the Shi'i''s house to facilitate the expansion of the Medini sanctuary.⁴ Ibn Iyās is probably the only source to report under 910/1504 that Sultan al-Ghawrī bought from the Arabs of Banū Ibrāhīm in Yanbu' some alleged relics of the Prophet Muḥammad in return for 60,000 dirhams.⁵

¹ Full titles of these works with some other relevant details have already been given.

² Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, pp. 28 and 32 respectively.

³ Ibid., vol. V, p.81.

⁴ Ibid., vol. III, p.140.

⁵ Ibid., vol. IV, pp. 68-69. Most probably some of these are among the items preserved - as relics of the Prophet Muḥammad - in the museum of Topkapi Sarayı (Istanbul).

The data available in Ibn Iyās's works was particularly useful in the section dealing with local administration and in relation to Egyptian expedition against the Portuguese.¹

3. The contemporary Yemenite sources

These like other regional or local historians were interested more in recording events within their own country and only occasionally refer to events in Mecca.

Ibn Wahhās (d. 812/1410) is the earliest² Yemenite source, during the Burjī period; his work al-'Uqūd³ is used but its data was of little significance in furthering this research.⁴

¹For some information concerning Ibn Iyās and his works, see: Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.140; vol. IV, p.47; Ḥajjī Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, p.229; W.M.Brinner, E.I.², art. "Ibn Iyas", pp. 812-13 and works cited in its bibliography. See also: Introduction of the editors of Badā'i' (Istanbul ed.), and also M.Muṣṭafa's introduction to Badā'i' (U.P.).

²Sakhāwī (al-Daw', vol. II, p.299) followed by Ismā'il Pasha, op.cit., vol. II, p.101 refers to a Rusulid ruler of the Yemen, Ismā'il b. al-'Abbās (d.803/1400) as being the author of two works dealing with the history of the Yemen and entitled: i) Al-'Asjad al-Masbūk wa'l-Jawhar al-Mahbūk fi Akhbār al-Khulafā' wa'l-Mulūk; ii) Al-'Uqūd al-Lu-lu'iyya fi Akhbār al-Dawla al-Rasuliyya. Unfortunately, the author failed to obtain and use these sources. As will be noticed, there is a striking similarity between the titles of these works and those of Ibn ~~al-Dawla~~ ^{wahhās} ~~Dayba'~~ and Khazraji discussed above, but there is no evidence to the effect that these Yemenite historians were not the original writers of their work.

³Alī b. Ḥasan b. Wahhās, al-'Uqūd al-Lu-lu'iyya fi Tā'rikh al-Dawla al-Rasuliyya, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1329-32/1911-14).

⁴For some information concerning Ibn ~~al-Dawla~~ ^{wahhās} ~~Dayba'~~ and his work, see: Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 105a; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, p.210; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 97-98; Ismā'il Pasha, op.cit., vol. II, pp.81 and 115.

Khazrajī (d. after 858/1454) - his work al-'Asjād,¹ which seems to be a part of the larger work, as the manuscript used consists of Chapters IV and V and ends rather abruptly;² this was useful but only in relation to some minor points.

Ibn al-Dayba' (866-944/1461-1537) - his work, Bughya with its two supplements, al-Faḍl and Qurra, has been used in certain sections of this thesis.³ The data available in these sources concerning events in or related to Mecca is comparatively richer than that provided by other Yemenite sources. Al-Faḍl particularly is useful for details related to the Egyptian invasion of the Yemen and the subsequent overthrow of the Ṭāhirid rule.⁴

Abū (Bā) Makhrāma (870-947/1465-1540) - his history of Aden⁵ has been consulted or used in relation to some minor points. Despite the fact that he lived in a very eventful period and was in contact with some celebrated historians such as Sakhāwī⁶ he did little more than compile this book by using the data of earlier historians such as

¹ Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-Khazrajī, al-'Asjād al-Masbūk fi man tawalla al-Yaman min al-Mulūk (Ms., M.H.M. No. 48, Ṭā'rikh).

² The last pages of this manuscript refer to some events related to the early part of 858/1454. See Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 505.

³ Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Alī b. al-Dayba', Bughyat al-Mustafīd fi ḍakhbār Madinat Zuhīd (Ms. A.S.No.2988) and its supplements: i) Al-Faḍl al-Mazīd 'ala Bughyat al-Mustafīd (Ms. A.S. No. 2988); ii) Qurrat al-'Uyūn fi ḍakhbār al-Yaman al-Maymūn (Ms., M.H.M.No. 71, Ṭā'rikh).

⁴ For some useful information about Ibn al-Dayba' and his works, see: Ibn al-Dayba's introduction to his Qurra; Ḥajji Khalifa, op.cit., vol. I, p.225; Ismā'il Pasha, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 225 and 1150; C. van Arendonk /G.Rentz, E.I., art. "Ibn al-Dayba", p.746, and works referred to in its bibliography.

⁵ Abdullah b. 'Abdullah Abū (Bā) Makhrāma, Ṭā'rikh Thaghr 'Adan, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1936).

⁶ Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 8-9.

Ibn al-Mujāwir, al-Ḥanadī and al-Ahdal.¹ In fact, the contribution of this source, in this thesis, is almost negligible.

4. The contemporary travellers

The only available account of a traveller is that given by the Italian Ludovico Di Varthema² (d. after 1508 A.D.) who visited Mecca and Medina in 1503 A.D., disguised as a Muslim Mamlūk after bribing in Damascus a commander of a Mamlūk force about to leave for Mecca as escort to the pilgrim caravan.³

The reliability of Varthema, on the basis of his bias and deliberate or unintentional distortion of the facts, is limited and the data available should not be accepted without due precaution and close examination. Varthema's statement that the Caliphs 'Alī, 'Uthmān and the Prophet Muḥammad's daughter Fāṭima are buried in al-Hujra al-Nahawiyya, in addition to the Prophet himself and the Caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar⁴, is absolutely wrong and al-Hujra does not contain the bodies of the first three mentioned. Similarly, his report that a mountainous area near Medina was inhabited by Jews⁵ is baseless. Moreover, his report about a well near Medina and its being made by St.

¹Abū Makhrama, op.cit., vol. I, pp.2, 10-12, 20, & 24-5.

²The travels of Ludovico Di Varthema, published by Burt Franklin (reprinted by permission of the Hakluyt Society, London 1863).

³Varthema, op.cit., p.16.

⁴Ibid., pp. 26-28.

⁵Ibid., pp. 22-25.

Mark the Evangelist is absurd.¹ But he may have made these mistakes simply through lack of information and understanding, as any person in his position could not have grasped the correct details and background of such places. But certain of his remarks clearly indicate his bias and hostility, as when he describes Mecca, on the basis of its being barren, as a cursed city,² and Muslims as pagans.³ In fact, his several other reports, such as his self-claimed romance with a wife of the Yemenite Sultan and his alleged adventures in southern India, are, to say the least, difficult to believe.

However, in various other respects, Varthema's reports are valuable and have been used. Thus, for instance, he is the only source to give some figures concerning the local population, a description of the buildings, and various other useful information such as the commercial decline, sources of food supply, and the scarcity of water in Jeddah.

5. The sources written before or after the Burjī period

A number of such sources have been marginally used in relation to certain specific points and the late sources have been cited in footnotes after the primary sources. The titles and other relevant details have been given in the footnotes, when mentioned for the first time, and also in the bibliography in which the Arabic sources have been arranged in chronological order. The period in which each of these historians lived is easily distinguishable from the year in which he died.

¹Ibid., p.32.

²Ibid., p.37.

³Ibid., p.52.

The real value of these sources lies either before or after the period under consideration and there is hardly any need for their evaluation. Probably what will be more appropriate here is to give some reason or justification for their use.

The pre-Burjī sources have been occasionally used in connection with certain issues or matters on which the information available in the contemporary sources is somewhat inadequate. These sources

have been equally useful on certain aspects of practices in the Burjī period which are characterized by a certain continuity so that they can be traced back to the pre-Burjī period.

The late sources occasionally provide some useful link between a disconnected chain of events or fill gaps or have been mentioned simply as complementary, or more correctly, as additional sources. But the discussion or conclusion is always on the basis of evidence available in the primary sources.

6. Modern works and articles

As has already been mentioned, modern scholars have paid, so far, little attention to the history of Mecca or other parts of the Hijāz. Most of their contribution in this respect is in the form of brief articles and even these are mainly to deal with a situation from the Egyptian point of view and contain only occasional remarks about the causes and effects from the Meccan angle. The titles and other relevant details concerning these works are given in appropriate places and need not be repeated here. Undoubtedly, these works were useful but their share in furthering this research was not too great.

Chapter I

AN ACCOUNT OF THE SUCCESSIVE
SHARIFS OF MECCA AGAINST THE
BACKGROUND OF THE LOCAL HISTORY

One may wonder why this introductory chapter has been entirely devoted to readily accessible information. The simple reason is that, to the best of my knowledge, there has hitherto been no proper attempt to correlate the scattered pieces of information in the form of a reasonably complete picture of the events. This chapter is probably the first contribution intended to fill this gap.

An additional purpose is to provide a general background for many aspects discussed in the following chapters.

The first Sharif of Mecca within the Burjī period

On the eve of the Burjī period Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān (d. 19th or 20th Sha'bān 788/15th or 16th Sept. 1386) was able to acquire a dominant position in the local politics. He was able to take advantage of a minor dispute and force his father, 'Ajlān (d. 777/1375), to abdicate. Subsequently, he took control of Mecca as sole Amir in 772 or 774/1370 or 1372. His abilities and strength of character enabled him to impose his authority on the various sections of the population and local forces. Even the opposing groups of Ashrāf¹ and Quwwād² had

¹See supra, pp. 11-12 fn. 2.

²This term (sing. Qā'id) literally means leaders, or commanders of the armies. In the sources, particularly the Meccan, this term is frequently applied to freed slaves and occasionally to Sharifs if they were warriors and in command of a body of fighting men. A Qā'id of slave origin used a title similar to those of the Ashrāf, such as al-Ḥasani, al-'Ajalāni, etc. This sometimes gave occasion to confusion between a Sharif and the other of a slave origin. However, the sources usually point to the slave origin of the person using such title and it is very rare that the confusion occurs. Some of these freed slaves, as well as those still slaves, were assigned important

to acknowledge, at least initially, his authority. Sharif Ahmad enjoyed unchallenged rule for a few years and the stability in the area served its population well.

In 780/1378 Sharif Ahmad appointed his young son Muhammad his co-Amir. Though it did not alter the factual position, this appointment was a significant step intended to prevent a clash over the succession at his death.

The emergence of Ahmad and his success in consolidating his position almost coincided with a far more significant change in Egypt. On 19th Ramaḍān 784/26th November 1382 the last of the Bahri Sultans, al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥajji, was swept away by Barqūq. The latter, an able Mamlūk officer of the Circassian origin, inaugurated a new line of Mamlūk Sultans who are known as Burjī or Circassians.¹ This change in Egypt was not, at the time, viewed by Sharif Ahmad with any concern. Initially, the relationship between Sharif Ahmad and Sultan Barqūq did not differ from the usual pattern. In 785/1383 the Sultan confirmed his subordinate Sharif Ahmad and his son in the emirate and the latter showed no reluctance in acknowledging Barqūq as their overlord.²

posts by the Sharifs of Mecca. According to a late source, this was a deliberate policy of the Sharifs of Mecca. 'Alī b. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabarī, Al-Arj al-Miski (MS., M.H.M. No. 3, Dihlawi), fol. 125. Qalqashandī describes these Quwwād as prominent Ashraf whose status under the Sharifs of Mecca was comparable to that of the Amirs under the Sultans. Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, p.276.

¹The last Bahri Sultan, al-Ṣāliḥ Ḥajji, was able to regain the Sultanate for a brief period between 791-2/1389-90 but Barqūq managed to regain the throne in Ṣafar 792/February 1392, G.Wiet, E.I.,², art. "Barquq", pp. 1050-51.

².

Ibn Khaldūn, op.cit. vol. IV, pp. 107-8, vol. V, p.474; Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. III, p.438, vol. IV, pp. 10-11 and 274; idem, Ma'athir, vol. II, pp. 175 and 194-95; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.206; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57a, 103a, 189b and 190a; part II, fols. 286a-87a; Ibn Ḥajar, al-Durar al-Kāmina, 4 vols. (Haydrabad,

Sharif Aḥmad's rather harsh attitude towards a group of Ashrāf made the latter resentful. By refusing to pay these Ashrāf, including 'Anān b. Muḡhāmis and Ḥasan b. Thuqba, their share of the revenue, Sharif Aḥmad had so seriously antagonised them that they went to Cairo in 786/1384 and secured a decision of the Sultan in their favour. However, returning to Mecca with an order to Sharif Aḥmad to pay them their dues, they were denied justice, and the dispute flared up with renewed intensity.¹ The Sharifs 'Anān and Ḥasan learned that Sharif Aḥmad was planning to have them assassinated and fled to Yanbu' with the intention of approaching the Sultan again. This aroused the solicitude of Sharif Aḥmad, who no doubt realized that to adopt an arrogant and stubborn attitude towards the Ashrāf was far easier than to defy a clear order of the Sultan. He therefore sent his brother Sharif Muḡammad to bring back 'Anān and Ḥasan, who, having been assured by Sharif Muḡammad and the Egyptian Amir

1348-50/1929-31), vol. I, pp. 201-2; idem, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 88a; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Nujūm al-Zahira, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1929-56), vol. XI, p.4 and pp. 139-40; idem, al-Manhal, 1 vol. (Cairo, 1375/1955), vol. I, pp. 369-70; 2 vols (MS., N.OS. No. 3428-29), vol. II, fol. 249a-49b and 323b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, Ithāf al-Warā', 2 vols. (MS., M.H.M. No. 2, Ta'rikh), vol. II, fols. 96-97, 100 and 102; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (MS., Kop. No. 1189), fol. 51b; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', 2 vols. (Bulaq, 1311/1893), vol. I, pp. 257-59, 268-75 and 289; idem, Uqūd al-Jumān, 2nd vol. (MS., A.S.No. 3311), vol. II, fols. 110a; see also: Ibn Uqba, op.cit., p.123; Suyūḡī, op.cit., p.504; 'Abd al-Qādir b. Muḡammad al-Jaziri, Durar al-Fawā'id (Cairo, 1384/1964), p.584; Muḡstafa b. Ḥasan al-Janābi, Ta'rikh (MS., A.S. No. 3033), fol. 304a; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, pp. 282, 286 and 322, vol. VII, pp. 6-7; 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥusayn al-'Iṣāmī, Simḡ al-Nujūm al-'Awāli, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1380/1960), vol. IV, pp. 245-47; 'Ali al-Ḥanafi al-Sinjāri, Manā'ih al-Karam, 3 vols. (MS., M.H.M. No. 30, Ta'rikh), vol. I, fols. 325-27; Muḡammad b. 'Ali al-Ṭabari, Ithāf Fuḡalā' al-Zaman, 3 vols. (MS., M.H.M. No. 126, Ta'rikh), vol. I, fols. 58-59 and 61; Aḥmad b. Zaynī Daḡlān, Khalāṣat al-Kalām (Cairo, 1305/1887), pp. 33-34.

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 190a, part II, fols. 287a-b, vol. II, part III, fols. 252a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 204a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 98-99 and 103; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, p.147. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.247; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 328.

al-Ḥajj¹ that their dues would be restored to them, they returned to Mecca. Contrary to their expectations, they were not only denied their rights but also were ill-treated and imprisoned. Sharif Muḥammad protested but in vain and he too was thrown into prison. The news reached Cairo and Sultan Barqūq sent an order for the release of these Ashraf but it was ignored by Sharif Aḥmad who appears

¹Here it might not be amiss to point out that the Egyptian pilgrims travelled in two separate caravans. The first to depart was called al-Rakb al-Awwal and the second Rakb al-Maḥmal. Though the Amirs of both caravans were high-ranking dignitaries and enjoyed respect and authority in Mecca the Amir of the second caravan enjoyed particular importance, as the Maḥmal, a palanquin, a Kiswa (veil) of Ka'ba, symbolizing the political hegemony of the Egyptian Sultan, were in this caravan. The Sharifs of Mecca usually gave formal reception to both Amirs, but it was obligatory for the Amir al-Maḥmal, otherwise his loyalty was in question. For further details, see: J. Jomier, E.I.², art. "Amir al-Ḥādjdj", pp. 443-44; Fr. Buhl, E.I.¹, art. "Maḥmal", pp. 123-24; A. J. Wensinck, E.I.², art. "Ḥādjdj", p. 34; Halil Inalcik, "The rise of the Ottoman Empire" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p. 321. As explained above, the Maḥmal (palanquin) symbolized the political hegemony. But for this the Maḥmal itself was not sufficient. The real importance of the Egyptian Maḥmal, apart from its leading position, lay in the fact that it brought the Kiswa for the Ka'ba sent annually from Egypt. As will be seen, there were non-Egyptian Maḥmals but none of these brought Kiswa. No non-Egyptian Sultan within the Burjī period except Shah Rukh enjoyed this privilege. The Kiswa sent by the latter, as will be seen, was by way of Egypt and was used for the interior of the Ka'ba. It will not be irrelevant to mention here that the annual ceremony of taking the Egyptian Maḥmal in procession to various parts of Cairo, usually celebrated in the month of Rajab, was a silent announcement that the route to Ḥijāz was safe, and that the Egyptian pilgrim caravan would depart in due course. Those intending to perform the pilgrimage were thus urged to prepare themselves and join the caravan. See Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 94b; Sakhāwī, al-Tihr, pp. 95-6. For details concerning the procession of Maḥmal, see: Qalqashandī, Subḥ, vol. IV, pp. 57-8.

to have begun over-estimating his position and authority.¹

In Jumādā I, 788/June 1386 an attempt to escape by the imprisoned Ashrāf was foiled, only one, 'Anān, succeeding. He managed to reach Cairo and was able to lodge a complaint with the Sultan against Sharif Ahmad. Sultan Barqūq ordered Sharif Ahmad to release the imprisoned Ashrāf but was again ignored. Infuriated by this persistent defiance, the Sultan would no doubt have punished the Sharif severely had death not removed him from the Sultan's jurisdiction in Sha'bān or Ramaḡān 788/September or October 1386. Sharif Muḡammad had succeeded his father, under the guardianship of his paternal uncle, Kubaysh,² and it was he who had to bear the brunt of the Sultan's anger.

Sharif Muḡammad and Kubaysh must have been aware of Sultan Barqūq's order; the wise course would have been to release the prisoners. However, they failed to do so and, moreover, affronted the Sultan further by blinding the captives. This act was regarded as a challenge in Cairo and the reaction was harsh. 'Anān was secretly appointed to the emirate and departed for Mecca with the Egyptian pilgrim caravan. In Dhū'l-Qa'da 788/December 1386 Sharif Muḡammad, while giving the usual reception³ to the Egyptian Mahmal, was assassinated during the

¹Alī b. al-Ḥasan Ibn Wahhās, al-'Uqūd al-Lu'lu'iyya, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1329-32/1911-14), vol. II, pp. 187-88; Fāsī, al-Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 190b, part II, fol. 269b and 287b-88a, vol. II, part III, fol. 252a-52b, part IV, fol. 287b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 204a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 323b-24a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 103-5; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.97, vol. IV, p.147; see also: Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 434; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 247-48; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 328; Dahlān, op.cit., p.34.

²According to Ibn 'Uqba this Kubaysh was an illegitimate son of Sharif 'Ajlān. See: 'Umdat al-Talib, pp. 123-24.

³This meant meeting the Amir at the outskirts of Mecca and kissing the hoof of the camel carrying Kiswat al-Ka'ba.

ceremony by two men in the same caravan.¹ The simultaneous attempt to assassinate Kubaysh failed and he escaped to Jēdda. 'Anān was declared Amir of Mecca and was able, with Egyptian assistance, to crush the resistance of Sharif Muḥammad's supporters. However, Jēdda was occupied by Kubaysh which was an economic blow to the newly appointed 'Anān.²

'Anān's feeble control over Mecca

The circumstances preceding and surrounding the appointment of 'Anān had deprived him of the support of many prominent local Ashrāf, who held him, not without justification, responsible for the assassination of Sharif Muḥammad and were unwilling to co-operate.

Shortly after his appointment, Sharif 'Anān had released the imprisoned Ashrāf. He had expected to win them over and consequently

¹ Most sources relate the episode of the assassination without further commentary, but some of them imply that it was done with the approval of Sultan Barqūq. Ibn Ḥajar states clearly that these assassins had been sent by the Sultan for that purpose. See: Inbā', vol. I, fol. 204a. It is interesting to note that this assassination was among the charges brought against Barqūq during his temporary deposition. See: Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥim Ibn al-Furāt, Ta'rikh, 3 vols. (ed. Q. Zurayq and N. 'Izz al-Din, Beirut, 1936-42), vol. IX, part I, p.157; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 103b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. XI, p.359; Ibn 'Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, p.282.

² Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 188-89; Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, pp. 274-75; idem, Ma'āthir, vol. II, pp. 195-96; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 206 and 250; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57a, 190a-90b and 103a-3b, part II, fols. 269b and 288a, vol. II, part III, fols. 252b-53a, part IV, fol. 287b; Maqrizi, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 230, vol. III, fols. 105b, 106b and 107b-8a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 85b, 88a and 204a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 167b-68a, 249a-49b and 324a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. XI, pp. 245-46 and 308; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 105-8; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 147-48; Ibn 'Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, p.265; idem, Uqūd, vol. II, fols. 113b-14a; see also: Ibn 'Uqba, op.cit., p.123; Khazraji, op.cit., fols. 434-35; Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 314 and 584-85; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; 'Alī al-Ṭabari, op.cit., fols. 69-70; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, pp. 299-300; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 248-49; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 326-29; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 61-62; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 34-35.

consolidate his position. This hope was not unfounded as 'Anān, helped by Muḥammad b. 'Ajlān, managed to regain the control of Jēdda. He appointed Sharif Muḥammad his deputy there but kept watch on him as a precaution. In so doing, 'Anān was evidently motivated by the fear that family ties might induce Muḥammad to go over to the side of Kubaysh. In the early part of 789/1387 'Anān's spy became overzealous and Sharif Muḥammad noticed that he was being spied upon and reacted by ^{taking} control of Jēdda as independent ruler. He formed an alliance with Kubaysh against 'Anān. Kubaysh and his supporters availed themselves of this unexpected opportunity to plunder rich merchants in the city and thus improved their financial position. Their resistance to 'Anān was thereby considerably strengthened.¹

The alliance between Sharif Muḥammad and Kubaysh and their hold on Jēdda had further weakened 'Anān's already feeble control over the region. The loss of Jēdda was bad enough, from the political point of view, but it also meant a loss of revenue, which resulted in a financial crisis, so that a number of 'Anān's men joined the opposing camp. Those who remained demanded their dues and maintenance allowances which 'Anān was unable to pay.

In Jumādā I 789/May 1387 Kubaysh and Muḥammad b. 'Ajlān set out with their forces and pitched camp in a place near Mecca. This move caused dismay to 'Anān, especially as the loyalty of his remaining

¹ . . . Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part I, p.7; Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.189; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 206-7; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57a, 189b and 221a, vol. II, part III, fols. 253a-53b, part IV, fols. 287b-88a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 109a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 91a and 204a-4b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 323a-b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 108-10; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 147-48. See also: Khazraji, op.cit., fol. 435; Jaziri, op.cit., p.58; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 249-50; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 329-30; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.35.

disgruntled supporters was in doubt. Aware that only money could save him he resorted to the confiscation of goods stored by merchants in the warehouses including some of the Sultan's property. His financial position, as well as his military strength, having been enhanced by this legally dubious move, 'Anān won over some prominent men from the opposing camp. The most influential among them were the Sharifs Ahmad b. Thuqba, 'Aqīl b. Mubārak and his brother 'Alī. So anxious was 'Anān to retain their support that he appointed them co-Amirs, reserving, however, for himself the position of first among equals. All this was done on 'Anān's personal initiative and was not confirmed by the Sultan in Cairo. Though 'Anān's increased strength deterred his opponents from launching an offensive, it did not suffice to launch a counter-offensive and oust his opponents from Jeddah.¹ The latter did their best to disrupt law and order in the region and were seldom checked by 'Anān. Not only were merchants and inhabitants victimized but also the property of the Sultan himself was plundered. The news of these events reached Cairo where they were viewed with concern, especially as they led to an almost complete breakdown of law and order.

Sultan Barqūq simply could not permit such a situation to continue. In or around Sha'bān 789/August or September 1387, Sharif 'Anān, by virtue of an edict, was deposed by Sharif 'Alī b. 'Ajlān. 'Anān, though deposed, was unwilling to leave Mecca and to acknowledge 'Alī's official position. Resulting friction led to a battle in the proximity

¹ . . . Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.207; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 57a, part II, fol. 269b, vol. II, part III, fol. 163a, 198a and 253b, part IV, fols. 288a-b; Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 230; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, vol. I, pp. 241-42, vol. II, fol. 120a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 110; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p.148. See also: Jaziri, op.cit., p.58; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.250; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 330; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 62; Dahlān, op.cit., p.35.

of Mecca. Kubaysh, a brother of 'Alī b. 'Ajlān, was at the head of 'Anān's opponents and his death, in the early stage of the battle, impaired the morale of 'Alī's supporters and 'Anān secured an easy victory and consequently remained in control of Mecca.

Sharif 'Alī went to Cairo to complain of 'Anān's refusal to comply with the Sultan's order and to secure military support against him. Sultan Barqūq does not appear to have, at least ostensibly, felt too bitter about 'Anān's failure to act according to the Sultani edict as the Sultan is said to have assured 'Anān that if he gave the Egyptian Mahmal the customary reception he would be appointed co-Amir with 'Alī. 'Anān, however, apparently finding the situation reminiscent of the assassination, in the immediate past, of Sharif Muḥammad on an analogous occasion, suspected a trap and left Mecca in the pilgrimage season of the same year without implementing the Sultan's order. Consequently, 'Alī was proclaimed sole Amir of Mecca.¹ 'Anān had left Mecca but remained in its neighbourhood and particularly in the valley of Marr.² 'Anān's subsequent policy of

¹ Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part I, pp. 18-19 and 21; Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.194; Qalqashandi, Subh, vol. IV, p.275; idem, Ma'āthir, vol. II, p.196; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.207; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57a, 291a-b and 246a, vol. II, part III, fol. 192a and 253b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 110a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 91a-b, 99a, 137b and 204a-b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 120a and 384a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 110-12; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, p.266; vol. V, p.149; vol. VI, p.148. Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. I, p.268; idem, Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 114b. See also: Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 438; Jazirī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.250.

² This valley, about 28 km. to the north-east of Mecca, is known by various names, such as: Baṭn Marr, Marr al-Zahrān, and presently as Wādi Fātima. It was and still is among the most fertile valleys in the region of Mecca. For further details, see: Yūsuf b. Ya'qūb b. al-Mujāwir, Ta'rikh al-Mustabsir, 2 vols. (Leiden 1951-2), vol. I, p.14; Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh b. Baṭṭūṭa, Tuhfat al-Nuzzār, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1357/1938), vol. I, pp. 78-79; Abī Bakr b. al-Ḥusayn Marāghī, Tahqīq al-Nusra (Cairo, 1374/1955), p.161; Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, pp. 259-60; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 30a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, pp. 369-70; Samhūdi, Wafā', vol. II, p.174; idem, Khulāṣat, p.229; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 30; 'Abd al-Quddūs al-Anṣārī, Tahqīq Amkina fi'l-Hijaz wa Tihama, a supplement to the magazine Al-Manhal, Mecca,

intercepting supplies of food and other commodities to Mecca by threatening and attacking caravans, merchants, and travellers alike, developed into a nuisance which Sharif 'Alī could not tolerate. He launched an offensive against 'Anān and forced him to flee from the vicinity of Mecca.

Early in 790/1388 'Anān tried to occupy Mecca by a surprise attack but failed and retreated to the valley of Marr and from there marched with his supporters and took control of Jeddah by a sudden attack. Having established himself firmly there, he sent the Sultan apologies for his disobedience attributing it to fear and not to disloyalty. The version of Ibn al-Furāt implies that 'Anān's purpose was to secure a Sultani edict declaring Jeddah a separate entity and confirming him in control of the city. However, other sources indicate that 'Anān's approach was mainly intended to secure both the favour of the Sultan and the co-emirate. Sharif 'Alī, aware of 'Anān's move, sent his brother Ḥasan to Cairo to nip any attempt by 'Anān to ingratiate himself with the Sultan in the bud. The decision of the Sultan, however, was that both 'Anān and 'Alī were to share the emirate of Mecca. An edict to this effect reached Mecca in Rabi' II or Jumādā I 790/April or May 1388, but 'Anān was unable to participate in the affairs of the emirate. By then he had become too unpopular and even many of his own supporters had deserted him, thus weakening 'Anān's military strength considerably, especially as he could not rely on the loyalty of his remaining supporters, who patently lacked zeal. Moreover, 'Anān was deprived of his share in the revenue and was unable to rectify the situation.

'Anān's journey to Cairo, in Shawwāl 790/October 1388, seems to have been motivated by the wish to air his grievances and to gain

the Sultan's sympathy. But the reception he met with was cool, nor was any help forthcoming. To make matters worse, Sultan Barqūq was deposed and imprisoned in the citadel of al-Karak in Jumādā II or Rajab 791/June or July 1389. The new Sultan, al-Mansūr (or al-Ṣāliḥ) Ḥajji showed himself favourably disposed to Sharif 'Alī and 'Anān was imprisoned in the Citadel of Cairo with a number of Mamlūks and supporters of the deposed Barqūq.¹

'Anān appointed co-Amir of Mecca

For Sharif 'Anān the contact with the Mamlūks of Barqūq resulted in a superficial and marginal involvement in Egyptian politics on Barqūq's side and he gained the goodwill of his fellow captives. Barqūq's escape from al-Karak in Ramaḡān 791/September 1389 marks a dramatic change in the fortunes of Barqūq as well as of 'Anān. When Barqūq's Mamlūks, by a happy coincidence, made an equally successful bid for freedom and seized the Cairo Citadel in the name of their master, 'Anān was among those who brought Barqūq the good news. After the latter's victorious entry to Cairo in Ṣafar 792/February 1390 he rewarded 'Anān with the coveted co-emirate of Mecca, to which he returned. He was accompanied by an Egyptian Amir on whom it was incumbent to bring about a reconciliation between the two co-Amirs

¹ Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part I, pp. 21-22, 25, 27, 35, 93-94 and 132; Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. III, p.438; Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, p.207; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 190b, part II, fol. 399b; vol. II, part III, fols. 192a-b and 253b-54a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 110b, 111b and 113b; Ibn Ḥajār, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 91a-b, 96a, 103b, 137b and 204b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manḥal, vol. II, fol. 120a-b, 167b-68a and 324a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 112-13; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 56a-b, Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 11 and 103, vol. IV, p.148. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 304a, 304b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., IV, pp. 250-51; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 331; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 62; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.35.

By the middle of 792/1390 a peculiar arrangement was arrived at. From the details given in the sources, and particularly by Fāsī followed by al-Najm Ibn Fahd, it is evident that both co-Amirs lacked any willingness to co-operate with each other. The most important points of this arrangement were as follows: Both Sharifs were to share, in equal parts, the revenue, and both had to renounce the privilege of a permanent residence in the city, which was to remain under the joint control of their deputies. Moreover, by mutual consent, each co-Amir was assigned his own group of supporters: 'Anān was henceforth to rely on the exclusive support of Quwwād, and 'Alī on that of Ashrāf.

This strange agreement remained in force for a brief period only. Early in 793/1390-91 their mutual resentment and disputes flared up again, a state of affairs which led to an abortive attempt to assassinate 'Anān in Ṣafar 794/January 1392. After 'Anān's escape, his deputy and some of his officials were expelled from the city and his name was omitted from the prayer on the roof of Zamzam.¹ The Khatib, however, refused to comply with an order to this effect. This was only the prelude to a spate of humiliations to which 'Anān was subjected and which culminated in his final downfall.²

¹Zamzam - a historical and sacred well within the Meccan sanctuary, near the Ka'ba. The Muslims revered its water and drank it as health-giving and to seek the blessing. See: B. Carra de Vaux, E.I.¹, art. "Zamzam", pp. 1212-13. These prayers were said daily in the evening for the Amir or Amirs of Mecca and the inclusion or exclusion of a name had its political implication. However, this practice was not as significant as the mentioning of the name in the Friday Khuṭba (i.e. sermon).

²Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part I, pp. 157, 192-93, 199, 205 and 208; Fāsī, Shifa', vol. II, p.207; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fols. 193a and 254a-b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inba', vol. I, fols. 103b-4a, 108b-9a, 137b and 204b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 120b, 168a and 324a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 113-16; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 10-12, vol. VI, p.148; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. I, pp. 268-75, 277-82 and 284-89. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304b; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 331; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.36.

'Alī appointed sole Amir of Mecca

The situation in Mecca having become chaotic in the early part of 794/1392, the Sultan summoned both co-Amirs to Cairo. Sharif 'Anān, anxious to remain in the Sultan's favour, responded immediately to the call and departed rather hurriedly in Jumādā II of the same year (May 1392). 'Alī's strategy seems to have been shrewder: he went first to Medina and held there a special ceremony of reading the Qur'ān followed by special prayers for the Sultan, and with a Mahdar¹ began his journey. On his arrival in Cairo in Shabān 794/July 1392, he presented the Mahdar and several valuable gifts to the Sultan. Sharif 'Alī made the better impression on the Sultan and was appointed sole Amir of Mecca. 'Anān was deposed and detained in Cairo.²

By a strange irony of fate, it was 'Alī's very success that cost him his life. One of his prominent supporters, Jar Allah b. Ḥamza, who had misinterpreted the Sultan's summons to the co-Amirs as a sign of the impending deposition of both, tried to secure the emirate for himself and went to Cairo with this aim in view. He returned not only disappointed in his ambitions, but also as a bitter foe of Sharif 'Alī, and found willing assistance among the ranks of the supporters of the deposed 'Anān. Therefore Sharif 'Alī, on his return, was forced to take up arms against these opponents. 'Alī's sudden split with his

¹A report detailing certain events, signed by a number of religious and notable persons to vouch for its authenticity.

²Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 303-4, 306, 308 and 310; Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, p.275; idem, Ma'āthir, vol. II, p.196; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 207-8; idem, al-Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 190b, vol. II, part III, fol. 193a-b and 254b-55a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 155a-56a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inba', vol. I, fols. 120a, 137b and 204b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 120b, 168a and 324a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 116-17; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p.148; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.252; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 332; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.36.

brother Ḥasan¹ and the resulting division among his own ranks weakened his military strength considerably. As so often, the reason for this sudden deterioration in the relations between Ḥasan and 'Alī cannot be ascertained. Possibly it began as a financial dispute which soon developed into an armed conflict. In or around Jumādā II 797/April 1395 Ḥasan tried to take Mecca but failed and fled to Cairo where he was imprisoned. Meanwhile, the hostility of the groups antagonistic to Sharif 'Alī continued, and the latter was assassinated on 7th Shawwāl 797/28th July 1395.²

Sharif Ḥasan appointed Amir of Mecca

The fear of the Meccans, following the assassination of Sharif 'Alī, that anarchy and looting would ensue fortunately did not materialize, as Sharif Muḥammad, a blind brother of 'Alī, managed with the help of the deceased's men and slaves, to maintain law and order and notified the Sultan of what had happened. In Dhū'l Qa'da 797/September 1395, the Sultan released Ḥasan and appointed him Amir of Mecca.

The latter reached Mecca in Rabi' II 798/February 1396. His immediate task, in accord with the tribal practice, was to retaliate against the assassins of his brother, and he succeeded. Unable to meet Ḥasan in an open battle, his opponents did their best to disrupt law and order. This led the merchants to avoid coming to Jeddah and Mecca and thus caused great financial losses for the Sharif and the

¹ Qalqashandī alone describes him as a nephew of 'Alī, Ṣubḥ, vol. IV, p.275.

² Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 332-33, 413-14 and 420; Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. IV, p.275; Fāsī, Shifa', vol. II, p. 208; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57a-b, part II, fol. 367b, vol. II, part III, fols.193b-95a; Maqrizi, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 157b and 171b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 120b, 135b, 137b and 204b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 120b; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. XII, pp. 144-45; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 117-20; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 61b; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, p.304; see also: Jaziri, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304b; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, p.350; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.252; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 331-32; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.36.

merchants in the area. Thanks to the efforts of the energetic Ḥasan law and order, and with its stability and prosperity, returned to the region in 799/1396-97.¹

Sharif Ḥasan was able, by persuasion or force, to unite various groups under his command. His relations with the Sultan, Barqūq, (d. 15th Shawwāl 801/20th June 1399) and then his son, Faraj (d. 815/1412) were, on the whole, good and this must have enhanced Ḥasan's influence and power in the region. In 804/1401, Ḥasan's relations with al-Muḥallī, a prominent official of Sultan Faraj, deteriorated for reasons discussed later.² Al-Muḥallī secured the release of Sharif 'Anān and made him hopeful of retrieving the emirate of Mecca at the expense of Ḥasan. The latter took the threat seriously and it caused him great anxiety. He did not receive the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj except with observable reluctance. However, the death of 'Anān in Jumādā II 805/December 1402 and then of al-Muḥallī himself in the following year relieved Ḥasan from a great politico-economic pressure.³

Ḥasan appointed Nā'ib al-Sultān

Between 809/1406 and 811/1408 Sharif Ḥasan appointed two of his sons, Barakāt I and Aḥmad, his co-Amirs, and the appointment was officially confirmed. In 811/1408 the Sultan granted Ḥasan the status

¹Ibn al-Furāt, *op.cit.*, vol. IX, part II, pp. 414, 434 and 442-43; Fāsī, *Shifā'*, vol. II, p.208; idem, *al-'Iqd*, vol. I, part I, fol. 189b, part II, fols. 399b-402a, vol. II, part III, fol. 195a; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. III, fols.171b, 172a and 174a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Manhal*, vol. II, fols. 120b and 323a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fols. 120-24; Sakhāwī, *al-Daw'*, vol. III, pp. 103-4. See also: Janābī, *op.cit.*, fol. 304b; 'Iṣāmī, *op.cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 252-53; Sinjāri, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fols. 333-34; Ṭabarī, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fol. 63; Daḥlān, *op.cit.*, pp. 36-37.

²See *infra*, pp. 159-60.

³Fāsī, *al-'Iqd*, vol. I, part II, fols. 403b-4a, vol. II, part III, fol. 255a; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. III, fols. 233b and 241b; Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbā'*, vol. I, fol. 204b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Manhal*, vol. II, fol. 168a;

of Nā'ib al-Sultān (deputy of the Sultan) in the Hijāz.¹ This was undoubtedly the most remarkable achievement of Ḥasan and was a step of great significance for the region. But in 812/1409, the attitude of the Sultan became markedly cooler and he instructed the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj to replace Ḥasan by another Sharif, 'Alī b. Mubāarak.

What caused this sudden change in the Sultan's attitude is not clear. From the version of certain sources, such as Fāsī, followed by al-Najm Ibn Fahd and others, it appears that this change was due, at least partly, to the efforts of Jābir al-Ḥarāshī,² an official of Ḥasan whose relations were at the time unfriendly, and to some financial dispute. Be it as it may, this much is certain, that after the departure of the Egyptian caravan some courtiers amicably disposed towards Ḥasan interceded with the Sultan on his behalf, assuring him that Ḥasan would pay a considerably sum to the treasury after he was re-instated.³ Sultan agreed and sent his servant Firūz al-Sāqī with a decree confirming Ḥasan in the same position and the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj was instructed to disregard the previous order.⁴

It was during the emirate and Niyāhat al-Sultana of Sharif Ḥasan that the rule of Sultan al-Nāṣir Faraj ended in or around Ṣafar 815/ June 1412 and a period of intense inter-faction rivalry began in Egypt and Syria, and the Caliph al-Musta'in, on the suggestion of Amir

Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 129 and 131-33; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 70b; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 112-13 and 197. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 332; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 62.

¹See infra, pp. 113-17.

²See infra, p. 245.

³See infra, p. 227.

⁴Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 208-9 and 252-54; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57b, 63b-64a, part II, fols. 408a-b and 605b-6a; vol. II, part III, fols. 195a and 197b-98a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 142-43; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 80a; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 51, vol. V, p. 277. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit.,

Shaykh al-Mahmūdī, was declared Sultan. The Abbāsīd caliphs of Egypt were "little more than minor court pensioners with purely ceremonial duties to perform on the accession of a new Sultan,"¹ with the only exception of Caliph al-Musta'in who "became a stop-gap ruler for six months in the course of a feud between rival claimants to the Sultanate."²

Al-Musta'in's accession to the Sultanate had pleased the pious circles who regarded this episode a revival of the bygone glory of the Caliphate. But those aware of the real situation knew from the start that it had no real significance. Even the Caliph himself had no illusions that the Sultanate was assigned to him for life-long tenure. He had only accepted it on condition that he would remain Caliph even when removed from the Sultanate. In Jumādā II 815/October 1412, al-Musta'in confirmed Sharif Ḥasan and his sons and sent an investiture of rule them/ and the robe of honour. This was the first and the last time in the Burjī period that an Abbāsīd caliph did so as sovereign. Al-Musta'in's name was subsequently mentioned in the Khuṭba, and prayers were said for him in the sanctuary of Mecca. In Sha'bān 815/December 1412, Amir Shaykh became himself Sultan, taking the regal name al-Mu'ayyad (d. Muḥarram 824/January 1421) but retained al-Musta'in as Caliph. This sudden change in al-Musta'in's status confused the Meccan Khatibs and some continued to mention his name, while others omitted it occasionally. It was finally excluded in

p.319; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 305a-b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 253-55; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 339-41; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 75; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 37-38.

¹B.Lewis, E.I.², art. "Abbasids", p.21.

²Ibid. See also: B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.221; W.Wansbrough, E.I.², art. "Faradj".

Rabi' II 817/July 1414.¹

Though not as a result of the above stated change of ruler in Egypt, it was shortly after that Sharif Ḥasan was facing internal dissension. In Jumādā I or II 816/August or September 1413, the hitherto tolerable relationship between Ḥasan and his nephew, Rumaytha, changed, possibly in the wake of some financial dispute, to open hostility. In the absence of Ḥasan, Rumaytha occupied Mecca for a short period, but fled on the approach of the former, and was allowed to escape unmolested.² This leniency was interpreted by Rumaytha and his supporters as a sign of Ḥasan's weakness, and they ventured outside the precincts of Mecca trespassing on the neighbouring territory. When Ḥasan launched an offensive they suffered defeat and fled in the direction of the Yemen.

Having renounced hope of occupying Mecca, they took control of Jeddah by a surprise attack in Ramaḡān 816/December 1413 and proceeded to loot it. Incensed by what had happened and fearing the loss of revenue, Sharif Ḥasan made preparations for an attack but desisted from it in view of the reluctance of his supporters. Instead, he solicited the help of Muḡbil, the Amir of Yanbu'. Meanwhile, after a prolonged negotiation, Rumaytha agreed to a truce until the end of the pilgrimage season and left Jeddah but remained in its neighbourhood.³

¹ Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. III, pp. 267, 279-80, 439 and 442; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 254-55; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 64a, part II, fol. 407b; Maqrizi, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 251 and 253; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 152, 154 and 160; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 63b-64a, 79a and 80a-b; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, pp. 355-59, vol. II, pp. 2-3; idem, 'Uḡūd, vol. II, fol. 183. See also: Muḡammad b. Aḡmad al-Nahrawālī, al-I'lām bi A'lām Bayt Allah al-Ḥarām, ex. published by F. Wüstenfeld in: Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka (Leipzig, 1857), p.201; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.108.

² Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.11; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 10a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 1b; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 592b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 154; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VIII, p.100. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b.

³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 409a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 155.

Sharif Muqbil reached Mecca with his forces during the pilgrimage. Soon after the expiry of the truce, Ḥasan and Muqbil marched jointly against Rumaytha, who fled towards Ḥaly¹ with his supporters and was not pursued.²

Shortly after, Rumaytha went to the Yemen and paid a visit to its Sultan who received him cordially and gave him financial aid. The relations of Sharif Ḥasan with the Yemenite Sultan, at the time, ~~were~~^{were} far from being friendly.³ This may have been the reason for the favour shown by the Yemenite Sultan towards Rumaytha. The former may~~or~~ may not have encouraged Rumaytha to renew hostilities against Ḥasan but it may be too much of a coincidence that Rumaytha marched against Ḥasan shortly after his return from the Yemen. In Ramaḡān 817/December 1414, Rumaytha with his supporters reached a valley near Mecca. Ḥasan went out to meet him with a strong force. However, on the intervention of some men of goodwill a truce was agreed upon by the two rivals which was intended to last until 10th Muḡarram 818/23rd March 1415.⁴

The hostilities between Ḥasan and Rumaytha and the resulting lack of law and order appear to have affected the commercial activities of the area, especially as the Yemenite Sultan seems to have imposed an embargo.⁵ Moreover, Sharif Ḥasan was compelled to pay a considerable

¹A coastal town and port about 385 km to the south of J̄dda also known as Ḥaly b. Ya'qūb. For further details, see, Qalqashandī, Subḡ, vol. V, p.13; Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 331; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 241b; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 31a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 124a; Anṣārī, op.cit., p.12.

²Fasī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 409a-b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 155 and 157-58.

³See infra, pp. 166 - 68.

⁴Fasī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 409b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 155 and 158.

⁵See infra, p. 168.

1

amount of money to secure the favour of Sultan Faraj and thus Hasan's financial position was rather weak. Consequently, in Dhul-Qa'da 817/February 1415, he was unable - in spite of reiterated demands, to pay the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj the price of grain sent by the Egyptian Sultan for sale. Though Hasan made a vague promise of payment in the near future it did not satisfy the Egyptian Amir, who did not hide his displeasure.² The latter, probably anticipating some hostility on the part of Sharif Hasan, had, on his arrival, forbidden the carrying of arms within the precincts of Mecca. Unaware of that order, a certain Qā'id was found to be armed and was arrested. This led to an armed clash between the Egyptians and various groups of Quwwād. Sharif Hasan took care to remain uninvolved and managed to pacify his supporters by obtaining the release of the captive. However, the Amirs of both Egyptian caravans departed with a grudge against Hasan. The failure of the latter to pay the price of grain and to protect the Egyptians from the attack of the Quwwād gave these Amirs valid reasons to make their report to Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh unfavourable to Hasan. The Amirs even seem to have gone so far as to recommend Hasan's replacement by Rumaytha.³

¹See supra, p. 63 and infra, p. 227.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 410a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 158. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 320.

³Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 255-57; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 410a-b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 263; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 7a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 158-60. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 320; 'Iṣāmī, vol. IV, pp. 255-56; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 342-43; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 78-79; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 38-39.

Hasan faces various problems

By the end of 817/1415, the period of relative stability which Ḥasan had enjoyed ended, and he was to face new internal crises and external pressures. In Rabi' I 818/June 1415, a decree reached Mecca by which Ḥasan was deposed by Rumaytha, but he remained in control until the pilgrimage season. Though Rumaytha was declared not only the Amir of Mecca but Nā'ib al-Sultān as well¹ but his authority was hardly acknowledged beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Mecca. This was mainly due to the continuous hostility on the part of the pro-Ḥasan group. As a result, Rumaytha's authority was practically non-existent outside Mecca and he even found it difficult to hold his own in Mecca.²

In a successful attempt to retrieve lost ground, Sharif Ḥasan sent his son Barakāt I to Cairo with gifts for the Sultan in Rajab 819/September 1416. Ḥasan's re-appointment in Shawwāl 819/December 1416 met with a determined opposition from Rumaytha. On 24th Shawwāl of the same year, Sharif Ḥasan supported by the Amir of Yanbu', Sharif Muqhil, launched an offensive, defeated Rumaytha, and took control of the city. He, however, granted Rumaytha and his men five days of grace to depart safely.³ The magnanimity shown by Ḥasan to

¹See infra, p. 117.

²Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.209; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 57b, part II, fols. 410b-11a, vol. II, part III, fols. 195a-b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 272; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 10a and 14b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 162-64; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 104. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 254 and 256-57; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 344; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 80; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.39.

³Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.11, vol. II, pp. 209-10; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57b-58a, part II, fols. 411a-12a and 415a-16a, vol. II, part III, fol. 195b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 277-78; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 19b-20b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 164-65; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 104. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Janābī, op.cit., fol.305b; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 70; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 254 and 257-58; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 344-45; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 80; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.38.

Rumaytha on this and previous occasions induced the latter to come to Mecca in Ṣafar 820/March 1417 to declare his loyalty to Ḥasan. He was received with unusual cordiality and respect. According to Fāsī (al-‘Iqd), Rumaytha's name was mentioned in the Khuṭba. Coins bearing his name were minted in Mecca to commemorate this reconciliation. It was not unwelcome to many on both sides, but was resented by most of Rumaytha's supporters who, in Jumādā I or II 820/July or August 1417, set up a rival emirate choosing Sharifs Meliḥ b. ‘Alī and Thuqba b. Aḥmad as their Amirs, and a few weeks later occupied Jēdda.

Sharif Ḥasan reacted quickly and decisively, sending a force led by Rumaytha who, after minor skirmishes, was able to oust the rebels and regain the control of Jēdda in Rajab 820/September 1417.² In Ramaḡān 820/November 1417, Ḥasan's opponents retaliated by attacking Mecca in Sharif Ḥasan's absence. His deputy did his best to defend the city but was defeated and killed. The victors, however, made no attempt to occupy Mecca and pitched camp in a neighbouring valley.³ Surprisingly enough, Sharif Ḥasan reacted to such provocation by concluding a truce with his opponents which was to last until 10th Muḡarram 821/18th February 1418.⁴ Probably Ḥasan did so partly from his weakness and partly to secure the safety of merchants and pilgrims.

¹ Fāsī, Shifā’, vol. II, p.210; idem, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 412a-12b, vol. II, part III, fol. 195b, part IV, fols. 331b-32a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 167-8. See also: ‘Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 258-59; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 345-46; Daḡlān, op.cit., p.39.

² Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 412b-13a, vol. II, part IV, fol. 332a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 168. See also: ‘Iṣāmī, op.cit., IV, p.259; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 346; Daḡlān, op.cit., p.39.

³ Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 413a, vol. II, part IV, fol. 33a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 168-69; Sakhāwī, al-Daw’, vol. X, p.166. See also: ‘Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.259; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 346; Daḡlān, op.cit., p.39.

⁴ Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 413a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 169.

Possibly this mild attitude of Ḥasan was due to his preoccupation with other problems and particularly his rather uneasy relations with Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh. This appears to have been due to some financial dispute including the failure of Ḥasan to pay the price of grain referred to earlier.¹ In Rabi' I, 821/April 1418, the Sultan sent a rather harshly worded epistle to Sharif Ḥasan giving vent to his anger about the latter's failure to pay his debt to him, and warned Ḥasan of the consequences if he failed to effect immediate payment. Ḥasan's wish to abdicate in favour of his son, Barakāt I, was not approved by the Sultan.² But this mere desire antagonized another of Ḥasan's sons, Aḥmad, who regarded himself as being neglected and went to Yenhu' in anger.³ This encouraged various groups of Ashrāf and Quwwād, previously at daggers drawn with Ḥasan, to challenge his authority and induce Rumaytha to join them, and occupied Jeddah early in 824/1421.⁴

Sharif Ḥasan, content for a while with the rôle of a passive spectator, let the events take their course at first. Meanwhile Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh died and was succeeded by his son al-Muzaffar Aḥmad. The new Sultan confirmed Sharif Ḥasan and granted his earlier request by appointing Barakāt I co-Amir of Mecca. Moreover, Sultan Aḥmad gratified Sharif Ḥasan further by avoiding any reference to the amount due from him.⁵ But the appointment of Barakāt I

¹See supra, pp. 66-67.

²G. Rentz states that Sharif Ḥasan abdicated in favour of his son Barakat I in 821/1418, E.I.², art. "Barakat", p.1032. But judging from the information given in the sources used in this work this abdication did not take place.

³Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 413b-14a, 415a and 416a; Al Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 170, 172-3 and 177; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.13. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.259; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 346; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.40.

⁴Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 418a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., Vol. II, fol. 179.

⁵Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 210-11 and 258; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I,

was resented by his brother Ibrāhīm who had been trying to secure this position for himself and he left Mecca in rebellious mood. He later returned to Mecca with a strong body of supporters and demanded the inclusion of his name in the offering of prayers. To avoid further dissension in the family Sharif Ḥasan acceded to his request, but the practice was soon discontinued.¹

For lack of a sufficiently strong military contingent, Ḥasan was at first compelled to remain inactive and made no attack on Rumaytha and his supporters who had occupied J̄dda earlier. Early in 825/1422, by intrigue rather than by force of arms, he lured many of Rumaytha's supporters into his camp and secured the aid of the Amir of Yanhu', Sharif Muqbil, in re-occupying J̄dda, but succeeded in regaining it himself without Muqbil's help. Rumaytha himself had no choice but to deprecate his disloyalty and set out, together with Ḥasan and Muqbil, against the dissident groups, only to slip away during the march.

Rumaytha's flight caused general surprise and gave rise to rumours which even threw suspicion on Muqbil as the instigator of this move, thus presumably sowing the seeds of discord between Ḥasan and Muqbil. It is no wonder that Sharif Ḥasan called off the expedition and returned to Mecca in Jumādā I 825/May 1422. Muqbil returned to Yanbu' with some resentment towards Sharif Ḥasan.²

part II, fols. 417a-b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 179; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.13. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 258-59; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 346-47; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 81; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.40.

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 417b and 418b-19a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 180 and 184; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.104. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.259; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 347; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.40.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 418a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 62a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 181.

Whatever the truth of the matter, Rumaytha was naturally encouraged and by a swift move re-occupied Jeddah, but was ousted shortly after and fled to Yanbu'. There he was well received and joined Sharif Muqbil against the latter's nephews who were at war with their uncle. The already cool relations between Hasan and Muqbil seem to have further deteriorated and Sharif Hasan's support went to Muqbil's nephews. He even prepared to march in person against Muqbil and Rumaytha, but in order to forestall this danger, Muqbil hurried to Mecca. He succeeded in convincing Hasan that he had been innocent of treachery, but had to expel Rumaytha from Yanbu' for his relations with Hasan to be normalized. Rumaytha went to Medina and asked its Amir, Sharif 'Ajlān b. Nu'ayr, to mediate between him and Hasan. His intervention having been successful, Rumaytha returned to Mecca in Rabi' I 826/March 1423. He was well received and allowed to stay there honourably.¹

Hasan deposed by 'Alī b. 'Anān

Ironically enough, no sooner had Hasan consolidated his position than things began to move against him from a new and unexpected quarter. His relations with some of his relatives having become adverse, the latter went to Cairo early in 826/1423, possibly to promote their appointment to the emirate of Mecca. Hasan felt rather uneasy at their departure but his anxiety was somewhat reduced on receiving a reassuring letter from Sultan Bārsbāy (825/1422-841/1438). Nevertheless, Hasan avoided meeting the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj in the pilgrimage season of the same year and instructed his son Barakāt I

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 418a-b; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 69b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 181-82 and 184; see also: Janābī, op.cit., fols. 305-b-306a.

to deputize for him at the official reception.¹

How far Ḥasan's fear was justified is open to question. Only 'Aynī states with any clarity that, owing to the objectionable behaviour of Ḥasan's men, the Egyptian Amirs had intended to arrest him had he appeared at the reception. Be it as it may, this much is certain, that the Egyptian Amirs regarded Ḥasan's absence as an affront and made no attempt to hide their animosity towards Ḥasan at their departure.² The most incensed was Amir Qarqmaṣ who stayed in Yanbu' and asked the Sultan to send an expedition against Ḥasan, a request to which the Sultan acceded towards the end of Muḥarram 827/December 1423. Sharif 'Alī b. 'Anān, sojourning in Cairo at that time, was appointed Amir of Mecca in partnership with Amir Qarqmaṣ. In Rabi' I 827/February 1424, Sharif 'Alī reached Yanbu' with a strong force, which had been placed under the command of Amir Qarqmaṣ. On the approach of the two co-Amirs Sharif Ḥasan left Mecca and the co-Amirs took control of the city in Jumādā I/ 827/April 1424 as well as Jeddā and other main centres shortly after.³

Sharif 'Alī and Amir Qarqmaṣ had met no opposition, but remained apprehensive of a counter-move by Ḥasan, but their fears

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 419a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 70a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 184; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.104.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 65b, part II, fols. 419a-b; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 638a and 652a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 185. See also: Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 348; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 81-82; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.40.

³ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.211; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 58a and 65b, part II, fol. 419b-20a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 328-31; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 638a-b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 70a, 76a-b and 80a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 284a, vol. II, fols. 124a, 164a and 201a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 49 and 170; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 185 and 187-88; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 104, vol. V, p.272, vol. VI, pp. 219-20; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 585-86; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 259-60; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 348-49; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 84; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.41.

were unfounded. However, late in 827/1424, Sharif Rumaytha, once a rival but then in close association with Ḥasan, visited Mecca. Suspected of subversive activities, he was arrested and sent to Cairo.¹

In the pilgrimage season of the same year Sharif Ḥasan received a spurious message to the effect that he had been re-appointed and was expected in Mecca for the usual ceremony. Sharif Ḥasan, thanks to the timely warnings of his son Barakāt, managed to avoid the trap. In Jumādā I 828/April 1425 'Alī and Qarqmāṣ marched with a strong force against Ḥasan and went as far as Ḥaly but failed to trace him and returned to Mecca empty-handed.²

Hasan re-appointed and succeeded by Barakāt I

Though both 'Alī and Qarqmāṣ were more than willing to attack Ḥasan he, on his part, did not let himself be drawn into any armed conflict with them. Instead, he made an approach to Sultan Bārsbāy in the matter of his re-appointment, which was given sympathetic consideration in Cairo. This is supported by the fact that the Egyptian Amir al-Maḥmal, prior to his entry into the city in the pilgrimage season of 828/September or October 1426, sent a friendly letter to Sharif Ḥasan inviting him to Mecca to give the Maḥmal the usual reception. The Amir had both assured Ḥasan of his personal safety and made it clear that the reception - a duty as well as a privilege

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 334; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 188. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.260.

²Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 65a-b, part II, fols. 420a-b (the copyist points out that Fāsi, due to some personal problems, left a blank space on this folio of part II. Therefore, he (the copyist) added the missing portion from Al-Najm Ibn Fahd's Ithāf); Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 336; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 188-89 and 191. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.260.

of the Amirs of Mecca - was a condition for his re-appointment.

Sharif Ḥasan, recalling a similar message earlier and warned of his experience then,¹ made sure that the message was genuine before acceding to the request. The fact that no opposition was raised by either 'Alī or Qarqmaṣ shows that the initiative of the Egyptian Amir al-Mahmal had the prior approval of the Egyptian Sultan.²

Such importance was attached to this positive response of Sharif Ḥasan that a special envoy was immediately dispatched to Cairo to bring the news to the Sultan. The latter is said to have been so pleased that he bestowed an unusually precious robe of honour on the envoy.³ Realizing that he had been deposed, Sharif 'Alī (d. 833/1429) left Mecca for Maghrib where he was well received by Sultan Abū Fāris and then for Cairo, where he spent the rest of his life.⁴

Ḥasan's reappointment having been made conditional on a prior visit to the Sultan, he reached Cairo early in Muḥarram 829/November 1425. The Sultan, as a gesture of goodwill, had released Rumaytha⁵ prior to the arrival of Ḥasan, who was cordially received. He was confirmed but not without acquitting himself of the payment of a substantial amount of money.⁶ In Jumādā II 829/May 1426 Ḥasan died just as he was getting out of Cairo on his return journey to Mecca,

¹See supra, p. 74.

² . . . Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p. 211; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 58a, part II, fol. 420a (see supra, p. 74 fn 2); Mazrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 338; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 284a, vol. II, fol. 124a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 49; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 92-93; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p. 104; see also: 'Iṣāmi, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 260-61; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 349; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 41.

³'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 645a.

⁴Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 154a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 124a; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 272-73. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b.

⁵See supra, p. 74.

⁶See infra, p. 228.

and was buried in Cairo. His son Barakāt I was summoned to Cairo and was appointed on similar financial conditions as his father in Ramadān 829/August 1426.¹

The financial obligations imposed upon and accepted by Barakāt I caused dissension between him and his brothers, which eventually developed into a serious challenge to Barakāt I.² In 832/1428, he was compelled to pay an agreed amount of money to his opponents in order to conclude a truce.³

Between 832/1428-29 and 842/1438-39 Sharif Barakāt I enjoyed a decade of relative stability and almost unchallenged authority, until the accession to the throne of Sultan Jaqmaq (842/1438 - 857/1453). The past relations between Barakāt I and Jaqmaq appear to have been somewhat unfriendly and the former viewed the accession of the latter to the throne with concern.⁴ This developed into anxiety when 'Alī, a rival brother of Barakāt I, went to Cairo. Afraid of being supplanted by his brother, Barakāt I disregarded a summons to Cairo in 843/1439. The Sultan considered this a sign of

¹ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.11; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 58a, part II, fols. 420b-21a (see supra, p. 74 fn.2); Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 339 and 343-44; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 85b and 89a; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 650b-51a and 652a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 181a and 284a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 49; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 193-96; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 104-5; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 322-24 and 586; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 261, 265 and 267; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 351, vol. II, fols. 1-2; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 84 and 88-89; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 41-42; G.Rentz, E.I.2, art. "Barakat", p.1032.

² See infra, p.270.

³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 415b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 175.

⁴ This was due, most likely, to the clash which occurred in Mecca between Jaqmaq, then Amir al-Ḥajj, and a group of Quwwād in 817/1415. Though Barakāt and his father Ḥasan, then Amir of Mecca, took no part in the clash Jaqmaq had departed with a grudge against them, see supra, p. 67.

disloyalty and for a time entertained the idea of replacing him by 'Alī, but desisted from it after an attempt at mediation by some of his courtiers.¹

It seems that Barakāt I was unduly apprehensive of the Sultan who does not appear to have borne any serious grudge against him. Not only the above stated change of the Sultan's mind about replacing Barakāt I indicates this, but also the fact that the Sultan relieved Barakāt in 843/1439 of the obligation to kiss the hoof of the camel which had brought the Egyptian Mahmal, which the Sultan may have regarded as a humiliating or degrading practice.² Besides, he was exempted, together with the Amirs of Medina and Yanbu', from paying the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj their customary dues.³ Moreover, had the Sultan felt any personal grudge or resentment against Barakat I he could have easily deposed and arrested him without calling him to Cairo. What is more convincing is that Barakāt I, by his over-cautious and suspicious attitude to the invitation of the Sultan did more damage than the service to his own interest, as he was a subordinate and it was his duty to obey the order of his overlord. Barakāt's refusal to do so was bound to convince the Sultan that the former was disloyal and as such unsuitable to be left in control of Mecca.

Barakāt I deposed by 'Alī

Barakāt I regarded his second summons to Cairo in 844/1440 with equal anxiety. Since caution forbade him to refuse it flatly, he

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 226 and 228; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 73. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.267; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 4; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.42.

²Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 435; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 229. See also: Jazirī, op.cit., p.328; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.42.

³See infra, p.225.

requested to be allowed to remain in Mecca for the maintenance of law and order and offered to pay a substantial amount of money in return.¹ Many inhabitants and officials of Mecca supported Barakāt's request, possibly in response to his desire, and permission was granted.²

Another invitation by the Sultan in Rabi' I 845/August 1441 met with a similar refusal and the Sultan was angered by the defiance of Barakāt I. The latter was deposed by Sharif 'Alī b. Ḥasan b. 'Ajlān in Jumādā I 845/October 1441. Barakāt I decided to leave Mecca without resistance in Rajab 845/December 1441 and 'Alī arrived in Mecca in the following month.³

'Alī replaced by Abu'l Qāsim

Sharif 'Alī had won the emirate easily but owing to accident rather than personal merit. It soon became evident that he lacked ability, appreciation of his official responsibilities and, above all, the power and will to maintain law and order in the area. Consequently, complaints against him and his men began piling up in Cairo. Although the exact nature of these complaints is unknown they seem to have convinced the Sultan, as 'Alī was deposed, arrested

¹See infra, pp. 228-29.

²Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 441; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 233.

³Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 172b and 173b-74a; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 686b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 181a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 125; idem, Ḥawāḍith, vol. I, fol. 5; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 235 and 237-39; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 14-15, 19-20 and 40-41; idem, vol. III, pp. 13, 73 and 256, vol. V, p. 211. See also: Muḥammad b. Jar Allah Ibn Zuhayra, al-Jām'i al-Laṭīf (Cairo, 1340/1921), p. 321; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 266-67; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 104; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 42.

and sent to Cairo in Shawwāl or Dhū'l Qa'da 846/March or April 1443. His brother Abu'l Qāsim, at that time in Cairo, was proclaimed Amir of Mecca in his stead. Abu'l Qāsim's son Zāhir took control of Mecca on behalf of his father.¹ It seems that among the immediate reasons for 'Alī's deposition was the excessive practice of al-Nuzla. This term means a grant of requested or unsolicited protection by the notables to those who were in need of such protection. Once a person, even if guilty of a crime, was accorded protection, he was defended against both individuals and authority.²

The assumption that the practice of al-Nuzla had caused the downfall of 'Alī is indicated by the fact that its abolition was imposed on his successor by order of the Sultan as a condition of appointment and was, as a matter of course, declared an illegal practice by the new Amir soon after his arrival in Mecca in Dhū'l Qa'da 846/April 1443. This seems to have been bitterly opposed by a group of Ashrāf and Quwwād who were expelled from the city.³ This appears to have been opposed by Zāhir, who early in 847/1443, left Mecca in anger to join them. In a deliberate challenge to Abu'l Qāsim, they entered Mecca in Sha'bān 847/December 1443, abducted a

¹ Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 177b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, vol. I, fol. 14; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 181a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 128; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 240-45; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, p.41, vol. V, p.211, vol. XI, p.134; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 45-46; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 37-38 and 57. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.321; Jazirī, op.cit., p.329; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 306b-7a; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 70; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 267-69; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 5-6; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 104-5; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.42.

² Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 177b; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 45-46. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b. The term al-Nuzla appears to have been a Meccan usage denoting the classical I'jāra which too has a similar meaning. See: W. Montgomery Watt, E.I.², art. "Idjara", pp. 1017-8.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 245-6

rich merchant and fled. This incensed Abu'l Qāsim who immediately marched with a strong force against the offenders, whom he compelled to free the captive without ransom.¹

A lenient father, Sharif Abu'l Qāsim refrained from reprisals in the hope that Zahir would desist from similar acts in the future. But since his forbearance merely seemed to stimulate Zahir to further disobedience, Abu'l Qāsim had him imprisoned in or around Jumādā I 849/September 1445 but released him a few months later on his promise to reform.² This act of Abu'l Qāsim reflects his concern for justice of law and order and the maintenance/and certainly did him credit. Yet his rule was not destined to last long.

Abu'l Qāsim deposed by Barakāt I

The relationship between Abu'l Qāsim and his brother Barakāt I became strained in the early part of 849/1445 and the latter was denied access to the local market to buy his provisions.³ This restriction widened the gulf and aggravated their hostility.

According to some late sources, Sharif Barakāt I ousted Abu'l Qāsim from Mecca in Rabi' I 849/July 1445 (Sinjārī gives the alternative date under 850/1446). This angered Sultan Jaqmaq, who instructed the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj to help Abu'l Qāsim to regain control. But Barakāt's strength was such that these Amirs refrained from complying with the order and even presented Barakāt I with the customary robe of honour. Feeling insecure, however, and apprehensive of any sudden move by the Egyptian Amirs, Barakāt I left the city.

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 247-51 and 253-54; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 73-74; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.232.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 257-58.

³ibid., fol. 259.

Sharif Abu'l Qāsim took control of Mecca and remained so till deposed by Barakāt I in Rabi' I or II 851/June or July 1447.¹

In the contemporary and some of the later sources, however, the sequence of events differs from the above. The gist of these reports is that, early in Muḥarram 850/April 1447, Sharif Barakāt I accepted an invitation to Cairo but sent his son Muḥammad in Ṣafar of the same year (May 1447) as his deputy with valuable gifts for the Sultan. This, no doubt, caused anxiety to Abu'l Qāsim, especially as Barakāt had moved with his supporters to a place near Mecca.

Sharif Muḥammad reached Cairo in or around Rabi' I 850/June 1447 and was well received. He succeeded in securing the re-appointment of his father, a decree to this effect having reached Mecca by the end of Rabi' I of the same year. Abu'l Qāsim left Mecca with his men for a neighbouring valley, Bāsh al-Mamālīk, maintained law and order and remained in control of the city until the ceremonial entry of Sharif Barakāt I in Jumādā I 850/August 1447.² Having secured his re-appointment, Sharif Barakāt I decided to pay a visit to Sultan Jaqmaq to express his gratitude and loyalty. In Rajab or Sha'bān 851/October or November 1447 he reached Cairo where he was treated with courtesy during his stay and on his departure for Mecca in

¹ Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 269-70; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 6-7; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 105-6; Dahlān, op.cit., pp. 42-43.

² Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 698b-99a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 181a-b; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 130; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 46; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 260-61; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 1-2; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.13, vol. VII, p.152, vol. X, p.184 and 209, vol. XI, p.134; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 143-44; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 747. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.321; Janābi, op.cit., fol. 306b.

Ramaḍān 851/December 1447.¹

Since his deposition, Sharif Abu'l Qāsim had been living in or around Mecca unharassed by Barakat or his men. Still hopeful of a sudden change in his fortunes, he grew less sanguine as time progressed and decided to go to Cairo in Dhū'l Hijja 852/March 1449. His death there in Ṣafar 853/April 1449 put an end to whatever hopes he may have cherished for his re-appointment.²

Sultan Jaqmaq's favour to Sharif Barakāt I enabled the latter to remain in effective control of the region till his death. But he from time to time had to deal with dissident groups. Early in 857/1453, in the face of a serious threat from a group of Ashrāf and Quwwād, Barakāt I had to conclude a truce on a financial basis.³ It is interesting to note that during this conflict between Barakāt I and his opponents, a number of Sharifs resident in Cairo and believed to be in sympathy with the opponents of Barakāt I, were arrested.⁴ This act, undoubtedly intended to support Barakāt I, must have sapped the morale of Barakāt's opponents, and he was able to assert his authority.

Sharif Muḥammad succeeds Barakāt I

The relationship between Sultan Ināl (857/1153-865/1461) and Barakāt I was better than normal. Early in 859/1455 Sharif

¹ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 181b; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 136-37; idem, Hawādith, vol. I, fol. 59, part II (ed. W. Popper), pp. 368-69; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 266-67; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 10; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p. 13; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 184-85; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, p. 34. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 331; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 270; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 7-8; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 106; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 43.

² Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, vol. I, fols. 87, 89 and 112; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 265b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 268-70; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. XI, p. 134; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 282-83; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 37-38. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307a; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 106-7.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 277-80.

⁴ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, vol. I, fol. 276.

Barakāt I fell seriously ill and secured the appointment of his son Muḥammad by the intercession of a Sulṭāni official in Jeddah and, in return for the payment of a sum of money.¹ Shortly after Sharif Barakāt's death on 19th Sha'bān 859/4 August 1455 an official edict confirming Sharif Muḥammad in the emirate reached Mecca.²

Having inherited a fairly stable emirate, Sharif Muḥammad (859/1455-903/1497) enjoyed the longest period of rule among the Sharifs of Mecca within the Burjī period. Despite various problems such as internal strife and financial difficulties at times he was able to ensure political stability and economic prosperity to the Meccan region. He also succeeded in extending his influence over various parts of the Ḥijāz and was finally awarded the status of Na'ib al-Sulṭān in the region.³

Among the most serious problems during the rule of Sharif Muḥammad was that caused by the deterioration of his relations with his wazīr, Budayr (or Budayd). Unrest set in in the area in the year 864/1459-60 and continued until 867/1462-63 when they were reconciled.⁴

Shortly after Sharif Muḥammad's relations with his brother 'Alī became strained and the latter escaped to Cairo in or around 872/1467-68. The fear of being deposed by his brother caused great anxiety to Sharif Muḥammad at the time, but eventually he was relieved, possibly as a result of the financial offering to the Sultan.⁵ Sharif Muḥammad

¹See infra, pp. 229 and 290.

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 347 and 362-63; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 239 and 274; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 283; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 747; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassū), p. 86; idem, al-Daw, vol. III, p. 14, vol. VII, p. 152; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. II, pp. 52-53; idem, Badā'i (U.P.), pp. 32-33. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., pp. 321-22; Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 333; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 307a-b; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p. 294; 'Isāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 275-76; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 9-10; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 108 and 110-11; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 43-44; G. Rentz, E.I., art. "Barakat", p. 1032.

suspected some of his officials and prominent members of the community and the Amir of Jazān to have conspired to effect this escape. Consequently, he dismissed one of his officials¹, executed a number of suspects,² and attacked Jazān.³

A few years later Sharif Muḥammad learned, to his dismay, that Abu'l Qāsim's son Rumaytha was trying to secure the emirate of Mecca. However, he was reassured by the assurance in Rabi' I 877/September 1472 from Cairo that the Sultan was not contemplating his replacement by anybody else. Nevertheless, when invited to Cairo in the pilgrimage season of the same year, Sharif Muḥammad preferred to send instead his son Barakāt II. Whatever the motive of the Sultan may have been, he was morally obliged to appreciate the services of Sharif Muḥammad who had reacted so sharply to the Irāqi affront and thus proved his loyalty to the Egyptian Sultan.⁴ Sharif Barakāt II and the Qādi Shāfai of Mecca - then deposed - went to Cairo taking with them the Irāqi captives. Barakāt II and the Qādi were well received. They are reported to have offered a considerable amount of money to the Sultan.⁵ The sources do not specify a purpose but it cannot have been a mere coincidence that, after their return to Mecca in Sha'bān 878/January 1474

³See infra, pp. 118-20.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 296-300, 302, 307-8 and 312; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.4; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Hassu), p.154.

⁵See infra, p. 230.

¹See infra, p. 240.

²See infra, p. 238.

³See infra, p. 110.

⁴For this incident, see infra, pp. 139-40.

⁵For this payment, see infra, p. 265.

the Qādi was re-appointed and Sharif Barakāt II co-Amir of Mecca.¹

Sultan Qā'it Bāy performs the Pilgrimage

Qā'it Bāy (873/1468-901/1495) was the only Egyptian Sultan, within the Burjī period, to perform the pilgrimage. He reached Mecca early in Dhū'l Hijja 884/March 1480.² Shortly after the departure of Sultan Qā'it Bāy from Cairo, the news reached Sharif Muḥammad and he sent an advance welcoming party to greet the Sultan and hold a feast in his honour. Having sent this party, Sharif Muḥammad himself came out of Mecca with a number of notables to welcome the Sultan, who had broken his journey in Medina. Sharif Muḥammad camped near al-Badr³ to welcome the Sultan. There the Sharif arranged a grandiose feast in honour of the sovereign. Then he took leave of the Sultan to give him another ceremonial welcome in the outskirts of Mecca. Sharif Muḥammad did his best to make the Sultan's stay in Mecca as pleasant as possible, and indeed the latter departed for Cairo greatly appreciative of Sharif Muḥammad's loyalty.⁴

Barakāt II succeeds Sharif Muḥammad

During the later part of Sharif Muḥammad's reign the region had enjoyed far greater stability and prosperity than under any of his

¹ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 338, 342, 344-45 and 347; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 95-96, vol. III, p.14; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 218-19; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 89-90. See also: Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 276 and 279; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 12; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 125; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.44; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Barakat", p.1032.

² Only Ibn Iyās mentions this (in al-Uḡūd) under 885/1481, but it is evidently a slip of the pen of the author or the scribe. as Ibn Iyās himself mentions (in Badā'i'), 884/1480.

³ Badr, or Badr Ḥunayn, a small town south-east of Medina, a night's journey from the coast. See: W. Montgomery Watt, E.I.², art. "Badr or Badr Ḥunayn", pp. 867-68.

⁴ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 371-73; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 206-7; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 155-57; idem, Uḡūd, vol. II, fols. 229a-b. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 339-40

predecessors within the period in question. His just treatment of the various sections of the community had won that general popularity which eluded most of the Sharifs of Mecca. In Rabi' II 903/December 1497 Sharif Muhammad died in the neighbourhood of Mecca; his body was brought to Mecca and buried with more than customary honours. His funeral was attended by a huge crowd among which were many notables and dignitaries. The people of Mecca appear to have felt genuine grief at his death. According to Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, the local market was closed for several days and many women mourners, against the teaching of Sharī'a,¹ cut their hair and marched through the city crying and beating their chests as a sign of bereavement.

Sharif Barakāt II had succeeded his father and shortly after received the decree of confirmation together with a letter of condolence from the Sultan.² When his relationship with his brothers, especially Hazzā',³ deteriorated soon after his appointment, a period of political chaos set in which was to last for eight years. Meccans were to suffer bloodshed, plunder and other atrocities, which contrasted sadly with the long period of prosperity under the deceased Sharif Muhammad.

and 682-86; Nahrawālī, al-'Ilām, pp. 229-31; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 45-47 and 277-78; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 15-17; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 128-32; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.45.

¹ Sharī'a. The revealed Holy law of Islam, derived in theory from the Qur'ān, Ḥadīth, the consensus (ijmā') of the 'Ulamā'', and analogical reasoning (qiyās). It is surprising that no objection to this defiance of Sharī'a by these mourners was made by the Qādis and other authorities.

² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 217-18 and 222-23; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.374. See also: 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Alī Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl al-Mazīd 'Ala Bughyat al-Mustafīd, (MS., A.S.No. 2988), fol. 99b; idem, Qurrat al-'Uyun, fol. 220; Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.322; Jazīrī, op.cit., p.348; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307b; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 278-80, 282 and 301; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 18-19; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 134; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 44 and 46; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Barakat", p.1032.

³ Among the sources, given in the footnote below, only Ibn Iyās describes Hazzā' as Barakāt's nephew.

The dispute appears to have begun over the Amir's refusal to pay his brothers their share of the revenue. In Jumadā I 903 or 904/January 1498 or 1499 a clash between Barakāt and Hazzā' was no longer to be avoided but the intervention of an Egyptian Amir speedily brought about a temporary suspension of hostilities. The trouble in Mecca was welcomed by the Amir of Yanbu', Sharif Yahya, who was at odds with Barakāt as he had been with his deceased father. Yahya had secured his appointment almost simultaneously with Barakāt at the expense of Sharif Darrāj who was held in great esteem by Barakāt.¹

A period of acute strife in Mecca

For the sake of space it will not be possible to give here a detailed account of this rather lengthy period of confrontation, clashes, intrigues, moves and counter moves between Barakāt II and his opponents. As explained earlier, the dispute between Barakāt II and his brothers had begun shortly after the appointment of the former but a temporary reconciliation prevented further hostilities.

Early in 906/1500 a number of Egyptian Sultans followed each other in quick succession. One of them, Sultan Ṭumān Bāy, had exiled an Amir named Qanṣawh al-Burj to Mecca. He was ignored by Sharif Barakāt II, which filled him with resentment. But his relations with Hazzā', on the contrary, became rather friendly. In Shawwāl 906/May 1501 Qanṣawh al-Ghawri (Shawwāl 906-Rajab 922/May 1501-September 1517) became Sultan and appointed Amir Qanṣawh al-Burj his deputy in Syria. An edict to this effect reached Mecca in Dhū'l Qāda (i.e. June) of the same year. Sharif Barakāt II went to Qanṣawh's residence to congratulate him but was slighted. The latter, whose fortunes had changed so suddenly, sent Hazzā' to Yanbu' with instructions to the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj to instal Hazzā' in the emirate of Mecca.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 227-28, 230, 232, 237-38 and 250; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. III, pp. 376-77, 382, 400 and 414. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 348; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Isāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 382 and 301; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 20; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 46.

Hazzā', having been assured by the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj of his support, marched from Yanbu' with his men and, overtaking the caravan, reached a point near Mecca. Sharif Barakāt II, forewarned, ambushed him and put him to flight. With the support of the Egyptians, however, Hazzā' turned the tables on Barakāt, who fled to Jēdda, abandoning his camp and valuables to the victor. Hazzā' took control of Mecca without further opposition and was proclaimed its Amir. The hostilities and their outcomes, together with the subsequent political changes, caused considerable suffering to the inhabitants and merchants of both Mecca and Jēdda.¹

Sharif Barakāt II remained inactive until the departure of the pilgrims, and then marched on Mecca. Unable to resist, Sharif Hazzā' left Mecca under the pretext of escorting the pilgrims. Consequently, by the end of 906 or early in 907/July 1501, Sharif Barakāt II entered Mecca unopposed and was given an enthusiastic reception.²

Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd reports, with a touch of doubt, that Sharif Barakāt II received in Rabi' I 907/October 1501 the robe of honour and a letter from the Sultan assuring him that the support given to Hazzā' by the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj had failed to meet with his approval. Whatever the merits of the case, Hazzā' decided on a second march to Mecca by the end of Rabi' II 907/November 1501. In addition, to his own impressive forces, he was accompanied by the Amir of Yanbu',

¹ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 256 and 261; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faql, fols. 114a-15a; idem, Qurra, fols. 222-23. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.322; Jaziri, op.cit., p.349; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Isāmi, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 282-83 and 301; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 20-21; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 135-36; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.46.

² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit. vol. I, fols. 262-63; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faql, fol. 115b; idem, Qurra, fol. 223; see also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.322; Jaziri, op.cit., p.349; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Isāmi, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 283 and 301; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 21; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 136-37; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.46.

Sharif Yahya, the Arabs of Zabīd, and Banu Ibrāhīm. In Jumādā I 907/December 1501 a fierce battle was fought which ended in the crushing defeat of Barakāt who fled towards the Yemen. Hazzā' took control of Mecca and the inhabitants had to pay a considerable ransom to avoid plunder. Shortly after, Hazzā' received the robe of honour and, in an official ceremony of investiture, was proclaimed Amir of Mecca.¹

Sharif Hazzā' died on 15th Rajab 907/24th January 1502 in a neighbouring valley of Mecca. His body was brought to the city and buried with due honour. His sudden death was followed by a new outbreak of the age old struggle for the succession. Sharif Aḥmad al-Jazānī² (known also as Jazān) and Sharif Ḥumayḍa, brothers of the deceased Hazzā', both desired the emirate, and a general meeting was called to decide which of the two should succeed. Mālīk b. Rūmī, chief of Zabīd and a maternal uncle of Aḥmad, supported the latter, and was seconded in this by the Qāḍī Shāfa'i of Mecca³ and eventually general agreement was reached and Aḥmad was proclaimed Amir of Mecca. The fait accompli was later confirmed by the Sultan.

The majority of the indigenous population, however, did not view his rule favourably and their ever increasing sufferings filled them with hatred of Jazānī and his supporters. This accounts for the overwhelming support given to Barakāt II in his successful attempt to take Mecca shortly after the appointment of Jazānī in Sha'bān 907/

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 2-9; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fols. 116b-17a; idem, Qurra, fol. 223. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.322; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.284 and 301; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 21-22; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 137; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.47.

²Apparently so named because of his birth in the region of Jazān. See G. Rentz, E.I.², "Djayzān", p.517.

³The Qāḍī paid dearly for this. See infra, pp.252-53.

March 1501 and Ahmad had to flee and took refuge in Yanbu'.¹

In Shawwāl 907/May 1501, Barakāt II launched an offensive against the Arabs of Zabīd, near Rābiḡh,² but without much success. The situation remained, on the whole, calm and stationary until the arrival of the Egyptian pilgrim caravan in the same year. The sources give different accounts of the attitude of the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj towards Jazānī. Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd states that the Egyptian Amir was so impressed by Jazānī's strength that he, to avoid endangering the safety of pilgrims, handed over to Jazānī both the decree and the robe of honour bestowed by the Sultan on Barakāt II. Ibn Iyās attributes this to a financial deal between the Egyptian Amir and Jazānī. According to Jazīrī, this was done to lure Jazānī into a trap. Other sources narrate the general course of events without reference to the background. In any case, there is no doubt that Jazānī trusted in the support of the Egyptian Amir when he marched with his supporters to Mecca. But he decided against continuing his journey when he began to suspect the Egyptian Amir and Barakāt of conspiring against him. The ceremony of Ḥajj ended without serious incident, but the Egyptian caravan refused to depart unless Barakāt II agreed to escort them. Near Yanbu' Jazānī lay in ambush and he attacked and inflicted heavy casualties on the caravan and its escort, and Barakāt II had to flee to Mecca. In Ṣāfar 908/August 1502, Jazānī launched a fierce attack on Mecca and Barakāt had little choice but to abandon the city, which was occupied by Jazānī.³

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 10-13; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fols. 117b-18a; see also Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 349-50 and 353; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 284 and 301-2; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 22-23; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 137-38; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.47.

²Anchorage and town on the western coast of the Red Sea, midway between Mecca and Medina.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 15-19; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 35-39 and 317; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 120b. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., pp. 322-23; Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 350-52; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.285; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 27; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 147; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.47.

The inhabitants were made to pay dearly for their support of Barakāt II, who attempted to oust Jazānī in Rajab 908/February 1503 but, to the disappointment of the Meccans, had to flee defeated.¹

But two months later Barakāt took control of Mecca by a surprise move and was assured by the Meccans of their full support. Jazānī launched a number of attacks but they were all repulsed. In Shawwāl 908/May 1503 Musa b. Barakūt, deputy of Barakāt II in al-Qunfudha, attacked Jeddah by a naval force but was unable to gain victory and returned to al-Qunfudha. In the following month Jazānī took the city of Mecca by storm and Barakāt fled. The inhabitants were again subjected to various atrocities by Jazānī and his men.²

Egyptian expedition and arrest of Barakāt

The news of these frequent clashes in or around Mecca and the resulting breakdown of law and order had been reaching Cairo and the Sultan could no longer tolerate this state of affairs. In the pilgrimage season of the same year, the Sultan sent an expedition composed of about six hundred soldiers under the command of Amir Qīt to enforce law and order and bring the culprits to justice. As a precaution, the Sultan banned women from participating in the pilgrimage. The news of this expedition reached Mecca and Jazānī felt so alarmed that he fled, and Barakāt II took control of Mecca. He waited eagerly for the arrival of the Egyptian force, assuming that it was sent against his opponents. Early in Dhū'l Hijja of the same year (908/July 1503), Amir

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 20 and 23-26; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Fadl, fols. 120b and 121b; see also Jaziri, op.cit., p. 353.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 27-31; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 47-48; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Fadl, fol. 122b; idem, Qurra, fol. 224. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p. 323; Janābi, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 285-86; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 28-9; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 147-48; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 47-48; Ludovico di Varthema, The travels of Ludovico di Varthema, pp. 35-6.

Qīt reached Mecca and was warmly received by Barakāt II. The latter was given a robe of honour and treated with deference. But only a short time later, to the surprise of the Meccans, both Barakāt II and his brother Qā'it Bāy were arrested, their property was confiscated, and they were sent to Cairo as captives. As far as one can judge, Barakāt II was not guilty of any offence which would justify this harsh treatment. In fact, the various atrocities of his opponents had made them the real culprits and logically liable for punishment. But it seems that they, by offering money and presenting false reports damaging to Barakāt II, had induced Amir Qīt to adopt a pro-Jazān attitude.

Be it as it may, the harsh treatment of Barakāt could not have taken place without the prior approval of the Sultan or his giving a free hand to Qīt. to act according to his decision. This is supported by the simple fact that Barakāt II was not released on reaching Cairo. Nor was he allowed to return to Mecca.¹

Humayda succeeds Jazān

Though Jazān had gained the emirate, he was unable to win the love of the people and remained unpopular. In or around Rajab 909/January 1504 the relations of Jazān with his brother Humayda became strained and the latter was ordered to leave Mecca and was threatened if he failed to do so. Humayda, ill at the time, took a number of Mamlūk soldiers, with whom he was on friendly terms, into his confidence

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 32-38; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. IV, pp. 48-50 and 54-57; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 128b; idem, Qurra, p.224; see also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.323; Jazīri, op.cit., p.353; Janābi, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 286-88 and 308; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 29-30; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 148; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.48; G.Rentz, E.I.², art. "Barakat", p.1032.

and told them of Jazān's threat and elicited an angry reply. On 9th or 10th Rajab 909/28th or 29th December 1503, Jazān was assassinated within the Meccan sanctuary by some Mamlūk soldiers with the apparent approval of Ḥumayda. The local population was pleased and Jazān's body was exposed to much humiliation before it was buried without a proper funeral.

This assassination resulted in utter confusion. Bāsh al-Mamālīk took the initiative, appointing Ḥumayda Amir of Mecca pending the approval of the Sultan which was presumably granted. This assumption is based on the fact that no opposition by the Sultan is reported in the sources.¹

Barakāt's escape and the appointment of Qāit Bāy

As a captive in Cairo, Sharif Barakāt was treated gently but was kept under constant watch. It appears, especially from the version of Ibn Iyās, that as a pre-condition of release the Sultan had demanded from Barakāt a certain amount of money which the latter, whose property had been confiscated, was unable to pay. Early in Shawwāl 909/April 1504, Barakāt II managed to escape with his brother and supporters, who were also held captive there, and headed for Mecca. He was joined, in the course of his journey, by some nomadic and other Arabs and thus acquired a strong body of supporters. His escape greatly angered the Sultan who was particularly worried about the safety of the pilgrims who were due to depart. Barakāt, however, did no harm to the pilgrim caravan. The Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj, greatly appreciative of Barakāt's conduct, sent the Sultan a letter in praise of Barakāt II.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 42-44 and 46-49; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.62; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 124a; idem, Qurra, fol. 225. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.323; Jazirī, op.cit., pp. 353-54; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 288 and 303; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 33; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 155 Daḥlān, op.cit., p.48.

The Sharif encamped near Mecca and made no attempt to enter the city or to force a meeting with Ḥumayḍa. This was partly due to Barakāt's own unwillingness to disrupt the pilgrimage ceremony and partly to the presence of the Egyptian and other Amirs who, anxious to maintain a peaceful situation for the duration of the pilgrimage, arranged a temporary truce between Barakāt and Ḥumayḍa. Soon after the ceremony a meeting was held in Mecca. Among those present were the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj, Barakāt II, Ḥumayḍa, Amir of Yanbu' and various other dignitaries. The decision arrived at in Ṣafar 910/July 1504, after prolonged negotiations, was in favour of Barakāt II. He was confirmed by an edict of the Sultan as well, but he however, declined the emirate for himself and, on his suggestion, his brother Qā'it Bāy and son 'Alī were appointed joint Amirs of Mecca. But it was Barakāt II who remained in actual control. Ḥumayḍa left with his men for Yanbu' and the Meccans celebrated this change for the better with a great show of joy.¹

In Rajab 910/December 1504 the news reached Mecca that Sharif Ḥumayḍa was heading towards Mecca with his supporters. Ḥumayḍa sent a message to Mecca that he had no aggressive plans and was coming simply as a visitor. In the absence of Qā'it Bāy and Barakāt from the city the matter was considered by Bāsh al-Mamālīk who decided to allow Ḥumayḍa to enter and remain in Mecca for a few days. The news had caused great anxiety among the inhabitants of Mecca and especially among the wealthy, who took the precaution of hiding their valuables

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 51-58 and 60. See also: Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.62; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 126b; idem, Qurra, fols. 225; Ibn Ḥayyā, op.cit., p.323; Jazīrī, op.cit., p.354; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 308b; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, fols. 70-71; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 288-89 and 303-4; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 33-34 and 38; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 154-55; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 48-49; G.Rentz, E.I.² art. "Barakat", p.1032.

in safer places. In the end of the same month Ḥumayḍa reached the outskirts of Mecca and, having undertaken an oath not to cause disturbance, was allowed to stay for three days. But only two days later, Ḥumayḍa provoked a fierce clash with Bāsh al-Mamālīk, in consequence of which he took to flight after suffering heavy casualties.¹

Ḥumayḍa and his men felt so humiliated and vindictive that they revived their old alliance with Yaḥya, the Amir of Yanbu', and the Arabs of Ḥabid, Banū Ibrahīm, and others. These acknowledged Yaḥya as their leader. Their attacks on merchants and travellers seem to have been initially motivated by the wish to enrich themselves by plunder, but they soon began to defy openly the authority of the Sultan. The activities of these rebellious groups were ignored at first, but by the end of 911/1506 had become so alarming that the Sultan had to suspend, for the first time during the Burjī period, the Egyptian pilgrim caravans. He began preparations for an expedition which reached Yanbu' in Rajab or Sha'bān 912/December 1506 or January 1507. It consisted of six hundred soldiers and was led by Amir Khayr Bek al-Sayfī. Shortly after, Sharif Barakāt II joined forces with the Egyptian Amir and they launched a series of attacks against the rebel groups. Yaḥya and his supporters suffered repeatedly crushing defeats and the heads of these rebels were sent to Cairo as trophies on several occasions. Early in 913/May 1507 the strength of these rebellious groups was shattered and the victorious Egyptian force returned to Cairo in Rabi' I 913/August 1507. Barakāt II continued a mopping-up operation and settled his old accounts with Yaḥya and his allies and it was not until early in 914/1508 that the region returned

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 58 and 64-68; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 127b; idem, Qurra, fol. 225; See also: Jaziri, op.cit., pp. 354-55.

to its normal condition.¹

Prior to the arrival of the Egyptian expedition, Sharif Barakāt II had left practically all the affairs of the emirate to his brother Qā'it Bāy and his son, 'Alī. Barakāt's, self-imposed passive attitude changed with the arrival of the Egyptian expedition and Barakāt's active participation and vigorous efforts contributed much to the victory of the Sultani forces. It was during this campaign that 'Alī died, and Barakāt II replaced him by another of his sons, Muḥammad al-Shāfa'i,² who survived his brother only a short time. His place was taken by another of Barakāt's sons, Abū Numayy II, then still a child. Qā'it Bāy continued co-Amir with all his nephews and all acknowledged Barakāt II as their superior.³

Qā'it Bāy's death on 21st Rabi' I or II 918/6th June or July 1512 left Barakāt II encumbered by the entire burden of government. Abū Numayy II was a child and his being co-Amir was hardly more than a symbolic position. Moreover, Sharif Barakāt II was granted around this time the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān as well.⁴ He showed his great ability in discharging his responsibilities. Invited to Cairo, Barakāt sent Abū Numayy II in his place. He reached Cairo in Shawwāl

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 79, 81, 120-22, 126, 130, 134-35 and 138-40; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. IV, pp. 82, 89, 93, 95, 97-99, 101, 103-6, 108-9, 116-17 and 122-24, vol. V, p.14. See also: Jazirī, op.cit., pp. 355-57; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 304-5; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 34-35; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 156; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.49.

²So named because of his birth in Egypt, while Barakāt was held in Cairo in semi-detention from the end of 908/July 1503 until Shawwāl 909/April 1504. See: Janābi, op.cit., fol. 309a.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 144 and 149; see also: Janābi, op.cit., fol. 309a; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 35; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 156; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.49.

⁴See infra, p. 126.

918/January 1513 and was cordially received by the Sultan who showered almost fatherly affection on this young Sharif. The latter returned to Mecca at the end of the same year grateful and well pleased.¹

Relations between Mecca and Cairo in the closing years of the Burjī period.

Sharif Barakāt II (d. 931/1524) and his son Abū Numayy II (d. 991/1583) were the last Sharifs of Mecca appointed by the last Mamlūk Sultan and were the first to be confirmed by the Ottomans. One of the most conspicuous traits of this relationship between these two Sharifs and their last Mamlūk overlord was their warmth and cordiality in the last years of the period in question. It seems as if both sides were unconsciously taking farewell of each other, with the nicest possible impression.

In Shawwāl 920/December 1514 the news reached Mecca that the wife and son of Sultan al Ghawrī were on their way to Mecca for pilgrimage. Sharif Abū Numayy II went with other notables to Yanbu' to greet the distinguished visitors. On their arrival in Mecca Sharif Barakāt II and Abū Numayy II brought them valuable gifts and made such a show of their affection and loyalty that the royal family invited Barakāt II to accompany them to Cairo. Throughout Barakāt's stay there he was treated with unprecedented cordiality and at his departure for Mecca was shown a courtesy unusual on the part of a sovereign.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 176, 178-79, 181-82, 219-20 and 222; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. IV, p.287; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Fadl, fol. 156b. See also: Ibn Zuhayra op.cit., pp. 323-24; Jaziri, op.cit., pp. 357-59; Janābi, op.cit., fol. 309a; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, p.87; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 289, 305-6 and 309-11; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 35 and 38-39; Ṭabari, op.cit., Vol. I, fol. 156; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 49-50.

This was to be the last meeting between Sultan al-Ghawrī and Sharif Barakāt II.¹

Relations between Sultan al-Ghawrī and the Ottoman Sultan, Selim I, had been uneasy for some time. The allegedly pro-Safavid attitude of the Mamlūk Sultan was one of the reasons which had led the Ottoman Sultan Selim I to invade Syria and with this a direct clash between the Ottomans and the Mamlūks had begun. On 25th Rajab 922/24th August 1516 a battle was joined on the plain of Marj Dābiq, north of Aleppo, and the Mamlūks were routed and al-Ghawrī killed. This battle decided the fate of the Mamlūk regime. Ṭūmān-Bāy, a nephew of al-Ghawrī, was declared by the Mamlūks in Cairo as the new Sultan. He tried in vain to halt the advance of the Ottomans but there was little he could do. On 29th Dhū'l Ḥijja 922/January 1517 the battle of al-Raydāniyya, near Cairo, destroyed any hope the Mamlūks might have had of repulsing the Ottomans. It is true that Ṭūmān-Bāy held out for a few more months but he himself realized that he was fighting a lost battle. Eventually he was betrayed and, on 22nd Rabi' I 923/14th April 1517 was hanged. Egypt and Syria were incorporated into the Ottoman domain and the last of the caliphs, al-Mutawakkil, was sent to Istanbul. Sultan Selim I is said to have intended to send a force to Mecca but to have given up the idea at the request of a Meccan qādi. Instead, he sent an investiture of rule to Barakāt II and his son Abū Numayy II. In Jumādā II 923/July 1517, Sharif Abū Numayy II visited the Sultan in Cairo to pay homage and was received favourably.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 250-52, 254-57 and 259-63; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 409-12, 432-33, 437-40, 442-, 444-49, 455-57 and 459; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fols. 165a-b. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 360 and 706; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 289 and 317-18; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 45-46; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.50.

This event was of greater importance for the Ottoman Sultan than for the Amir of Mecca. For the former, to gain control over Mecca and other parts of the Ḥijāz was a fact of great significance. It lent the Ottoman dominion a spiritual touch conveying immense prestige. For the latter, it meant no less but no more than a change of sovereign.¹

¹ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. IV, pp. 230, 268-69, 391-92 and 409, vol. V, pp. 33, 37-38, 40, 58-59, 62-63, 66-69, 103, 122-23, 126, 130-31, 140-48, 150-64, 167-74, 179-81, 185, 189, 201, 203, 205-11, 214-15 and 222-23. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p. 324; Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 126-27, 361 and 364; Nahrawālī, al-Ilām, pp. 69, 243 and 284-87; idem, al-Barq al-Yamānī (ed. Ḥamad al-Jāsir, Riyād, 1387/1967), pp. 24-27; Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Bakārī, Fayḍ al-Mannān (MS., A.S. No. 3345), fols. 38 and 49-50; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 102 and 113-15; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 52-57, 70-72, 292-93 and 318; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 51-54; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 176-79; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 50-51; B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islām, vol. I, pp. 229-30; Halil Inalcik, "The rise of the Ottoman Empire", in The Cambridge History of Islām, vol. I, pp. 318-19; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Barakat", p. 1032.

Chapter II

EXPOSITION OF ASPECTS RELEVANT TO
THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN MECCA

A. The dependencies of Mecca

The Sharifs of Mecca, whether they enjoyed the privileges and the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān or not, succeeded in extending their influence over various small principalities of the Ḥijāz. Most of these had not been originally part of the Meccan emirate and were, sometimes forcibly, incorporated at different times into the territory of Mecca. But what was the original territory? In fact, no exact definition is feasible, though it is possible with regard to certain towns and valleys.

The nucleus of the entire territory of the Meccan emirate, including the parts incorporated into it prior to and during the Burjī period, was Mecca. The city is situated in a valley surrounded by mountains which formed a natural wall barring access to the city. Entrance to Mecca could be gained only at certain points in mountain passes at which three man made walls (Sūr) were erected, each with a gate (Bāb) guarded by the men of the ruling Sharif. Sūr Bāb al-Ma'lā' guarded the eastern approach to the upper part of Mecca; the west was protected by Sūr Bāb al-Shubayka, and the southern and lower part by Sūr Bāb al-Yaman also known as Sūr Bāb al-Mājin. The existence of these walls and gates is borne out by a number of direct and indirect references to occasional damage and repairs within the Burjī period.¹

¹ Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 10-12, 339-40, 342-43, 346, vol. II, pp. 209-10, 253, 257 and 269; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 10a and 67a, part II, fols. 408b, 409b-10b and 411b-12a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 277; Ibn Ḥajar, 'Inbā', vol. II, fol. 20a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 112, 154-55, 166, 164-65, 174-75, 183 and 188; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p. 147; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 119 and 183, vol. II, fols. 28 and 104. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 320; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 13-15; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 257-58; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 6-7 and 345, vol. II, fols. 28-29; Dahlān, op.cit., pp. 39 and 47.

Ludovico Varthema, who visited Mecca in the pilgrimage season of 908/May 1503, describes the city as "most beautiful", "The houses are extremely good, like our own, and there are houses worth three or four thousand ducats each", and assesses its population at six thousand families. He fails to mention the existence of the man-made wall. "The walls of the said city are the mountains, and it has four entrances."¹ This was presumably because it did not encircle the city as such walls usually did. Judging by Varthema's report, the city was well-populated and was possibly the largest in the region. Its population, like that of any other city, fluctuated in accordance with the circumstances which were determined by the policies of the Sharif in question, especially by his ability to keep law and order and ensure reasonable economic prosperity. It seems that the internal strife between Barakāt II and his brothers² in the closing years of the Burjī period resulted in the loss of a considerable part of its population by emigration to places of comparative safety. According to Nahrawālī, Mecca was depopulated towards the end of the period in question and that wild animals, at times, could enter the Meccan sanctuary and leave it unhindered. Caravans bringing a supply of grain to Mecca found difficulty in selling their merchandise; so sparse was the population and so reduced its purchasing power that the caravans either returned with their goods unsold or had to offer deferred payment to stimulate demand.³

Second in importance but, like Mecca, an integral part of the emirate, was the port town of Jeddā. It is referred to by Varthema

¹Varthema, op.cit., pp. 35-36.

²See supra, pp. 86-96.

³Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 10-12. Allowance should be made for Nahrawālī's pro-Ottoman attitude. His statement may have been motivated by the wish to discredit the Mamlūk Sultan al-Ghawrī and his subordinate, the Sharif of Mecca.

in the following words: "This city is not surrounded by walls, but very beautiful houses, as is the custom in Italy. It is a city of very extensive traffic..." The same traveller states that the inhabitants were suffering from the shortage of drinking water. He estimates its population at about five hundred families.¹ The reason why this important commercial centre appears to have been rather underpopulated was, apart from the scarcity of drinking water, that the absence of a protecting wall rendered it so insecure that it presented an easy target to unruly elements as well as to opponents of the ruling Amir of Mecca, which deterred many from living there.

Ṭā'if, now a flourishing city, was then hardly more than a village whose permanent residents were so few that the Friday prayer was not held² in the famous mosque of Ibn 'Abbās unless by previous arrangement, as was the case in 915/1509.³ Ṭā'if, with the surrounding rural areas, especially the valleys of Wajj and Liyya, was among the territories of the Meccan emirate.⁴ Though Ṭā'if proper housed only an insignificant number of people, the surrounding areas were quite densely populated, which is indicated by the amounts of money collected in sporadic levies by the Sharifs of Mecca.⁵ The dwindling population of Ṭā'if could be ascribed to the simple fact that, though agriculturally

¹Varthema, op.cit., pp. 52-53. His remark about the wall is correct, as it was not built until later as will be seen.

²According to some, the presence of forty persons is an essential requirement for the Friday prayer. Otherwise, the people should perform the normal Ḍuhr prayer.

³Jar Allah b. 'Abd al-'Aziz (Al-'Izz) Ibn Fahd, Tuhfat al-Laṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 15, Ta'rikh), fols. 67-68; Muḥammad b. 'Alī Ibn 'Alān, Tayf al-Ṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 120, Ta'rikh), fols. 65-66; Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-'Ujaymī, I'hdā' al-Laṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 14, Ta'rikh), fols. 33-34.

⁴Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, p.25; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 10b. See also: Jar Allah Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fol. 4; Ibn 'Alān, op.cit., fols. 31-32.

⁵See infra, pp. 104-7.

prominent, it had long been deprived of any politico-commercial significance and, hence gone into an ever-increasing decline.

The area between these three main centres and the stretch of country in its immediate vicinity, consisting of valleys and rural areas, remained as a rule under the control of the Meccan Amirs throughout the Burjī period. The coastal area in the north of Jēdda up to Rābigh, with its adjoining rural areas in the east, was assigned to the Amirs of Mecca officially and it was administered by them and they were held responsible, by the Egyptian Sultans, for whatever occurred in these areas.¹ The coastal area in the south of Jēdda, together with its eastern stretch, as far as al-Layth,² can also be considered an integral part of the Meccan emirate.

The Sharifs of Mecca, probably on the basis of a well-calculated plan, seem to have been intent more on extending their influence to the south of Mecca and Jēdda than to their ~~north~~. As will be seen, several dependencies of Mecca existed in the areas between al-Layth and the northern part of the Yemen.³ The obvious aim, beside the acquisition of new territory and influence, was to control the sea and land routes to Jēdda and Mecca which were normally used by the Yemenite and Indian merchants. The Sharifs were concerned about the safety of the merchants and the revenue derived from trade. The best way to attain both was the direct or indirect control over the area and it

¹See infra, p.159.

²At the distance of about 220 km. south of Jēdda. See. Anṣārī, op.cit., p.10.

³At present part of this area is known as 'Asīr, which is a new regional name, after a confederation of tribes in al-Sarat, but then it was regarded as the southernmost extension of the region of the Ḥijāz. The concept of a separate region intervening between al-Ḥijāz and the Yemen developed in the 19th century and was sanctioned fairly recently by the Saudi Arabian government and became a well-defined geo *graphical* entity. See; R.Headley, E.I.², art. "'Asīr", pp. 707-10.

was this precisely which they did. They secured further material gains, as will be seen, through the levy or tribute imposed on the inhabitants or chiefs of these dependencies. According to Fāsī, the dependencies of Mecca were in his time less numerous than they had originally been and were confined to: al-Ḥasaba, a small town whose location is given as at one day's distance from Qanūnā,¹ and two days' from Ḥaly in the direction of the Yemen; Dawqa;² al-Wādiyan;³ and al-Layth. All these places, evidently with the adjoining areas, and Hadat Bani Jābir, near Harr al-Zahrān, were dependencies of Mecca and the chiefs and inhabitants of al-Ḥasaba and Dawqa paid annually to the Sharifs of Mecca one hundred gharāra, and those of al-Wādiyan and al-Layth two hundred gharāra of grain.⁴ Apart from levy or tributes in kind, the Sharifs of Mecca received, from time to time, a certain amount of money from the inhabitants of the neighbouring valleys of

¹A town and port on the western coast of the Arabian peninsula about 385 km south of Jadda. Later known as al-Qunfudha. See: Anṣārī, op.cit., p.12.

²A coastal town roughly midway between al-Qunfudha and al-Layth.

³Literally means "two valleys" but it is a proper name for a coastal town about sixty miles to the north of Ḥaly. Al-Wādiyan is known also as al-Sirrayn. See: Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. V, p.15; Aynī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 31a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 60 and 67.

⁴Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.25; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 10b-11a. The term gharāra is applied to a unit of weight used particularly for grain. See: Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, p.276. This unit had different equivalents, all of which are based on smaller units explained later. See: infra, p. 105 fn. 1. According to Fāsī, one gharāra equalled forty Meccan Ruba' (literally "a quarter" but of what is not clear. But presumably it meant mudd?) See: Shifā', vol. II, p.276. Maqrīzī describes it as equal to seven Egyptian wayba. (See: Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 306. The same source mentions in another place that it was equal to one hundred Qadah. Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 9a. Nahrawālī states that one gharāra is the quantity of grain which an average camel could be expected to carry. Al-I'lām, p.202. It seems that the weight of gharāra differed from region to region. A Syrian gharāra is defined as being equal to twelve kayla, each of which was slightly less than one-fourth of an Egyptian wayba, Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, p.181. This is much less than that mentioned by Maqrīzī above (i.e. 7 Egyptian wayba).

Ṭā'if. These sums of money, usually referred to by the term Qatīa', were most likely fines imposed in retaliation for disloyalty.

In Shawwāl 801/July 1399, Sharif Ḥasan marched against a group of rebellious Arabs named Ḥamaḍa, in the region of Ṭā'if, subdued them and exacted 80,000 dirhams from them. A similar amount was paid by another group of Arabs named Banū Musa, in the valley of Liyya, near Ṭā'if.² Shortly after, the Sharif summoned a third group of Arabs

¹This term was originally applied to one of the units in the Troy weight system of the Arabs which is based on Ḥabba (grain) and was later used for coins. Any detailed examination of the various units of weight and coins is neither intended nor is possible, for the sake of space. But it will not be amiss to mention briefly some of them which are referred to in one way or the other in the various sections of this thesis. The weight of 4,200 wild mustard, or about 52 mature grains of barley, with chopped off edges, was equal to one dirham. Some preferred to give the equivalent of one dirham in Qirāṭ (one-twentyfourth of a unit or 22 cg). The number of Qirāṭ in each dirham is given differently between 14 and 24. The variation is mainly based on the difference in the number of mustard, barley, wheat, or locust-beans (Ḥabb kharrūb) grains which were regarded as equal to one Qirāṭ, about 20 or 22 of which are considered to be one Mithqāl. Seven Mithqāl are usually regarded as equal to seven dinārs or ten dirhams. Both Mithqāl and dirham were used in weighing silver and gold, but gradually the former became exclusively used for gold (frequently called dinār) and the dirham was usually reserved for silver. Many larger units of weight or measurement (Kayl or Mikyāl) are usually based on the above stated smaller units. The points mentioned above are merely general remarks and by no means are conclusive. For further details about these and other traditional units of weight or measurement, see Ibn al-Mujāwir, op.cit., vol. I, p.13; Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. III, pp. 440-41, 443 and 445; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 265; idem, Nubdha Laṭīfa fi 'Umūr al-Nuqūd al-Islāmiyya (M.S., A.HK. No. 264), fols. 3-4; Anistas Mari Karmly, al-Nuqūd al-'Arabiyya wa I'lm al-Nummiyyat (Cairo, 1939), pp. 9, 25, 27-28, 38 and 76-79; G.C.Miles, E.I.², art. "Dinār", pp. 297-99; idem, E.I.², art. "Dirham", pp. 319-20; E.C.Zambur, E.I.², art. "Ḥabba", pp. 10-11; J.Allan, E.I.¹, art. "Sikka", pp. 423-24; idem, E.I.¹, art. "Mithqāl", p.558; E.V. Zambaur, E.I.¹, art. "Qirat", pp. 1023-24, and various works cited in the bibliography of these articles.

²The valley of Liyya is one of the neighbouring valleys of Ṭā'if at the distance of about eight miles. See; Marāghī, op.cit., p.165; Samhūdī, Wafā', vol. II, p.184; idem, Khulāṣa, p.232; Jar Allah Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fol. 4; Ibn 'Alān, op.cit., fols. 31-32.

named Al Bani al-Nimr (known also as Al Abi'l Khayr) to appear in person and to acquit themselves of the amount due, but they refused. The resultant anger of the Sharif was exploited by the Arabs of Hamaqa, who were at daggers drawn with Bani al-Nimr, and urged the Sharif to attack them. They not only offered to join forces with the Sharif but also paid him 40,000 dirhams as a further inducement. Sharif Hasan had no reason to turn their offer down, launched an offensive and inflicted great losses on Bani al-Nimr. Whether or not the latter paid the amount due is uncertain.¹ Fāsi followed by Al-Najm Ibn Fahd reports that Sharif Hasan visited these areas again in 802 and 803/1399 and 1400 and brought the amount imposed on them back to Mecca.² It was presumably paid without defiance at least for several years in succession. But in 808/1405, some of the above-named suspended payment and Sharif Hasan had to go on several punitive raids against them to secure his dues.³ In 817/1414 the Sharif received the tribute without serious opposition.⁴

The amount imposed was increased at some time between 818 and 820/1415 and 1417, which aroused strong resentment and the groups concerned refused to pay. They were raided and made to comply by force of arms in 821 and the following year/1418 and 1419.⁵

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 401b and 402a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 126.

² Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 402a-b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 127-28.

³ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 404b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 135.

⁴ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 409b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 158.

⁵ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 414b-15b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 173-75.

Though no clear reference to the payment of this tribute is made for several successive years, the usage appears to have continued. In Šafar 847/June 1443, Sharif Barakāt I, deposed at the time, pitched camp near the valley of Liyya. His presence there may or may not have been intended as a threat but it caused anxiety to the ruling Amir, Sharif Abu'l-Qāsim. He, to ward off a possible danger, sent Barakāt I 1,900 Iflori¹ previously levied from the area. Barakāt I, having received this together with a further amount, 1,100 Iflori delivered on Abu'l Qāsim's instruction by inhabitants of a valley near Ṭā'if, departed.² This account proves that these tributes were indeed paid regularly and that their payment, when outstanding, was usually enforced. It also indicates the possibility of an arrangement between the ruling Sharif and his deposed brother, giving the latter the right to claim part of the dues, for Barakāt I could hardly have exacted, and obtained, payment without use of force, unless there was a previous arrangement in this respect.

In the following year, however, the share of Barakāt I in the levy appears to have been withheld, as he carried out a number of raids on these valleys in Rabi' II 848/August 1444 and forced their inhabitants to pay him 2,400 Iflori. This resulted in a tension between him and Abu'l Qāsim, an armed clash was only averted by a compromise in which Barakāt agreed to pay back 2,000 Iflori and was in return promised a share in the revenue of Jādda, together with some other minor financial concessions.³ After this, references to the levies from this area cease in the sources and whether they continued and for how long after the events described is uncertain. But an

¹Florence.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 250.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 253-55.

abrupt end to such references suggests that these inhabitants either refused to pay in future or were relieved by the Sharifs themselves from the payment of tribute. This, however, should not be taken to mean that the Sharifs of Mecca abandoned it in connection with other areas as well. In 913/1507, for instance, Sharif Barakāt II during a campaign against Yaḥya and his supporters¹ imposed on the Arabs of Banū Ibrāhīm an annual tribute of 6,000 dinars.² Various references in the sources are found during the Burjī period to the effect that the Sharifs of Mecca often resorted to force in exacting dues, tributes, or simply material gains through plundering or punitive raids against certain areas and tribes. These often yielded considerable booty, and some of these expeditions could have been made with the object of enforcing payment of previously imposed levies.³

The Sharifs of Mecca usually allowed the Amirs of the areas under their influence to continue as before, provided they acknowledged the former as their overlords and to pay the tribute, if imposed, regularly. The three most outstanding dependencies of Mecca were al-Qunfudha, Ḥaly and Jazān. The first was more or less incorporated into the Meccan territory and was ruled by deputies of the Meccan Amirs. The most active and famous among these deputies was Musa b. Barakūt (d. 911/1505).⁴

¹See supra, pp. 95-96.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 266.

³For the relevant details, see; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 415b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 392; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 135b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 126, 175, 181, 269, 295, 306, 322, 324, 331, 335 and 363-64; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 144, 188 and 352; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 25, 39, 85, 94, 100-101, 104-5, 167-9, 112, 117, 119, 178, 180-81, 252 and 259-60, vol. II, fols. 85, 155 and 196; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 106 and 122; See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 336; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 276; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 11 and 34-35; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 82 and 124; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 44.

⁴See supra, p. 91.

Ḥaly Banī Ya^(or simply Ḥaly) qūb' was an important dependency of Mecca.

The Amir of Ḥaly, Aḥmad b. I'sā al-Ḥarāmī, was subjugated by the Sharif of Mecca, 'Ajlān b. Rumaytha (d. 777/1375), in 763/1361, but was allowed to remain in control of Ḥaly as vassal of the Meccan Amir. Their relations became closer in consequence of a marriage between a son of 'Ajlān and a daughter of Amir 'Isa.¹ Sharif 'Ajlān, either immediately after the conquest of Ḥaly or at some later date, imposed on the Amir of Ḥaly a tribute of which no figure is given in the source. The tribute seems to have been paid regularly until around 780/1378 when Sharif Aḥmad b. 'Ajlān increased that tribute by an unspecified sum which the Amir of Ḥaly refused to pay. Sharif Aḥmad marched at the head of his men to attack Ḥaly, but on his approach there a compromise solution was reached by peaceful negotiation.²

The Sharifs of Mecca continued in the position of overlords over the successive Amirs of Ḥaly with a possible and short interruption around 828/1424-25 when the Amir of Ḥaly appear to have been under the protection of the Yemenite Sultan. This is borne out by a report of Fāsī that an Egyptian Amir, Qarqmas, came as far as Ḥaly on his search for Sharif Ḥasan³ but avoided entering it on the grounds that it was a dependency of the Yemen.⁴ This, however, does not appear to have lasted long, as ample evidence is found to show that the Amirs of Mecca were enjoying again authority over the Amirs of Ḥaly shortly after that year. The influence of the Sharifs of Mecca in Ḥaly was particularly strong in the closing years of the Burjī period, when a

¹ . Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 534b, vol. II, part III, fol. 150a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 28a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 89 and 91. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.245; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 325-26; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 61.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 287a-b.

³ See supra, p. 174.

⁴ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 65a-b.

contingent of Meccan soldiers was sent to establish a garrison there.¹

The last but not the least dependency of Mecca was the emirate of Jazān (or Jīzān) which formed the southernmost limit of the area controlled by the Meccan Sharifs. When exactly the emirate of Jazān became a dependency of Mecca is not clear, but it appears that it was during the rule of Abu'l Ghawā'ir Aḥmad, who had succeeded his father Qutḥ al-Dīn Durayb al-Ḥasanī in 876/1471.² In Rabi' I 882/July 1477 (according to some late sources in 884/1479) the Amir of Mecca, Sharif Muḥammad b. Barakāt, who suspected Abu'l Ghawā'ir of having connived at the escape of his disloyal brother to Cairo,³ attacked him. Abu'l Ghawā'ir was to suffer a humiliating defeat and his lands were devastated by the victorious Sharif of Mecca. The former was, however, allowed to retain his position but as a subordinate of the Meccan Amir. Al-Najm Ibn Fahd alone among the sources states that Abu'l Ghawā'ir had to pay an annual tribute of which he gives no figure to the Sharif of Mecca. From the few scattered items of information in the sources, it could be ascertained that the Sharifs of Mecca continued in control over Abu'l Ghawā'ir and his successors in the emirate of Jazān.⁴

¹For the relevant details, see Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 402b, 403b, 404a, 415a and 416a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 241b, vol. II, fol. 25b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 224; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 349; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 129-30, 132, 174, 177, 275, 312 and 316; Sakhawī, al-Ḍaw', vol. III, pp. 217-18, vol. X, pp. 176 and 191; idem, al-Tibr, p.394; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 60 and 154; Al-'Izz, Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 236, 242-43 and 248-49, vol. II, fol. 266. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.262; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 64; R.B.Serjeant, The Portuguese off the South Arabian Coast (London 1963), p.5.

² . Sakhawī, al-Ḍaw', vol. III, p.218.

³See supra, pp. 83-84.

⁴ . Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 360-61; Sakhawī, al-Ḍaw', vol. I, pp. 33 and 299, vol. VII, p.152; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu),

B. Occasional elevation of the Sharif of Mecca to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān

The region of Ḥijāz, as is evident from the preceding pages, was not a single political entity but was divided into three main emirates: Mecca, Medina, and Yanbu'. The Sharifs of Mecca surpassed the others in wealth, military strength, influence and administration. Some aspect of their supremacy in the region has already been explained and others are given in the following chapters. Owing to all these factors, the Sharifs of Mecca were able to impose and maintain their authority on various parts of the region, as shown earlier, which, at least, was not opposed by their Egyptian overlords. The latter often received, as will be seen, considerable amounts of money and valuables from the Sharifs of Mecca and must have been aware of their greater politico-economic importance. Therefore, it was not strange to find that the relations between the Sharifs of Mecca and the Egyptian Sultans, on the whole, were much friendlier than those of Yanbu' and Medina. In view of all this, it is not surprising that the status of Nā'ib (deputy) of the Egyptian Sultan in the Ḥijāz was bestowed exclusively on certain Sharifs of Mecca. As the term Nā'ib al-Sultān indicates, the Sharif who held this position had, at least in theory, supreme authority over all the chiefs and Amirs in the region, as deputy of the Egyptian Sultan. The assignment of this position to a Sharif of Mecca was usually preceded by the payment of a considerable sum of money to the Sultan. This, however, does

p.249; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 217; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.129; Ibn al-Dayba', Bughyat al-Mustafid (MS., A.S. No. 2988), fol. 60b; idem, Qurra, fol. 202. See also: Jaziri, op.cit., pp. 338-39; Janābi, op.cit., fol. 307b; 'Isāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.277; Sinjāri, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 14; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 128; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.45; G.Rentz, E.I.², art. "Djayzān", pp. 516-18; Serjeant, op.cit., p.5.

not necessarily imply permanent or lifelong tenure of office. Nor could this office be regarded as hereditary. A deposed Nā'ib al-Sultān could be later re-appointed mere Amir, which is sometimes confusing when his status and the basis of his relationship to other Amirs have, at certain times, to be determined. Some sources, especially the late ones, occasionally refer to a certain Sharif erroneously with the title of Nā'ib al-Sultān before he actually acquired that advantageous position, or continue to refer to him as such long after he had lost this status and was no more than a mere Sharif of Mecca. Needless to say, all such references are carefully examined and excluded unless supported by other contemporary sources and proved to be correct.

Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān was the ruling Amir of Mecca at the beginning of the Burjī period. Most sources refer to him and his father 'Ajlān as Sharif of Mecca. But there are some passages in certain sources which indicate that both these Sharifs enjoyed authority in other parts of the Ḥijāz. That is to say, in addition to the usual territories of Mecca and its dependencies. Al-Najm Ibn Fahd uses once, when referring to Sharif 'Ajlān, the title Sulṭān al-Haramayn (i.e. Sultan of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina) and speaks of his son Sharif Ahmad as being appointed to the "Sultanat Makka wa sā'ir al-Bilād al-Ḥijāziyya" (i.e., Sultanate of Mecca and all the areas within the region of the Ḥijāz¹). The term Ra'īs al-Ḥijāz (denoting either ruler or the wealthy person in the region) is also used in a reference to Sharif Ahmad.² It is/very likely that this term has here any political significance. It is apparently used to indicate Sharif Ahmad's wealth which is reported to have been

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 97 and 99.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 286a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, pp. 369-70.

considerable.¹ Ibn Ḥajar gives Sharif Ahmad the title "Sultan al-Hijāz", but only once.²

Though the use of these titles indicates that both these Sharifs possessed influence in the Ḥijāz, there is no clear factual evidence to confirm beyond doubt that they enjoyed the authority of overlords. Sharif Hasan b. 'Ajlān was the first Amir of Mecca who definitely acquired the position of Nā'ib al-Sultān in the Ḥijāz. This elevation was the natural culmination of the career of a man of his personal ability. Shortly after his appointment to the emirate of Mecca in 797/1394, he was able to compel the Amir of Yanbu' to pay him the price of grain which had been a gift to him from the ^{Egyptian} Sultan,³ and to take revenge on the assassins of his brother 'Alī.⁴ Ḥasan's military strength enabled him to pursue his opponents in far distant areas, to meet and defeat them. In or around Rabi' II 798/February 1396, Sharif Hasan went to Yanbu' in pursuit of his opponents, and, despite the recent dispute between them, received a fairly friendly reception by the Amir of Yanbu'. According to Ibn al-Furāt, Ḥasan on his return journey was ambushed by his opponents who were supported by the Amir of Yanbu'. But the latter suffered defeat and were put to flight.⁵ According to Maqrīzī, Amir of Yanbu' supported Ḥasan against his opponents who suffered defeat.⁶ Whatever the merits of the case, the mere fact that Ḥasan, shortly after his appointment, was able to

1. See infra, p. 155.

2. Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, vol. I, pp. 201-2.

3. See infra, p. 199.

4. See supra, pp. 61-62.

5. Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, p. 434.

6. Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 174a.

take revenge for his brother and to chase his opponents to distant areas, and that he was strong and shrewd enough to win victory even though taken by surprise, reflects his great personal merit. This enabled him to gather, on several occasions, a huge number of supporters and occasional followers who often helped him to achieve his goal.¹

By increasing his military strength, Ḥasan acquired considerable influence over the chiefs and Amirs of the area, who must have known that to maintain good relations with a powerful Amir in the region was far better than to be at loggerheads with him. Especially as the Sultan was unlikely to intervene should one of them be attacked by another, unless his own position was challenged. This is clearly indicated by the passive attitude of the Egyptian Sultan to the expansionist policy of the Meccan Amirs who had several dependencies, as shown earlier, in the south of their territory.

One can easily see that the concept "might is right" was not looked upon disapprovingly by the Mamlūks, especially the Burjī Sultans. Thus, for instance, in 809/1406 Sharif Thābit and Jammāz, at enmity with each other, both approached the ^{Egyptian} Sultan, trying to secure appointment to the emirate of Medina. The Sultan's reaction was rather strange; he sent a message to both rivals suggesting that they should resolve the situation between them at the point of the sword. An armed encounter actually took place and Jammāz, who gained the upper hand, appears to have been declared Amir of Medina.²

¹As token examples, see: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 252-53; idem, al-Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 403b, 404b and 406a; AlNajm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 122, 128-30, 140, 142 and 154; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.477; See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305a; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 340-41; Dahlān, op.cit., p.37.

²Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 233a; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p..385.

There can be little doubt that it was the growing military might of Ḥasan which compelled Muḡhil and Wubayr, joint Amirs of Yanbu' whose relations with Ḥasan were strained, to visit him in Mecca and normalize their mutual relations in Ramaḡān 809/March 1407.¹ Ḥasan's ever-increasing power must have contributed in the decision of the Egyptian Sultan to grant the former the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān in Rabi' I 811/August or September 1408. Ḥasan was authorized to depose or appoint the local Amirs, and to deal with all the affairs of the region.

Shortly before this, a Sharif named Thābit b. Nu'ayr had, at the expense of the above-mentioned Jammāz b. Hiba, secured the emirate of Medina, but as he had not yet received the formal decree, Jammāz had remained in control. The newly appointed Nā'ib al-Sultān confirmed Thābit but the latter died before taking actual control. Jammāz had hoped that he would be allowed to remain in control of Medina, but Ḥasan decided to replace him by 'Ajlān b. Nu'ayr, a brother of the deceased. This became known to Jammāz who appropriated various valuables from the sanctuary and fled. In Rabi' II or Jumādā I of the same year (i.e. 811/September or October 1408), Sharif 'Ajlān and Sharif Barakāt I b. Ḥasan reached Medina with a strong force and the former was declared Amir of Medina as deputy of Ḥasan. An attempt was made to arrest Jammāz but in vain. Ḥasan's name was mentioned in the Khuṭba and prayers were said for him immediately after prayers for the Sultan and before those for 'Ajlān. This usage prevailed until the end of 812/May 1410, when it was suspended following the deposition of 'Ajlān, for the reason explained later,

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 405a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 136.

by Jammāz or Sulaymān b. Hiba but was resumed later.¹ In connection with the offering of prayers for Ḥasan in the sanctuary of Medina² it is worth pointing out that the sources rarely if ever refer to this usage for any Nā'ib al-Sultān or for the Sultan himself in any mosque other than the sanctuaries in Mecca and Medina. The obvious reason was that the practice in ordinary mosques had no political significance. It can safely be assumed that Sharif Ḥasan was acknowledged Nā'ib al-Sultān in Yanbu' and the prayers were said for him in the local mosques there and indeed in others in the region. As to the temporary suspension of the offering of prayers for Sharif Ḥasan in Medina, as mentioned earlier, it was in all probability due to the supposed deposition of Ḥasan at the end of 812/May 1410 which, however, was averted at the last moment.³ The offering of prayers must have been resumed following the re-instating of Ḥasan. The assumption is corroborated by the recourse to a number of sources which state that Sharif Ḥasan remained

¹For the points mentioned and further details about this episode, see: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.332, vol. II, pp. 208-9 and 252-53; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 57b, part II, fols. 376b-77a and 405a-b, vol. II, part III, fol. 195a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 230, 263 and 344, vol. IV, fol. 14b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 246a, vol. II, fols. 4b and 6b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 181b, 245b and 284a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 48-49; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 139-41; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 747; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.62, 80-81, 159 and 476-77, vol. II, p.229, vol. III, pp. 408-9; idem, al-Dhayl, fols. 76a-77a and 82b; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13, 50, 78 and 103-4, vol. VII, p.152; Sambūdi, Wafā', vol. I, pp. 418-9; idem, Khulāsa, pp. 145-46. See also: Qalqashandī, Ma'āthir, vol. II, p.207; Jazīrī, op.cit., p.585; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.200; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 304b-5a and 310a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 35 and 252-53; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 338-39; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 73-74; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.37.

²The similar practice in Mecca should be taken for granted for all the Sharifs of Mecca.

³See supra, pp. 62-63.

Nā'ib al-Sultān for about seven years after the acquisition of that status.¹ Had Ḥasan's name been permanently dropped from the Khuṭba, the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān would have become meaningless. In Ṣafar 818/May 1415, Sharif Ḥasan was deposed by his nephew Rumaytha.² That, in some sources,³ the title Amir of Mecca is used for both, does not necessarily mean that Ḥasan had ceased to be Nā'ib al-Sultān, or that Rumaytha had not been assigned the same status, since a Sharif had to be Amir first before he could acquire a higher status. Many sources state unequivocally that Rumaytha had replaced his cousins Barakāt I and Aḥmad in the emirate, and his uncle Ḥasan in Niyāhat al-Sultana.⁴

Sharif Rumaytha, however, does not seem to have enjoyed any authority outside the Meccan territory, which may have been partly caused by the continuous opposition by Ḥasan's supporters and partly by the brevity of his rule, for he was replaced by Ḥasan in Ramaḍān 819/November 1416. The latter appears to have remained, henceforward, merely Amir of Mecca. This did not prevent the energetic and tactful Ḥasan from retaining part of his previous official influence in Medina and Yanbu'.⁵

¹ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.209; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 57b, part II, fols. 399a, vol. II, part III, fol. 195a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 284a; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.477; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.13. See also: Jaziri, op.cit., p.585; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 254-55.

² For the circumstances leading to this change, see supra, pp. 66-68.

³ Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 10b; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 13 and 104. See also: Janābi, op.cit., fol. 305b.

⁴ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.209; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 195a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 272; AlNajm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 163. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 256; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 344; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 80; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.39.

⁵ See supra, pp. 68-72.

Sinjārī, reporting the deposition of Ḥasan by 'Alī in Jumādā I 827/April 1424¹, states that the latter was appointed Nā'ib al-Sultān in the Ḥijāz.² But this statement is, insofar as it can be ascertained, not supported by other sources. Sharif Barakat I had succeeded his father Ḥasan in Ramaḍān 829/August 1426.³ Despite some vague references to him with the title "Sāhib al-Ḥijāz",⁴ there is no conclusive evidence to the effect that Barakāt I ever acquired the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān.

Sharif Barakāt I was succeeded by his son Muḥammad who not only enjoyed the longest period of rule and cordial relations with the Sultan but was also the most popular and able Sharif of Mecca within the Burjī period.⁵ This combination served him well in extending his influence and authority, officially or otherwise, in the various parts of the Ḥijāz. Though he was granted the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān the actual date of the appointment is uncertain.

In 870/1465 Sakhāwī, referring to the appointment of a Sharif named Zuhayr to the emirate of Medina ascribes it to the favour shown by Sharif Muḥammad, the Sāhib al-Ḥijāz (the ruler of the Ḥijāz).⁶ This implies that in this year, if not earlier, Sharif Muḥammad enjoyed the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān. According to some later sources, this

¹See supra, p. 73.

²See Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 349.

³See supra, p. 76.

⁴. Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.198; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 1-2 and 10.

⁵See supra, pp. 85-86.

⁶Sakhāwī, al-Tuḥfa, vol. II, pp. 320-21.

status was assigned to Sharif Muḥammad in 872/1467.¹ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd refers to Sharif Muḥammad in 872/1467 as Sultan of Mecca.² This term, in itself, does not point to any additional authority but may have been used to indicate the hegemony of Mecca over other parts of the Ḥijāz. This assumption is supported by the above stated version of Sakhāwī and some other sources as well as by a report by Ibn Iyās that in Dhu'l Qa'da 872/July 1468 an expedition was sent from Mecca to subdue the unruly elements in Yanbu'.³ In 874/1469, Sharif Muḥammad is referred to again with the title "Sāhib al-Ḥijāz".⁴ Nevertheless, two Sharifs, one in Medina in 874/1469⁵ and the other in Yanbu' in 875/1470,⁶ were appointed by the ^{Egyptian} Sultan himself. Obviously, the Sultan had the power to appoint or depose any Amir, including his Nā'ib in the Ḥijāz. But it was the usual practice, as will be seen, that he at least consulted his Nā'ib in the Ḥijāz when considering the appointment or deposition of an Amir in Yanbu' or Medina. That he did not do so in this case implies some doubt about the credibility of the earlier references to Sharif Muḥammad as Nā'ib al-Sultān in the Ḥijāz. However, it should be stated that according to Sakhāwī's reports Sharif Muḥammad was enjoying this status from 870/1465 onwards. Sakhāwī's several

¹ . Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.223; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 124.

² Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 319.

³ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.14.

⁴ Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.188.

⁵ . Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. II, p.321; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.196.

⁶ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.57.

references to the Sharif in that capacity have already been mentioned. References to Sharif Muhammad as "Sāhib al-Hijāz" are made by the same source in 878/1473 and 881/1476 again.¹ In fact, it is in or after 878/1473 that Sharif Muhammad appears to have begun enjoying some real influence over the Amirs of Yanbu' and Medina which developed into full official control around 883/1478 in his capacity of Nā'ib al-Sultān. This is supported by several evidential examples. In 878/1473, for instance, a Sharif named Abū Fāris Shāmān beleaguered Medina with a strong body of supporters to claim his dues from its Amir, Sharif Dughaym. The former threatened to storm the city unless his dues were paid. On receiving this news, Sharif Muhammad sent orders to Shāmān to depart peacefully, and was obeyed.²

In the same year the Egyptian Sultan deposed the Amir of Yanbu', Sharif Saba' b. Hajjān, and authorized Sharif Muhammad to appoint whom he chose to the emirate of Yanbu'.³ Who was appointed by Sharif Muhammad is not clear but it was presumably Sharif Saqr who was replaced in Rajab 883/November 1478 by Saba'.⁴

In Ramaḡān 883/January 1479, Sharif Muhammad, at the instruction of the Egyptian Sultan, went to Medina personally to investigate the murder of a local Qāḡi in the previous year and also to rebuke its Amir, Sharif Dughaym for his failure to bring the murderer to justice and to give the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj the customary reception. Dughaym was rather apprehensive, and left Medina before the arrival of Sharif Muhammad. When Dughaym disregarded Muhammad's invitation to co-operate

¹ Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.al-Ḥassu), pp. 218 and 241 respectively.

² Sakhāwī, al-Tuḡfa, vol. II, p.321.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol.II, fol. 342. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.337.

⁴ Ibn Iyās, Badā'ī, vol. III, p.143.

in tracking down the murderer, Sharif Muḥammad left Medina in anger, leaving a force to maintain law and order. Sharif Muḥammad had obviously sent an unfavourable report, about Ḍughaym, to Cairo which led to the replacement of Ḍughaym, shortly after, by Sharif Qusayṭil.¹

In Shawwāl 883/February 1479, the Amir of Yanbu', Sharif Saba' b. Hajjān, whose relations with Muḥammad were strained, paid him a visit and, as a friendly gesture, offered him 8,000 ḍīnars as blood money for some men killed in earlier hostilities. Magnanimously Sharif Muḥammad accepted only half of the amount and their relations improved.² Though not clearly mentioned, it is more than acceptable to assume that Saba' acted as he did in fear of Sharif Muḥammad's authority and to avoid the fate of Ḍughaym.

The fact that Sharif Muḥammad alone among the local Amirs played the rôle of main host to Sultan Qā'it Bāy during the latter's pilgrimage is a clear indication that he already enjoyed the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān in the Ḥijāz.³

In Rabi' II or Jumādā I 887/June or July 1482, Sharif Muḥammad, following the death of Saba' and the dissatisfaction of the inhabitants in Medina with Qusayṭil, appointed the Sharifs Darrāj and Zubayrī his deputies in Yanbu' and Medina respectively. Whether the name of Sharif Muḥammad was mentioned and prayers said for him in Friday's Khuṭba in Medini sanctuary prior to this year is open to question. But in 887/1482 and the following years several references are made to the effect that this was the practice in the sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina and

¹ . Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 368; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 250 and 256-57; idem, al-Daw', vol. IV, p.2, vol. VI, p.221, vol. IX, pp. 102-3; idem, al-Tuḥfa, vol. I, p. 440, 82, vol. II, pp. 321-22; idem, al-Tuḥfa, vol. I, fol. 690 and 706, vol. II, fols. 13-14; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i, vol. III, p.140.

² Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 368.

³ See supra, p. 85.

that Sharif Muḥammad continued to enjoy the privileges of Nā'ib al-Sultān.¹ In Ramaḍān 888/November 1483, Sharif Zubayrī died and Sharif Muḥammad appointed Ḥasan, a son of the deceased, his deputy in Medina.²

Relations between Sharif Darrāj, the deputy of Sharif Muḥammad in Yanbu', and Yaḥya b. Saba' became rather hostile shortly after the appointment of Darrāj. The reason was that Sharif Yaḥya tried, following the death of his father Saba', for his appointment in Yanbu' but in vain, as the choice of Sharif Muḥammad fell on Sharif Darrāj. This was bitterly resented by Yaḥya and the resultant tension led to a clash between Darrāj and Yaḥya in the early part of 890/1485. It was Darrāj who suffered greater losses, was practically besieged, and was forced to pay Yaḥya a sum of money to conclude a truce.³

Shortly after, the two rivals - whether spontaneously or in answer to a summons is not known - paid a visit to Sharif Muḥammad in Mecca. What exactly happened there is unclear, but it is safe to assume that Nā'ib al-Sultān tried to reconcile Yaḥya and Darrāj with each other. However, shortly after the return of Yaḥya and Darrāj to Yanbu' hostility flared up again. Yaḥya secured the support of Banū Ibrāhīm, a powerful tribe in Yanbu' about 2,000 strong, and Darrāj was hard pressed and in real trouble. He sent to Sharif Muḥammad requesting his help. In Rabi' II 891/May 1486, Sharif Muḥammad himself marched with a strong force against Yaḥya and inflicted a crushing defeat on him. But soon after the Sharif's return to Mecca Darrāj found himself

¹ Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.82, vol. II, p.95; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 690 and 747; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 289, 295 and 329-30; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 217, 232 and 243, vol. VI, p.221, vol. VII, p.152; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 20-22, 32, 72 and 110. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.278.

² Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.304; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.82, vol. II, p.95; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 100 and 232-33; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 40.

³ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 63.

again under pressure and the Nā'ib al-Sultān Sharif Muḥammad went again to the rescue of his deputy in Yanbu'.¹

Late in 891 or early in 892/December 1486, Sharif Yaḥya requested the Sultan to appoint him to the emirate of Yanbu' and offered to pay in return 30,000 dinars. Despite this financial temptation, the Sultan left the matter to the decision of his Nā'ib in the Ḥijāz whose respons^e was not favourable to Yaḥya.² This stand of the Sultan must have convinced the local Amirs that the position of Nā'ib al-Sultān was not a mere symbol but conveyed on its incumbent not only corresponding authority but the support of the Sultan. This must have enhanced Sharif Muḥammad's influence in the region.

In 902/1496-97 Yaḥya tried again to persuade the Sultan to grant him the appointment to the emirate of Yanbu' but in vain. On his failure, Yaḥya renewed hostilities against Darrāj but when Yaḥya's supporters, particularly the Arabs of Banū Ibrāhīm, became a menace to the authority of the Sharif Muḥammad, they were subdued and forced to pay tribute.³

The deputies of Sharif Muḥammad in Yanbu' and Medina were, on the whole, loyal but some were, or became, unwilling to act as "deputy". They may have thought that it detracted from their dignity. Sharif Ḥasan b. Zubayrī, the deputy of Sharif Muḥammad in Medina, was becoming increasingly dissatisfied with his subordinate position, especially as he believed that he was being deprived of his share in the revenue of the fiefs and endowments made in favour of Medina. Early in Rabi' I

¹ . Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.330; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 73 and 75-76.

² . Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.352; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 84-85.

³ . Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.352; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 201-2 and 204; see also: Jazirī, op.cit., pp. 347-48.

901/December 1495, Ḥasan took possession of a number of valuables which belonged to the sanctuary and escaped from Medina. Sharif Muḥammad sent an expeditionary force to arrest Ḥasan and recover the loot, but in vain. Sharif Muḥammad appointed Sharif Fāris b. Shāmān his deputy in Medina.¹

Sharif Muḥammad continued to wield effective power, not only in the Meccan territory, in Medina and Yanbu', but also in various other parts of the Ḥijāz until his death early in Muḥarram 903/September 1497.² He was succeeded by his son Barakāt II who seems to have initially inherited his father's status. A reference of 897/1491-92 in which Barakāt II is described as "Qasīm /partner/" of his father referred to as "Sāhib al-Ḥijāz" indicates this,³ the more so as Barakāt is mentioned, shortly after his appointment, as ruler of the Ḥijāz. He is reported to have confirmed the Sharifs Fāris and Darrāj in their positions.⁴ This proves that Barakāt II possessed initially the privilege of Nā'ib al-Sultān. Otherwise, his being Qasīm and his confirmation of Fāris and Darrāj would have been devoid of meaning. But this official status did not last long. Most likely Barakāt's split with his brother and the resultant clashes contributed much in dwindling his authority

¹ . Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 681; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, pp. 82 and 474-75; Samhūdī, Wafā', vol. I, p.422; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 189, 193-95 and 216; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.311.

² . Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VII, pp. 150-53; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 217; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 99b; idem, Qurra, fol. 220; See also: Janābī, op.cit., fols. 307b-8a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit.: vol. IV, pp. 278-79.

³ Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 540 and 543; idem, al-Daw', vol. VII, p.152.

⁴ . Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 223; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 99b; see also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 282 and 301; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 18-19.

in the region as well as the favour of the Sultan in Cairo.¹

In Jumādā II or Sha'bān 903/February or April 1498 Sharif Yahya at last succeeded in his lifelong endeavour and secured, against the wish of Barakat II and at the expense of Darrāj, his appointment to the emirate of Yanbu' direct from the Sultan. Darrāj, having been deposed and expelled from Yanbu', went to Mecca where he died an exile.²

In 906-7/1500-1501 some references to Barakāt and his rival brother Hazzā' under the use of the title "Ṣahib al-Ḥijāz" are found in certain sources.³ Some other rather late sources state that Sharif Barakāt II was appointed ruler of Mecca and the rest of the Ḥijāz in 910/1504 or 1505.⁴ But both these statements, at this stage, are not supported either by a clear official edict or by the factual evidence in the sources. In fact, under the rival brothers the situation in Mecca remained rather chaotic for several years between 906-10/1500-04 and was not stabilized until 910/1504, when Barakāt II secured the emirate of Mecca and had his brother Qā'it Bāy appointed in his stead.⁵ There is no conclusive evidence to the effect that either Barakāt II or his brother enjoyed the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān in this year. In fact, there are clear indications to the contrary. In the latter part of 911/1505, for instance, Sultan Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī deposed Yahya from the emirate of Yanbu' and appointed Sharif Hajjar b. Darrāj instead.⁶

¹ See supra, pp. 86-92.

² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 227 and 250; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p. 377; see also: Jazirī, op.cit., p. 348; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 301.

³ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 256, vol. II, fols. 2-4, 10-11 and 26; Ibn al-Dayba, al-Faḍl, fol. 114a.

⁴ 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 289; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 154.

⁵ See supra, pp. 93-94.

⁶ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p. 89.

There is nothing to suggest that this was done at the request of or in consultation with Sharif Barakāt II, which should have been the case had the latter or his brother Qā'it Bāy enjoyed the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān. In Ramaḍān 914/February 1509, the Sultan had pardoned Sharif Yaḥya against a strong current of public opinion.¹ Yaḥya had recently led a movement of rebellion² and it is almost certain that, had Barakāt's status equalled that of his father, he would have made every effort to prevent Yaḥya from obtaining the Sultan's forgiveness. However, Yaḥya does not appear to have been granted the coveted emirate of Yanbu' as Sharif Hajjar remained Amir of Yanbu' until his death at the end of 916/February or March 1511. In Muḥarram 917/April 1511, Yaḥya, despite strenuous efforts on his part, was again overlooked in favour of Sharif Ajwad.³ The date is significant since Ajwad's appointment was made after Barakāt II had finally acquired the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān as it is from 916/1510 onwards that clear references to this effect appear in the sources.⁴ It was most probably Barakāt's opposition which deprived Yaḥya of his prize.

It was obviously because Barakāt II was Nā'ib al-Sultān that the Ottoman Sultan Selim I considered the homage paid to him by Sharif Abū Numayy II, Barakāt's son,⁵ sufficiently representative of all other Amirs in the region not to exact any other homage. Indeed, it seems that

¹ . . . Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 157; Ibn Iyas, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 130 and 138.

² See supra, pp. 95-96.

³ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 211 and 214.

⁴ . . . Al-'Izz, Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 171, 178, 182-83, 198, 222, 258-60 and 262; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p. 455; Ibn al-Dayha', al-Faḍl, fol. 156b; see also: Janābī op.cit., fol. 309a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 289, 305-6 and 317; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 35 and 38-39; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 49-50.

⁵ See supra, pp. 98-99.

none was paid to the Sultan by the Amirs of Medina and Yanbu' after the incorporation of Ḥijāz into the Ottoman domain.

C. Relations of the Sharifs of Mecca with the rulers of Egypt, 'Irāq and the Yemen.

In the pre-Burjī period the rulers of 'Irāq and the Yemen competed with the Mamlūk Sultans of Egypt for the hegemony over Haramayn (Mecca and Medina) and other parts of the Ḥijāz. But the issue was finally settled in favour of the Egyptian Sultans. Though occasionally the Sharifs of Mecca and other principalities in the Ḥijāz adopted a more independent position, this was not tolerated by the Mamlūk Sultans who were determined to keep the reginn of Ḥijāz within their domain and under ^{full} control and reserve the prestige and other advantages for themselves.¹

The privileges reserved for and enjoyed by the Mamlūk Sultans in the Meccan region in particular and in other parts of the Ḥijāz in general are well exemplified by the oath of allegiance taken by Sharif Abū Numayy I to the Egyptian Sultan Baybars in 667/1268 and more particularly to Sultan Qalawūn in 681/1282, which remained essentially the same for the successive Sharifs of Mecca. In that oath, Sharif Abū Numayy I acknowledged the sovereignty of the Egyptian Sultan and promised to continue observing the mention of his name in the Khuṭba and on the sikka (i.e. coins), giving precedence to the Egyptian Mahmal and the flag, and using exclusively the Kiswa sent by the Egyptian Sultan to cover the Ka'ba.² Thereafter, the sovereignty of the Egyptian Sultans

¹B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 216-17 and 223.

²Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 247-48; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I fols. 148b-49a and 150a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, (ed. M. Ziyada, Cairo, 1934-42), vol. I, part III, pp. 706-707; AlNajm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 33.

was recognized, on the whole, by the local Amirs and the Sultans or rulers of the neighbouring countries and remained uncontested throughout the Burjī period.

The main reasons for the original rivalry between the Egyptian and other Sultans, in the pre-Burjī period, were manifold, politico-economic interests of a general nature. But by far the strongest motive was the overwhelming desire of the contestants to enhance personal prestige by obtaining control of the Ḥijāz - the cradle of Islam, which contained the two most sacred sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina and possessed in the Muslim world a unique religious significance - and becoming the guardian of the holy cities, as whoever obtained this status was bound to enjoy immense prestige. The Egyptian Sultans have regarded this a point of distinction and honour over all other Sultans.¹ These, or other rulers whose domain included the region of the Ḥijāz, boasted the title "Khādim al-Ḥaramayn al-Sharifayn"² and enjoyed great prestige.³ The importance of this title and the respect enjoyed by its bearer throughout the Muslim world was and is still tremendous and this is not surprising. But what is of particular interest is that the non-Muslim rulers and princes, in the period under examination, were not unaware of its value. This is illustrated by an account to the effect that a Georgian prince, visited Sultan Barqūq in 788/1386 and claimed that he saw a dream in which the Prophet Muḥammad enjoined him to adopt Islam

¹ See Qalqashandī, Subḥ, vol. IV, pp. 57-58.

² This phrase means "the servant of the holy sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina". The use of the term 'servant' instead of 'ruler' is justified by the consideration of their sacredness.

³ As token references, see: Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. V, p.203; Marā'ī (or Mira'ī) b. Yūsuf Al-Ḥanbalī, Qalā'id al-ʿUqyan (MS., E.E.No. 2340), fol. 50. The Ayyubid Saladin is reported to have been the first to bear this title. See: Et. Combe, J.Sauvaget and G.Wiet, Repertoire Chronologique de l'epigraphie arabe (Cairo, 1931), ix, no. 3464, inscription of 587/1191. See also: B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 216-17; Ḥasan al-Basha, al-Alqāb al-Islāmiyya (Cairo, 1957), p.268.

at the hands of Khādim al-Ḥaramayn. The prince may have been telling the truth but he also may have been using this to gain Barqūq's favour. Whatever the case may have been, the Christian prince was well received, converted to Islām, and honourably treated during his stay in Cairo.¹

The possession of this title must have appeared as the most shining prize and most coveted of objectives to the Ottoman Sultan Selim I on his march against Qānṣawh al-Ghawri. Thus it is no wonder that Sultan Selim I cried with joy in public when, after the battle of Marj Dābiq, the Khaṭīb of Aleppo Mosque mentioned his name with this title in the Khuṭba and that the Sultan showed great favour to the Khatīb.² Prior to his entry into Egypt and after the battle of Marj Dābiq, Sultan Selim I sent a letter to Sultan Ṭumān Bāy inviting him to accept the status of an Ottoman deputy and offering him the rule of Egypt. The Ottoman Sultan has described himself as caliph, possessing a greater right than any other ruler to serve al-Ḥaramayn. But the proud Ṭumān-Bāy rejected both the Ottoman claim and offer.³ It was not long, however, until the name of Selim I, followed by this title, was mentioned in the Khuṭba throughout the Ottoman domains.⁴

The Sharifs of Mecca, subordinate as they were to the Egyptian Sultans, had no independent foreign policy of their own. The nature of their relations with non-Egyptian rulers was, of necessity, fully aligned with the conduct of foreign affairs of their Egyptian overlords.

¹For the points mentioned and further details, see Magrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 105b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbāʾ, vol. I, fol. 86b; Ibn Iyās, ʿUqūd, vol. II, fol. 113a; idem, Badāʾiʿ, vol. I, p.264.

²Ibn Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 176-77. See also: Halil Inalcik, "Rise of the Ottoman Empire" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.320.

³Ibn Iyās, Badāʾiʿ, vol. V, pp. 122-23.

⁴Ibn Iyās, Badāʾiʿ, vol. V, pp.144-45; Nahrawālī, al-Iʿlām, pp. 278-79; Al-Bakari, op.cit., fol. 38.

The Sharifs were nevertheless the immediate rulers of the area. Their names were mentioned and prayers were said for them in the Khuṭba immediately after the Egyptian Sultan and, as such, the Sharifs enjoyed considerable prestige among the Muslim rulers. Though the authority of the Sharifs in the area was rather limited they could bestow minor privileges on other Muslim rulers on condition that the dominant rights of the Egyptian Sultans were not affected. It was the implied objective of the frequent gifts sent to the Sharifs of Mecca by the Muslim rulers to propitiate them and obtain their co-operation permission and/or certain charitable undertakings and pious works in Mecca. Likewise, the maintenance of friendly relations with these Sharifs was not only a matter of prestige but the best way for these rulers to secure fair treatment of their merchants and pilgrims.

The non-Egyptian rulers generally accepted without demur that they could not challenge the authority of the Egyptian Sultans in the Hijāz. They were more than satisfied with some minor and purely ceremonial privileges such as the permission to send their Mahmal and being prayed for in the sanctuary and so on. Even if granted, such concessions never put any other ruler on an equal footing with the Egyptian Sultans. Come what may, the Egyptian Mahmal had always to be in the leading position; The Syrian Mahmal came second, then those sent by other Egyptian domains and only at the very end the Mahmals sent by the other rulers. Likewise, the prayers in the Khuṭba were said first for the Egyptian Sultan, then for the Sharif of Mecca and only in the last place for any other ruler. This sequence was always observed, and will be taken for granted in the following discussion, whenever reference is made to the presence of the Irāqī or the Yemeni Mahmal or of prayers being said for a non-Egyptian ruler.

If and when an attempt was made to alter this order, the offender was brought to account.

The Sharifs of Mecca and the 'Irāqī rulers

On the eve and in the early part of the Burjī period the tripartite relations between the Egyptian Sultans, the Sharifs of Mecca, and the 'Irāqī rulers were amicable. That is why the 'Irāqī rulers were granted, as will be seen, minor privileges in Mecca. But before we examine these in some detail, it is essential to mention briefly the 'Irāqī rulers, or rather the dynasties within the Burjī period. It is neither intended nor is it required and possible to give a detailed account of all these rulers. Therefore, the following is a mere hint of the successive dynasties and at the end of the passage a number of sources are given for further details.

The Īl-Khanid¹ empire in 'Irāq and its adjoining areas - once a serious rival of the Mamlūk Sultans - had disintegrated following the death of Bū Said (or Abū Said) in 737/1336 without heirs. Among the successor-dynasties were the Jalāyirid of Baghdād. The most important of these, for the present discussion, were Uways b. Ḥasan (d. 776/1374) and his two sons, Ḥusayn (d. 783/1381) and Aḥmad (d. 813/1410). The latter was ousted, for a short period, from Baghdād by Timūr² but

¹Īl-Khans (i.e. 'viceroys'), a title given to the successors of Hülegü (d. 663/1265). See B. Spuler, "The disintegration of the Caliphate in the east", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.165.

²Properly Temür, the Turkish word for 'iron'. He was crippled, probably by a war wound, and is known to history as Timūr-i-Lang (Timur the lame). The europeanized form of the name is Tamerlane. See B. Spuler, "The disintegration of the Caliphate in the east", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.170.

regained its control shortly after the death of Timūr in 807/1404 and remained its ruler until his death. Aḥmad was killed during a clash with Qara Yūsuf, a ruler of the Turcomans of the 'Black sheep' (Qara Qoyunlu), and Baghdād fell to the latter. Qara Qoyunlu remained in control until 872/1467-68 when Baghdād passed to 'White sheep' (Aq Qoyunlu). After the death of Uzūn Ḥasan (Ḥasan al-Ṭawīl, the 'tall Ḥasan') in 883/1478 his empire was divided up among several of his sons. But Baghdād, after a period of occupation by the Safawid in 914/1507-8, remained under the control of Aq Qoyunlu until 921/1515.¹

None of the above-mentioned dynasties formed a threat to the Egyptian hegemony over the Ḥijāz. It was due to this that the 'Irāqī pilgrim caravan and Maḥmal were, on the whole, fairly treated in Mecca. Once or twice the rulers of Aq Qoyunlu, especially Uzūn Ḥasan, tried to challenge the dominant position and exclusive privileges of the Mamlūk Sultans but his Amir al-Ḥajj and other dignitaries were to suffer arrest and humiliation.

But these 'Irāqī rulers, particularly on the eve and in the early part of the Burjī period, were on friendly terms with the Egyptian Sultans

¹For the points mentioned and further details, see: Fāsī, al-ʿIqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 63b and 97a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 93a and 114a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbāʾ, vol. I, fols. 18b-19a, 66b, 72a, 86a, 123b-24b, 171b-72a and 216b, vol. II, fols. 14a-14b; idem, al-Durar, vol. I, p.501; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 294a and 296a; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 204, part II (ed. W. Popper), pp. 283, 292, 302, 305-6 and 345, part III (ed. W. Popper), pp.494, 505-6, 523-24, 546, 591-93 and 662-63; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 147, 204 and 262-63; Sakhāwī, al-Dawʾ, vol. III, p.80; idem, al-Dhayl, fol. 72a; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 215 and 226; Al-ʿIzz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 15, 99 and 113, vol. II, fol. 157; Ibn Iyās, Badāʾiʿ, vol. III, p.145; idem, Badāʾiʿ (U.P.), pp. 48-49; Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, pp. 241-42, vol. VII, p.2; B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 167- and 171-72; B. Spuler and R. Ettinghausen, E.I.², art. "Ilkhāns", pp. 1120-27; J.M. Smith, JR., E.I.², art. "Djalāyir, Djalāyirid", pp. 401-2; V. Minorsky, E.I.¹, art. "Uwais I (Sultan Uwais)", pp. 1061-62; idem, E.I.², art. "Aq Qoyunlu", pp. 311-12; A.A. Al-Duri, E.I.², art. "Baghdād", pp. 894-908; M. Miquel and others, E.I.², art. "Irāk", pp. 1250-68.

as well as with the Sharifs of Mecca and were granted minor privileges in Mecca. Thus, for instance, Uways b. Ḥasan Buzurg (d. 776/1374), the Jalāyirid ruler of Baghdād, Tabriz, and other places, is reported to have sent four large chandeliers, two silver and two gold ones, to Mecca, which were used, for a short period, in the Ka'ba but were then removed to some other place.¹ Uways also sent valuable gifts to the Sharif of Mecca, 'Ajlān b. Rumaytha (d. 777/1375) and his son Aḥmad (d. 788/1386). A Meccan Qāḍi and Khaṭīb, on the instructions of these two Sharifs, said the prayer in the Khuṭba for Sultan Uways, but this arrangement was not permanent.²

Uways' son Aḥmad was also on the best of terms with the Egyptian Sultan Barqūq to whom he sent gifts in 785/1383, repeating this friendly gesture later.³ It was Sultan Aḥmad who in 788/1386, following a clash between him and Timūr, warned Sultan Barqūq against certain movements of Timūr's troops near the Egyptian frontier.⁴ In 795/1392-93, Sultan Aḥmad took refuge in Cairo, following the fall of Baghdād to Timūr.⁵ The latter sent an envoy to Barqūq to demand Aḥmad's return but the Egyptian Sultan responded by putting Timūr's envoy to death.⁶

¹ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.250; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 18b and 63a.

² Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.250; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 63a and 97a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 18b-19a. See also: Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, pp. 241-42.

³ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 93a and 105b.

⁴ Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 86a; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, fols. 264-65; idem, 'Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 113b.

⁵ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 159b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 123b-24b; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, pp. 299-300; B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge history of Islam, vol. I, p.220; J.M.Smith, Jr., E.I.², art. "Djalāyir, Djalāyirid", p.401.

⁶ B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.220.

These facts sufficiently exemplify the friendliness of their relations. But whether Ahmad was ever prayed for, as his father had been, in the Khuṭba cannot be borne out by evidence from the sources.

The relations between the Mamlūk Sultans and the Timurid ruler were generally unfriendly and the former, together with the Sharif of Mecca, felt somewhat uneasy on the occupation of Baghdād by Timūr. But this must not be interpreted as complete lack of communication between them. In 807/1404, for instance, the Sharif of Mecca sent an envoy to 'Irāq, probably to the Timūrīds, in an attempt to secure a financial grant but the mission met with failure.¹

In the pilgrimage season of the same year a rumour spread in Mecca, following the arrival of 'Irāqī pilgrims with their Mahmal sent by a Timūrīd prince, that the latter was on his way to Mecca with a strong force. The Sharif was apprehensive, the more so as some 'Irāqī had measured the walls of the Ka'ba and reportedly said that it was intended to be used for sending a Kiswa for the Ka'ba in the following year. The Sharif had sent the news by a dispatch to Cairo but this was eventually proved incorrect.²

Shāh-Rukh and Kiswat al-Ka'ba

Timūr had died in Shawwāl 807/May 1405,³ and among his successors the most able ruler was Shāh-Rukh (d. 851/1447) who gained power in 809/1407 in Samarqand, Bukhara, and in the greater part of Persia.⁴

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part IV, fol. 356a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 134.

² Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, p.251; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 63b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 252a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. XII, p.322; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fds. 134-35; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.315.

³ Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, p.251; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 63b.

⁴ B. Spuler, "The disintegration of the Caliphate in the east", in The Cambridge history of Islam, vol. I, p.171.

The rumour concerning the intention of a Timūrid prince to send a Kiswa for the Ka'ba, as mentioned above, may not have proved, at the time, correct but it is possible that the Timūrid prince referred to there was Shāh-Rukh. He was the only Timūrid and in fact the only non-Egyptian ruler, during the Burjī period, who was granted the privilege of sending a Kiswa for the Ka'ba.

Initially, relations between Shāh-Rukh and the Sharif of Mecca and the Egyptian Sultan had been normal, which is confirmed by the fact that Sharif Ḥasan sent an envoy to Shāh-Rukh with gifts in 823/1420.¹ Prior to 830/1426-27, two sons of Sharif Ḥasan, Aḥmad and 'Alī, visited a Timūrid prince, possibly Shāh-Rukh, and received valuable gifts.² A Meccan Qādi frequently visited Shāh-Rukh and received a considerable amount of money and other valuables as a gift.³ Similarly, relations between Shāh-Rukh and the Egyptian Sultans appear to have been friendly up to the early years of Sultan Bārsbāy's rule. In or around 828/1424-25, Shāh-Rukh seems to have sought, for the first time, the permission of Bārsbāy to send a Kiswa for the Ka'ba to fulfil an oath, but he was politely denied the favour.⁴ In the period between 833-39/1429-35, several envoys were sent to Cairo, most of them to secure the desired permission, but in vain. Consequently, their relations deteriorated and Shāh-Rukh began criticizing Bārsbāy's conduct, particularly for participating in commercial transactions and taking taxes from the merchants in Jadda and Mecca.⁵

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 416b.

² Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 90b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 199.

³ See infra, pp. 258-59.

⁴ Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 80a.

⁵ For the relevant details, see Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 361, 375, 383-84, 387 and 433; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 101b, 126a-b, 131a, 134b-35a and 136b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 17-18, 20 and 121-22; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 373b-74a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 230.

According to Halil Inalcik, the request of Shāh-Rukh was rejected "on the ground that it was tantamount to a claim to overlordship".¹ This may be a slight exaggeration as Shāh-Rukh repeatedly requested but never tried to take or send the Kiswa direct to Mecca. Shāh-Rukh may genuinely have taken the oath and was simply seeking the permission to fulfil it but, on the other hand, and equally likely, was his political ambition. What seems to be more convincing is the following analysis by B. Lewis:

"... Shāh-Rukh, while avoiding open conflict, carried on the old feud against the Mamluk Sultanate by indirect means - through his Turcoman allies in the north, and by seeking to gain influence in Arabia. This is no doubt the meaning of the request to the Sultan in Cairo for permission to provide a veil (Kiswa) to cover the Ka'ba, 'if only for one day'. The request was refused, on the grounds that the privilege of providing the Kiswa belonged by ancient custom to the rulers of Egypt, who had established great waqfs for this purpose. Bārsbāy had good reason for not wishing to grant his rival a foothold, however tenuous, in the Hijāz."²

This was bound to increase the existing tension between Bārsbāy and Shāh-Rukh. In Rajab 839/February or March 1436, an insulting letter from Shāh-Rukh reached Bārsbāy in which he was described as the deputy of Shāh-Rukh and was ordered to wear a robe and a crown, sent with the envoy, and to mention the name of Shāh-Rukh in the Khuṭba and to strike it on the sikka in acknowledgement of the sovereignty of Shāh-Rukh. This outrageous epistle incensed Bārsbāy. He wreaked his wrath upon the envoys who were humiliated, thrown into a pool and almost beaten to death. The robe was torn to pieces and Sultan Bārsbāy uttered several insulting remarks about Shāh-Rukh. Bārsbāy's reply was scornful and he challenged Shāh-Rukh to meet him in combat. Shāh-Rukh was so awe-struck that he did not dare to raise the issue of the Kiswa again while Bārsbāy's rule lasted.³

¹"Rise of the Ottoman empire" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, fol. 321.

²B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p. 223. See also: G. Wiet, E.I.², art. "Bārsbāy", p. 1054.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 391-92; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols.

It is therefore no wonder that the accession of Sultan Jaqmaq early in 842/1438 was considered by Shāh-Rukh an event worth celebrating. Between 843-48/1439-44, friendly letters, envoys and gifts were repeatedly exchanged and Shāh-Rukh reiterated his request to be allowed to send a Kiswa for the Ka'ba to fulfil his old oath. This was finally granted on condition that the Kiswa was sent to Cairo, and was to be used only for the interior of the Ka'ba. Shāh-Rukh naturally agreed but when his Kiswa reached Cairo in 848/1444 and the news spread there it provoked such a violent re-action on the part of the local population that they attacked, humiliated and plundered the envoys of Shāh-Rukh. After harsh measures to quell the riots the Kiswa was sent to Mecca with the Egyptian pilgrim caravan and was used for the interior of the Ka'ba.¹

In Ramaḡān 856/October 1452 the Kiswa of Shāh-Rukh, together with that of Bārsbāy, were removed and only the Kiswa of Jaqmaq was retained.² Shāh-Rukh was the only non-Egyptian ruler during the Burjī period whose Kiswa was used for the Ka'ba. But this was done in agreement with the Egyptian Sultan and not in defiance of the latter's exclusive privilege.

fols. 135a-b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 26-27; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 373b-74a; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.297.

1. Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 438; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 163a and 167a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 121-23 and 131-32; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 374a-b; idem, Hawādith, vol. I, fols. 6, 14, 25 and 33-35; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 107a and 111b-12a; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.15. idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 297-98; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 17, 45, 67 and 96-98; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 257; see also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.217; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 6; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 105; M. Sobernheim, E.I.², art. "Üakmak", p.6.

2. Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 275-76; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.60; idem, al-Tibr, p.391. See also: Jazirī, op.cit., p. 332; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.219; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 8; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 107.

There was, as a rule, no restriction on the entry of Irāqī pilgrims or their Maḥmal to Mecca, provided their behaviour was correct and that they infringed in no way upon the exclusive prerogatives of the Egyptian Sultans. Obviously the pilgrims from any other areas were not barred from Mecca in normal circumstances. But whether or not any Maḥmal sent by a Timūrid prince, apart from those who were in control of Baghdād early in the 9th/15th century, was allowed in Mecca is uncertain. There is regular mention in the sources of the sporadic arrivals in Mecca of the Irāqī pilgrim caravan, usually after prolonged and frequently occurring absence, with or without their Maḥmal. Though the sources seldom mention the name of the ruler who sent the Maḥmal and simply ascribe the Maḥmal as having been "Irāqī" there can be little doubt that it was sent by the Jalāyirid and the rulers of the Turcoman dynasties of Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu. The Irāqī pilgrim caravans and their Maḥmal were, on the whole, fairly treated and their arrival was usually looked upon favourably by the local population, apparently because of the expected distribution of charities. Even the sources take notice of their absence and usually mention the reason for their delay or absence. This reflects that the Irāqī pilgrims and their Maḥmal were not only expected and accepted but also, at least occasionally, awaited in Mecca.¹

Relations between the Qara Qoyunlu dynasty, the ruler of Baghdād, and the Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt were, on the whole, friendly. In 861/1456-57,

¹For the relevant details, see Ibn al-Furāt, *op.cit.*, vol. IX, part II, pp. 312-13 and 350; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 250-51, 254 and 257; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 63a-b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 298, 306, 318 and 334; vol. III, fols. 98a, 160a and 252a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 76b and 225a; vol. II, fols. 90b and 95a; Ibn Taghrī-Birdī, Ḥawāḍith, vol. I, fols. 282 and 366-67, part II (ed. W.Popper), pp. 305-6, part III, p.546 and 549; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fols. 103, 119, 121, 131, 135, 137, 147, 156, 160, 163, 166, 171, 174, 178, 204, 262-63, 270 and 316; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl fol. 69a; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 164, 386 and 467; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.80; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, p.54; idem, Badā'i' (U.P.), pp. 17, 35 and 48-49. See also: Jazīrī, *op.cit.*, pp. 313, 315, 317-21, 325, 330-31, 335-36, 343 and 590.

a ruler of the former dynasty is reported to have sent an envoy with gifts for the Egyptian Sultan.¹ The matter may have reciprocated and there may have been other similar exchanges. However, relations between the Egyptian Sultan and the last Qara Qoyunlu ruler, Jahān Shāh, does not appear to have been friendly. In Rabi' II or Jumādā I 872/December 1467 or January 1468, when Jahān Shāh was killed during a clash with Uzūn Ḥasan, the latter sent the former's head to Cairo where it ^{was} hung for several days.² This would hardly have been allowed by the Egyptian Sultan if Jahān Shāh had been on friendly terms with the Sultan in Cairo. In 872/1467-68 Baghdād passed to Aq Qoyunlu and initially their pilgrim caravan and Maḥmal were also treated fairly in Mecca and no hostility against them is reported. But in 876/1471 the Amir al-Ḥajj of the 'Irāqī pilgrim caravan tried to secure a leading position in the procession for the Maḥmal sent by Uzūn Ḥasan and suffered personal humiliation and the 'Irāqī Maḥmal was pushed back to the rear.³

In the following year, the 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj made a deliberate attack on the exclusive privileges of the Egyptian Sultan by forcing the Khatīb in Medina to say prayers for Uzūn Ḥasan in the Khuṭba. The 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj, according to Ibn Iyās, compelled the Khatīb to use the title Khādīm al-Ḥaramayn al-Sharifayn as well for Uzūn Ḥasan. The officials and inhabitants in Medina sent the news to Mecca with the warning that the 'Irāqīs intended to repeat this performance in Mecca. The Sharif and Bāsh al-Mamālīk of Mecca awaited the 'Irāqī caravan with a strong force in the outskirts of Mecca. Their Amir al-

¹Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, p.60.

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith (ed. W.Popper), part III, pp. 662-63.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 335. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.337.

Hajj and Qādi were arrested and, though they were first allowed to perform the pilgrimage under custody, were taken to Cairo together with their Mahmal and imprisoned there. The ordinary pilgrims, however, were not harassed and were allowed to perform pilgrimage and depart.¹ In Rabi' II 878/October 1473 these 'Irāqī captives were released as a conciliatory gesture to Ḥasan al-Tawīl (Uzūn Ḥasan).²

But the attitude of the Amirs of Mecca and Medina appears, as a result of this incident, to have become rather hostile to the 'Irāqī. Consequently, the 'Irāqī ruler asked the Egyptian Sultan in Muḥarram 879/May 1474, to instruct the Sharifs of Mecca and Medina to treat his pilgrims fairly.³ Whatever the response of the Egyptian Sultan, the treatment meted out to the 'Irāqī for a further several years, as will be seen, remained rather unfriendly, if not harsh. It is possible that this was in accord with the instructions of Sultan Qā'it Bāy, who does not seem to have forgotten the incident and was still resentful. Probably the support given by the governor of Aleppo in Rabi' II 880/September 1475 to Muḥammad, a disloyal son of Uzūn Ḥasan,⁴ was with the approval of Sultan Qā'it Bāy.

In 880 or 881/1475 or 1476, the 'Irāqī Mahmal was barred from Mecca and other places of pilgrimage but ~~were~~^{was} eventually, after a good deal of effort and, according to Al-Najm Ibn Fahd followed by Jazīrī, in return for money paid to the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj and the Bāsh al-Mamālīk, allowed to enter.⁵ In the pilgrimage season of 886/January 1482,

¹ . Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 338 and 344; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.215; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. III, pp. 84 and 86. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.337; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307b; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 276-77; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 12.

² Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. III, p.87.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 347; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.226.

⁴ Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. III, p.105.

⁵ . Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 352 and 356-57. See also:

the 'Irāqī Maḥmal was again denied access to Mecca and the 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj was arrested and sent in captivity, together with the Maḥmal, to Cairo.¹ In Rabi' II 887/June 1482, Sultan Qā'it Bāy sent a letter to Sharif Muḥammad b. Barakāt I and thanked him for his loyal attitude and his action against the 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj.² In Ramaḡān 887/November 1482, the Sultan urged the Sharif to remain on guard against a possible 'Irāqī pilgrim caravan whose Amir was reportedly instructed to use an 'Irāqī Kiswa for the Ka'ba.³ This appears to have been a mere rumour, as no such action is reported. This is further supported by the fact that the Egyptian Sultan released the above mentioned 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj at the end of 887/January or February 1483.⁴

In the closing years of the Burjī period, especially from 892/1487 onwards, the treatment of the 'Irāqī pilgrims and their Maḥmal in Mecca improved as a result of better relations between Cairo and Baghdād. Even the Sharif occasionally gave the 'Irāqī Amir al-Ḥajj reception on the outskirts of Mecca.⁵

The Sharifs of Mecca and the Yemenite Sultans

As already stated, the Sharifs of Mecca had no independent foreign policy and were and had to be in line with that followed by their Egyptian overlords. The latter were, on the whole, on friendly

Jazīrī, op.cit., p.338; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.277; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 12-13.

¹Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.282; al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 15. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.341.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 18.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 25.

⁴Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.186.

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp.364, 467, 526, 547 and 573; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 56-57; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 89-90, 99, 113, 124-25, 151 and 198; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.466, vol. IV, pp. 7 and 145; idem, Badā'i' (U.P.), pp. 48-49.

terms with the Yemenite Sultans and had granted them some minor privileges. Therefore, the Sharifs of Mecca had to carry out the directives of the Egyptian Sultan.

The Yemenite Sultans, unlike the Jalāyirid of Baghdād and those who followed them, were once a serious rival to the Egyptian Sultan. There can be little doubt that the grant of minor privileges to them was not on a conciliatory basis but for commercial and other financial considerations. This is supported by the fact, as will be seen, that the Rasūlid Sultans of the Yemen lost these privileges shortly after the desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants. On the eve and in the early part of the Burjī period the Yemenite Sultans enjoyed the privilege of having their names mentioned and prayers said for them in the Khuṭba. They were also entitled to send their Mahmal and flag to Mecca and other places connected with the pilgrimage ceremony. It was, on the whole, fairly treated but was sometimes slighted. This occurred only when the Yemenite Amir al-Ḥajj tried to infringe the exclusive privileges of the Egyptian Sultan or the Yemenite Mahmal reached Mecca after a long suspension. In the pilgrimage season of 780 or 781/March 1379 or 1380, for instance, the Yemenite Sultan had, after a long period of suspension, sent his flag, his Mahmal, and, according to Maqrīzī, Ibn Ḥajar and Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, his own Kiswa for the Ka'ba as well. Not only the arrival of the Yemenite Mahmal was unexpected but the presence of the Kiswa in particular infuriated the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj. He refused to allow the Mahmal and even individual Yemenite pilgrims to enter Mecca. Eventually, on the intervention of Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān, the Yemenite pilgrims were allowed, with their Mahmal, to perform their pilgrimage unmolested. Permission to use the Kiswa was out of the question and the Yemenite apparently

had to take it back.¹ Some other sources mention the arrival of the Yemenite Mahmal and flag in the pilgrimage season of 781/March 1380 but without reporting any opposition on the part of the Egyptian of the Amir al-Ḥajj. Nor is the subsequent intervention /Sharif referred to.² According to Ibn Wahhās, the Yemenite Amir al-Ḥajj was imprisoned for a few months on his return to the Yemen in Ṣafar 782/June 1380.³ Whether or not this was connected with some incident during the pilgrimage is not certain. According to Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, followed by Jazīrī, the Yemenite Sultan, following the above stated incident of 780 or 781/1379 or 1380, desisted from sending the Mahmal until 800/1397-98.⁴ However, a report of Ibn Ḥajar entered under 784/1382-83 differs from the above. It indicates that the Yemenite Mahmal reached Mecca in the pilgrimage season of either 784/February or March 1383 or a year before. But the Mahmal was either not allowed to enter Mecca or roughly treated. In consequence of this relations between the Yemenite Sultan and the Sharif of Mecca deteriorated and the former imposed an embargo on Mecca and Yadda.⁵ It is this embargo that may have been partly responsible for the absence of the Yemenites in the pilgrimage ceremony of 785/January 1384.⁶ Thus it is highly probable that, in the closing years of the eighth century of the Hijra/fourteenth century of the Christian era, the Yemenite Mahmal was suspended; what

¹ . Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.250; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 63a; Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 66b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 45b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 100-101; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.312.

² . Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.154; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 424; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, fol. 168. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 313b.

³ Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 170-71.

⁴ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 101. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 312-13.

⁵ Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 71b-72a.

⁶ . Maqrizī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 98a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 103.

is doubtful is when this was done. Despite the suspension of the Mahmal, the Yemenite Sultan continued to send his flag during these years as a symbol of Yemenite participation in the ceremony of pilgrimage.¹ This substitution of the flag for the Mahmal may have originated in the prevention of the Yemenite Mahmal from entering Mecca. This can be inferred from the fact that, in 798/1395-96, the Yemenite Sultan requested the Egyptian Sultan's permission to send the Mahmal to Mecca every year.² This appears to have been granted as, in 800/1397, Sharif Muhammad b. 'Ajlān, a brother of the ruling Amir of Mecca, Sharif Ahmad, visited the Yemenite ruler; he was cordially received and given valuable gifts. He accompanied, on his return journey to Mecca, the Yemenite pilgrims and Mahmal, which does not seem to have met with any opposition. The same Sharif went to the Yemen in the following year, no doubt with the intention of rendering the Yemenites the same service, but the Sultan there decided, for an unknown reason, to refrain from sending a Mahmal that year.³ Whether the Yemenite Mahmal was sent in the following years is not clear, but it is safe to assume that the custom was resumed. The more so, as the prayers said for the Yemenite Sultan were continued at least, as will be seen, until early in Jumādā I 827/May 1424.

¹ . Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 211-12; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 221a-b; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 445; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 841.

² Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. VIII, p.75.

³ . Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.298; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.251; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 63a and 190b, part II, fols. 401a-b; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 176b; Khazrajī, op.cit., fols. 479-80; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 324a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 124-25; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. VIII, pp. 150-51. See also: Jazirī, op.cit., p.316.

Prayers for the Yemenite Sultan in the Meccan sanctuary used to be said on the eve and in the early part of the Burjī period. According to Fāsī, a Meccan Qādi and Khaṭīb (d. 786/1384) said prayers in the Khuṭba for the Yemenite Sultan, and performed certain other religious services on his behalf. He did so, no doubt, with the approval of the Sultan in Cairo and the Sharif of Mecca. The Qādi was very generously rewarded for his services with favours and substantial amounts of money, which in some years amounted to 27,000 dirhams.¹ The prayers for the Yemenite Sultan continued to be said until 801/1398, when they were suspended following the objection on the part of an Egyptian Amir.² The practice was resumed some time later but was suspended again in Rabi' II 804/December 1401 by an Egyptian Amir named Baysaq acting as the deputy of Sharif Ḥasan during the absence of the latter from Mecca in a campaign. But it was resumed shortly after the return of Sharif Ḥasan to Mecca.³ This cycle of suspension and resumption repeated itself again and the prayers were suspended in the pilgrimage season of 826/around November 1423 and resumed again in Jumādā I 827/May 1424.⁴

How long the Yemenite Sultan still continued to enjoy this privilege is not exactly known but, to judge from the absence of references in the sources to the Yemenite Mahmal and the offering of prayer, it is apparent that he lost both privileges shortly after. It is possible that these privileges were conceded to the Yemenite Sultan only for

¹ Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 97a.

² Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 401b and 402b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 125.

³ Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 402b-3a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 130.

⁴ Fāsī, al-‘Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 65a, part II, fol. 420a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 331; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 186 and 188.

commercial consideration. But the desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants around 827/1424, as will be seen, diminished, if not completely wiped out, the need for a concession of this kind, and most likely it was abandoned for good at a later date.

The Egyptian pilgrim caravan and Mahmal reached Mecca annually and maintained its leading position among all others. Only twice within the Burjī period did the Egyptian Mahmal absent itself. Their first absence, in 911/1506, can be ascribed to the rebellious movement in certain areas of the Hijāz¹ and is said to have been later regretted by Sultan Qānsawh al-Ghawrī as detracting from his prestige². The second occurred in 922/1516, when the Mamlūk régime had already received the mortal blow in Marj Dābiq, at the hand of the Ottomans³. Shortly after the final overthrow of the Mamlūk régime in 923/1517 the Ottoman Sultan Selim 1 secured all the privileges once enjoyed by the Mamlūk Sultans in the region of the Hijāz⁴.

¹ See supra, pp. 95-96.

² Ibn Iyās, Bada'i, vol. 1V, pp. 89, 93 and 95. See also: Jazirī, op. cit., p. 355.

³ Ibn Iyās, Bada'i, vol. 1V, p. 112. See also: Jazirī, op. cit., pp. 127, 361 and 364; Iṣāmī, op. cit. vol. 1V, p. 318.

⁴ Ibn Iyās, Bada'i, vol. V, pp. 201, 205-6, 208-11 and 214-15. See also: Jazirī, op. cit., pp. 126-27 and 361; Nahrawālī, al-I'ṭām, pp. 69 and 284-87; Al-Bakarī, op. cit., fols. 38 and 49-51; Iṣāmī, op. cit., vol. 1V, p. 57; Sinjārī, op. cit., vol. 11, fols. 51-54; Tabarī, op. cit., vol. 1, fols. 177-78; Dahlān, op. cit., p. 51.

Chapter III

ILLUSTRATION OF ASPECTS RELATED TO
TRADE AND COMMERCE IN MECCA AND JĒDDA

A. The commercial significance of the Pilgrimage

The annual ceremony of the pilgrimage has always been an occasion of great religio-economic significance. A large number of pilgrims and merchants from all over the Muslim world gathered in the city of Mecca and other places connected with the ceremony of the pilgrimage and intense commercial activities developed simultaneously and parallel with worship and religious ritual. The merger of religious and commercial interests is not incompatible with the teachings of the Sharī'ā. The pilgrimage provided the merchants with a unique opportunity for commercial transactions and was exploited fully in furthering the trading interests of the merchants. For a few days Mecca and its neighbourhood became an emporium to which various merchandise was brought from different countries and was sold, bought, or exchanged without any adverse effect on the city's religious character and significance. Needless to say, the pattern of this activity was familiar in Mecca long before the period under examination.¹

In the Burjī period this commercial significance of the pilgrimage not only continued but increased. It was due, in addition to Mecca's religious significance, to the ever-increasing commercial importance of the area, enhanced by a very suitable geographical location, and facilities made specially available during the pilgrimage. Moreover, the

¹See as token references: Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Jubayr, Tadhkira bi'l-akhbār 'an ittifaqāt al-Asfār (or simply Rihla), 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1907), pp. 119-22 and 178-79; A.J.Wensinck [J. Jomier] and B. Lewis, E.I.², art. "Ḥadīj", pp. 31-38. See also: R.B.Serjeant, op.cit., p.5.

area was ruled by a Sharif appointed by the Egyptian Sultan and the former was comparatively less likely and able to exploit or harm merchants than a powerful Sultan such as those of Egypt or the Yemen. This relative safety must have inspired the Indian merchants to choose J̄dda, after their desertion of Aden, instead of other ports which were directly controlled by the Egyptian Sultan. They naturally could not have foreseen that their arrival would lead the Egyptian Sultan to take almost full control of J̄dda and that they were to suffer the same restriction and exploitation which had forced them to desert Aden.

Usually merchants from the neighbouring countries accompanied the pilgrim caravan, but the advantages of trading in Mecca were so great that they took occasionally the not inconsiderable risk of travelling on their own. Thus, for instance, in 808/1405, when the Syrian pilgrim caravan was not sent to Mecca, some Syrian merchants congregated and set out together on the arduous journey to Mecca.¹

The commercial importance of Mecca was not confined within the pilgrimage season, as this may not coincide with the season suitable for navigation and thus/occasionally unattainable by the foreign merchants coming by sea. Nor was it only professional merchants who participated in the commercial activities. There is evidence to the effect that the visitors who came to Mecca for the 'Umra'² (lesser pilgrimage), and even pilgrims proper, were able to secure material gains through petty trading. For the greater part of the Burjī period a yearly caravan called al-Rajabīyya,³ consisting of visitors for the

¹ Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, p.252; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.317.

² 'Umra' could be performed at any time while the proper Hajj takes place only between 8th and 12th or 13th Dhu'l-Hijja.

³ So named because it usually departed in or around the month of Rajab.

lesser pilgrimage, officials, and other travellers departed from Cairo.¹ Permission to join this caravan was eagerly solicited, as it promised spiritual as well as material benefits and both prospects were so attractive that those turned down were greatly disappointed.²

The intensity of the commercial activities, particularly in Minā,³ and the resultant great financial gains at times motivated merchants to persuade the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj to delay his departure so that they could engage in more trade transactions. It can be said that the merchants succeeded in convincing him more often than not, though at a considerable cost to themselves.⁴ But when the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj found the financial offer of the merchants less than satisfactory, he sometimes even departed prior to schedule - out of

¹This Rajabi caravan seems to have been suspended in 783/1381 and was not resumed until 801/1398. See: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 125; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, p.313. However, this caravan was suspended shortly after and was not sent until 825/1422. Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 64b. It is worth mentioning that this long suspension was in the period preceding the desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants and their making Jeddā the centre of their activities in 827/1424. But from this year onwards the caravan reached Mecca fairly regularly. Obviously, the increased commercial activities in the area were, at least partly, the reason for this regularity. It was not so during the period of relative decline of commercial activities in the area. Ibn Taghrī Birdī, for instance, reporting the departure of Rajabi caravan in 871/1466, states that it was sent after several years (Ḥawādith, part III (ed. W.Popper), p. 527).

²Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 371, 375 and 398; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 127b, 134b and 140b-41a.

³An important seasonal market place, three miles south-east of Mecca, where several ceremonies of the pilgrimage were performed. Minā was an important commercial centre long before the Burjī period and the merchandise bought or sold there varied from petty items to precious pearls and stones. Ibn Jubayr, op.cit., pp. 178-79. This importance of Minā increased considerably during the Burjī period when it became a centre for the spice trade. See: Gaston Wiet, "Les Marchands d'épices sous les Sultans Mamlouks!" éditions der Cahiers d'histoire Egyptienne (Le Cairo 1955, 5 Juin), p.94.

⁴For relevant details, see: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p.254; idem, al-Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 64a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 80a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 147-48; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit. vol. I, fol. 15.

spite - to deprive them of their financial gains.¹

Realizing, on the occasion of his visit to Mecca in 1503 A.D., the religio-commercial significance of the pilgrimage, Varthema states: "Truly I never saw so many people collected in one spot as during the twenty days I remained here. Of these people some had come for the purpose of trade, and some on pilgrimage for their pardon..."²

The chance of material gain in Mecca was so ample that, according to Fāsi, it induced many Egyptian traders to settle there permanently, soon they were able, to the great resentment of the indigenous traders, to dominate the local market. This was not welcomed by the local authorities, but they could do little as these merchants were able to secure, in return for money, the protection of Mamlūk soldiers and prominent men of Ashrāf and Quwwād. The predominant position and exploitation of these merchants continued long after Fāsi's death until they were, according to Maqrīzī followed by later sources, expelled from Mecca by the order of the Egyptian Sultan in 843/1439.³

The huge profit obtainable during the pilgrimage season even through petty trade led some traders to use part of the Meccan sanctuary, against the teaching of the Sharī'a, for the display and sale of various goods. This practice is observable in the pre-Burjī period⁴ as well as in the period under consideration until it was forbidden by the Egyptian Sultan in Dhu'l-Hijja 830/October 1427.⁵ But this practice was resumed

¹Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 140a.

²Varthema, op.cit., pp. 37-38.

³Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 421b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 435; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 229. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.328; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5.

⁴Ibn Jubayr, op.cit., p.181.

⁵Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 90a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 200; Sakhawī, al-Dhayl, fol. 92b. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.324.

later, which is obvious from the report of Varthema who visited Mecca in 1503 A.D. (908 A.H.).¹

Though the commercial activities in Mecca were considerably less in the later part of the Burjī period, it was attractive enough for many Egyptian traders to settle again in Mecca and re-embark on the same course of exploitation which had led to the expulsion of earlier settlers. This is borne out by a Sulṭani edict of 916/1510 ordering the repatriation of these merchants, with the exception of those whose long sojourn in Mecca had gained them the right of residence there.²

Two important points should be mentioned here. First, that the local resentment and the Sultan's opposition to immigrant traders were obviously not directed against all merchants and traders alike, but only against such whose exploitation exceeded the boundaries of legitimate profit and whose conduct conflicted with the interests of the local traders. Second, most of the references to the commercial activities and the collection of taxes occur in connection with foreign merchants. This should not be taken to mean that the commercial activities were left entirely in the hands of foreign merchants, as the native and immigrant merchants of Mecca cannot have remained inactive. Indeed, there is ample evidence to the effect that a numerous community of merchants and traders existed in Mecca and Jeddah in the Burjī period and took a very active part in the commercial activities at home and abroad. Many of these merchants possessed great wealth and some sailed their own vessels. They went on commercial journeys and voyages to various neighbouring and distant countries

¹Varthema, op.cit., pp. 38-39.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 190.

and evidently paid, on their return or on the arrival of their goods, the usual taxes.¹

B. Revenue of the Sharifs from the local tolls and occasional dues

As there is a singular dearth of references to this aspect of the economic life in Mecca in the period in question inferences have had to be drawn, to a certain extent, from evidence about the immediately preceding period, especially as many of them are backed by the contemporary sources as well, which vouch for the continuity of certain facts.

from 832/1429

Unlike other commercial dues which were shared with the Egyptian Sultan the revenue yielded by the tolls belonged in its entirety to Sharifs of Mecca. Most references to the collection of tolls concern grain and other food stuffs imported to Mecca, but the methods of their collection and in what proportion they stood to the total value of the goods is seldom made clear.

¹For the sake of space it is not possible to elaborate this point further but the following sources not only contain evidence supporting the above mentioned statement but also provide valuable additional information: Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 38b, 97a, 147b, 207a, 214a-14b, 282b, 283a, 290a and 311a: part II, fol. 269b, 368a, 410b, 462b, 470b, 474b and 531b: vol. II, part III, fols. 7a, 59b, 65a, 74a, 160b-61a, 199b, 204b, 214a-14b, 234a and 259a-b: part IV, fols. 273a and 381a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 123b-24a; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 254a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 162, 179, 212-13, 222-23, 229, 231, 245, 247-49, 258, 264-65, 291-93, 329 and 346-47; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 45 and 127: vol. V, pp. 28-29, 148, 165, 177, 220-21 and 281-82: Vol. VI, pp. 30-31 and 80: vol. X, pp. 50 and 160; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 100-101 and 276; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 14-15, 282, 310, 517 and 544-45; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 15, 23, 30, 49, 51, 54, 57-58, 64-65, 67, 81-82, 95, 97-98, 108, 114, 125-26, 131, 136, 145-46, 150, 156, 162, 172, 189, 194-95, 214 and 258: vol. II, fols. 4, 7-8, 11, 15, 18, 40-41, 64, 72, 74, 78, 80, 92-96, 98, 105-7, 117-18, 130, 134, 137, 155, 158, 162-63, 165-66, 177, 184, 193, 205, 212, 215-17, 221, 223 and 231; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.270; Abū Makhrama, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 69, 118 and 254.

Obviously, these tolls were no burden to the traders who must have increased the price of the goods to the consumer. Thus the local population was naturally resentful at being forced to pay higher prices for grain and other food stuffs. It is to the credit of the Egyptian Sultans that they repeatedly abolished these tolls, at a certain cost to the treasury, as they often granted the Sharifs of Mecca appropriate compensation for the lost revenue.

The fact that for the early part of the Burjī period no clear reference to the collection of tolls in Mecca can be traced in the available sources is connected with their abolition in the pre-Burjī period by the Egyptian Sultan in Sha' bān 766/May 1365.^{The} Sharif of Mecca was granted 160,000 dirhams in cash and 1,000 Irdab¹ of wheat to be sent from Cairo each year as compensation for the financial loss of the Sharif of Mecca.² Though not complete, some very useful information, especially in the Meccan sources, shows that the abolished tolls used to be levied :

1. On each camel-load of grain coming from Tā'if³ or Bajīla⁴ 1¹/₄ mudd and on that coming from Jēdda one mudd.⁵
2. On each camel-load of fine plain dates 8 Mas'ūdi - a local coin equal to ^adirham - and on ordinary stuffed dates 3 Mas'ūdi.
3. On each sheep and goat 6 Mas'ūdi.
4. On certain items such as butter, honey and vegetables ¹/₆ of the value.

¹A weight, particularly used in Egypt.

²This gives an idea of the amount of revenue the Sharif drew from these tolls.

³A town about 75 miles S.E. of Mecca around 5,000 feet above sea level in the mountains of Sarāt. For further details, see: H.Lammens, E.I.¹, art. "Tā'if", pp. 621-22.

⁴Bajīla, an Arab tribe, the nisba (ascription) is Bajali, part of which lived near the mountain chain of the Sarāt, south of Mecca. For further details, see: W.Montgomery Watt, E.I.², art. "Badjila", p.865.

⁵A Meccan measurement used for grain. This difference was presumably

An excessive amount was charged - in addition to tolls - on the sale of these items in the Meccan market by the local authority, but no relevant details are known.¹

The abolition of the toll did not materially affect the Sharif's financial position, not only because he received the above-mentioned adequate compensation but also because the tax collected from the Indian, Kārimī, 'Irāqī and other foreign merchants was left, in its entirety, to the Sharif of Mecca.² The latter retained, moreover, the rights to impose, as before, certain charges on the traders in the market, craftsmen, measurers, weighers, and brokers. This right was voluntarily renounced by Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān in 774/1372.³

due to the fact that the grain coming from Jēdda was brought there via sea and the merchant most likely had already paid some tax in Jēdda and thus was entitled to reduce toll. While on that brought from Ṭā'if or Bajīla no other tax was paid before its entry to Mecca.

¹Though all the sources given below confirm the facts of the abolition and compensation, they vary in other details. The account given above is based on the version of Fāsī followed by Al-Najm and others and is supported in its essential details by the Egyptian sources as well. Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, vol. IV, pp. 107-8; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, pp. 249-50; idem, al-Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 63a; part II, fol. 540a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 9b and 66a; Ibn Ḥajar, Imbā', vol. I, fol. 28a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 74a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. XI (of the portion published in 12 vols., Cairo, 1929-56), p. 34; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 92; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 311; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 244 and 246-47; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 325; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 59; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 33.

²Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p. 249; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 9b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 92 and 97.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 97.

The revenue of Sharif Ahmad around this year(774/1372) appears to have been at least 300,000 dirhams. This is borne out by the fact that when Sharif Ahmad forced his father 'Ajlān to abdicate in this year or two years earlier - sources differ - the latter did so on several conditions, including that his son would pay to him annually 300,000 dirhams, which was accepted and honoured by Sharif Ahmad.¹ There can be little doubt that the amount promised and paid by Sharif Ahmad formed a part of his total revenue, which seems to have been fairly considerable.

This compensation appears to have been sent regularly to Mecca, at least until the early years of the 9th century of the Hijra. As Fāsi (d. 832/1429) states in his mention of the abolition of these tolls and the compensation received by the Sharif, the arrangement was observed "till the time of writing".² Though Fāsi does not mention the specific year in which he wrote that passage, it is evident from the following that it must have been before 824/1421, as in Rabi' I of that year (March 1421) an edict was sent to Mecca to order the abolition of the recently re-introduced tolls. But whether or how much compensation was paid this time is not clear. Some sources such as Fāsi followed by Al-Najm Ibn Fahd refer to the dispatch by the Sultan of a sum of 1,000 dinars in another context, where this amount is said to have been given by the Sharif of Mecca to the Egyptian Amir al-Hajj but sent back by the Sultan, where it is clearly not a question of compensation. However, the passage seems to have been misinterpreted

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 286b; Ibn Taghri Birdi, al-Manhal, vol. I (of the partly published part of this source, Cairo, 1375/1955), pp. 369-70; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol.II, fols. 96-97. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 246-47.

² Fāsi, Shifa', vol. II, p.250.

by later authors as a reference to the compensatory grant and, among them, 'Iṣāmī gives the amount of compensation as 20,000 dinars.¹

Probably the arrival of a large number of Indian merchants in Jēdda, and the subsequent improvement of the Sharif's financial position, had rendered the petty gains obtained from local tolls of little value. This may be the reason why no reference to such tolls is made for many years. As will be seen, within a decade or two after their arrival many Indian merchants drifted back to Aden and thus caused a setback to the commercial prosperity of the Meccan region. It seems that in this period the tolls were repeatedly re-imposed and abolished but other details are unfortunately seldom provided.

In Rabi' I, 850/July 1446, for instance, an edict abolishing these tolls was sent to Mecca, which indicates that they were re-imposed earlier.² But whether or not the order was implemented is uncertain. The doubt arises from the fact that Sakhāwī reports a clash in Dhu'l-Hijja 851/February or March 1448, between a group of 'Arabs and the men of the Sharif over the toll on the sheep brought by the 'Arabs for sale, but the latter were unwilling to pay the toll demanded.³ This indicates that the Sulṭani order of the previous year was either not carried out or the tolls had been re-imposed. But another version of Sakhāwī and of Al-Najm Ibn Fahd points to the fact that the clash was not over tolls but over an attempt at appropriation of some of the sheep.⁴ In any case, these tolls were definitely

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 65a; part II, fol. 417b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 179-80; see also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.205; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.38; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 347; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 81; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.40.

² Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 261.

³ Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 186-87; idem, al-Daw', vol. X, p.272.

⁴ Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.11; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 267.

re-imposed some time before 855/1451, as can be inferred from an edict sent from Cairo in this year by which they were abolished again.¹

This ruling appears to have been observed for a fairly long period, but the old practice must have reappeared some time before 872/1467 when it was forbidden again,² only to be re-introduced in time to give a Sharif of Mecca the opportunity of abolishing voluntarily in 903/1497. This reference of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd mentions only that the abolished toll was collected from the caravan of Bajīla and amounted to half an Ashrafi on each camel's load of grain.³

The Egyptian Sultan interfered little with the activities of the traders in the local market of Mecca. But in 890/1485 the traders were instructed, apparently for reasons of hygiene, to transfer their activities to shops which had been recently built by order of the Sultan.⁴ Presumably these were rented and the amounts obtained sent to the royal treasury. It could be assumed that the Sultan's concern with the health of the Meccans was motivated by financial considerations.

There are some vague references in the sources from 817/1414 onwards, but with a long interruption in between, to the effect that occasionally the pilgrims, particularly the Iraqis, were subjected to the payment of a tax on their entry into Mecca or at their departure from the city. These references, however, do not give any amount obtained from them, nor make it clear whether it was imposed on the pilgrims themselves or on the goods brought into or bought by them in Mecca.⁵

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 273.

²Ibid., fol. 319. See also: Nahravālī, al-I'lām, p.223; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.43; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. II; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 124; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.44.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 218.

⁴Ibid., fol. 63.

⁵For relevant details, see: Fāsī Shifā', vol. II, p.257; AlNajm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 16; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 20.

There are a few direct or indirect examples in various sources to the effect that slave trade was conducted in Mecca and some indications are found in Al-Najm Ibn Fahd's reports showing that the local Sharifs obtained certain amounts as their dues on transactions of this kind, but there is otherwise remarkably little information on this subject.¹

In 909/1503 a toll of a completely new kind was introduced in Mecca. On each camel or Shuqduf² six Muḥallaq - a Meccan coin^{which} replaced Masūḍī - and on each donkey three Muḥallaq were levied on the departure of the caravan on behalf of the Sharif of Mecca³ and were presumably exclusively imposed on the mounts of the merchants.

Varthema, who visited Mecca in 1503 A.D., may have been referring to these tolls in his statement that two "Seraphim" (evidently a misnomer for Ashrafi) were charged on each camel-load of spices.⁴ However, this report of Varthema may have meant a different tax, as the value of two Ashrafi was much higher than six Muḥallaq and moreover this tax, being imposed on spices, was most likely collected for the royal treasury in Cairo, and not on behalf of the Sharif of Mecca.

In addition to these tolls and his share in the 'Ushr - discussed later - the Sharif of Mecca obtained occasionally a considerable

¹For the relevant details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 277 and 372; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 645b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 99, 166, 244 and 247; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. Al-Hassu), p.545; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, p.70; vol. VI, p.11; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 5, 99, 117 and 228; vol. II, fols. 132 and 162.

²A kind of wooden chair or seat usable by two persons fastened on the back of a camel and used by the travellers, one person on each side of the camel.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 54-55.

⁴Varthema, op.cit., p.51.

amount of money, as their dues, from the merchants in certain circumstances, and often on the basis of an arrangement between themselves and the merchants. But before going into detail, it is imperative to mention a few points relevant to the payment of such dues by the merchants.

As has been seen during the discussion of the occasional elevation of the Sharif to Niyāhat al-Saltana and the Meccan dependencies, the authority of the Meccan Amirs extended to the almost entire coastal area between Jeddā and the Yemen. When the Sharif acquired the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān it was extended, theoretically at least, to all the coastal and other areas in the Ḥijāz. But when the Sharif of Mecca was no longer Nā'ib al-Sultān his official authority in the north of Jeddā, particularly the coastal area, was recognised between Jeddā and Rābigh.¹ The Sharifs took possession of all the goods aboard a foundered or abandoned vessel within their territory,² but only a quarter of the cargo of the damaged but unabandoned vessels which were bound elsewhere but unable to continue their journey. In Ṣafar 804/October 1401, for instance, a Kārimi vessel was damaged on its voyage from the Yemen to Egypt near Jeddā. The Sharif of Mecca claimed the quarter of the goods but the merchants paid him 65,000 Mithqāl, apparently of gold, instead.³ The cargo aboard this vessel belonged to a son of al-Muḥallī, a prominent courtier of the Egyptian Sultan, and al-Muḥallī's reaction was quite vehement and he almost brought about the downfall of the Sharif in question.⁴ A mixture of

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 11a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 350

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 11a.

³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 403b; vol. II, part III, fol. 255a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 129.

⁴ See supra, p. 62.

diplomacy and luck enabled the Sharif to get away, to keep the amount and to secure further gains from the death of al-Muḥallī's son.¹

In 809/1406, the Sharif obtained again a considerable sum of money from the owners of goods aboard a Kārimī vessel damaged near Jēdda. The exact amount paid by the merchants, in return for the Sharif's customary quarter, is not clear, but the sources refer to this payment, together with the amount derived from the confiscation of the property of Jābir al-Ḥarāshī, an official of the Sharif in Jēdda,² stating that the total sum obtained by the Sharif was 40,000 Mithqāl.³ In view of the figure given earlier for a similar situation there can be little doubt that most of it came from the merchants.

Sharifs of Mecca even took one quarter of the charitable gifts which constituted the load of a damaged ship; such was the case in 813/1410, when a ship carrying gifts from a ruler of Bengal for the Amir and inhabitants of Medina was damaged south of Jēdda.⁴

In 822/1419 the Sharif of Mecca obtained from a damaged Kārimī vessel, evidently in return for his traditional claim of a quarter of the cargo, 10,000 Afranti (or Iflori).⁵ In the following year, the Sharif obtained from a Kārimī vessel, on the same basis, 2,000 Afranti. Unfortunately for him, the cargo belonged to the Egyptian

¹See infra, p. 260.

²See infra, p. 245.

³Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 404b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 136.

⁴Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 406b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 147. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.200; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.35; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol.74.

⁵Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 415b-16a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 175.

Sultan who rebuked him but took no further action.¹ This incident may account for a change in the attitude of the Sharif, as there is no evidence to support the continuation of this practice in years to come, despite the intensity of the commercial traffic.

¹ Fāsi, al-Iqd, vol. 1, part 11, fol. 416a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. 11, fol. 177.

Chapter IV

SHARE OF THE SHARIFS IN THE 'USHR OBTAINED
IN JEDDA WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE
TO THE YEMENITE AND THE INDIAN MERCHANTS

The gist of a statement by Qalqashandī indicates that though Jeddah and Mecca were the destination of merchants from various countries, the Yemenites and the Indians, even prior to their desertion of Aden, represented the most considerable source of income for the Sharifs of Mecca.¹

There is evidence to the effect ^{that} the merchants from Sawākin, Zayla' and Berbera were also active and brought supplies of grain and other foodstuffs. The 'Irāqī merchants too brought occasionally merchandise for sale in Mecca. What exactly these were is not clear, but the quantity seems to have been considerable. Thus, for instance, in Dhu'l Hijja 830/October 1427, an 'Irāqī caravan was plundered during its journey to Mecca and many merchants were to suffer great material loss. The goods belonging to one merchant alone were loaded on 100 camels.³ Obviously these and other merchants coming from the areas within the Egyptian domain have benefitted, in one way or the other, the Sharifs of Mecca and the local merchants. These paid taxes which, in the pre-Burjī period, were reserved for the Sharifs of Mecca⁴ but during the period under consideration ^{most of} such revenues seem to have been reserved for the treasury in Cairo.

¹Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, p.276.

²For details see: Fāsi, Shifā', vol. II, pp.274 and 276; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 369; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 545; Al-Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 70, 86, 101, 119, 153, 160 and 168; vol. II, fols. 21, 32, 56, 62-63, 71, 119, 123, 133, 141, 205-6, 253 and 268; Jazirī, op.cit., p. 339.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349.

⁴See supra, p. 154.

A. The revenue obtained from the Yemenite merchants

As the revenue obtained from the Yemenite merchants was left, usually in its entirety, for the Sharifs of Mecca, it will be appropriate to illustrate the great benefits which the local Amirs must have derived from the visits of the Yemenite merchants in respect of revenue and of the import of various goods, particularly spices. It is a known fact that in the early part of the Burjī period the Yemen, and particularly the port of Aden, was among the most important centres of the spice trade and most of the Indian merchants made Aden their favourite port where they sold their merchandise, which was carried to other places, including Mecca, by the Kārim or other Yemenite merchants. It was this commercial importance of the Yemen that found reflection in its cordial relations with neighbouring areas and far distant countries. The close examination of the Yemen's politico-commercial relationships with other countries is outside the scope of this thesis. But a brief glimpse of the influential position of the Yemenite Sultan, which occasionally affected the affairs and internal situation of Mecca, will not be out of place. To begin with, the privileges enjoyed in Mecca by the Yemenite Sultans¹ were apparently due to commercial considerations. Likewise, the valuable gifts sent by the ruler of Dahlak² in 787/1385 and later,³ by the Amir of Ḥaly in 790/1388,⁴ and the gifts sent by the Qādi and Muslim merchants of Calicut, in southern India, and the far more significant fact that the prayers were said for the Yemenite Sultan in Khuṭba there in 795/1392 or 1393⁵ and possibly in the following years

Khuṭba

¹ See supra, pp. 142-46.

² Archipelago off the west coast of the Red Sea, opposite Muṣawwa (Eritrea). For further details, see: S.H. Longrigg, E. I. C., art. "Dahlak", pp. 90-91.

³ Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 182 and 193.

⁴ Ibid., p. 198.

⁵ Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., p. 244; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 460.

as well, were all due to the same commercial interests.

This long established relationship between the Yemen and other parts of the world was bound to develop ^{relationship} cordial personal/ between the Yemenite Sultans and various other rulers. Thus, for instance, in 798/1395, an Indian prince, during a political crisis in his homeland, took refuge in the Yemen.¹ In 802/1399, an Indian ruler sent valuable gifts to the Yemenite Sultan.² In 800/1397 or 1398 an envoy sent by the ruler of Ceylon (now called Sri Lanka) reached Yemen with friendly greetings and valuable gifts. In this very year, eighteen embassies of various rulers went to the Yemen, including the envoys of Egypt, India and the Sharif of Mecca.³ In 811/1408 a Muslim ruler of Ḥabasha⁴ requested the help of the Yemenite Sultan against a Christian ruler in the same region.⁵ This request was apparently based, in addition to religious sentiment and geographical proximity, on commercial reasons. The same considerations kept the relation between the Yemenite and the Egyptian Sultans more or less cordial, especially in the early part of the Burjī period, and there were frequent exchanges of envoys and valuable gifts.⁶

¹Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.285; Khazrajī, op.cit., fols. 474-75.

²Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.310; Khazrajī, op.cit., fols. 584-86.

³Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.297; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 479; Ibn al-Dayba. Qurra, p.174.

⁴Ḥabash, Ḥabasha (Abyssinia), a name applied in 'Arabic usage to the land people of Ethiopia, and at times to the adjoining areas in the Horn of Africa. For further details, see: E. Ullendorf and others, E.I.², art. "Ḥabash, Ḥabasha", pp. 2-8.

⁵Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 493.

⁶For the relevant details, see: Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 458-59; Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 182, 186, 193, 198, 283, 294-95 and 307; Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. V, p.37; vol. VIII, pp.72-76; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 65b and 95b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 341; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 650b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 43a; Khazrajī, op.cit., fols. 434, 437, 474, 478, 480 and 484; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 191-92; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 629; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.35; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit.,

By 823/1420 the commercial importance of the Yemen seems to have reached its highest point with the arrival of three Chinese vessels bearing various goods and bringing also an envoy of the Chinese ruler with valuable gifts for the Yemenite Sultan. The Chinese envoy was well received, and the Yemenite Sultan reciprocated.¹ These Chinese envoys seem to have been sent by the Ming emperors and this may not have been the first and the only contact between China and the Yemen. Professor B. Lewis, referring to the commercial activities of the Chinese, states:

"... In the early fifteenth century, Chinese junks began to sail as far as the Red Sea. Under the Ming emperors, China had entered on a new era of commercial prosperity, and sought new outlets in the west. Efforts to re-open the overland routes through Persia came to nothing, and the Chinese directed their main efforts to the Red Sea, where they exchanged embassies with the Yemen."²

There can be little doubt that this Chinese move was motivated by their wish to find an important market to sell their merchandise, and they seem to have succeeded.

It is against this background that the commercial activities of the Yemenite merchants in Mecca and Jidda and the subsequent revenue of the Sharifs of Mecca can and should be viewed. Though substantial evidence clearly indicates that the Yemenite merchants frequently reached Mecca and Jidda and played a significant role in the commercial activities there, very little is known about the nature of their merchandise or about the sums they paid in taxes. However, it can be

vol. II, fol. 189; Ibn al-Dayba^c, al-Faql, fol. 113b; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. I, p. 307; idem, 'Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 143b.

¹Khazraji, op.cit., fol. 494; Ibn al-Dayba^c, Qurra, pp. 177-78.

²B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p. 224.

inferred from some clear evidence or oblique remarks in the sources that, in the early part of the period in question, spices were the main merchandise and that the dues paid on them were considerable.

The Yemenite Sultans were fully aware of the importance of their merchants for the commercial prosperity of the Meccan region. Whenever their relations with the Sharifs of Mecca were strained, they imposed commercial embargo to compel the Sharif in question to accept the Yemenite point of view in commercial or other matters. In 784/1382, for instance, following a dispute over the Yemeni Mahmal, an embargo of this kind was imposed and was only lifted after attempts at conciliation on the part of Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān.¹ The Yemenites do not seem to have returned to Mecca or Jeddā before 786/1384, as in the previous year not even the Yemenite pilgrims reached Mecca.²

In 799/1396-97, the Yemenite merchants, deterred by the lack of law and order, avoided Jeddā and went to Yanbu' instead. Consequently Sharif Hasan b. 'Ajlān suffered a considerable loss of revenue and had to take certain measures, including reductions in taxes, before he succeeded in bringing the merchants back to Jeddā.³

Obviously, any embargo imposed on Mecca was a financial loss to the Yemenite merchants and the state treasury, as well, but they seem to have managed to sell their goods elsewhere without much difficulty or suffering material loss. This may account for the over-sensitivity and harsh reaction of the Yemenite Sultan against any objectionable act of the Sharifs of Mecca and explain also why the Yemenite merchants observed fully such decisions. In 812/1409, Sharif Hasan ill-treated

¹Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol.I, fols. 71b-72a.

²Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 98a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol.II, fol. 103.

³Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 400b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 123.

a Yemenite notable named al-Hibbī and extorted money from him during his sojourn in Mecca. This incensed the Yemenite Sultan who imposed an embargo on trade with Mecca which was not lifted until the Sharif sent his apology to the Sultan and promised to repay the extorted amount.¹ But whether or not the merchants returned to Jēdda or Mecca on their usual scale is not certain. In any case, shortly after a fresh dispute led to the re-imposition of the embargo. This new dispute originally began from the delay of the Sharif in the settlement of compensation which caused the anger of Ibn Jumay', a relative of al-Hibbī and a prominent Yemenite courtier who, in 813/1410, confiscated the property of one of the Sharif's men in the Yemen. The Sharif retaliated by confiscating the belongings of Ibn Jumay' in Mecca and Jēdda. Though the Sharif had informed the Yemenite Sultan that this act of retaliation was against Ibn Jumay' alone and not against the Yemenites in general, this justification or assurance was not accepted and an embargo was imposed in 814/1411. The resulting severe repercussions compelled the Sharif to send an envoy to the Yemen in 815/1412 with 10,000 Mithqāl, apparently gold, and to promise to pay 20,000 more as repayment of the amount which he took from al-Hibbī. Simultaneously, the Sharif asked for the embargo to be lifted; this request was eventually granted but not without some reluctance.² It is significant to note that in 815/1412-Ibn Ḥajar hesitates between this year and 825/1422 - the Egyptian Sultan, in urgent need of a large quantity of spices and particularly pepper, could not secure his requirements but through the Yemenite merchants in Mecca.³ In 816/1413, however, /the embargo was imposed again, an

¹ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 405b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 142-43.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 406b-7a and 408a-8b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 148-51 and 153.

³ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 255; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 30b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 153.

act which was provoked partly by the ill-treatment of the Yemenite merchants in Mecca and partly by the Sharif's failure to acquit himself of the remaining two-thirds of the debt. It was at this time that Rumaytha¹ went to the Yemen and was shown favour by the Yemenite Sultan which was no doubt the consequence of his displeasure with Sharif Hasan. The embargo remained in force for several years and may have been maintained for such a lengthy period because of the internal instability in Mecca, which led the merchants to substitute Yanbu' for J'dda. It was not until 821/1418 that the Yemenite merchants returned to J'dda and Mecca and the region, thanks to Sharif Hasan's various efforts, regained its lost commercial activities, prosperity and importance.²

Not only in Mecca but in Cairo too the affect of the Yemenite embargo was felt, especially when the relationship between the Egyptian and the Yemenite Sultans was not too cordial. Thus, for instance, in 816/1413, when the Yemenite Sultan imposed embargo on trade with Mecca, this seems to have been extended, intentionally or accidentally, to Egypt itself and the absence of direct commercial links seems to have affected badly the Egyptian economy. This is evident from the fact that the Egyptian Sultan requested the Yemenite ruler to send merchants to Egypt but does not seem to have received a favourable reply.³

Here, it should be mentioned that the visit of the Yemenite merchants to other Hijāzi ports was not confined to the period when a Yemenite embargo was imposed on J'dda but they went to these ports in normal circumstances as well. Thus, for instance, in 823/1420, a number

¹See supra, p. 66.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 409b, 410b-11a and 413a-14b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 155, 157-58, 162, 164, 169-70 and 172-73.

³Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 270a; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 2a; Sakhāwi, al-Daw', vol. I, p.268.

of Yemenite vessels called at Jeddah but went on to Yanbu'.¹

The commercial vessels reaching Jeddah during the pilgrimage season were - with the exception of the early days of Dhu'l-Hijja - not allowed to unload their goods anywhere but on the pier of Jeddah especially reserved for this purpose. This was evidently devised with a dual aim in view: it was intended to ensure the easy collection of the full dues, and the safety of the merchants and merchandise. An official of Sharif Hasan who disregarded this rule in 800/1397 was punished by being blinded.²

The sources seldom specify the number of commercial vessels which actually reached Jeddah or the amount of tax obtained, in cash or kind, by the local authorities. However, occasionally available figures - usually quoted in connection with the amount paid by the owners of damaged or foundered vessels³ or paid by the Sharifs of Mecca to their Egyptian overlords⁴ of their to secure the continuation/rule and subsequently the revenue — prove that both were considerable. This is supported further by the fact that in the later part of the period under consideration the revenue was shared, as will be seen, by the Egyptian Sultans. Obviously the amount must have been attractive enough to induce these Sultans to disregard the exclusive right of the Sharifs of Mecca.

The fact that about twenty Yemenite vessels are said to have sunk in the pilgrimage season of 790/November or December 1388,⁵

¹ Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 416a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 177.

² Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 401a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 124.

³ See supra, pp. 159-61.

⁴ See infra, pp. 226-33.

⁵ Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p. 199; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 440.

and over thirty in 794/October or November 1392,¹ in the course of a storm on their way to Jeddah, indicates that the commercial activities of the Yemenites and the revenue obtained by the Sharifs of Mecca were substantial. The above mentioned foundered vessels were apparently carrying both merchants and pilgrims and obviously they were only a part of the Yemenite fleet, and the remainder presumably reached Jeddah in safety. In Ramaḍān 802/June 1400, more than ten large Kārīmi vessels reached Jeddah together with other Yemenite ships. Though no exact figure is given the tax collected by Sharif Ḥasan is described as quite considerable.²

Though the Yemenite merchants continued to enjoy commercial importance throughout the Burjī period, their impact was far greater prior to 825/1422, the year of the Indian traders' exit from Aden. Any absence of the Yemenite merchants, whatever its cause, not only unfailingly resulted in financial loss for the Sharif and the local trade, but also in the concomitant rise of prices and shortage of certain goods in Mecca. Thus was the case in 792/1390,³ 817/1414,⁴ and 824/1421.⁵

The desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants was undoubtedly a great but not a fatal blow to the Yemenite economy. As will be seen, not only the Yemenite merchants continued on a reduced scale their activities, but it was not long before some of the Indian merchants

¹Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 312-13; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 193b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 156a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 117. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.315.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 402a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 127.

³Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part I, p.327.

⁴Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 60lb.

⁵Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 59b.

themselves chose Aden again as a centre of their trade. One of the results of this revival of the commercial importance of the Yemen was, as will be seen, that the revenue obtained from the Yemenite merchants, usually left in its entirety for the Sharifs of Mecca, was shared from time to time by the Egyptian Sultans.

The Yemenite merchants usually came via the sea but occasionally used a land route. The Sharifs of Mecca were evidently indifferent to the route these merchants used as long as they paid the taxes. But in the closing years of the Burjī period the Sharifs of Mecca, faced with serious financial problems and suspecting the Yemenites of using land routes to avoid payment of dues, discouraged and sometimes prevented such caravans from coming to Mecca. In the pilgrimage season of 914/March or April 1509, adverse winds prevented the Yemenite vessels from maintaining the desired speed on their voyage to Jeddā. A group of the Yemenite merchants and pilgrims, led by a certain 'Affī b. Marzūq, disembarked and headed for Mecca by land. They were regarded as ordinary pilgrims and allowed in the city and the merchants paid no dues. Sharif Barakāt II resented this loss of revenue and instructed his deputy in al-Qunfudha to prevent the Yemenites - apparently the merchants - from travelling to Mecca by land, which the deputy did in the following year. Another group of Yemenite merchants reached Jeddā by sea and the Sharif took from them, in addition to the usual dues, 2,400 Ashrafi as a loan.¹

B. The revenue obtained from the Indian merchants

As already pointed out, the Indian merchants used to go to Mecca and Jeddā well before the Burjī period,² and the levy imposed on their

¹Ibn al-Dayba', al-Fadl, fols. 145b-46a; idem, Qurra, fols. 227-28.

²See supra, p. 154.

goods must have been of great value for the Sharifs of Mecca. The interest of the Egyptian Sultan in the Red Sea and eastern trade could also be traced long before the period under examination.¹

However, despite the arrival of some Indian merchants and the availability of the Indian merchandise in Mecca and Jeddah, it was the Yemen and more precisely the port of Aden which had become a favourite port for the Indian merchants and subsequently a far more important centre of trade in spices and other eastern commodities, and remained so for many years in the Burji period. According to Heyd, the Yemenite Sultans imposed restrictions on trade with Egypt which were resented by the Indian merchants.² In view of this the Mamlūk Sultans of Egypt were - for obvious commercial and financial reasons - more than desirous to divert this important trade to their own domain but only Sultan Bārsbāy (825-41/1422-38) succeeded.

"A period of upheaval and extortion in the Yemen, coinciding with the consolidation of Egyptian control in the Hijāz, gave Bārsbāy his opportunity. Rather than face the exactions and uncertainties of Aden, the eastern merchants sailed right past the southern port, and made for Jeddah, where the Egyptians tried to create conditions attractive to them. As Aden declined, Jeddah rose, becoming one of the main commercial ports of the Mamluk empire."³

The desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants and their arrival at Jeddah was at the invitation of Sultan Bārsbāy.⁴ This must have been resented by the Yemenite Sultan but there was little he could do.

In 825/1422, an Indian Nakhudha⁵ from Calicut named Ibrāhīm, resenting the lack of equity on the part of the Yemenite Sultan, bypassed Aden and, desirous of finding a substitute for the port of Aden

¹See, for instance, B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 223-224; R. Hartmann [Phebe Ann Marr], E.I.2, art. "Djudda", p.572.

²W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1923), vol. II, p.445.

³B. Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 224-25.

⁴G. W. Wiet, E.I.2, art. "Bārsbāy", p.1054.
⁵Captain of a vessel.

for himself and his compatriots, anchored at Jēdda. Sharif Ḥasan b. 'Ajlān failed to realize the significance of this move and, presumably under some economic pressure and financial need, or simply motivated by his greed, appropriated Ibrāhīm's goods and Ibrāhīm, dismayed, departed with a grudge. In the following year Ibrāhīm tried the ports of Sawākin and Dahlak but also had reason to be more than dissatisfied with the treatment he received there. Meanwhile, the news of Sharif Ḥasan's unjustifiable act had reached Cairo and Sultan Bārsbāy instructed the Sharif to make good the losses suffered by the Indian merchants, but this order does not appear to have been obeyed. This defiance may account for the deposition of Ḥasan by 'Alī b. 'Anān.¹

This concern of Sultan Bārsbāy for the injustice suffered by Ibrāhīm was evidently for reasons of his own financial interest and not for the sake of justice itself, as he himself can hardly be regarded as a just ruler. According to G. Wiet, "From the moment Barsbay acceded to the Sultanate, he displayed the salient features of his nature: greed, bad temper, and cruelty..."²

The newly appointed Amir of Mecca, Sharif 'Alī, was apparently instructed by Sultan Bārsbāy to do his best to induce the Indian merchants to come and to treat them fairly. Therefore, when in JumādāI 827/ May 1424, Ibrāhīm returning with two vessels intended to by-pass Jēdda, he was most cordially invited by Sharif 'Alī and Qarqmas, commander of an Egyptian force, to anchor at Jēdda. Ibrāhīm accepted and was fairly treated, he sold his own goods and those of other merchants with reasonable profit and paid the usual 'ushr. The merchants having made large gains departed satisfied.³ Thus, in this year, the Indian merchants

¹Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 419a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 334-35; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 182 and 184-85. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 322-23; W. Heyd, op.cit., vol. I, p.379; vol. II, p.445; G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.98.

²G.Wiet, E.I.², art. "Barsbāy", pp. 1053-54.

³Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 420a; idem, Shifā', vol. II, p.211;

finally chose, among the Red Sea ports, Jeddah for their main commercial centre. The exact amount obtained in 'ushr is not clear but whatever it may have been it was left in its entirety for Sharif 'Alī. But after this year the sum obtained from the Indian merchants in 'ushr and other dues was reserved, completely or mostly, for the treasury in Cairo.

The Yemenite Sultan seems to have been thinking of preventing the Indian commercial vessels from crossing the straits of Bāb al-Mandab for Jeddah which became known to Sultan Barsbāy, who decided to send, in or around Jumādā I 828/April 1425, two Egyptian vessels to Haly.¹ This was evidently intended to be a warning to the Yemenite Sultan who seems to have promised to leave the Indians' trade unhindered.²

In 828/1425, fourteen Indian vessels reached Jeddah with various goods and paid 'ushr to the Sultani officials in Jeddah. The amount thus obtained was sent to Cairo. According to Maqrīzī, followed partly or fully by other sources, forty Indian and other vessels called at Jeddah in 829/1426. He states that the total amount of the revenue sent to Cairo exceeded 70,000 dinars, an act which is commented upon bitterly by Maqrīzī and others. There is some uncertainty whether this amount consisted of the revenue of both 828-29/1425-26 or was exclusively of the later year. Be it as it may, it indicates the remarkable growth of Jeddah, at the expense of Aden, a fact explicitly pointed out by Maqrīzī and other sources.³

Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 335; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 76b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 188; see also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; 'Isāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.260; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 349; W.Heyd, op.cit., vol. II, p.445; G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.98.

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 191.

²W.Heyd, op.cit., vol. II, p.445.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 335, 339-40 and 383; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 53; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 192 and 215. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 322-23; Sinjārī, op.cit.

In view of the facts mentioned above, it is by no means surprising that Sultan Bārsbāy decided to divert to Cairo all the revenue obtained from the Indian merchants in 828-29/1425-26 which exceeded 70,000 dinars. In 831/1428, various spices and a quantity of cloth obtained as 'ushr in Jeddā were brought to Cairo and valued there at about 50,000 dinars.¹

Thus, in these last years, the Sharifs of Mecca were not to profit from the huge amount of revenue obtained from the Indian merchants, as it was delivered in its entirety to Cairo. This was obviously an unjustifiable act, as the Sharifs of Mecca were after all the immediate rulers of the area and thus were entitled legally and morally to the local revenue.

Whether it was the influence of pious circles in Egypt,² or the opposition on the part of the brothers of Barakāt I,³ and above all the resentment of the Sharif himself against the Sultan being the only beneficiary of the 'ushr collected from the Indian merchants, Sharif Barakāt I was given, in Rabi' I 832/January 1429, the legal right to one-third of the yield of this tax. However, what was the amount to be received is not made clear in the sources.⁴ But in view of the figures given in connection with the previous years it is safe to assume that it was substantial.

vol. I, fols. 349-50; W. Heyd, op. cit., vol. II, p. 445; G. Wiet, Les Marchands, p. 98.

¹ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 351. See also: G. Wiet, Les Marchands, p. 99.

² Though such circles hardly enjoyed sufficient power to influence the Sultan's policies they did, at least at times, register their disapproval. For instance, in 833/1429, they suggested as a remedy against the plague, a curb on the malpractices of the Sultan which affected the merchants. See: Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 103a.

³ See supra, p. 176 and infra, pp. 228 and 270.

⁴ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fols. 205 and 208. See also: Jazīrī, op. cit., p. 325; Sinjārī, op. cit., vol. II, fol. 3; Daḥlān, op. cit., p. 42.

The Indian commercial vessels reached Jēdda with their usual merchandise almost annually but the references to their arrival seldom provide data related to their number, quantity of goods, and the amount of money obtained from these merchants, but both the merchandise and subsequently customs dues seem to have been substantial. Professor B. Lewis states:

Bārsbāy's Red Sea policies gave him greater control of commerce, and a great increase in customs revenue from Jēdda and from the Egyptian ports on African side. 'Every year', says a near contemporary author,¹ 'more than a hundred ships call at Jēdda, some of them with seven sails, and provide an average annual revenue of 200,000 dinars.'²

This may have been the case - especially in the period which immediately followed 828/1425 - but the data in the contemporary sources used in this thesis is not so explicit.

Maqrīzī followed by Ibn Ḥajar and others relates that, in or around Shawwāl 835/July 1432 a number of Chinese junks laden with various merchandise such as silk, china ware, and perfume, arrived in Aden but, unable to effect a sale there, went to Jēdda where they were well received and paid the usual 'ushr and were able to sell their goods.³ This shows, on the one hand the decline of Aden and, on the other, the extent of Jēdda's growth. Though no exact figure is given concerning the amount paid by these Chinese as 'ushr, it must have been considerable and one-third of this revenue was apparently given to Sharif Barakāt I. Whether or not the Chinese merchants re-visited Jēdda is uncertain.

¹He, as referred to by Professor B. Lewis, was: Khalīl al-Zāhirī, Zubdat Kashf al-Mamālik, ed. P. Ravaisse (Paris, 1894), p.14.

²B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.225.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 372; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 111b. See also: W.Heyd: op.cit., vol. II, p.445; G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.99.

The unfair treatment of the Indian merchants by the officials of Sultan Bārsbāy in Jēdda seems to have increased, particularly around 837/1433. These merchants were subjected to various exploitation, being made to pay, in addition to the usual 'ushr, a certain amount on behalf of and to the officials of the Sultan in Jēdda,¹ and furthermore they were compelled to buy certain goods such as coral and copper which were sent by Bārsbāy or his officials. This was strongly resented by the merchants, some of whom decided in 837/1433 to choose Aden again as their port of call.² This renewed preference for Aden must have caused great concern to Bārsbāy whose financial position seems to have been rather weak at this time.³ To counter this drift back to Aden, Sultan Bārsbāy sent an edict to Mecca in 838/1434, to the effect that the 'ushr was to be the only tax collected from the Indian merchants, that Egyptian and Syrian merchants who had purchased merchandise in Aden and transferred it to Jēdda, or any other place in the Egyptian domain for that matter, were to pay two-tenths of its value as double 'ushr, a punitive tax/ⁱⁿ⁻tended to act as deterrent which must have been felt as a strong blow by these merchants. The edict also ruled that the goods brought to Jēdda by Yemenite merchants were to be confiscated. The edict was rather harsh where it related to the

¹According to R.B.Serjeant the Egyptian Pasha of Jēdda (meaning the official in charge of Jēdda) was granted a portion of the custom duty itself. See: The Portuguese, p.5. As will be seen, this is indicated in the latter part of the Burjī period by the contemporary sources.

²Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 383; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 670a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 215-16. See also: G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.100.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol.380.

Syrians and Egyptians and particularly to the Yemenites. Sharif Barakāt I felt compelled to ask for the withdrawal of these orders - evidently with the exception of the one concerning the Indians - and his request was granted.¹ Obviously, Sharif Barakāt I was more concerned with what happened to the Yemenites, as he must have been most anxious that nothing should prevent them from coming to Jēdda, which would result in a loss of dues which they had hitherto paid exclusively to the Sharifs of Mecca.

This withdrawal of the edict by Sultan Bārsbāy was obviously ascribable in a higher degree to practical commercial considerations than to his sense of justice, for oppression unalterably remained a dominant feature of his policy. Even the envoys were, at times, ill-treated as a result of some occurrences which were not of their doing. This manifests itself most clearly in the cruel treatment of the Bengali envoys. Sultan Bārsbāy had, prior to 839/1435-36, sent an envoy with gifts to a ruler of Bengal, Jalāl al-Dīn Abu'l-Muzaffar Muḥammad. The latter selected some return gifts, which were valued at about 12,000 gold "tanka",² a figure given by most sources, apart from Ibn Ḥajar who briefly refers to the event without supplying any figures. But Jalāl al-Dīn died before he could send the gifts. His successor, al-Malik al-Muzaffar Aḥmad Shāh, transmitted the gifts of his father with additional presents from himself. During the voyage to Cairo, Bārsbāy's envoy died on the island of Maldivē. Its ruler took possession of the

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 383; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 127b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 215-16. See also: W.Heyd, op.cit., vol. II, p.446; G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.99-100 .

²So, in Arabic text, but this may have been a corrupt form of some other terms, such as "taka", still used as a major currency in Bengal equal to Indo-Pak rupees. According to Qalqashandī, one "tanka" was a unit equal to three mithqāl. There were silver and gold "tanka" called white and red "tanka" respectively. One hundred thousand tankas equalled a "Lukk" (apparently the present Lakh in Indo-Pakistani usage). See: Ṣubḥ, vol. V, pp. 84-85.

belongings of the deceased envoy, but made no attempt to appropriate the gifts themselves. The vessel carrying the Bengali envoys and gifts foundered near Jedda and, though some of the gifts were salvaged and the envoys survived, the greater part of the gifts was lost. The envoys could hardly be made responsible for this misfortune but were, by order of the Sultan, arrested and taken to Cairo where their personal belongings were confiscated. Sultan Bārsbāy, in retaliation against the ruler of Maldives, confiscated the goods which belonged to the merchants of that area.¹

Despite the Sultan's cruel propensities, his relations with Sharif Barakāt I appear to have remained rather friendly. The share of the Sharif in the revenue obtained from the Indian merchants was raised in Jumādā II 840/January 1347 from the hitherto one-third to one-half of the total amount obtained.²

Though Sultan al-Zāhir Jaqmaq (842-57/1438-53) is praised for his piety he too was unwilling or unable to put an end to the policy of state monopolies of spices and other trade initiated by Bārsbāy.³ However, he sought and secured in 843/1439 by a well-phrased fatwa⁴

¹ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 393; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 134b-35a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 214-15 and 218-19; see also: G.Wiet, Les Marchands, pp. 100-101.

² Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 219. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.327; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 3-4; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 102; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.42.

³ For relevant details, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, part II (ed. W. Popper), pp. 349-52. See also: M. Sobernheim, E.I.², art. "Çakmak", p.6; G. Rentz, E.I.², art. "Barsbāy", pp. 1053-54.

⁴ This term means a formal statement of 'ulamā' (sing. 'ālim; a scholar of the Islamic sciences relating to the Qur'an, Ḥadith, theology and jurisprudence) on a point of Shari'ā. Though fatwa could be given by any 'ālim, usually it was done by a jurisconsult known as a muftī. See: J.R. Walsh, E.I.², art. "Fatwa", pp. 866-67.

the approval of the 'ulamā'. It is interesting to note that he tried to justify the collection of taxes by his financial need to maintain a body of soldiers in Mecca to guard the safety of the merchants.¹

In the same year Sultan Jaqmaq issued a decree to the effect that henceforth only 'ushr was to be collected and that all additional dues were to be abolished.² Jazmaq's attitude towards Sharif Barakāt I seems to have been somewhat unfriendly, as he reduced, in the same year, the share of the Sharif in the 'ushr from one-half to one-quarter only.³ Sinjārī states that the Sharif was completely deprived of all the revenue except that obtained as escheat.⁴ But Sinjārī, who is a late source, cannot be given credence against Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, a contemporary source, who was obviously more aware of the details concerning the decision in question.

For reasons mentioned earlier,⁵ Sharif Barakāt I was deposed by his brother 'Alī in Jumādā I 845/September 1441, who too was deposed in the following year by Abu'l Qāsim. A few years later Barakāt I was re-appointed and remained in control well after Jaqmaq's death.⁶ Whether or not the share of any of these Sharifs of Mecca was officially

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 433-35; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 121-22; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 229-30; see also: G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.102.

²Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 435; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 129; see also: Jazirī, op.cit., p.328; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 229.

⁴Manā'ih, vol. II, fols. 4-5.

⁵See supra, pp. 76-78.

⁶For the relevant details, see supra, pp. 81-83.

raised from one-quarter to a higher proportion is uncertain. Assuming that the reduction made in the share of Barakāt I continued to be the case for his successors, it may not have weakened their financial position too badly as Jaqmaq's comparatively fair treatment revived the commercial importance of Jedda. In Dhu'l-Ḥijja 845/April or May 1442, for instance, a large number of mercantile vessels reached Jedda with various goods, including valuable items such as pearls and cornelian. About five hundred camel-loads of various merchandise were taken daily to Mecca.¹ How long this continued is not clear, but if it lasted only a few days on such a scale it must have involved a huge quantity of goods which is indicative of a lively commercial activity in the area and, subsequently, the amount obtained in 'ushr must have been substantial but, as so often, no figure is given by the sources.

In Ṣafar 846/June or July 1442, from the details concerning a conflict between Barakāt I and his brother and ruling Amir of Mecca, Sharif 'Alī, it could be assumed that the revenue obtained from the merchants in Jedda was considerable and that the share of Sharif 'Alī in the 'ushr was raised to half the total amount obtained from the Indian merchants in that port. This assumption is made on the basis that Barakāt I, during his occupation of Jedda, demanded from the merchants aboard a number of Indian and other vessels anchored at the port 4,000 dinars as 'ushr on each vessel. The merchants showed willingness to pay provided that Barakāt I assessed the amount due from each vessel according to the value of its goods. During the argument with Barakāt I the merchants went as far as to offer him a total sum of 40,000 dinars - as equivalent to half the 'ushr which they seem to have already paid to Sharif 'Alī - but Barakāt I refused

¹Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 173b; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 18-19.
See also: G. Wiet, Les Marchands, p. 102.

to accept it, and demanded 100,000 dirhams (dinars).¹ Whether Barakāt I received any amount of money from them is not clear as he was ousted from Jedda by his brother shortly after.²

In any case, this clearly shows that the part of Jedda was called at by a large number of the merchants and the 'ushr paid by them was considerable. In 854/1450 Timrāz, an official of Jaqmaq in Jedda escaped with the total tax collected there, the figure of which is reported to have been either 30,000 or 50,000 dinars.³ Presumably this figure represented the share of the Sultan alone and was not the total revenue, as most likely the share of Sharif Barakāt I was already paid.

During the Sultanate of al-Malik al-Ashraf Ināl (857-65/1453-61) both the commercial activities and the revenue obtained from the merchants in Jedda seem to have been fairly considerable. Ibn Taghrī Birdī states that at the end of Dhul'l-Hijja 863/October 1459, the 'ushr in Jedda was paid by the merchants in kind and the quantity brought to Cairo amounted to 7,400 takrā⁴ of pepper. He describes the revenue obtained as being so substantial that it had no precedent.⁵ Though no clear reference to the share of the then ruling Amir of Mecca, Sharif Muḥammad b. Barakāt I, is made apparently his share must have been equally significant.

Though the port of Jedda was never completely abandoned in the Burjī period by the Indian and other merchants, from the time of Sultan Khushqadam (865-72/1461-7) it began losing ground to the port of Aden. This decline of Jedda is more observable during the rule of

¹In the source the word dinār is used several times except at this point where the word dirham is mentioned instead, which is confusing. Which of the two it was in reality is difficult to ascertain. However, in view of the fact that in the text dinar is used several times one can assume that the use of dirham was a slip of the pen.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 237-39.

³See infra, pp. 291-92.

⁴What exactly this term meant is not clear, but possibly it was used

Sultan Qā'it Bāy (873-901/1468-95). Obviously this has weakened the financial position of these two Sultans as well as of the Amir of Mecca, Sharif Muḥammad, who outlived them both. As so often, the sources do not provide explicit data relevant to the causes of this decline but from some indications it can be established that the frequent internal strife in the region of Mecca and the resulting suffering of the merchants who were harassed by the unruly elements or exploited by the Sharīfī or Sulṭānī officials had accelerated the decline of Jedda. Possibly the comparative political stability and fairness of the new Tāhirid rule in the Yemen which began in 860/1456¹ had much to do with the renewed commercial activities in Aden, especially as some Tāhirid rulers abolished certain tolls and taxes, obviously to attract merchants,² and their justice was noted and praised even by foreign travellers.³

Sultan Qā'it Bāy is reported to have been faced with financial difficulties soon after his accession to the throne.⁴ This obviously was not entirely due to the relative decline of Jedda but this must have aggravated his difficulties. It is attributable to his desire, as well as of those who followed him, to stop the decline of trade in Jedda and other ports that they issued decrees ordering the just

for sacks.

⁵Hawādith, part II (ed. W. Popper), p. 327.

¹Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, vol. I, fol. 397; part II (ed. W. Popper), p. 284; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, fol. 189-91.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fol. 87; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, fol. 195.

³G. Wiet, Les Marchands, p. 102.

⁴Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Hawādith, part III (ed. W. Popper), p. 635.

treatment of the merchants.¹ The restrictions imposed in 881/1476 on the export of coral and other merchandise, so desired by the Indian merchants, from Cairo to the Yemen were apparently connected with the wish to lure the Indian merchants back to Jedda.²

The revival of the port of Aden seems to have benefitted Sharif Muḥammad more than the Sultan, in the sense that the Yemenite merchants were able again to bring to Jedda considerable quantities of goods which were much in demand, such as spices, and paid large sums in 'ushr. It is known that the tax obtained from the Yemenites was left in its entirety for the Sharifs of Mecca and was not shared by the Egyptian Sultans. Thus, the increase in this revenue benefitted the Sharifs of Mecca but not their Egyptian overlords. In 881/1476, however, Sultan Qā'it Bāy ruled that the revenue obtained from the levy imposed on Indian or other merchandise brought to Jedda was to be shared equally between himself and Sharif Muḥammad.³ Such merchandise was usually brought by Yemenite vessels and this ruling of the Sulṭān meant that the revenue was no longer reserved for the Sharif, who thus lost half of his revenue from this quarter, and the treasury in Cairo benefitted from this encroachment on a long established and recognized right of the Sharifs of Mecca.

However, from 886/1481, the whole revenue obtained from the Yemenite vessels was restored to Sharif Muḥammad.⁴ But from 895/1490, the share of the Sharif in the revenue obtained from the Yemenites or

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 319; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 202 and 205-6; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 35, 38 and 214; vol. II, fols. 134-35 and 149; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.51.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 356. See also: Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 12.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 356 and 368. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.338; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.277; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 12.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 374. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 340 and 685.

those regarded as such was again reduced to one half and the other half reserved for the royal treasury/in Cairo.¹

Sultan Qā'it Bāy is praised for his fairness and justice,² but his financial encroachment on the Sharif's rights reflect the extent of his financial need. It was this which led him to issue an order in 894/1489 to his officials in Jedda instructing them to take 'ushr on the merchandise which belonged to Egyptian dignitaries - apparently without differentiating between imports and exports - whose privileged tax position was thus terminated.³

From a report of Ibn Iyās concerning the sinking of an Egyptian vessel in 912/1506 it is evident that the involvement of the Egyptian Amirs in trade transactions to and from Jedda was considerable. The merchandise sent by some was valued at 10,000 dinars.⁴

Though it was not unusual for the Egyptian Sultans or the Sharifs of Mecca to extort money from merchants or to confiscate their goods,⁵ the deportation of some merchants from Mecca to Cairo between 894-5/1489-90 for the purpose of extorting money from them was an extraordinary act indicative of Qā'it Bāy's weakened financial position.⁶

Despite the fact that the general population of Mecca had little direct connection with the commercial activities in the region, their financial position was undoubtedly affected in one way or another

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 120, 157, 159, 168 and 213. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.346.

²Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 202 and 205-6; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.51.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 108.

⁴Badā'i', vol. IV, p.103.

⁵This sometimes went so far that some left Mecca for good. See: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 462b: vol. II, part III, fol. 65a and 78b; Abū (Bā) Makhrama, op.cit., vol. II, p.69.

⁶For further details, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 436 and 460-61.

with the intensity or decline of trade in the region. Various references in the sources show that in the later part of the period under consideration the commercial activities in the area were in continuous decline¹ and consequently the financial position of many Meccans was weakened and they suffered hardship.²

This decline must have reduced the revenue obtained from the merchants in Jedda, affecting the financial position of Sultan Qā'it Bāy as well as of Sharif Muḥammad, especially the latter, whose income from the Yemenites was also cut by half. However, no figures are given in the sources concerning the total revenue and the share of the Sultan or the Sharif in the closing years of the 9th century of the Hijra/15th century of the Christian era.

Qā'it Bāy's son and successor, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (Dhu'l-Qa'da 901-Rabi' I 904/August 1496-November 1498) had inherited acute financial difficulties. Unable to improve the revenue through better commercial policy, he seems to have adopted a policy of exploitation. Thus, for instance, in Shawwāl 902/June 1497 the Sultan instructed Sharif Muḥammad and officials in Jedda to buy pepper for the Sultan at the price of the previous year - which was obviously cheaper - and in the same quantity. The officials were ordered to prevent the Syrian merchants from leaving Jedda with their merchandise.³ This presumably implied sending them to Egypt for the payment of dues and the order was apparently carried out.

¹For details, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 427, 458, 495 and 544-45; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 9, 18-19, 23-24, 30, 33, 107, 119, 129, 156, 228, 248 and 258; vol. II, fols. 29, 39, 80-81, 92, 141, 158 and 193.

²Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 257, 317, 354, 427, 454 and 458; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 119.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 213-14.

Varthema who visited Mecca in 1503 A.D. found that the quantity and variety of goods in Mecca failed to come up to his expectations, but describes them nevertheless as considerable.¹ He found in the port of Jedda about one hundred vessels of various sizes,² many of which must have served purely commercial ends.

It seems that the frequent disruption of law and order in the area by Yahya and his supporters³ had made the merchants rather reluctant to come to Jedda and Mecca and they preferred to carry out their commercial transactions in the relative safety of Aden. This port seemed to have regained much of its old importance and was teeming again with ships. Thus, for instance, early in 911/June or July 1505, about eighty Indian and other commercial vessels were anchored there.

This seems to have made the Sulṭānī officials in Jedda envious and they sent a messenger to these merchants with an invitation to come to Jedda. They are reported to have shown willingness but made certain undisclosed conditions. So the messenger had to return to discuss them with the Sharif and the Nā'ib of Jedda, who presumably agreed, as the messenger rushed back to Aden in order to deliver the reply before the merchants' departure from that port.⁴ Apparently it was in response to this invitation that, at the end of the same year, about thirty-seven vessels of Indian, Hurmūzi and Yemenite origin reached Jedda.⁵

¹The travels, pp. 38-39 and 49-50.

²Ibid., p.54. See also: G.Wiet, Les Marchands, p.102.

³See supra, pp.95-96.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol.87.

⁵Ibid., fol.109.

The rebellious movement of Yaḥya grew to unforeseen proportions and Nā'ib Jedda Amir Ḥusayn al-Kurḍī felt obliged to instruct the ruler of Sawākin in Ramaḡān 911/February 1506 to refrain from sheltering Yaḥya's supporters. Amir Ḥusayn had also instructed the ruler of Sawākin, for obvious commercial reasons, to deny entry to such vessels as did not anchor there as a rule.¹ This appears to have been disregarded which, in addition to the Portuguese threat, may have contributed to the occupation of Sawākin by the Egyptians in the following year.²

Amir Ḥusayn had, for political as well as financial reasons, imposed a commercial blockade on Yanbu'. In Ṣafar 912/June or July 1506, three commercial vessels heading for Yanbu' were intercepted by an Egyptian combat vessel. Two of them, with their cargo, and goods of the third vessel, which was damaged, were brought to Jedda and the merchandise sold to the merchants.³

In view of such internal disorder, the harmful effect of the Portuguese, and the exploitation by the local authorities, the decline of Jedda is not surprising. The wonder is that the commercial activities there continued, even on a modest scale, despite all the unfavourable conditions and obstacles. The revenue must have been decreased but it was not negligible. In 913/1507, for instance, the share of Sharif Barakāt II and his brother Qā'it Bāy in the revenue of Jedda is reported to have been 10,000.⁴ Obviously a similar amount at least was sent for the treasury in Cairo. In 915/1509, the

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 103.

²Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.96.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol.123.

⁴Ibid., fol. 131.

amount obtained in Jedda for Sultan al-Ghawrī is said to have been 70,000¹ but the references mention/ neither of these two cases whether it was a question of dinars or of dirhams.

Ibn Iyās, reporting under 920/1514, states that since 914/1508 no commercial vessel reached Jedda.² Evidence from others sources amply proves that this was not the case. In addition to the figures mentioned above, the fact that in 916/1510 four Indian commercial vessels managed to reach Jedda, though some of them were chased by the Portuguese, indicates clearly that the port of Jedda was by no means abandoned or ceased to function as an important commercial centre. The captains of these vessels informed the local authorities that three more Indian boats were on their way to Jedda.³ G. Wiet⁴ points to quite a lively trade in Cairo which received spices and other merchandise from India, Persia and Mecca as late as 918/1512.⁵

In the closing years of the Burjī period, the Portuguese became a serious threat to Jedda itself. Ibn Iyās reports the arrest of three Faranj⁶ spies in Mecca in Jumādā I 916/September 1510. These were disguised as Turks and were sent in chains to Cairo.⁷ In all

¹Ibid., fol. 165.

²Badā'i', vol. IV, p.359.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 177.

⁴On the basis of the account given by J. Thenaud.

⁵Les Marchands, p.95.

⁶The Arabic term for the Franks. For further details, see: B. Lewis, and J. F. P. Hopkins, E.I.², art. "Ifrandj", pp. 1044-46.

⁷Badā'i', vol. IV, p.191. See also: Ahmad Darrāj, al-Mamālik wa'l-Faranj fi'l-Qarn al-Tāsi' al-Hijrī (Cairo, 1961), p.147.

probability, they were Portuguese and were busy gathering information on the political, commercial and military strength of the area. Though no Portuguese attack on Jeddah, during the period in question, occurred,¹ their activities in other parts of the world, particularly in India and the Red Sea, was the main reason for its decline. Ibn Iyās, followed by al-Bakarī, attributes this to the unjust treatment of the indigenous and foreign merchants in Jeddah and other Egyptian ports by the Sultan and his officials but, from his own account and details provided by a number of modern scholars it is evident that such oppressive policies were contributory factors and not the main cause, as after all this was not the exclusive case in the closing years of the Burjī period but had been a long established practice. Thus, it is certain that this decline was not brought about by certain individuals, but by a combination of several reasons - both local and international - including the Portuguese menaces which were undoubtedly a major factor and dealt a heavy blow to the Egyptian domination of the spice trade. From the early tenth/sixteenth century the Portuguese fleets had almost continuously harassed and intercepted the Indian and other commercial vessels and had made several armed attacks on various Muslim rulers. They were able to establish their naval supremacy in eastern water and subsequently took control of the spice trade. Lisbon had been growing fast at the expense of Jeddah and other Egyptian ports and had become the most important centre of the spice trade. It is interesting to note that Ibn Iyās, while

¹A Portuguese commander, Lapo Soares de Albergaria, is reported to have sailed to the Jeddah harbour in 923/1517 in pursuit of the Mamlūk fleet commanded by Salmān Re'is but declined to attack the city because of its powerful fortifications. See: R.Hartmann, E.I.2, art. "Djudda", p.572.

referring to the scarcity of various commodities in Egypt in the closing years of the period in question does not refer to spices, which implies that this trade had been diverted from Egypt to Portugal, a fact explicitly mentioned by modern scholars.¹

¹For details, see: Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 44-46, 109, 287, 317, 359 and 433; vol. V, pp. 88 and 186; Al-Bakarī, op.cit., fol. 29; B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 228-29; R.B.Serjeant, op.cit., pp. 13-17 and 35; A.Darrāj, op.cit., pp. 127-29, 132-34, 136-38, 146 and 154-56; W.Heyd, op.cit., vol. II, p.427, 510-14, 517-29, 533-37 and 547-50. See also the sources mentioned on p. ~~295~~ infra, fn. 1.

Chapter V

FINANCIAL GAINS OF THE SHARIFS FROM
THE SOURCES NOT RELATED TO TRADE

A. Gifts

The personal gifts the Sharifs of Mecca received from the Egyptian Sultans, the royal family or the Egyptian nobility were usually of great value. These when sent by their Egyptian overlords, were either a form of help from sovereign to subordinate, or were compliments returned. They were not politically motivated as the hold of the Burjī Sultans over the Ḥijāz was so great that they hardly needed to propitiate the Sharifs of Mecca. But such gifts were not only materially useful for the Sharifs, they had political significance as well. They obviously reflected the favour of the Sultan and the Sharif in question must have exploited the occasion to boost the morale of his supporters, to put pressure on his opponents, to strengthen his authority within the Meccan region and to enhance his prestige, if not influence, among other local chiefs and Amirs.

The first grant of valuable gifts, during the period under consideration, was during the rule of Sultan Barqūq. In Sha' bān 794/ July 1392, the Sultan summoned to Cairo the Sharifs 'Alī and 'Anān, joint Amirs of Mecca, on receiving the news of their animosity against each other and appointed 'Alī sole Amir of Mecca.¹ The Sultan showered the Sharif with costly gifts. They consisted of 3,000 Irdab of wheat, 1,000 Irdab of barley, 1,000 Irdab of beans, ten Mamlūks and forty horses, including a mount which had belonged to the Sultan and whose

¹See supra, pp. 60-61.

saddle and bridle were ornamented with pure gold. A number of Egyptian Amirs also presented the Sharif with various valuable gifts including Mamlūks and horses.¹

In or around Shawwāl 797/August 1394, Sharif Ḥasan was released and appointed Amir of Mecca following the assassination of his brother 'Alī in Mecca.² Sultan Barqūq granted him, on his departure from Cairo, military and financial support which included a quantity of grain which had earlier been sent to Yanbu' for sale. Early in 798/November or December 1395, Sharif Ḥasan reached Yanbu' and demanded its Amir, Wubayr b. Mikhbār, should hand over the grain. The latter showed reluctance and Ḥasan prepared for battle, but this was averted when Ḥasan was compensated for the grain by the Amir of Yanbu' with 35,000 dirhams.³

In Jumādā I 845/October 1441, Sharif 'Alī was appointed Amir of Mecca following the deposition of Barakāt I by Sultan Jaqmaq.⁴ Sharif 'Alī, before leaving Cairo, was granted 5,000 dinars by the Sultan.⁵

¹ Meccan sources confirm the details as mentioned above, but the accounts of Egyptian sources - though agreeing in essential points - differ slightly. Ibn al-Furāt followed by Maqrīzī, for instance, gives most of the over-stated details but differs from other sources on the gifts of Mamlūks and horses by the Egyptian Amirs. Instead they add that 'Alī was allowed to employ one hundred Mamlūks. Ibn Ḥajar followed by Ibn Taghrī Birdī and Janābī merely refer to various gifts describing them as being substantial but without giving details of each item.

For the points mentioned above and other relevant details, see: Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 303-4, 306 and 308; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fols. 193a-93b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 155a-55b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 137b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 120b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 116-17. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 304b.

² See supra, p. 61.

³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 499b-500a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 121. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 103-4; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 333; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 63.

⁴ See supra, p. 78.

⁵ Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 686b; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 14-15.

In Shawwāl 918/January 1513, Sharif Abū Numayy II, accompanied by a number of Meccan notables, paid a visit to Sultan al-Ghawri in Cairo and were well received.¹ Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd states that the Sharif was given valuable gifts but provides no further details. He mentions, however, that those who had accompanied Abū Numayy II received between 60-200 dinars each.² According to Jazīrī, the Sultan granted the Sharif 3,000 gold dinars and minor sums to his companions.³ ‘Iṣāmī states that the gifts received by Abū Numayy II consisted of a flag and forty Mamlūks.⁴

Early in 921/1515, Sharif Barakāt II accompanied the royal family to Cairo.⁵ During his stay and on his departure he was treated with unusual courtesy and was presented with various gifts which included several thousand dinars, a number of Mamlūks, horses, and a quantity of cloth.⁶

As will be seen, several Indian rulers took a keen interest in charitable works in Mecca and often sent valuable gifts to the Sharifs of Mecca. The gifts sent by these or the rulers of other areas -excluding Egypt - may not have been given without ulterior motives. The intention might have been to win minor concessions such as permission for their men to gather together in the sanctuary and say prayers for their ruler at private meetings. Though the offering of prayers at such meetings was neither of any political significance nor was restricted unless opposed by the authorities for one reason or another, it was not without some importance and at least it must have provided some satisfaction to the rulers concerned. These rulers seem to have

¹See supra, pp. 96-97.

²Bulūgh, vol. II, fols. 220-21.

³Durar, p.359.

⁴Simt, vol. IV, pp. 309-11.

⁵See supra, pp. 97-98.

⁶For details, see: Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 256 and

sent their gifts also to secure the Sharif's help in building and maintaining pious and charitable institutions, or last but not least, to ensure that their merchants and pilgrims were fairly treated in Mecca.

Several mentions^{of} gifts of Indian provenance, in cash or kind, occur in the sources within the period in question. But the data available seldom provides additional information.¹

Occasional references to gifts of the Yemeni Sulṭān to the Sharifs and officials of Mecca are found in the sources. They mostly concern the early Burjī period and do not seem to have been of great material value.²

Sharifs of Mecca seem to have been entitled to the receipt of some fixed amounts from the rulers of certain countries and there are references to the / effect that they occasionally claim their dues by sending special envoys to Egypt,³ 'Irāq⁴ and Hurmuz.⁵

Varthema states that he, during his stay in Mecca in May, 1503 A.D., saw two unicorns which were presented by "a king of Ethiopia, that is, by a Moorish king" to the Sharif of Mecca, either Barakāt II

259-60; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i, vol. IV, pp. 436-42, 445-49 and 453-57. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.360; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.317.

¹ Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.11; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 288b, 405a and 406b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 242a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 104, 112, 136-37, 147 and 164-65; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 151. See also: Nahrawālī, al-'Ilām, pp. 13 and 198-99; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 304a and 305a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 34-35; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 338; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 73-74; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.37.

² For details, see: Ibn Wahhās, op.cit., vol. II, p.298; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 97a; Al-Najm; Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 150; Khazrajī, op.cit., fols. 479-80

³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 404b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 136.

⁴ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349.

⁵ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 204.

or his brother, Ahmad al-Jazānī, as a prelude to an alliance.¹

However, this statement is not supported by any other source and it is difficult to believe that a foreign ruler had attempted to form an alliance with a Sharif whose military strength, at its best, could hardly have been able to assist a distant ally.

B. Sharif's customary claim to one-third of the Sadaqāt²

As will be seen, a number of Muslim rulers, officials and dignitaries sent to or distributed in Mecca a considerable amount of charities. They consisted partly of personal donations, in cash or kind, and partly of the revenue of Awqāf³ set up in favour of the holy cities, Mecca and Medina, or for other pious purposes.

Though figures or quantities of such donations are rarely mentioned in the sources the use of certain set phrases or occasional reference in the sources to the figures and quantities of such donations, as will be seen, indicates that the amounts in question were considerable and their obvious aim was to benefit the poor and needy. However, to judge by the details found in the sources, especially in Al-Najm Ibn Fahd and his son Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, this was rarely the

¹The Travels, pp. 46-49.

²Sing. "Sadaqa", charity. This term is sometimes used as synonymous with Zakāt, that is, the legal and compulsory poor-tax (~~see above, pp. 33-35~~). But more frequently and accurately this term is used to denote the voluntary alms-giving. See: T.H. Weir, E.I.¹, art. "Sadaqa", pp. 33-35.

³Sing. "Waqf", endowment. The term waqf or Habs in Muslim legal terminology means primarily to protect a thing, to prevent it from becoming the property of a third person (tamlīk), but it is widely used for a pious endowment. For further details, see: Heffening, E.I.¹, art. "Wakf or Habs", pp. 1096-1103. Endowments established for pious purposes are usually called "Waqf khayri", while those for the benefit of the donor's family are referred to as "waqf Ahli".

case. The general pattern of the distribution observed with all charitable donations - on the basis of the details provided by the aforesaid Meccan historians - was almost immutable. The distribution lay - with the exception of the Egyptian al-Šurr al-Hukmī and al-Dhakhīra¹ - seemingly sent separately to the Qādis of each particular school or to the individual concerned respectively- in the hand of the Qādi Shafa'i of Mecca. The Sharifs of Mecca took, exclusive of the Egyptian Sadaqa, one-third² of the whole amount as his due and the lion's share of the remainder was distributed among the Qādis and various other officials, especially among those attached to the Meccan sanctuary. This may have been a long established practice but explicit references to this effect are found from 881/1476 onwards.³

This claim of the Sharifs of Mecca to one-third of the donation, or the exclusive privilege of the Qādi Shafa'i were rarely questioned; neither was the eligibility of the Qādis, Imāms and other officials as recipients of large portions of the charities. The share of the poor,

¹The word Šurr literally means "a sealed bag of money" and the whole term al-Šurr al-Hukmī denotes the allowance or the salary derived from the revenue of endowments. As to al-Dhakhīra, the term which is vaguely translated as "treasure or treasury", was applied to sums sent individually from the state treasury or the personal fortune of the Egyptian Sultan in grants or for the benefit of certain welfare works. See: Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 303a-3b and 306a-6b; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.285; Al-Bakari, op.cit., fol. 51; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 53-54; 'Alī al-Ṭabari, op.cit., fols. 130 and 132; Ṭabari, op.cit., vol.I, fol. 178.

²R.B.Serjeant, referring to the revenues of the Sharifs of Mecca, states that Sharif Barakāt I took one-fourth of these contributions. See: The Portuguese, pp. 5-6. This, however, does not seem to have been confined to this Sharif but was common to all the Sharifs who claimed usually one-third as their due.

³For details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 359; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 44, 46, 51, 59, 64, 124, 138-39, 151-52, 186, 192, 198 and 216; vol. II, fols. 83, 114, 123-24, 152 and 211-13.

the ostensible beneficiaries, was the smallest, and it appears doubtful, in the light of the above mentioned pattern, in respect of the distribution, whether it was a question of abuse by local authorities or whether part of these donations was intended, from the outset, as grants for these officials.

The customary claim of the Sharifs of Mecca to one-third of the Ṣadaqa was, on the whole, recognized by the Egyptian Sultans as well as by the contributors. The Ottoman Sultan Selim I (918-26/1512-20) seems to have been reluctant to accept this right of the Sharifs. This is evident from a report of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd that in 919/1513 the Egyptian Sultan informed Sharif Barakāt II that the Ottoman Sultan had consulted him about the validity of this claim and that he (i.e. al-Ghawri) had confirmed that the practice was long established and observed.¹

As has already been stated, the figures concerning the amount of contributions is seldom given in the sources and thus it is not possible to give the exact figures concerning the revenue of the Sharifs of Mecca through their customary share in the Ṣadaqāt, but a rough estimate is possible on the basis of the few figures available mentioned in the chapter dealing exclusively with Ṣadaqāt.

C. Sharif's right in al-Mawārīth al-Ḥashariyya (escheat).²

This was one of the sources of revenue for the Sharifs of Mecca and of the Egyptian Sultans.

¹ Bulūgh, vol. II, fol. 226.

² It is necessary to explain a few essential points before going into details relevant to the revenue of the Sharifs of Mecca through this source. Mawārīth (sing. Mirāth, legacy); Ḥashariyya (derived from Ḥashr, doomsday). The term al-Mawārīth al-Ḥashariyya means "succession to the inheritance of persons dying without legal heirs". See: N.J. Coulson and others, E.I. 2, art. "Bayt al-Māl", p. 1144.

The nearest English equivalent to al-Mawārīth al-Ḥashariyya is escheat which is used in this discussion with some reservation. It

The amount of money obtained from escheat appears to have formed a regular and fairly substantial portion of the total revenue and officials who were mainly concerned to claim it were appointed in both Cairo¹ and Mecca.² It seems that from 896/1491, if not earlier, Nāzir al-Mawārith al-Ḥashariyya even accompanied the Egyptian pilgrim caravan in order to secure the escheat.³

In the early part of the Burjī period, the escheat of those died in the Meccan region was claimed in its entirety for the Sharifs of Mecca, who seem to have refrained from encroaching on the rights of the legal heirs. Thus, for instance, when at the time of Sharif

is known that the term escheat denotes the acquisition by the state of the property of a person who dies intestate and without issue or next of kin. Al-Mawārith al-Ḥashariyya also is taken over by the state but differs from escheat in the sense that in certain circumstances it could be acquired by the state even despite the existence of some heirs. This is due to the fact that according to Muslim law of inheritance the distribution of legacies is based on a twofold consideration. Certain relatives are entitled to inherit their fixed share and are termed Ashāb al-Furūd while some others take - in addition to their fixed share - residue after each of the Ashāb al-Furūd has received his recognized percentage of the total estate, and are termed 'Uṣba (sing. 'Asīb). The details concerning both these groups are too long and complicated and could not be given in such a brief note. The important point in respect of this discussion is that if there were no heirs the estate was taken over by the state unless there was a will which was, at least supposedly, carried out. But if there were Ashāb al-Furūd and no 'Uṣba the former were given their share while residue was taken over by the state. See: Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. III, p.464. See also: N.J.Coulson and others, E.I.², art. "Bayt al-Māl", p.1144; Th. W. Joynt, E.I.², art. "Farā'id", p.783; Joseph Schacht, E.I.¹, art. "Mirath", pp. 508-14.

¹For details see: Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. III, p.464; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fols. 101b and 111a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, part II (ed. W. Popper), p.321; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.215; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 185 and 293; vol. III, p.184; vol. VII, p.158.

²For details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 281 and 333-34; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.256; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 51; vol. II, fols. 149-50 and 223.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 138; Jazīrī, op.cit., p.344.

Aḥmad b. 'Ajlān a rich merchant died in Mecca, his son anticipating a claim by the Sharif to a share in the estate sent him 200,000 dirhams. The Sharif did not accept it and sent it back. The son of the merchant, supposing that the Sharif had found the sum inadequate, doubled it, and it is to the credit of the Sharif that he declined it again stating that he did not consider himself entitled to a share.¹

But when there were no heirs, the Sharifs of Mecca were more than willing to take fortunes to which there were no legal claimants. The right of the Sharifs to the escheat was not confined to the amounts left by persons of Meccan origin but applied to the belongings of all those who died intestate and without legal heirs in Mecca. Thus, for instance, when a rich Egyptian merchant, Aḥmad al-Muḥallī,² died, on his return journey from the Yemen, in Mecca in Dhu'l-Qa'da 806/June 1404. According to Ibn Ḥajar followed by Sakhāwī the deceased had brought to Mecca six thousand sacks of spices. Aḥmad's sudden death in Mecca, shortly after the death of his father in Egypt, benefitted Sultan Faraj b. Barqūq who appears to have gained 100,000 dinars.³ According to Fāsī followed by Al-Najm Ibn Fahd Sharif Ḥasan's share in the fortune left by Aḥmad al-Muḥallī amounted to 1,400 sacks of spices.⁴ Though the market value of this quantity is not made clear it must have been in the vicinity of 75,000 Mithqāl of gold, as only a few years later one thousand sacks of spices reported to have been sold in Egypt

¹Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 288b-89a.

²See supra, p. 62.

³Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 209b; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 112-13 and 197.

⁴Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 404a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 132-33.

for 50,000 Mithqāl of gold.¹

The right of the Sharifs of Mecca to the escheat seems to have been inclusive of the fortunes left in Mecca by the merchants or others who have died elsewhere. Thus, for example, when a Kārīmi merchant - who had been living in Mecca for some time - went to Yanbu' and died there, heirless, early in 819/March or April 1416, his fortune in Mecca was taken possession of by Sharif Rumaytha.²

In 843/1439, Şulţan Jaqmaq confined Sharif Barakāt I's right to the escheat to Meccans and reserved the escheat of others for himself.³

In 876/1471, Sulţan Qā'it Bāy imposed a further limit leaving to Sharif Muḥammad the right to claim escheat up to the value of 1,000 dinars, reserving amounts above this figure for himself.⁴ This was re-affirmed by the same Sulţan in 881/1476,⁵ and by Sulţan al-Ghawrī in 915/1509.⁶

Though the rights of legal heirs seem to have been usually respected in the early part of the period under consideration, from around 830/1426-27 there is abundant evidence to the effect that officials of the Egyptian Sultans or of the Sharifs of Mecca took possession, partly or fully, of estates in spite of the existence of heirs to the deceased, and the appointment of Qāḍi Shāfa'i or some other high ranking

¹See infra, p. 227.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 65a.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 229. See also: Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 333-34.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 356. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.338; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.277.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 170.

official by the testator as executor of his will. The appointment of these officials by the legator as executor of his will was obviously to safeguard the interest of the legatee but this seldom prevented such encroachment. The figures or the value of such acquisitions is seldom given in the sources. But the simple fact that this well-documented disregard of the religious and ethical aspects shown, particularly by the officials of the Egyptian Sultans with financial gain in view, proves that the amounts obtained must have been considerable.¹

It appears that, upto 881/1476, the amount obtained for the Cairo treasury by escheat, or by usurpation of inheritance remained, under the care of the Qādi Shāfa'if of Mecca. But this responsibility was assigned to the Nā'ib of Jedda in the same year.²

Sultan Qā'it Bāy showed ever-increasing interest in escheat. In 887/1482, the Sultan receiving the news of the death of a wealthy merchant in Mecca and anticipating benefitting by a large amount of money from the estate of the deceased, sent his personal slave to Mecca, who even went to India to enforce the Sultan's claim.³

From 888/1483 onwards the Sultan repeatedly instructed Sharif Muḥammad and officials in Mecca to send him reports on the number of merchants who had died and on the amount they had secured for the treasury from their estates. He occasionally summoned a legatee to Cairo to obtain money for the treasury.⁴

¹For details, see: Al-Najm ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 199, 202, 205-6, 291-3 and 362; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 629; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 316, 331-2, 457 and 528-31; idem, al-Ḍaw', vol. II, p. 257; vol. V, p. 165; vol. VI, pp. 61 and 270; vol. VII, p. 203; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 34, 37, 52, 54, 68, 72, 75, 84, 91, 96-97, 172, 177-79, 183, 200-201, 203, 212, 226-27, 244-45, 253-54 and 258; vol. II, fols. 2, 15, 18, 20, 40-41, 56, 59, 62, 79-80, 84-85, 134-35, 137, 155-56, 158-59, 164-66, 168-70, 174, 178, 189, 210, 214, 221, 225, 228, 231 and 247; Ibn Iyās, Bādā'i', vol. IV, pp. 270 and 284.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 355-56. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 338; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV p. 277.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 21-23.

⁴Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 331; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit.,

Though the exact yield from the escheat is seldom mentioned in the sources, it is obvious from occasional details that it was substantial. Thus, for instance, in 903/1497, Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Qā'it Bāy secured from the estate of a deceased merchant in Jedda several boxes of coral, jars of quick silver, a considerable quantity of pure silver, and other valuables. The deceased had several heirs who protested against this but in vain. The Sulṭānī officials sent these items to Cairo together with 4,000 dinars obtained from escheat.¹

The Sharifs of Mecca and their officials were obviously more aware of the fortunes left by a deceased and evidently secured, with or without justification, considerable amounts of money but surprisingly the sources provide very little information concerning the amounts obtained.

The last Burjī Sultan, Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī, is said to have maintained, at least around 915/1509, a spy in Mecca to check on the honesty of his officials and on the prospective income from escheat.² He is particularly criticized for his excessive disregard of the law of inheritance and some of the sources, such as Nahrawālī (al-Barq) regards this as the reason for the overthrow of the Mamlūk regime.³

vol. I, fols. 38-39, 78, 197 and 214.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 224-25.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 168-70.

³Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.242; idem, al-Barq, pp. 25-26; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, p.114; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.51.

Chapter VI

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE ṢADAQAT AND OTHER
CONTRIBUTION SENT TO MECCA FOR CHARITABLE WORKS¹

A. Charities of the Egyptian Sultans and dignitaries sent, in cash or kind, to assist individuals or maintain welfare institutions.

Various useful points concerning the Egyptian and other charities have already been mentioned,² and from these points one can easily conclude that the Egyptian Sultans took a keen interest in charitable works. The amounts sent by them in financing projects of this kind were derived, from their personal fortune and state treasury, as well as from the revenue of the endowments made in favour of the sanctuaries of Mecca and Medina.

While the revenue of the endowments had to be sent to these holy cities to fulfil the socio-religious obligation, the other contributions made by the non-Egyptian Sultans were in all probability out of piety or simply to acquire personal prestige. But the personal contributions of the Egyptian Sultans, within the period in question, may or maynot have been out of piety and religious sentiment but were definitely a political necessity to justify their hold over the Ḥijaz.

The first Burjī Sultan, Barqūq, who is described by Sakhāwī as greedy and mean³ and in the light of such description it may seem unlikely that he made generous contributions. However, various sources including Sakhāwī praise his good deeds, his charitable donations both in cash

¹ Obviously, a detailed examination of such a vast subject with its several side issues and relevant institutions was not possible in a single chapter. Therefore, it was inevitable to confine this discussion to mere hints at various contributions, and local practices and institutions.

² See supra, pp. 196-98.

³ See: Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.12; idem, al-Tibr, p.12. See also: Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 6-7.

and kind, and his concern for the welfare of the pilgrims.¹

Similar credits are given to Sulṭan al-Shaykh,² Sulṭan Bārsbāy,³ and Sulṭan Jaqmaq whose most important contribution was the distribution of Dashīsha⁴ in both Mecca and Medina.⁵

An unrivalled position in this respect was held by Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy who by his generous and varied donations by far surpassed all other Burjī Sultans. In addition to the usual contributions, he left to Mecca and Medina, as a lasting monument, various buildings and institutions for pious and charitable purposes such as Mosques, Madrasa (Schools), and Rubāṭ.⁶ He had places of religious significance, including the sanctuary of Mecca, repaired and that of Medina, which had been almost completely destroyed, rebuilt. He destined vast endowments to benefit charitable institutions including a Dashīsha service in

¹For details, see: Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 304 and 315; vol. II, p.274; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 180b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 115; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 64a; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.12; idem, al-Tibr, p.12; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.355; Ibid., vol. I, fol. 690; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. I, p.315; idem, Uqūd, vol. II, fols. 149b-50a. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 315-16.

²Fāsi, Shifā', vol. I, p.348; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 27a and 40b, part II, fol. 363a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 161-63, 173-75 and 178; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 629. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 21, 25 and 326-27; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.204; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol.79.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 196-97 and 204; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.126.

⁴The alternative form is Jashīsha, and both these terms describe the free distribution of prepared meals among the needy.

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.73; vol. X, pp. 155-56. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.413; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.333; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.291; Mar'ī Ḥanbalī, op.cit., fol. 58; Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 131.

⁶Also Ribāṭ, the term originally meant a fortified place but here it is used for the places built to serve as free lodgings for the pilgrims, travellers, or needy inhabitants. For further details see: Georges Marçais, E.I., art. "Ribāṭ", pp.1150-53.

Medina on a grand scale around 885/1480.¹

There is no clear reference in the sources to a simultaneous introduction of Dashīsha on the same scale in Mecca at the expense of the same Sulṭān. However, the existence of this service in Mecca before Qā'it Bāy is reported.² The Sultan himself seems to have arranged the distribution of Dashīsha in Mecca prior to that in Medina.

In 875/1470, Ibn al-Zaman, an official of Sultan Qā'it Bāy, who was engaged by order and at the expense of the Sultan in some construction work in Mecca, undertook arrangements for Dashīsha to be distributed among the poor and needy of Mecca and made several endowments to provide the necessary funds for this purpose.³ Though these free meals could have been Ibn al-Zaman's personal contribution to the welfare services of Mecca, it is more likely that they were financed by the Sultan himself, an assumption which is not disproved by the fact that this particular charity is named after Ibn al-Zaman. According to Nahrawālī, this Dashīsha of Ibn al-Zaman continued functioning until well after the Burjī period.⁴

¹For details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 372; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 688; idem, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 206-7; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 189-90, 257, 262, 296 and 305; Samhūdī, Wafā', vol. I, pp. 462-65, 507 and 515-16; idem, Khulāṣa, pp. 160-61; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 57; Ibn Iyas, Bada'i', vol. III, pp. 156, 160, 206 and 321-22; idem, Uqūd, vol. II, fols. 229b-30a and 240b-41a. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 336, 338-40, 343 and 682-85; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 100, 223-36 and 426; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 6-9; Mar'i Ḥanbalī, op.cit., fol. 58; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 131-32; Sinjarī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 11-17; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 43-47 and 277; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 124-33.

²See supra, p. 205.

³Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VIII, pp. 260-62. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 105-6.

⁴Al-I'lām, pp. 225-26. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 44.

Sakhāwī referring to the grant of Qā'it Bāy a maintenance allowance to the staff of his school in Mecca in 882/1477 states that the Sulṭan had destined for this purpose the revenue of a number of endowments to the amount of 2,000 dinars annually, apart from an unspecified but large quantity of wheat. This may have been sent for use in the Sulṭan's Dashīsha, the existence of which is confirmed around this year and later by the sources.¹

The death of a Sulṭan may have occasionally exercised a disruptive influence on the Dashīsha service, but did not necessarily cause an interruption in the distribution of the meals, not only because his successor was most likely ready to finance it but also because the income from the endowments alone may have sufficed in case of need. This is corroborated by a remark of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd that in Dhu'l-Hijja 889/December 1484 or January 1485, two parallel Dashīsha services were in existence in Mecca, one endowed by Sulṭan Jaqmaq (d. 857/1453), and the other by the then ruling Sulṭan, Qā'it Bāy, and that they were functioning side by side, but independently of each other.²

The Dashīsha of some Sultans was occasionally suspended in his lifetime. There is corroborative evidence to this effect in Sakhāwī. In 893 and early in 894/1487-88, the distribution of bread and Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy's Dashīsha in Medina was suspended and it was almost at the same time that many people were deprived of their share

¹Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 206-7; vol. XI, pp. 58-60; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 43 and 45. See also: Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 6-9.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 58.

of freely distributed bread in Mecca, well before Qā'it Bāy's death.¹ This suspension was evidently due to some financial difficulty, as in 896/1491, if not earlier, the distribution of bread and Dashīsha in Mecca seems, according to an entry made by Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, restored to its former level.² Qā'it Bāy's Dashīsha seems to have also been resumed in Medina at a later date as its suspension in Medina is referred to by Ibn Iyās under a date following Qā'it Bāy's death in Dhu'l-Qa'da 901/August 1496.³ It can be assumed that it was also suspended in Mecca at about the same time, as in both Mecca and Medina the distribution of Dashīsha is reported to be in full swing again in 907/1501⁴ and 912/1506⁵ respectively.

Ibn Iyās describes the last Burjī Sultan, Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī, as mean and greedy,⁶ an allegation which may or may not have been true. It is, however, an indisputable fact that welfare services under al-Ghawrī left much to be desired. But it must be admitted that, though the financial problems facing him were many and arduous, several references in the sources, including Ibn Iyās himself, confirm it beyond doubt that the Sultan made some contribution to charity and general welfare in Mecca, even if it was on a modest scale.⁷

¹Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.426.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 135.

³Ibn Iyās, 'Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 241a.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 8.

⁵Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.103.

⁶Badā'i', vol. IV, p.441.

⁷Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp.133, 144, 151-52 and 163; vol. V, p.93; See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., pp. 338-39; Jaziri, op.cit., pp. 25-26; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 240, 244, 338 and 420; Al-Bakari, op.cit., fol. 31; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 113-14; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 19-20 and 38; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 52-53 and 84; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 158.

The Egyptian Sultans sent frequently, if not annually, a considerably amount to a large number of Meccans through al-Surr al-Hukmī and al-Dhakhīra. The institution of al-Surr can be traced back, as will be seen, to the pre-Burjī period, while al-Dhakhīra seems to have been introduced at a later date. Many Meccans depended for their livelihood on their share in these contributions. The beneficiaries were either officials or chosen arbitrarily from among the local population. The amounts of these contributions are not mentioned, but must have been at least on the level of subsistence. The fact that both al-Dhakhīra and al-Surr al-Hukmī could be also sent as or in lieu of a salary indicates that they were not pure charities but verged on remuneration for services rendered.

It appears that whatever the character of al-Surr - that is, whether it was a grant, an allowance, a charitable donation or a salary proper - it represented a lifelong entitlement, and one that could be expected with a certain regularity. Al-Dhakhīra, on the other hand, appears to have represented an occasional rather than a regular payment. Al-Dhakhīra exhibits the same slightly ambiguous character of half grant and half salary as al-Surr. When al-Dhakhīra first appeared in Mecca and Medina on a regular basis is not clear; this much is certain that it became quite substantial under Sulṭān Jaqmaq. He is reported to have granted numerous allowances and salaries, ranging between ten and one hundred dinars from al-Dhakhīra.¹ The sources contain occasional references - during the period under consideration - to the arrival of al-Dhakhīra in the holy cities, but seldom provide further details.²

¹ Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 72-73; vol. X., p.125.

² Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, p.247; vol. IX, p.33; vol. X, p.125; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 688; Samhūdī, Wafā', vol. I, pp. 11-14 and 516-17; idem, Khulāṣa, p.165; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II,

Regular remittance of al-Ṣurr to Mecca can be established for the whole of the Burjī period and there is evidence to indicate that the practice existed before. This regularity is ascribable to the fact that, to many officials of the Meccan sanctuary, al-Ṣurr was identical with their salary long before the period in question. Al-Fāsi, for instance, states that a well-to-do Meccan Qādi, Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Ṭabarī (d. 760/1359), used to lend money to officials of the Meccan sanctuary and other recipients of al-Ṣurr (ahl al-Ṣurar) and claimed it back when their Ṣurr arrived in the following year.¹ This corroborates the fact that the regularity of the Ṣurr payment could be unfailingly relied on.

That, with regard to the officials of the Meccan sanctuary at least, al-Ṣurr represented a salary is further borne out by the fact that, on the death of an official, it could be inherited, together with the post, by his sons and that some of them could sell his share to others, in return for an agreed amount of money.² Amounts were sent, during the Burjī period, to people working in other institutions, such as Rubāt.³ It could also be regarded as payment for their services, which shows that al-Ṣurr in its salaried character was not confined to the Meccan sanctuary.

What the total of all al-Ṣurr al-Hukmī remittances amounted to, and what the number of recipients in Mecca was is not clear, but it can be safely assumed that both were considerable.

fols. 129, 158 and 176. See also: Nahravālī, al-I'lām, p.285; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 130 and 132; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 53-54; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 178.

¹Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 306a.

²Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 303a-3b; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 139-40.

³Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 352a.

B. Contribution of the Ottoman Sultans in the material well-being of the Meccans

In extent and regularity, Ṣadaqāt al-Rūm, the Ottoman charities, seem to have rivalled the Egyptian donations. The composition of both these charities was comparable in that they were partly derived from the state treasury and partly from the revenue of endowments. The Ottoman charity was often sent with the Syrian pilgrim caravan and was not, at least initially, connected with any political design over the Ḥijāz. But there is little doubt that their generous contributions must have won them the good will of large numbers among the population of the region which obviously had paved the way for their dominion over the region after the overthrow of the Mamlūk regime.

The Ottoman charities were apparently distributed in Mecca in accordance with the established pattern.¹ But, judging by the details given in the sources concerning its distribution, it is evident that the common people benefitted more from Ṣadaqat al-Rūm, mostly in cash, than other contributions with the possible exception of that sent from Egypt. According to Sakhāwī, the Ottoman charities surpassed, at times, the Egyptian in both the amount and regularity. Though this fact is stressed under 895/1490 by Sakhāwī, who adds that many people received as much as 100 dinars, it may not have been confined to this year alone.² Indeed, several evidences, as will be seen, show that the amounts of the Ottoman charities were, in certain years, far more considerable than those sent by the Mamlūks and incomparably greater than others.

¹See supra, p. 197.

²Al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 464 and 467.

The Ottoman Sultans may well have sent their contributions prior to the period under consideration but it is within this period that the Arab historians refer to their contributions. A number of Meccan and other historians, writing during the Ottoman period, indicate that a number of Ottoman Sultans, especially from Bāyezīd I, called Yildirim 'the Thunderbolt' (791-805/1389-1402), took a keen interest in sending the charities and reached its peak during the rule of Sultan Selim I, known as Yavuz, 'the Grim' (918-26/1512-20). The contribution of these Sultans is often referred to as al-Ṣurr al-Rūmi and is reported to have varied between 3,000-14,000 dinars annually and many individuals appear to have been given the right to a permanent annual allowance.¹

The contemporary Egyptian and Meccan sources do not seem to confirm or deny the contributions of the earlier Ottoman Sultans but they do not refer clearly to the contributions of the Ottoman Sultans or their dignitaries except from 850/1446 onwards and usually with long interruption between the years in which these charities actually reached Mecca. In the pilgrimage season of 850/in or around February 1447, a wazīr of the Ottoman Sultan Murād II (824-55/1421-51) came to Mecca to perform the pilgrimage and is reported to have distributed a considerable amount of ṣadaqa among the Meccans together with supplying to pilgrims with sweetened drink.²

¹For details, see: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 256, 261-64, 283-85 and 287; Mar'i Hanbali, op.cit., fols. 58-59; Al-Bakari, op.cit., fols. 6-7, 13-14 and 51; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 130-32; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 86-87; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 65-66 and 68-69; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 50-54; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 114 and 177-79; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 50-51.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 263 and 316; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.2; idem, al-Tibr, p.148; see also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 331 and 695; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.218; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 8; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 105.

In the last quarter of the 9th/15th century several times a wakīl¹ was sent to Istanbul to collect the revenue of endowments or other charitable donations and bring them back to the Ḥijāz. The emissary was given a certain portion of the total amount, usually 10⁰%, in return for his services.² Possibly the bearers of other charities were also given similar amounts or were able to derive material benefit through their services. Some of the bearers of the Egyptian charity were able, mainly on account of their personal relations with the Qāḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca, to secure considerable material gain.³

The fact that occasionally a wakīl was sent to Rūm to collect the donations, as mentioned above, is indicative of the irregularity in the sending of the Ottoman charity to Mecca. This is further supported by the fact that often several years elapsed before the next mention of a new arrival in the local sources is made. However, in view of the rather limited number of available sources used, this should not be regarded as conclusive for the late Burjī period. The less so as Sakhāwī explicitly stresses the regularity of the Ottoman donations.⁴

The figures given in the sources show the amounts fluctuated from one year to another. In both 888 and 889/1483-84 the Ottoman charity equalled 1,600 dinars.⁵ In 895/1490 it amounted to about 2,900 dinars.⁶ In 896/1491, it was 5,620 dinars⁷ and in the following year

¹The term wakīl is derived from wakāla (or wikāla), mandate, authorization, is a contract (ʿaqd) by which the contracting party, the Muwakkil commissions the other, the mandatory (wakīl) to perform some service for him. See: Otto Spies, E.I.², art. "Wakāla", pp. 1094-95.

²See details in: Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 224-25; vol. VI, p. 315; vol. VII, p. 82; vol. IX, p. 226; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 717-18; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 90, 124, 152 and 160-61.

³Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 47-48.

⁴See supra, p. 211.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 45-46 and 59 respectively.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 124. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fol. 718.

⁷Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 138; See also: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl

only 600 dinars.¹

The amounts sent in charitable donations to Medina at times far exceeded those destined for Mecca. In 898/1493, for instance, Medina received 10,000 dinars while the amount sent to Mecca was only 400 dinars.² This great discrepancy is possibly accounted for by the fact that the figures for Medina included its share in the revenue of endowments for a few preceding years, while those for Mecca merely represented a personal donation of the Ottoman Sultan or some of his Amirs. The same may have been the case in 898/1494 and 900/1495 when only 300³ and 900⁴ dinars reached Mecca respectively.

Sometimes part of the amount sent from Istanbul for charitable purposes was used by the ruling Sharif of Mecca to appease his opponents and thereby ward off potential danger to the pilgrims. Thus Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd relates, without stating the exact figure of the Ottoman donation in question, that in the pilgrimage season of 909/May 1504 Sharif Ḥumayḍa took 1,000 dinars to conclude a truce with his rival brother Barakāt II and make him consent, for 2,000 dinars, to a suspension of hostilities until the end of the pilgrimage ceremony.⁵ Though the exact amount of the above mentioned Ottoman charity is not made clear, it can safely be assumed that it was considerable, as the Ottoman charities in the closing years of the Burjī period were - politically motivated or not - substantial and often impressive. In

(ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 504; Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 344.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 152.

²Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p. 315; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 717-18; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 160-61.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 171.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fols. 186 and 198.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 53.

910/1505, for instance, the bearer of the Ottoman charity was traveling with the Syrian pilgrim caravan. During his journey to Mecca the caravan was harassed by a group of Arabs which forced the Syrian Amīr al-Hajj to pay 20,000 dinars in ransom to secure the safety of the pilgrims. The amount paid was raised partly from the pilgrims and the Amir but, for the most part, borrowed from the Ottoman emissary. This loan of about 13,000 dinars was supposed to be repaid on their arrival at Mecca but the Syrian Amir was unable to fulfil his promise despite repeated attempts to raise the money. During the argument about the return of the money, it was agreed - on the intervention of the Nā'ib Jedda - that the amount for general distribution should be reduced to only 2,200 dinars, which was apparently as much as was left in the possession of the Ottoman emissary.¹ This incident appears to have been resented by the Ottomans which may account for dispatching the next donation, in 912/1506, in the amount of 2,000 dinars, via Cairo. Its bearer refused to pay Sharif Barakāt II his customary one-third of the total and gave him instead only 150 dinars as an ordinary recipient.² No precedent for such a clear denial of the customary right of the Sharif to one-third of the charity is reported. Presumably, the bearer had been instructed to do this as retaliation against the Sharif for his failure to help the Ottoman emissary to obtain the repayment of the amount lent to the Syrian Amir during the above related episode of 910/1505.

In 913/1507, Ṣadaqat al-Rūm reached Mecca, but no figure is specified.³ In the following year 14,000 dinars for Mecca and 27,000

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 83.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 110 and 132-33.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 146.

dinars for Medina was sent from Istanbul.¹ Ibn Iyās, under 915/1509, reporting the arrival of an Ottoman Amir in Cairo, states that he was bearing 40,000 dinars for distribution in Mecca and Medina.² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd confirms the arrival of an Ottoman emissary via Egypt to Mecca in Dhu'l-Hijja 915/March 1510, with donation, but gives no exact figure. However, the details given in connection with its distribution imply that the amount was substantial. The greater part of the total was shared, as usual, among those entitled to fixed annual allowances. The shares of 300 recipients who were absent at the time were deposited with the Bāsh al-Mamālīk and Muhtasib of Mecca to be handed over to the destined on their return. The allowances of deceased persons were distributed according to judgment of the Ottoman envoy. Sharifs Barakāt II and Qā'it Bāy tried to obtain their customary third of the total amount but in vain.³ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd registered the arrival of the Ottoman charity in Mecca, by way of Egypt, in the pilgrimage season of 916/March 1511, but without mentioning a figure. But the amount seems to have been substantial as the share of a beneficiary could reach one hundred dinars or more. The joint Amirs of Mecca unsuccessfully claimed their usual third, but they were given only about 800 dinars as a conciliatory gesture.⁴ In the pilgrimage season of 918/February 1513 the Sharifs of Mecca received 1,700 dinars, which is not likely to have been a third of an unspecified total of the Ottoman charities but rather a conciliatory grant, and the ordinary people received their usual share. The only departure from the routine was that those

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 160,

²Badā'i', vol. IV, p.168.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 175.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 191.

who were not present in person lost their share.¹

In his repeated and futile attempts to press his claim to the traditional third, Sharif Barakāt II seems to have annoyed the Ottoman Sultan Selim I, who consulted his Egyptian counterpart, Sultan al-Ghawrī, on the merit of the case and the latter seems to have supported the validity of the Sharif's claim in 919/1513² and advised the Sharif also to send an explanatory letter to the Ottoman Sultan.³ The Sharif may have sent an envoy but Selim I does not seem to have recognized this claim. This is indicated by the fact that in 921/1515 the sum of 60,000 dinars was sent by Selim I for distribution in Mecca and Medina in two equal parts, but nothing in the account of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd suggests that the Sharif was given his customary third of the total amount.⁴

According to Halil Inalcik, Selīm I tried to win over the Sharif of Mecca who in 922/1516 despatched a delegation to Selīm I which the Mamlūk did not allow to proceed to Istanbul.⁵ But, in view of the rather uneasy relationship between Selīm I and Sharif Barakāt II, on the basis of the former's refusal to accept the Sharif's claim to one-third of the total Ottoman charity, which is evident from the various above mentioned examples given by Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, it is

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 223.

²See supra, p. 198.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 226.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 270.

⁵See: "Rise of the Ottoman Empire" in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, p.318.

difficult to accept that the Sharif had become pro-Ottoman prior to the final downfall of the Mamlūks. Especially as several evidences clearly show that the relationship between the Sharifs of Mecca and their Egyptian overlord in the closing years of the Burjī period was extremely cordial.¹

C. Participation of the Indian rulers in the works of general welfare.

Muslim rulers in India took a lively interest in the pious works in Mecca as well as in the welfare of its population but, as so often, the sources are usually silent on the extent of their financial contributions. The most munificent of these rulers were those of Bengal, and the first important contribution to come from there in the Burjī period was made by Sultan Ghayāth al-Dīn A'zam Shāh Abu'l-Muzaffar (d. 814 or 815/1411 or 1412) and his wazīr Khān Jahān. Their contributions seem to have progressively increased from 810/1407 until they reached their peak around 813/1410. Between these years there are frequent references to the arrival in Mecca of their charities, both in cash and kind. It was mostly accompanied by the ruler's personal gifts to Sharif Hasan. The Bengali ruler financed the construction of a school and the repairs made to an ²'Ayn to improve the supply of water to the inhabitants of Mecca and endowed several properties for the benefit of his school in Mecca. The Sharif, personally derived considerable gain from the donations of the Bengali ruler either by taking directly part of a donation for himself, or by selling some of his own property at a high price to Bengali envoys to house the school as

1 See *supra*, pp. 97-99.

2 This word has several meanings including Spring; source of water and it is used here in that meaning but in a slightly different sense. It is applied to a canal or tunnel supplying water to Mecca by inter-linking a number of 'Ayn and their subsidiaries outside Mecca proper.

well as to be endowed on its behalf.¹

Scarcely less generous was another ruler of Bengal, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 837/1433) who was newly converted to Islām and seems therefore particularly eager to establish cordial relations with the Abbasid Caliph, the Egyptian Sultan, and the Sharif of Mecca. Sultan Jalāl al-Dīn sent valuable gifts to Cairo and according to Maqrīzī followed by other sources such as Ibn Ḥajar and Ibn Taghri Birdī received from the Abbasid Caliph an investiture of rule and a robe of honour. He also made valuable contribution to the welfare works in Mecca. His son and successor, Abu'l-Muzaffar Aḥmad Shāh seems to have followed the policies of his father and sent charitable donations to Mecca.²

'Alī al-Ṭabarī, a late source, referring to a large amount of money which was distributed in Mecca, without giving the date of the distribution or the name of the donor, only states that it was known as al-Jalāliyya.³ It is more than probable that it is a question here of a contribution of the above mentioned Jalāl al-Dīn, the ruler of Bengal.

Another ruler of Bengal is said to have sent a quantity of perfume and some gold and silver chandeliers, evidently for Ka'ba, together with

¹For details, see: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 328-30; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 38a; part II, fols. 346b-47a, 404b-5a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 242a; vol. II, fols. 22b-23a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 125a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 136-37 and 147; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p. 319; idem, al-Daw', vol. II, p. 313. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 198-200; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 34-35; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 338-39; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 73-74.

²For details, see; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 349 and 382; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 23a and 125b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 344b; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 66; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 200 and 208; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 100a-b; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p. 280. See also: Ibn al-Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p. 225.

³Al-Arj al-Miskī, fol. 132.

a few hundred dinars for the Meccan Imāms and Qādis and a quantity of cloth which was apparently sent for general distribution.¹

In Rabi' II 901/January 1496 contributions sent by a ruler of Bengal - described as being of Ḥaḥashi origin - were distributed in Mecca. The amount of charity is reported to have amounted to thirty to sixty thousand dinars, together with some large silver chandeliers and a quantity of cloth. However, the Bengali emissaries on reaching Aden received the news that their master had died. They dispatched the cloth together with the chandeliers to Mecca but appropriated the money and fled to different countries. The cloth was subsequently sold in Mecca for about 2,100 dinars and the proceeds distributed.²

Among the rulers of Gulbarga,³ another Muslim principality in India, Shihāb al-Dīn Abu'l-Maghāzī Ahmad Shāh (d. Rajab 838/March 1435) showed marked interest in the welfare institutions of Mecca.⁴

The Muslim rulers of Mandwa (India) usually referred to by the title of al-Khiljī, are reported to have sent frequent donations of money to Mecca and to have occasionally financed some charitable works such as Dashīsha and appear to have been on friendly terms with the Mamlūk Sultans as well as with the Sharifs of Mecca.⁵

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 77.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 191-92.

³A town and district in the north of Mysore on the western border of "the Deccan" in India. See: J. Burton-Page, E.I.², art. "Gulbarga", p.1135.

⁴For details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 349; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 67; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, p.215; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 199-200 and 203; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, p.210; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.262. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.343.

⁵For details, see: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 346b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 333 and 351; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. X, pp. 148-49 and 166; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.504; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 23, 41, 44, 139 and 151.

Chapter VII
FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AND PERSONAL
EXPENDITURE OF THE SHARIFIS OF MECCA

A. Amounts spent to maintain the family, or paid as allowances and salaries.

It has been seen that exact figures of the revenue are rarely given in the sources, and the same is true of most of the expenditure. It can be established, however, that the expenditure and various financial obligations of the Sharifs of Mecca were quite considerable. A very great part of the revenue must have obviously been expended on the upkeep of their families, concubines, slaves, and other members of the household in a manner befitting their station.

The Sharifs of Mecca must have received and entertained, in accordance with the traditional Arab hospitality, a number of tribal chiefs, heads of the clans, individual guests and may also have made generous gifts to these visitors. Moreover, hospitality to a visiting Sultan or members of the royal family must have cost them substantial amounts of money.¹ They must also have spent a considerable amount on the formal receptions they gave almost annually to the Egyptian Amir al-Hajj, and frequently to other high ranking Egyptian officials, dignitaries and envoys.

As will be seen, the Sharifs of Mecca employed a fairly large number of officials, the maintenance of whom, together with that of his supporters and a body of paid soldiers, their horses, camels, arms, accommodation, clothes and food, must also have cost the Sharif a huge sum. It is impossible not to mention, in this context, the huge amounts the Sharifs must have of Mecca/paid out to the Ashraf and Quwwad either as their dues, for

¹See supra, pp. 85 and 97.

their upkeep, or to appease them. Though unfortunately it is not possible to determine the exact total amounts spent by the Sharifs of Mecca on these and other similar expenditures, it is easy to see that they must have absorbed a considerable portion of their total revenue.

B. Sums of money spent by the Sharifs in financing the benevolent works.

Though several Sharifs of Mecca, as will be seen, personally contributed to works of charity and general welfare, they rarely did so on a grand scale. Possibly the large influx of contributions from various parts of the Muslim territory to Mecca catered adequately for its needs in this respect.¹ The relatively insignificant contributions of the Sharifs may have been motivated too by their desire to keep their wealth secret. It is said that Sharif Hasan once spent 50,000 dirhams on repairs to an 'Ayn and intended further to donate a similar amount for the same purpose. But, on the advice of one of his officials, he renounced the idea for fear that he might arouse the greed of the Egyptian Sulṭān.² There is another remotely possible reason for the reluctance of the Sharifs - at least some of them - to finance pious institutions on the basis of regarding most of their revenue as being not Halāl,³ which is regarded as detracting from the acceptability of a pious contribution. Thus, for instance, in 921/1515, Sharif Barakāt II, on a visit to Medina, asked his officials in Mecca to send some Halāl money for distribution in Medina. Obviously, both the Sharif and his officials must have possessed money but seem not to have considered it sufficiently Halāl to be used for a pious purpose. Consequently, a number of the Sharif's palm trees were

¹See Chapter VI.

²Tabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 82.

³Halāl, earned in a religiously justified way.

sold for 700 dinars and the proceeds sent to the Sharif in Medina.¹

True, such great respect for the teaching of the Sharī'a was not generally shown by the Sharifs, but the example of Barakāt II indicates that it was not completely lacking.

Though the contributions of the Sharifs of Mecca to charitable works were far less than those expected from the immediate rulers of the area, they were not deprived of this credit and may have used the income derived from their personal estates and sources other than taxes and tolls to finance their pious and charitable institutions.

Fāsī, followed by others, describes Sharif Ḥasan as the first Amir of Mecca - during the Burjī period - to make significant contributions to the charitable works of Mecca.² In fact, Sharif Ḥasan's various contributions are not only impressive but also indicative of his solid financial position, genuine concern for the general welfare of the Meccans as well as the pilgrims and other visitors. His charitable works included the financing of the construction of or repairs to schools, Rubāt, a Bimāristān,³ an 'Ayn, a Sabīl.⁴ He endowed a number of profit earning establishments in favour of these institutions.⁵

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 261.

²Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.332; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 38b: part II, fol. 402b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 128; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.104. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 63.

³Bimāristān, often contracted to Māristān - from Persian bīmār 'sick' and the suffix "istān" denoting place, a hospital. See: Bedi N. Şehsuvaroglu, E.I.², art. "Bimāristān", pp. 1222-26.

⁴It denotes, among other meanings, a public drinking fountain, which is meant here. See: T.W.Haig, E.I.¹, art. "Sabīl", pp. 22-23.

⁵See details in: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 332-33, 335, 337-38 and 347-48; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 38b-39b: part II, fols. 402b, 404b-5a, 407b, 408b, 421a-21b and 478b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 127-28, 137, 147, 149, 152, 155-56 and 160-61; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 88 and 104: vol. V, pp. 30-31; Vol. IX, p.106; Samhūdī, Wafā', vol. II, p.174. See also: Nahravālī, al-I'lām, pp.194, 202-3 and 337; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 35, 84 and

In 847/1443, an 'Ayn was repaired in Khulays¹ by order, and apparently at the expense, of Sharif Abu'l-Qāsim.² Sharif Barakāt I is also given the credit for constructing some Rubāt, digging new wells or making existing ones fit for use, and for endowments in favour of welfare works.³ Similar contributions, including the construction of a school and a Sabīl, are attributed to Sharif Muḥammad b. Barakāt I.⁴

Sharif Barakāt II seems to have been particularly careful not to use anything but amounts obtained from Halāl sources⁵ for charitable purposes and apparently this was the reason for his rather modest charitable contributions.⁶

C. Voluntary or compulsory payments to the Egyptian Sultan or his Amirs.

There is occasional evidence to the effect that the Sharifs of Mecca were obliged to pay a certain unspecified amount of money to the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj. It is not clear why this payment was imposed nor is it easy to ascertain how far this obligation goes back. Presumably such payments were made initially on a voluntary basis to secure his goodwill, and possibly in return for his bringing the customary robe of honour and edicts for the Sharifs of Mecca, but later became compulsory. So much so that some of the Sharifs of Mecca had to incur debts in order

161-62; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 341 and 351; Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 63, 72, 77-78 and 84; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.41.

¹A place in the north-east of Mecca, which lies roughly midway between Mecca and Rābiḡh. See: Qalqashandī, Ṣubḡ, vol. IV, p.260.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 251.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 151 and 226; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.14. vol. V, pp. 30-31. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 275-76 and 292.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 371; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VII, pp. 150-53; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 416-17; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 22 and 100-101; vol. II, fols. 11-12. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fols. 307b-8a; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 278-79; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 18; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 134.

⁵See supra, pp. 222-23.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 141 and 261; see also:

to make the payments. In 823/1420, for instance, Sharif Ḥasan borrowed 1,000 Iflori from a merchant in order to pay the dues of the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj. Sultan Ṭaḥar, disapproving of such compulsion, not only abolished this practice in the following year but also sent back the amount already paid by Sharif Ḥasan under duress.¹

Commenting on this, Ibn Ḥajar states that this edict of the Sulṭan was, in fact, more beneficial to the merchants than to the Sharif, as the latter borrowed from the merchants to pay the Amir al-Ḥajj, but seldom regarded the loan as repayable.²

This practice seems to have been resumed during the rule of Sultan Bārsbāy, as in 826/1423 Sharif Barakāt I paid, on behalf of his father Sharif Ḥasan, 5,000 or 6,000 dinars to some Egyptian Amirs including Amir al-Ḥajj.³ This payment may have been intended primarily to ease the tension between these Amirs and Sharif Ḥasan,⁴ but the possibility of the resumption of the compulsory annual payment cannot be excluded as in 844/1440 it was abolished again by an edict of Sulṭan Jaqmaq.⁵ This annual offering seems to have been resumed in the closing years of Sulṭan Qā'it Bey's rule and continued. In 896/1491, the Egyptian Amir al-Maḥmal demanded from Sharif Muḥammad 5,000 dinars as his customary due. The Sharif was unable to raise more than 4,000 dinars, which he offered to the Amir, promising to pay the rest later. But the Egyptian

¹ Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.292.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 416b and 417b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 179-80. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.321; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 81.

³ Inbā', vol. II, fol. 59a.

⁴ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 419b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 185.

⁵ See supra, pp. 72-73.

⁶ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 441; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 233. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.328.

Amir insisted on full payment before his departure. Friction ensued and the Egyptian Amir withheld the presentation of the customary robe of honour for a while, but eventually presented it and departed.

According to Sakhāwī, the Sharif sent the remaining part of the payment to Yanbu' where the Egyptian Amir received it on his way back to Egypt.¹

A similar dispute occurred in 910/1505 when the Egyptian Amirs refused to hand over the robe of honour until Sharif Barakāt II promised to pay 8,000 dinars.² In 913/1508 the Sharif paid 1,000 dinars to the Egyptian Amir and promised to pay later a further sum of 3,000 dinars.³

In the same year the Sharif is reported to have paid to the commander of the Egyptian expedition⁴ ten thousand - apparently dinars - which appears to have been taken from the share of the Sharif in the revenue of Jedda.⁵

In Sha'ban 918/November 1512, Sharif Barakāt II again either promised or paid to an Egyptian Amir 4,000 dinars plus fifty camels.⁶

Far from content with the political hegemony and with the dominant position of their officials in the local administration, the Egyptian Sultans found the lion's share of the Meccan revenue, overwhelming as it was, still unsatisfactory. Greed drove them to extort further financial gains, with or without pretext, from the Sharifs of Mecca.

Several references in the sources are made to the gifts sent by the Sharifs of Mecca to their Egyptian overlords between 786-811/1384-1408. These usually consisted of horses and some other ~~not so valuable~~ goods,

¹Sakhāwī, *al-Dhayl* (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 505; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fols. 138-39.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fols. 81-82.

³*Ibid.*, fol. 131.

⁴See *supra*, pp. 95-96.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fol. 131.

⁶*Ibid.*, fols. 217-18.

and were sent voluntarily by the Sharifs to express their loyalty.¹ However, it was not long before the Sharifs of Mecca were often compelled to pay considerable sums of money to the Egyptian Sultan, to secure their appointment to the emirate; then, occasionally, a further payment - in cash or kind - to extend the term of office or simply to remain in favour.

Probably the first significant financial payment - within the period in question - for the re-instatement was made in 813/1410 by the recently reappointed Sharif Ḥasan.² The Sharif is reported to have sent Sulṭān Faraj one thousand sacks of various spices which were sold in Cairo for fifty thousand Mithqāl (apparently gold).³ But not even this huge amount seems to have satisfied the Sultan in Cairo who, in the following year, appears to have expressed his displeasure with Sharif Ḥasan's negligence in sending the gifts. The Sharif was not slow to realize the danger and sent further valuable gifts.⁴ In 819/1416, the same Sharif, deposed at the time, sent his son Barakāt I with gifts to Sulṭān Shaykh and secured his re-appointment.⁵ Though the sources reporting this agree that the re-appointment of Ḥasan was granted in return for money, they do not specify the figure. Only Fāsī followed by Al-Najm Ibn Fahd relates that the amount imposed was 30,000 Mithqāl (apparently gold).⁶ Sharif Ḥasan

¹See details in: Ibn al-Furāt, op.cit., vol. IX, part II, pp. 303-4; Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 405a-5b; vol. II, part III, fol. 193a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 101a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 120a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 117 and 139.

²See supra, p. 63.

³Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 57b; part II, fol. 406a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fol. 142-43. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 319.

⁴Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 407a-7b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 150.

⁵See supra, p. 68.

⁶Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 57b-58a; part II, fols. 411a, 412a, 415a and 416a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 277 and 286; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 20a-20b and 31b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 164-5 and 177. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b.

appears to have paid only two-thirds of the amount and the Sulṭān in 821/1418 and later exacted payment of the remainder under threats, but whether he received it is uncertain.¹

Local and other events having caused the downfall of Sharif Ḥasan, he found himself soon in the position again to curry favour with the Sulṭān.² In Muḥarram 829/November or December 1425, Sharif Ḥasan paid a visit to Sulṭān Bārsbāy and was re-appointed in return for 30,000 dinars. The Sharif, after affecting a part payment, departed for Mecca in Jumādā II 829/May 1426, but died at the very outset of his journey. His son, Barakāt I, was summoned to Cairo and appointed but on condition that he paid the rest of his father's debt, paid annually 10,000 dinars, and did not claim any part of the revenue obtained from the Indian merchants in Jeddā.³

Sulṭān Bārsbāy had sent his servant named Yāqūt to Mecca to claim payment. Yāqūt left for Cairo in Ṣafar 830/December 1426 or January 1427 with 13,000 dinars;⁴ the remainder was apparently paid later.

In Ramaḍān 842/March 1439, Sharif Barakāt I sent to Sulṭān Jaqmāq valuable gifts consisting of a ruby and a diamond weighing 15 and 17¹/₂ carat respectively. The gift also included two slaves, two concubines, five horses and two hundred pieces of cloth.⁵

In 843/1439, Barakāt I was called to Cairo but was reluctant to go⁶ and secured the permission of Sulṭān Jaqmāq to remain in Mecca against

¹For details see: Fāsī, al-ʿIqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 415a and 416a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 172-73 and 177.

²See supra, pp. 79-81, 73-75.

³For details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 339 and 343-44; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbāʾ, vol. II, fols. 85b and 89a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. III, fols. 192-96; Sakhāwī, al-Dawʾ, vol. III, pp. 13 and 104-5. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 322-24 and 586; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306a; ʿIṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 261, 265 and 267; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 1-2.

⁴Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 346; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 196. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 323-24.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 226.

⁶See supra, pp. 76-78.

the payment of an amount of money in 844/1440 which, according to Maqrīzī, was 10,000 dinars¹ but which, according to Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, was 15,000 dinars. The latter adds that one-third of the amount was paid in order to secure the permission to bring back to Mecca some of his exiled officials.²

In 850/1446 Barakāt I, who was deposed at the time, sent his son Muḥammad with gifts to Sultan Jaqmāq in a successful attempt to secure his re-appointment.³ Most of the sources reporting the re-instatement of Barakāt I only refer to a gift but Ibn Taghrī Birdī (in al-Manhal and Ḥawādith) and Sakhāwī (in al-Daw') refer to a payment of money to the Sultan by the Amir of Yanbu', Sharif Hilman, on behalf of Barakāt I.⁴

In 859/1455, Sharif Muḥammad was appointed in return for a payment of 50,000 dinars to Sultan I'nāl.⁵ This figure was, so far, the largest sum paid by a Sharif for his appointment and it is possible that its size was proportionate to the large fortune Sharif Muḥammad had inherited from his father, which is reported to have consisted of 30,000 dinars, 10,000 camels, 600 horses, and great numbers of sheep, tents, and arms.⁶ It will

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 438 and 441.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 228-29 and 233.

³See supra, p. 81.

⁴See details in: 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 698b-99a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 46 and 199; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 130 and 133; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 181a-81b; vol. II, fol. 441a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 260-62; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 143-44 and 380-81; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 1-2; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.13; vol. VII, p.152; vol. X, pp.184 and 209. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.341; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b.

⁵Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 239; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 347 and 363; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, pp. 52-53; idem, Badā'i' (U.P.), pp. 32-33.

⁶Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 363.

be noted that this list does not include immovable property which must also have been considerable.

Sharif Muḥammad paid to Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy in 872/1467 or shortly after a substantial amount of money in return for keeping a disloyal brother in Cairo.¹ Ibn Taghrī Birdī followed by Ibn Iyās states that the Sharif agreed to pay 60,000 dinars.² Sakhāwī referred to the payment of a substantial amount by the Sharif but gives no figure.³

Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy, when on pilgrimage,⁴ is reported to have received gifts from the local Amirs, officials and merchants. Their value is given by Ibn Iyās as 200,000 dinars.⁵ To this, Sharif Muḥammad does not seem to have contributed to any remarkable extent, as from other sources it is evident that the Sharif's gifts were horses and some other not too valuable presents but no payment in cash is reported on this occasion.⁶

In 894/1489, Sharif Muḥammad is reported to have paid 2,000 dinars to Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy but it is not clear on what grounds it was made.⁷ But this seems to have been one of several such small offerings of Sharif Muḥammad to Sulṭan Qā'it Bāy - both of whom enjoyed the longest period of rule among other Sharifs and Sultans during the Burjī period - and it is supported by a statement of Sakhāwī implying that the huge size of the amounts of money paid by Sharif Muḥammad to the Sultan was

¹See supra, pp. 83-84.

²Hawādith (ed. W. Popper), part III, p. 628; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 9-10.

³Al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 197-98.

⁴See supra, p. 85.

⁵Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 157-58.

⁶Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 372. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 340 and 686; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p. 235; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 47; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 130.

⁷Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 427.

unprecedented.¹

In Rabi' II 907/December 1497, Barakāt II succeeded his father, Sharif Muḥammad, and seems to have been confirmed by Sulṭan Muḥammad in return for a certain amount, the figure of which is not given but which he was unable to pay,² probably on account of discord between him and his brothers which developed into armed hostilities.³ This, however, was to serve the royal treasury well. According to Jazīrī followed by 'Iṣāmī, the opponents of Barakāt II offered to Sulṭan Muḥammad early in 904/1498 100000 dinars in return for the appointment of Hazzā'. The amount in question was so large that some of the Egyptian Amirs, advised the Sulṭan to grant the request. But some pro-Barakāt Amirs opposed this and it is to the credit of the Sultan that he did not succumb to the temptation.⁴ But according to Sinjārī and Ṭabarī this offer was made to Sulṭan al-Ghawri in 906/1501 and these sources create the impression that the Sultan responded positively.⁵ However, from the account of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, a contemporary source, it is evident that Sharif Barakāt II was left in control of Mecca in return for a sum of money, but the source is hesitant in giving the figure which is supposed to have varied between a few thousand and a hundred thousand dinars. In Jumādā I 906/December 1500, an emissary of Sulṭan Janblāṭ reached Mecca to demand payment from Barakāt II, but whether any amount of money was paid or not is uncertain.⁶ Meanwhile, in Egypt Janblāṭ was replaced by Ṭumān Bāy who too was deposed in Shawwāl

¹Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.153.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 228-29.

³See supra, pp. 86 - 94.

⁴Jazīrī, op.cit., p.348; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.301.

⁵Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 20-21; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 135-36.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 237 and 253.

906/May 1501 by Sulṭan al-Ghawrī. These changes indirectly involved Barakāt II and he was deposed in Dhu'l-Qa'da 906/June 1501.¹

In or around Sha'bān 908/March 1503, Sharif Ahmad al-Jāzānī secured his appointment to the emirate in return for a promise to pay Sulṭan al-Ghawrī 100,000 dinars.² But whether or not this amount was actually paid is uncertain as he was shortly after ousted by Barakāt II and Jāzānī had to secure the support of Amir Qīt to regain the control of Mecca.³ Jāzānī seems to have promised or paid Amir Qīt between 40,000 and 100,000 dinars to achieve his objectives. Part of the amount appears to have been offered as a bribe to the Amir but the greater portion must have been destined for the royal treasury. Jāzānī had also promised to pay the Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj and Amir al-Maḥmal a joint amount of 16,000 dinars.⁴

In Ṣafar 910/July 1504, following the escape of Barakāt II from Cairo,⁵ Qā'it Bāy was appointed to the emirate in return for a payment of 50,000 dinars to the Sultan, a total of 22,000 dinars which seems to have included the arrears in payment of his predecessor Ḥumayda, to Egyptian Amir al-Ḥajj and Amir al-Maḥmal, and a further 5,200 dinars in allowance and compensation to a number of Ashrāf including the Amir of Yanbu'.⁶

In or around 915/1509, Sharif Barakāt II sent valuable gifts to Sulṭan al-Ghawrī which consisted of 20,000 dinars and a number of slaves

¹See supra, pp. 87-88.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 26.

³See supra, pp. 91-92.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 35-37. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 285-88; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 29; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 148-49; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.48.

⁵See supra, pp. 93-94.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 57.

together with several horses and 3,000 dinars to an Egyptian Amir.¹

In 920/1514 the wife and the son of the Sultan came to Mecca for the pilgrimage² and Barakāt II is said to have presented them with 20,000 dinars in cash and various other valuable gifts. A number of Amirs in the retinue of these distinguished visitors received a total amount of 10,000 dinars.³ Sharif Barakāt II accompanied the royal family on their return journey and was cordially received. He brought the Sultan valuable gifts including an amount of cash which is reported to have exceeded 100,000 dinars.⁴ In view of such valuable gifts - at a time when the Sultan was faced with a financial crisis - it is not surprising that the Sultan received the Sharif with unusual cordiality⁵ and re-affirmed the Sharif's position as Nā'ib al-Sulṭān and gave him authority over the Sulṭānī Muḩtasib and Bāsh in Mecca,⁶ but the real wonder is that the Sharif was able to present such huge amounts at a time when the revenue of the Sharif from the traders - particularly the Indians - as well as from other channels of income, was at its lowest scale.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 176 and 178-79. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.357; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.305; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 35; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 160; Daḩlān, op.cit., p.49.

²See supra, p.97.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 252. See also: Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, p.433; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.317.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 256-57 and 262. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.360.

⁵See supra, pp.97-98.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 262.

Chapter VIII

THE EXTENT OF THE SHARIF'S OF MECCA'S
PARTICIPATION IN THE LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

A. The officials appointed by and responsible to the Sharifs of Mecca

Qalqashandī's statement that the Meccan emirate was nomadic in character¹ cannot be accepted for the period under consideration and he, himself, may not have meant this period when making that comment. To do so unreservedly would be to imply that the emirate of Mecca had no proper administrative institutions, which was not the case, even if they were not too elaborate.

There are several references in the sources to a number of persons who served the Sharifs of Mecca in one way or another, mostly in the early part of the Burjī period. But these references very seldom offer useful information about their official status and responsibilities.² They were functioning, as will be seen, with the Sultani officials appointed to a number of religious, judicial and administrative posts.

That, and to what extent, the Sharifs of Mecca owed allegiance to the Mamlūk Sultans is reflected in his modest share in the administration and rather narrow limits of his authority over the Sultani officials. In comparison with the fairly large amount of historical and politico-economic detail on Sultani officials found in the sources, there is a positive dearth of information even on the principal officials nominated

¹See Qalqashandī, Ṣubḥ, vol. IV, p. 276.

²For details, see: Fāsī, Shifā', vol. II, p. 208; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 189b, 221b, 246a and 248b-49a; part II, fols. 269b, 272b-73a, 288a-88b, 311a, 401b and 488b; vol. II, part III, fols. 39b, 192a-93a, 194a-95b, 210b and 253a-54b; part IV, fol. 288b; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 99a and 192a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 323a-23b and 383b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 109-10, 114, 116, 120, 122-23, 127-29, 172 and 244; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 231 and 256; vol. V, pp. 220 and 231; vol. VIII, p. 150; vol. X, pp. 42-43 and 158; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 39. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fols. 305a-5b; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p. 39; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, p. 333; Tabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 63.

by and directly dependent on the Sharif in both Mecca and Jedda, such as the wazīr,¹ the Nā'ib al-Balad², the wālī,³ the Ḥakim,⁴ and the Muḥtasib.⁵ Most of the available information on these and other officials of minor rank hardly amounts to more than a few names, dates and minor details. Nevertheless, the data available suffice to prove that the officials of the Sharifs played a fairly active and important role in the local administrative system.

Many of the Sharif's officials were - or had been - slaves of the ruling Sharif or his father. According to a late source, this practice was a deliberate policy of the Sharifs of Mecca.⁶ Apparently the quality they most valued in an official was not so much efficiency as reliability and personal loyalty. The Sharifs could hardly consider leaving the city of Mecca or the port of Jedda under one of the prominent Ashraf. This would have been distinctly unwise, not to say risky, as the Ashraf were inclined to challenge his authority and could easily become a rival.⁷

¹This term, in a general sense, means: assistant, but usually describes an official enjoying great authority and, more specifically, a minister. See: Franz Bahinger, E.I.¹, art. "Wazir", pp. 1135-36.

²Applied to the person in charge of the city in the absence of the Sharif, as his deputy.

³This title, from the Arabic root waliya, means to govern, to rule, and to protect someone. See: B. Carra de Vaux, E.I.¹, art. "Wālī", pp. 1109-1111. See also: Heffening, E.I.¹, art. "Wilaya", pp. 1137-38. However, judging from the available information about the Walīs in Mecca, this title had, at that time, a sense reminiscent of the modern police officer.

⁴Roughly similar to Wālī.

⁵This term is applied to the person entrusted with the ḥisba, which means, on the one hand, the duty of every Muslim to "promote good and forbid evil" and, on the other, the function of the person who is effectively entrusted in a town with the application of this rule in the supervision of moral behaviour and, more particularly, of the markets. See: Cl. Cahen and others, E.I.², art. "Ḥisba", pp. 485-93; R. Levy, E.I.¹, art. "Muḥtasib", pp. 702-3.

⁶Ali al-Tabarī, op.cit., fol. 125.

⁷See supra, pp. 54-55.

Wazīr

Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān¹ was served by several wazīrs. The first was Ahmad b. Sulaymān, who died in the lifetime of the Sharif. The post was then assigned to Mas'ūd b. Ahmad al-Azraq. A third wazīr of the Sharif was Ibrāhīm b. 'Aṭiyya al-Ḥamāmī, who retained the same post during the rule of Sharifs Muḥammad and 'Anān. Ibrāhīm played an active role against Sharif 'Alī, one of 'Anān's opponents, and had to flee to a neighbouring valley when the former replaced 'Anān.² Later, however, Ibrāhīm was allowed to return and remained in Mecca until his death in Sha'bān 791/August 1389.³

'Alī b. Mas'ūd al-Azraq (d. 798 or 799/1395-96), a son of the above-mentioned Mas'ūd, had served Sharif Ahmad and then his son as an ordinary clerk. But during the emirate of Sharif 'Anān he acquired the status of wazīr, which he retained under Sharif 'Alī b. 'Ajlān.⁴

A Qā'id named 'Alī b. Sinān (d. around 805/1402) is also referred to as the Wazīr of Sharif Ahmad b. 'Ajlān.⁵

Another Qā'id, Zayn al-Dīn Shukr, is mentioned among the prominent officials of Sharif Hasan b. 'Ajlān, and seems to have been his Wazīr. Shukhr's efforts brought the embargo imposed by the Yemenite ruler to an end in 815/1412.⁶ Early in Muḥarram 829/November 1425, he accompanied Sharif Hasan to Cairo⁷ and, following the re-appointment of the Sharif, in return for the payment of a sum of money,⁸ Shukhr returned to Jedda

¹See supra, pp. 48-52.

²See supra, pp. 55-56.³ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 274b and 324a.

⁴Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 209b.

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, p. 229.

⁶Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 408b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 151. See also: supra, p. 217, 167.

⁷See supra, pp. 75-76.

⁸See supra, p. 228-

to take charge of the port and its revenue.¹ Presumably Shukr was supposed to return to Cairo with the required sum of money but refrained from the return journey when the death of Sharif Hasan and the appointment of Barakāt I on new terms rendered it unnecessary.² In 843/1439 Sultan Jaḡmaq, for some not further specified reason, ordered the Sharif to expel from Mecca Shukhr and his sons, Budayr and 'Alī, with some of their subordinates. Though the Sharif complied with this order, he secured in the following year, in return for 5,000 dinars, the Sultan's permission for the return of the exiled to Mecca.³ Shukr appears to have remained wazīr until his death in Jumādā I 845/October 1441.⁴

In 845/1441, Barakāt I was deposed⁵ by his brother 'Alī who had, prior to his entry into Mecca, sent his wazīr, Mazrū' al-'Ajalānī, to take control of the city, which he did without meeting any resistance.⁶

Another local dignitary, named Khurṣ, is described as the wazīr of Sharif 'Alī. Late in 846/1443 he appears to have been taken captive and sent to Cairo together with the deposed 'Alī.⁷ They both died there in 853/1449.⁸ 'Alī b. Barakāt, deputy of the deposed Sharif 'Alī, was arrested⁹ and seems to have been taken to Cairo too.

In 847/1443 Abu'l-Qāsim's wazīr, 'Alī b. Muḡammad al-Shubaykī, seems to have enjoyed great influence. Little is known about him except that he seems to have played an active part in an expedition against a group of disloyal Ashraf headed by Abu'l Qāsim's son Zahir.¹⁰

¹ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 194. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.323.

² Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 392; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 217. See also infra, p. 238.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 228 and 233.

⁴ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 237 and 267-68; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.306.

⁵ See supra, pp. 77-78.

⁶ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 235. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.267; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 5; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 104.

⁷ See supra, pp. 78-79.

From 850/1446 onwards Budayr b. Shukr served Barakāt I in the capacity of wazīr and retained this post during the rule of Sharif Muḥammad and served him faithfully until he began to suspect, early in 864/1459, that the Sharif wanted to arrest him. Consequently, his relations with the Sharif became hostile and he took control of Jedda but was forced to leave after a short time. Budayr, having suffered great financial losses and having been deserted by most of his supporters, took refuge among nomadic Arabs until he was reconciled with the Sharif. In 866/1462, Sultan Khushqadam, on receiving a report about some objectionable acts of Budayr, was so displeased that he ordered the Sharif to bar Budayr from residing in Mecca. According to Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, Sharif Muḥammad secured in the following year the Sultan's permission for the return of Budayr to Mecca against a payment of 6,000 dinars. Budayr continued to enjoy great favour of the Sharif, and prestige in Mecca, until his death in Jumādā I 869/February 1465.¹

Whether Budayr had an immediate successor is not clear. But whoever may have been appointed to that post did not come from his family, as they were not on friendly terms with the Sharif. In 872/1467 a disloyal brother of Sharif Muḥammad escaped to Cairo.² The Sharif learned that one of Budayr's sons and his maternal uncle had caused this split and retaliated by putting both to death early in 873/July or August 1468.³

⁸ Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.37.

⁹ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 242.

¹⁰ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 249. See also, supra, pp. ~~85-86~~ ⁷⁹⁻⁸⁰.

¹ Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 349; idem, Hawādith (ed. W. Popper), part II, p.343; part III, p.579; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 282-84, 291-93, 296-300, 305, 307-8 and 312; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.4; vol. V, p.21; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.154; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i' (U.P.), p.150.

² See supra, pp.83-84 and 110.

³ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 321; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, p.64; vol. VII, p.149.

After the death of Budayr until about 791/1486 a clear reference to a wazīr does not appear in the sources. In this year Qunayd b. Mithqāl al-Ḥasanī is described as wazīr of Sharif Muḥammad.¹ Sakhāwī, too, refers to Qunayd as wazīr, adding that his son Mas'ūd held the same post.² Mas'ūd acted as Nā'ib al-Balad too, and his brother 'Anān is said to have been the wālī of Mecca.³ Mas'ūd is reported to have introduced, in Sha'bān 909/February 1504, a number of taxes the details of which are not given, except that they included $1\frac{1}{4}$ Ashrafi imposed on the family of a deceased.⁴

Though the wazīr was the higher in rank among the Sharif's officials he does not seem to have been held in great respect by the Sultani officials and not even by the Mamlūk rank and file. In Dhu'l-Qa'da 914/April 1509, for example, 'Alī b. Mubārak, a wazīr of Sharif Barakāt II, was beaten by an ordinary soldier and the offender was not brought to account.⁵ 'Alī appears to have remained wazīr until 917/1511 and to have acted occasionally as Nā'ib al-Balad.⁶

Nā'ib al-Balad

As the title indicates, this post was assigned for the duration of the Sharif's absence from the city. This official was usually a Meccan and frequently a slave of the ruling Sharif, but exceptions are reported. In Ṣafar 804/September or October 1401, for instance, an Egyptian Amir named Baysaq was appointed Nā'ib al-Balad on the departure of Sharif Ḥasan for Ḥaly.⁷ This was the first and last time that a Sharif assigned this post

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 70.

²Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. X, p.157.

³Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p.147.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 46.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 59 and 159.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 197-99.

⁷Fasī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 402b-3a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 129-30.

outside his own entourage. The first duty of the Nā'ib was to defend the city against any attack. On 12th Ramaḍān 820/23rd October 1417, for instance, Miftāḥ al-Ziftāwī, a Nā'ib of Sharif Ḥasan, lost his life in a battle with a group of Ḥasan's opponents who were trying to seize control of the city.¹

Among his duties was to keep close watch on subversive elements and those suspected of being potentially disloyal to the ruling Sharif. In Rabi' II 832/February 1429, 'Alī b. Kubaysh b. 'Ajlān (d. 838/1428-29), the deputy of Sharif Barakāt I in Mecca, arrested a number of persons who were spying on behalf of the opponents of the Sharif.²

What the Sharif expected from his officials, and particularly from his Nā'ib, was, first and foremost, personal loyalty and those suspected of disloyalty were immediately brought to account. Thus, in Ramaḍān 872/April 1468, after the secret departure of a disloyal brother of Sharif Muḥammad to Cairo, the Nā'ib al-Balad, 'Abdullah, was suspected of connivance in his flight and was deposed and expelled from the city.³

The sources mention a number of other Nā'ib al-Balad but little is known beyond their names, and the dates of their appointment.⁴

Wālī

The term "wālī", as mentioned earlier, was used in Mecca to denote a police officer.⁵ This usage is observable in Sakhāwī who, having mentioned an officer in charge of the Shurṭa (i.e. police) in Medina in the early part of the 9th/15th century, then refers to his brother to whom the

¹Fāṣī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 413a; vol. II, part IV, fols. 33a and 331b-32a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 149-50 and 168-69; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. X, p.166; see also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.259; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 346; Dahlān, op.cit., p.39.

²Fāṣī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 400a and 401b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 206; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. V, p.276.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 318.

⁴See: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 215, 225, 248-49, 259, 261-62, 264-65, 282-83, 303 and 336-38; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. I, p.304; vol. III, p.256;

post was assigned after the resignation of his brother as a "wālī".¹ This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that from the reported activities of several wālīs it is evident that their principal responsibility was to enforce respect for law and order, prevention of crime, and to punish the guilty and to protect the inhabitants from unruly elements within or outside the city.² This is further borne out by an interesting report of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd in *Shahān* 903/April 1498 of certain peculiar behaviour of Sultan Muḥammad, who used to roam Cairo at night "like a wālī".³

The existence of a fairly large and well-guarded jail in Mecca is documented by numerous references in the sources. It is obvious that a large number of jailers must have been employed, but it cannot be a mere coincidence that most mentions of jailers are accompanied, in the sources - especially in Al-Najm Ibn Fahd and his son Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd - by the phrase "son of Ibn Qunayd", which indicates that most jailers were from this family, many of whom held the post of wālī in Mecca. The prison appears to have been used simultaneously for political opponents, petty offenders and a hard core of criminals.⁴

vol. VI, p.225; vol. VII, p.253; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fols. 6-7 and 10; vol. II, fols. 63 and 199. See also: Daḥlān, *op.cit.*, p.39.

⁵See *supra*, p.235 fn 3.

¹Sakhāwī, *al-Tuḥfa*, vol. I, fols. 629.

²For the relevant details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fols. 178, 318 and 324; Sakhāwī, *al-Daw'*, vol. IV, p.143; idem, *al-Dhayl* (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p.410; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fols. 31, 84-85, 92, 104-7 and 250-51; vol. II, fols. 8-9, 21, 24-25, 33-34, 41, 58 and 109.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fol. 228.

⁴For the relevant details, see: Ibn Waḥḥās, *op.cit.*, vol. II, pp. 187-88; Fāsī, *al-'Iqd*, vol. I, part I, fols. 103a and 190a; part II, fol. 288a; vol. II, part III, fols. 193b and 252b; Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, vol. III, fol. 105b; Ibn Ḥajar, *Inbā'*, vol. I, fol. 204a; Khazrajī, *op.cit.*, fol. 434; Ibn Taghri Birdī, *al-Manhal*, vol. II, fols. 168a, 249b and 324a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. II, fols. 105, 136, 158, 318 and 336-38; Sakhāwī, *al-Daw'*, vol. VI, p.147; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fols. 6-7, 10, 19, 31, 39-40, 62, 100, 105-7, 109, 136, 158, 178, 234, 239, 245 and 247-48; vol. II, fols. 13-14 and 98. See also: Janābī, *op.cit.*, fol. 304a; 'Iṣāmī, *op.cit.*, vol. IV, p.248; Sinjārī, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fol. 327; Ṭabarī, *op.cit.*, vol. I, fol. 61; Daḥlān, *op.cit.*, p.34.

Hakim

This title is used in reference to a number of officials, especially from 908/1502 onwards. Most of them are also occasionally referred to by other titles such as wazir and wali which creates the impression that the term "Hakim" did not designate the holder of a particular post, but it seems more probable that other titles applied to the official in question indicate his consecutive and not simultaneous positions. Little information is available about the sphere of the Hakim's activities with exhibit a striking similarity to the responsibilities of the wali.

Muhtasib

As will be seen, the post of Hisba was often assigned by the Egyptian Sultans to the Qadi Shafa'i and Bash al-Mamalik in Mecca. There are references to the effect that the Sharifs of Mecca were given control of this office for an interim period, or instructed to supervise the performance of the Muhtasib appointed by the Sultan.

It is obvious that the Sharifs passed on this office to one or another of their own officials. Therefore, when these responsibilities were withdrawn from the Sharif it did not in the least affect the reputation of the Sharif or his official.

There are a few evidential examples to support the fact that two Muhtasib, one appointed by the Sharif and the other by the Sultan, performed their duties separately and that the Sharifs of Mecca controlled at times both posts. In Sha'ban 848/December 1444, for instance, Sultan Jaqmaq instructed Sharif Abu'l Qasim to investigate an accusation of bribery

¹For details concerning the Hakim, see: Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 24-25, 63, 96, 98, 130, 135, 137, 151, 187, 200, 212, 224-25, 228-29, 249 and 272.

raised against the Sultani Muhtasib and, if he were found guilty, to depose him and assign the Hisba to somebody else. The charge appears to have been proved, for the Sharif replaced him by the wālī of Mecca, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ghānim.¹ He, however, does not seem to have held this post very long, as in Dhu'l-Qa'da 849/March 1446 it was assigned to a Qāḍi Shafa'i of Mecca.²

In the following year, the Hisba together with other posts was entrusted to an Egyptian Amir named Bayram Khuja.³

In Rajab 872/March 1468 the Hisba seems to have been again assigned by Sultan Qā'it Bāy to Sharif Muḥammad, as Shahīn, a slave of the Sharif, is explicitly referred to as a wālī and muhtasib.⁴ He appears to have held the post of Hisba only until Dhu'l-Qa'da 872/July 1468 when it was assigned to Bāsh al-Mamālīk.⁵

Later, probably around 874/1469, the Hisba was again assigned to Sharif Muḥammad.⁶ An edict sent in Jumādā I 875/November 1470, proves that the Sharif was reluctant to keep the post which subsequently was assigned, by the end of 875/May or June 1471, to Bāsh al-Mamālīk.⁷

This reluctance of the Sharif may have been due to the difficulties resulting from the dual responsibilities or his dislike of taking charge of the duties for an interim period. However, whether or not the duties of

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 256. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, p.143.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 259.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 263.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 318.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 319.

⁶Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 322.

⁷Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 325 and 332-33.

Sulṭānī Muhtasib were placed under the supervision of the Sharif, his right to appoint his own Muhtasib was not affected and the simultaneous existence of Sulṭānī and Sharifī Muhtasib is well documented. Al-Najm Ibn Fahd and his son Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, for instance, refer to Amir Sunqur al-Jamālī as Sulṭānī Muhtasib in Mecca prior to, during, and after 890/1485.¹ But in this very year, during Sunqur's tenure of this office, the Sharif appointed one of his men, ‘Alī al-‘Ajalānī, to the post of Hisba in Mecca.²

In Rabi‘ I or II 905/November or December 1499, reference is made to the presence of two Muhtasibs at a social gathering in Mecca.³ Obviously one of these was appointed by the Egyptian Sultan and the other by the Sharif of Mecca.

In Shawwāl 905/June 1500, after the deposition of the Sulṭānī Muhtasib, the responsibilities of the post were assigned to Sharif Barakāt II, who entrusted his own Muhtasib with the duties until the arrival of an official from Cairo, Qānṣawh al-Jawshan, in the capacity of Bāsh and Muhtasib in Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 905/July 1500.⁴ This, however, does not mean that the Muhtasib appointed by the Sharif ceased to function, as shortly after the Sharif appointed his slave Dūghān to the post of Hisba.⁵

The simultaneous presence of two officials with the identical title and the same or similar responsibilities cannot but have resulted in occasional friction and some arrangement or other to facilitate their peaceful, not to say harmonious, co-existence must have been made. Unfortunately, no details of this kind are given in the sources. Possibly

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 369 and 374; Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 47, 63-64 and 68.

²Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 62.

³Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 243-44.

⁴Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 247-50.

⁵Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 250.

there was a clear-cut division in their responsibilities so that, for example, the authority of the Sharīfī Muhtasib was confined to the supervision of the local markets and petty trade, while the Sulṭānī Muhtasib enjoyed a somewhat superior position and dealt with the matters of greater importance. In 899/1493-94, for instance, Sharif Muḥammad asked the Sulṭānī Muhtasib and not his own to prevent the Egyptian visitors from trading in grain.¹

The Egyptian Sultans have left the administration as well as the revenue of the port of Jedda in their entirety to the Sharifs of Mecca in the early part of the Burjī period. There are occasional references to officials of the Sharifs in Jedda in this period, but usually no mention is made of their official status, responsibilities, or methods of work. Among the ablest was Jābir al-Harāshī, who was appointed by Sharif Ḥasan as official in charge of Jedda around 806/1403-4. His most important achievement was the construction of a pier of Jedda which greatly increased the commercial activities in the port, and consequently its revenue. Jābir became rather arrogant and boastful of his achievements which soon led to the deterioration of his relations with Sharif Ḥasan. Jābir fled once to Egypt and then to Yemen, and his intrigues created occasional tension between the Sultans of these countries and Sharif Ḥasan. Shortly after, however, Jābir was reconciled with the Sharif and restored to his former position in Jedda. Their relations, however, were subject to further fluctuations. In 816/1413 Sharif Ḥasan suspected Jābir of being in sympathy with Rumaytha,² and reacted sharply by arresting Jābir together with his son and hanging them in Mecca in Dhu'l-Hijja 816/April 1414.³

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 166.

²See supra, pp. 65-66.

³Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 141a-41b; part II, fols. 366a-67a, 404a-6a and 408a-8b; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 3b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 275b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 132, 136, 138, 141-42, 146, 152-53 and 155; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. III, vol. IV, p. 51; vol. VII, p. 208. See also: Janābī, op.cit., fol. 305b; Iṣāmī, op.cit., / pp. 254-55.

While Jābir was still in charge of Jedda, another official, Mas'ūd al-Ṣubḥī also appears to have held a responsible position and possibly was in control of the revenue. This assumption is confirmed by an account in Fāsī followed by others of how Mas'ūd al-Ṣubḥī suffered in 815/1412 grievous bodily harm from a nephew of Sharif Ḥasan, to whom he had failed to pay the remainder of a draft. That this incident led to a confrontation between the Sharif and his nephew proves in what esteem this official was held by the Sharif.¹

Fāsī followed by Sakhāwī refer to another official of Sharif Ḥasan in Jedda, 'Abdullah b. 'Alī, known as al-Muzriq (d. 826/1423) whose official responsibility appears to have been the collection of taxes.² Most of the officials of the Sharifs who are referred to under mention of their titles were appointed in the later part of the Burjī period and fall into the following categories, analogous to those existing in Mecca.

Wazīr

Strange as it may seem, few individuals are referred to with the title "Wazīr Jedda" in addition to those who held this post in Mecca. This indicates that the post was assigned on a regional basis and that the Sharif may have been served by more than one wazīr. The most important official in Jedda in the capacity of ^{wazīr was} Rājih b. Shumayla who, like his father, had been initially an official of minor rank but soon reached prominence and eventually became wazīr of Sharif Muḥammad. Rājih seems to have possessed considerable wealth. According to al-Najm Ibn Fahd, Rājih offered the Sharif financial help during the hostility between the Sharif and Budayr. During this confrontation Rājih joined Budayr under duress

¹Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 407b-8a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 151 and 155; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. X, p.158.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 39b; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. V, pp.35-36.

³This Shumayla too is reported to have been a Wazīr of Sharif Ḥasan b. 'Ajlān See: Muḥammad(?) b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Faraj, al-Silāh wa'l-'Udda fī Ta'rikh Bandar Jidda, (MS, L.U.I. Adbiyat Kutuphanesi, No. 7415(127), fol. 19b.

but then deserted when the opportunity arose. The Sharif abstained from reprisals against him; nor did he withhold his favours and Rājiḥ seems to have retained the post until his death in Rabi' I 887/May 1482.¹ Another official, Badr al-Ḥabashī, described by Sakhāwī as wazīr Jedda around 887/1482, was probably appointed after Rājiḥ's death.² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd in the same year describes Badr, not as wazīr but as al-Muqaddam³ of Jedda.⁴ It may, however, be a question of the successive positions, or the official in question acting in both capacities simultaneously.

When Sharif Hazzā', after defeating his brother Barakāt II, appointed his own officials in Jedda in Jumādā I 907/December 1501, he seems to have nominated his wazīr Muḥammad, son of above mentioned Rājiḥ, a governor of Jedda, who, thus, may have acted as wazīr Jedda.⁵ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd does not mention Muḥammad b. Rājiḥ's official capacity at the time of his appointment⁶ but describes him much later during the emirate of Barakāt II as the head of the Sharif's officials (Kabīr al-Mubāshirīn) in Jedda.⁷

¹ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fols. 293-300 and 319; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.223; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 18. See also: Ibn Faraj, op.cit., fol. 19b.

² Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. X, p.166.

³ Literally - head of a group. Evidently it is used here to describe the official in charge of the pier of Jedda which belonged to the Sharif.

⁴ . . Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 23

⁵ Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḍl, fol. 116b; idem, Qurra, p.223. See also: 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.284; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 22.

⁶ Bulūgh, vol. II, fol. 6.

⁷ Bulūgh, vol. II, fol. 262.

Nā'ib al-Balad

In Ṣafar 846/June or July 1442, Miftāḥ Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasanī, a slave of Sharif Ḥasan, is referred to as the deputy of Sharif Barakāt I in Jedda. Nothing much is known about him except that he was killed during a clash between his deposed master and the newly appointed Amir of Mecca, Sharif 'Alī.¹

Presumably there were many other officials who acted as deputy of the Sharif in Jedda. For many years, however, the sources make no clear reference to the existence of Nā'ib al-Balad in Jedda until Jumādā II 919/August 1513.²

The deputy or other officials of the Sharif enjoyed reasonable authority over the indigenous population and a fair share in local administration. But they do not seem to have been treated with much respect by the Egyptian dignitaries and the Sultani officials. In Sha'bān 919/November 1513, for instance, the then Nā'ib of the Sharif in Jedda tried to prevent an Egyptian dignitary from monopolizing the grain trade. He not only did not succeed, but was rebuked and insulted. Unable to retaliate, he left the city in anger, taking other officials of the Sharif with him.³ In Rajab 920/September or October 1514, Nā'ib of the Sharif in Jedda, Mas'ūd, was humiliated by Amir Ḥusayn al-Kurdī.⁴ No retaliatory measures on his part or that of Sharif Barakāt II are reported.⁵

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 239; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. X., pp. 40-41 and 166; idem, al-Tibr, p.61.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 231-32.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 234.

⁴See infra, pp. 293-97.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fols. 247-48.

Wālī

There may have been several successive wālīs but surprisingly only one person is clearly referred to as such. He was Yāqūt al-‘Uqaylī (or al-‘Aqīlī) and appears to have acted as wālī during the emirate of Barakāt I and his son Muḥammad. In Rajab 860/July 1456, Yāqūt was attacked and killed by the slave of a man he was trying to arrest.¹

Hākīm

In the sources several references indicate that a number of officials acted in Jedda in that capacity. But what little information is available does not exceed this fact.²

Tax collectors

In fact the spheres of activity of administrators and tax-collectors, among the officials of the Sharifs in Jedda, cannot be effectively separated so that the distinction is somewhat artificial. However, a number of officials whose prime concern it was to collect taxes were in attendance at the Furḍa (i.e. pier) of Jedda, which was divided between the Egyptian Sultans and the Sharifs of Mecca and was called Furḍat al-Sultān and Furḍat al-Sharīf respectively.³ The officials of the latter are usually referred to by the vague term "Rijāl al-Sharīf" (i.e. the men of the Sharif) and very occasional specific titles are used to indicate their rank and duties. Thus an official of Barakāt I, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Yamāni (d. Ṣafar 840/August or September 1436) is described as Mustawfī⁴ in Jedda.⁵

¹Sakhāwī, al-Daw, vol. X, p.214.

²Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 41-42, 59, 151, 247 and 262; vol. II, fols. 38, 42 and 59; Ibn al-Dayba‘, al-Faḍl, fols. 116b-17a; idem, Qurra, fol. 223. See also: ‘Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.284; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol.22; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 137.

³Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 168; vol. II, fols. 96-97, 108, 115, 164, 172 and 209.

⁴Mustawfī, an official in charge of government accounts. See: R.Levy, E.I.¹,

Another official in Jedda named 'Umar al-Yamānī (d. Dhu'l-Qa'da 865/September 1461) seems to have been acting as tax collector.¹

Another, Muwaffaq al-Ḥabashī by name (d. Ramāḍan 888/November 1483), is designated as al-Mutaṣarrif bi amr Bandar Jedda (i.e. the official in charge of Jedda's port).²

A number of the officials appointed by the Sharifs are described as Mubāshir³ in Jedda or with other similar title, but little else is known about them.⁴

The existence of two parallel groups of Sultānī and Sharifī officials, together with the division of Jedda's pier and the revenue between them was bound to create financial disputes over the distribution of the revenue levied on certain vessels and these were usually settled in favour of the Sultan's officials.⁵

B. The influence of the Sharifs over the Sultani officials

The influence of the Sharifs over the Sultani officials was rather limited. Nevertheless, it was not negligible as, after all, they were the

art. "Mustawfi", pp. 772-73. The duties of this official in Jedda appear to have been similar to those of a modern auditor.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 220; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p.34.

¹Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. VI, p.77.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 41.

³From Bāshara "to manage", "to conduct" etc; it does not designate the holder of a specific post but is often used as a general term with reference to those officials in Jedda who were appointed for the collection of taxes.

⁴See: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 290; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.307; vol. IV, p.77; vol. X, p.166; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 101, 546 and 571; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 3-4, 23, 39, 142-43 and 262; vol. II, fols. 40, 194 and 259.

⁵For details, see: Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 168; vol. II, fols. 96-97, 108, 115, 142, 172, 260-64 and 272-73.

immediate rulers of the area and their views were given some consideration by their Egyptian overlords themselves, so that it would have been sheer folly for an official to disregard or ignore them completely.

The influence of the Sharifs was comparatively greater on those Sulṭānī officials who were of local origin than on those who had been sent from Cairo. For an appointee to a local post it was imperative to be on good terms with the Sharif so as to be able to perform his duties satisfactorily; if he was not, snags were bound to occur almost immediately. Thus, in Jumādā I 788/July 1386, Sultan Barquq deposed, at the suggestion of Sharif Ahmad, a Qādi Shafa'ī of Mecca who held the posts of Khiṭāba¹ and Naṣr al-Ḥaram² as well, and appointed another official instead.³

Early in 820/February or March 1417, a newly appointed Qādi Māliki, whose relations with Sharif Ḥasan were not friendly, was unable to discharge his official responsibilities and - whether it was the doing of the Sharif or not - was shortly after replaced by another Qādi.⁴

There is evidence to the effect that some Shaykh al-Ḥajaba,⁵ in the early part of the period in question, were appointed by the Sharifs

¹The official assigned to this post is mentioned with the title Khaṭīb, who delivers Khuṭba (i.e. sermon) at the Friday congregational prayer in the mosque. See: John Pederson, E.I.¹, art. "Khaṭīb", pp. 927-29; A.J. Wensinck, E.I.¹, art. "Khuṭba", pp. 980-83.

²The official who held this post supervised the functions and matters related to the Meccan sanctuary and enjoyed authority over most of its officials. The office of "Naṣr al-Ḥaram", in the pre-Burjī period, was called "Mashikhat al-Ḥaram". See: Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 96b. ³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. III, fol. 105b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 109.

⁴Fāsi, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 289b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 170; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, p. 8.

⁵This term is used in its plural form (sing. Ḥajīb). The title Ḥajīb has several meanings, such as "sheltering", "veiling", but is used here in the sense of "chamberlain". This title is applied to the senior member of the Shaybi family who, since the time of the Prophet Muhammad, enjoyed the exclusive privilege of being the custodian of the Ka'ba and holding the key to its door.

of Mecca and were usually confirmed by the Egyptian Sultans.¹

In Jumādā I or II 824/June or July 1421 the two joint officials to the posts of Khiṭāba, Ḥisba, and Naẓr al-Ḥaram, found it difficult to work in harmony with each other. At the suggestion of Sharif Ḥasan, they agreed to a suspension in favour of a candidate recommended by the Sharif to perform their duties temporarily. The Sharif sent the news to Sultan Ṭaṭar with the suggestion that these posts should be assigned to a single official, a request which was viewed with favour by the Sultan, so that one of the two previous incumbents was appointed.²

In 837/1433, a certain merchant, Dā'wūd al-Kīlānī by name, secured, by offering a sum of money to Sultan Barsbāy, the post of Naẓr al-Ḥaram. But Sharif Barakāt I refused to acknowledge him as such and replaced him by another Egyptian official and his decision was confirmed by the Sultan.³ In Dhu'l-Qa'da 882/March 1478, Sultan Qā'it Bāy appointed a candidate, on the recommendation of Sharif Muḥammad, to the post of Qaḍā' in Jedda.⁴

It is unnecessary to say that any decision of the Sharifs was valid only if confirmed by the Sultan. In Jumādā II 799/April 1397, for instance, a Qaḍī Shafa'i of Mecca appointed the sons of a deceased Māliki Imām to the post held by their father. This was opposed by Sharif Ḥasan, who put forward a favourite of his own. But Sultan Barquq confirmed the previous appointment of the Qaḍī and the Sharif's nominee was deposed.⁵

The Sultānī officials usually did not take sides during the frequently ensuing internal strife. Some of those who did were to suffer dire

¹See: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 313b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 127b-28a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 81, 98, 105 and 109; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. V, pp. 295-96.

²Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 123a-23b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 180; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IX, p.214; idem, al-Tibr, p.31.

³Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 379 and 382-83; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 127b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., fols. 214 and 216; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 214 and 285-86; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 152-53.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 364.

⁵Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 289a; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IX, p.78.

consequences. This is evident from the fate of a Qādi Shafa'i of Mecca who supported Sharif ^{Jazānī} ~~Hasā~~¹ and was later brought to account by Sharif Barakāt II. Qādi's property was confiscated and he himself was imprisoned, tortured, and eventually put to death by drowning near al-Qumfudha about 908/1502. There is nothing in the sources to suggest that the Egyptian Sultan tried to intervene or showed displeasure at this harsh treatment of the Qādi and his tragic death.²

Unlike other officials, ^{sent from Cairo} the Sulṭānī Muḥtasib was under somewhat greater influence of the Sharifs.³ Though he was not obliged to, some fought with the Sharif against his opponents. In 907/1502, for instance, the Sulṭānī Muḥtasib was killed during a clash with the opponents of the ruling Sharif of Mecca.⁴

However, when the post of Ḥisba was assigned to Bāsh al-Mamālīk, the influence of the Sharif on this/^{official in his dual capacity} was almost negligible. Though the Sultan sometimes sent explicit instructions to Bāsh and Muḥtasib of Mecca to pay heed to the views of the Sharif and to avoid harming the people,⁵ they were seldom obeyed.⁶ The Sharifs of Mecca were very occasionally able to impose their decision on the Bāsh and Muḥtasib of Mecca. In 905/1499, for instance, someone complained to Sharif Barakāt II that the Bāsh had extorted forty dinars from him, the Sharif intervened

¹See supra, p. 89.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 6, 13-16 and 18; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, p. 223; idem, al-Faql, fols. 117b-19a. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 352-53; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, p. 36; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 284-85 and 301-2; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 20-24 and 27; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 137-39; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 47.

³See supra, pp. 242-45.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 5-6 and 27-28.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 284 and 350.

⁶See infra, pp. 273-80.

and the Bāsh had to return the amount to his victim.¹ In the same year, a number of Mamlūk soldiers, guilty of causing disturbances, were expelled from Mecca at the order of Egyptian Sultan who appears to have responded to Sharif's request.² In 906/1500, the Egyptian Sultan instructed the Sharif to keep the conduct of Bāsh and Muhtasib in Mecca under strict supervision.³ This and other similar instructions obviously meant that the Sharif was authorized to intervene whenever he regarded it necessary. Early in 915/April or May 1509, Sharif Barakāt II sent a strongly worded warning to the Bāsh to desist from his harmful policies. This angered the Bāsh who thought of sending back a harsh reply. But on the advice of a local qādi he replied politely, and even in an apologetic manner.⁴

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 242.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 247-48.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 256.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 162.

Chapter IX

THE POSTS HELD BY THE SULTANI OFFICIALS IN MECCA

A. The officials appointed to the posts related to the Meccan sanctuary

The politico-economic hegemony of the Egyptian Sultans was fully reflected in the dominant position of their officials in the local administration. The Sultānī officials, in both Jedda and Mecca, enjoyed a far greater measure of authority than those appointed by the Sharifs of Mecca.

The usual duties of officials such as the Imāms, Khatibs and Mu'adhhdhins¹ are well known, but it may not be amiss to mention certain local particularities. Long before the Burjī period four Maqāmāt² were erected in the Meccan sanctuary, where the Imāms of the four Sunni schools³ led the five prayers⁴ for their followers.⁵ This remained the case throughout the Burjī period. The Shafa'i Imām, as the first to lead the prayer, held the dominant position; second in order was the Māliki, who was followed by the Ḥanafi and Ḥanbali Imāms. In 792/1389-90, however, a change in the sequence occurred and the Ḥanafi preceded both his Māliki

¹ Mu'adhhdhin is a title used for the caller to the prayer.

² Maqāmāt, sing. Maqām, were four small semi-enclosed places located at a short distance away from the Ka'ba, each facing one of its four walls.

³ The Shāfa'i, Ḥanbalī, Mālikī, and Ḥanafi.

⁴ Fajr, Ẓuhr, 'Aṣr, Maghrib, and 'Ishā', held daily in the order of mentioning, shortly before dawn, shortly after noon, early evening, immediately after sunset, roughly two hours after Maghrib.

⁵ Ibn Jubayr, op.cit., pp. 101-4; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, op.cit., vol. I, pp. 83-84, 92-94, 98-99 and 102-3.

and Ḥanbali colleagues. This sequence was observed in four out of the five prayers: only the prayer of Maghrib was led by all four Imāms simultaneously, which often gave rise to confusion. In or around 811/1408, the Shafa'i alone was authorised to lead this prayer but around 816/1413 the original practice was restored.¹

Several Mua'dhdhin were employed at the Meccan sanctuary and followed their chief in adhān,² who determined the time appropriate by the traditional method according to the position of the sun and the stars, with the additional use of the sundial.³

In the early part of the period in question the post of Khiṭāba was exclusively assigned to the Shafa'i but a Ḥanafi Khatīb was also appointed at a later date. The Māliki and Ḥanbali were not appointed in this post until usage changed in the Ottoman period around 1030/1620-21.⁴

Shaykh al-Ḥajaba,⁵ held the key to the Ka'ba's door and was alone, except for his deputy, entitled to open it for visitors.⁶ He was in charge of the maintenance of order, cleanliness and minor repairs in the Ka'ba.⁷ The gifts sent for the Ka'ba were obviously kept under his custody. Some of these are said to have been occasionally appropriated

¹ Fasī, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 243-46 and 256; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 4, 6, 8, 125, 133 and 141; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 115, 138, 141 and 156. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., pp. 209-16; Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 314 and 317; Nahrawālī, op.cit., p.196; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 107-8 and 116-18; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 281, 334-35, 337-39, 341-42 and 344; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 73-75 and 77.

² This word means "announcement" but it is used as a technical term for the call to prayers. See: Th. W. Joynboll, E.I.², art. "Adhān", pp. 187-88.

³ Fasī, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 113b; idem, Shifā', vol. I, p.242; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 38 and 90. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.216; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 40 and 119.

⁴ 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 118.

⁵ See supra, p. 251 *fn 5*.

⁶ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 128a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 109; Sakhawī, al-Daw', vol. XI, p.7. See also: 'Alī al-Ṭabarī,

by this or other officials.¹

The Shaykh al-Ḥajaba was not only almost entirely free of financial obligation to the Sultan but also drew a substantial financial income. This was derived partly from gifts of gold, silver and precious woods donated by the Egyptian Sultans whenever the Ka'ba's door was altered and the reject became the property of this official. The majority of the references to such gifts or ornamentation come from the pre-Burjī period, and the sources assess the value of the gold and silver alone at 35,000 dirhams, but occasional references are found during the Burjī period though the amount spent was not great. The wood of the door was also of great value, as it was usually cut into pieces and sold for considerable sums of money.² The Shaykh al-Ḥajaba also benefited by the annual replacement of the Kiswa of the Ka'ba, as he claimed the old Kiswa, pieces of which were offered for sale to the faithful. This gift, however, was shared with Sharif of Mecca who received a portion in kind or the sum of five or six thousand dirhams. In 788/1386, Sharif 'Anān voluntarily renounced his share but in 798/1396 Sharif Ḥasan claimed it again and the practice seems to have continued thereafter.³ The Shaykh al-Ḥajaba's income was further eked out by the traditional tips paid by the pilgrims and other faithful on entering the Ka'ba.⁴

op.cit., fol. 124; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 88-89.

⁷ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 185-86; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 174, 179-80 and 190. See also: Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 127-28.

¹ Ibn Ḥayyāra, op.cit., p.113; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 62-63.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 17a; vol. II, part IV, fol. 387b; idem, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 103-4 and 116; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 59, 98, 101 and 126; Suyūṭī, op.cit., p.486; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. I, p.166. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.25; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 54-55; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, p.342; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol.100.

³ Qalqashandī, Subh, vol. IV, pp. 276 and 283; Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, pp. 125-26; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. II, part III, fol. 255b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 108. See also: Ibn Ḥayyāra, op.cit., p.108; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 71-72; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 84; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 249-50.

⁴ Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 20a; idem, Shifā', vol. I, p.128.

This official was occasionally appointed to other posts. In Sha'bān 830/July 1427, for instance, Muḥammad al-Shaybī, then the incumbent of the post, was nominated Qāḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca, a position he retained until his death in Rabi' II 837/December 1433 or January 1434.¹ In Ramaḍān 907/April 1502, a Shaykh al-Ḥajaba was offered by Sharif Barakāt I some of the responsibilities of Nāzir al-Ḥaram but the official declined the offer.² As the post could not but be assigned to one of the Shaybis, and no outsider could compete, disputes were rare and far between and were usually amicably settled.³

B. Qāḍis of four Sunni schools and the dominant position of the Shāfa'i

In the early part of the Burjī period, the Qāḍi of Mecca was exclusively of Shāfa'i madhhab.⁴

The first appointment of a Ḥanafī Qāḍi in Mecca is reported in 806/1404⁵ or 807/1405,⁶ and of the first Mālikī Qāḍi in 807/1405.⁷ A year or two later, the first Ḥanbalī Qāḍi was appointed in Mecca and later he was offered and accepted a parallel appointment in Medina, and subsequently held both positions until his death in Shawwāl 853/December 1449. He is said to have often visited Shāh Rukh or his son. The Qāḍi was honourably

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 382; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 90a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 331a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fols. 198 and 214; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. IX, pp. 13-14; idem, al-Dhayl, fols. 92b and 99b; see also: Ibn al-Imād, op. cit., vol. VII, pp. 223-24.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fol. 13.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. I, fols. 94 and 107.

⁴Usually translated 'rite', 'provenance' or 'school'. A madhhab is one of four legal systems recognized as orthodox by Sunni Muslims. They are named after their founders - the Ḥanafī, Ḥanbalī, Mālikī, and Shāfa'i madhhab.

⁵Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 307b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 80a-80b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fols. 132-33; Sakhāwī, al-Ḍaw', vol. II, p. 189.

⁶Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fol. 216b; 'Aynī, op. cit., vol. IV, fol. 543a. See also: Janābī, op. cit., fol. 305a.

⁷Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 107b and 122a; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā',

treated by these Timūrid rulers and received from them a substantial sum of money as a grant.¹ All Qādis of Mecca were generally selected from certain prominent local families, but there were exceptions to this custom. In 848/1444, for instance, the post of Qādā' in Mecca was assigned to an Egyptian for a short period.²

The Qādi Shāfa'i enjoyed a dominant position among the Qādis of Mecca. His judicial authority was undisputed, and unlike that of others, was recognized in Mecca itself as well as in other places in the region.³ His supremacy was rarely challenged but there were sporadic occurrences of that kind. In Rajab 916/November 1510, for instance, the Qādi Māliki of Mecca secured a decree by which he obtained, like the Shāfa'i, judicial authority in the whole region of Mecca which was regarded by the Qādi Shāfa'i as a serious infringement of his exclusive position, and he refused to acknowledge the Māliki's equal status. In Ramaḍān of the same year (January 1511) the Shāfa'i secured an edict re-affirming his exclusive position.⁴

vol. I, fol. 216b; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 543a; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 250b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 133; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VII, p.19; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 726-27. See also: Janabī, op.cit., fol. 305a; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.199.

¹Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols.78b-79a; idem, Hawādith, vol. I, fols. 107 and 117-18; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 189 and 200; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 133, 138 and 270-71; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, pp. 333-34; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.36; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, p.46; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 281-82. See also: Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 277-78.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 255; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 94-95, 114 and 140.

³Fasī, Shifā', vol. I, p.25; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 10b, part II, fol. 274a; vol. II, part III, fol. 260b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 161, 163, 211, 239, 259, 295, 333-34 and 345; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 303-4; vol. II, pp. 190-93; vol. IV, p.20; vol. V, pp. 209 and 219; vol. VI, pp. 9-10, 156 and 269; vol. VIII, pp. 208-9; vol. IX, pp. 92, 144, 193 and 266-67; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 124, 290-91 and 374; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.338; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 54, 57, 79-80, 126, 133, 144, 223 and 251; vol. II, fols. 101 and 188. See also: 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fols. 120-21; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.168.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 185-86 and 188.

The superior status and wider influence of the Qādi Shāfa'ī was due to a large extent to the fact that he often held several other posts such as: Khiṭāba, Hisba, Nāẓir al-Ḥaram, distributed various donations and supervised various charitable and welfare institutions, which is confirmed by several references in the sources.¹ This, however, was not an unbreakable rule. At times, some of these posts were assigned to a person or persons other than the Qādi Shāfa'ī of Mecca.² The assignment of more than one post to an official was occasionally beyond the reasonable limit and one wonders how that incumbent could have performed the conflicting duties of his various posts. Thus, for instance, an official, Bardbek al-Ṭāji, sent to Mecca in Sha'bān 854/October 1450, acted, until his dismissal in 857/1453, as Muḥtasib, Nāẓir al-Ḥaram, Shādd al-'Amā'ir,³ Shādd Jadda,⁴ and the supervision of various endowments and general works of welfare.⁵

¹For details, see: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 96a-97a, 121b-23b, 168a-70a and 230a-30b: part II, fols. 295b-96a; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 263 and 417: vol. III, fols. 101a, 102a and 105b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 251a, 258b, 313b-14b, 381b and 512b; idem, Ḥawāḍith, vol. I, fol. 118: part II (ed. W. Popper), p. 316; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 27, 104, 109, 124, 128, 132, 135, 138, 142, 146, 156, 160-61, 170-71, 176-77, 189, 197, 226, 239, 250, 259, 333-34 and 345; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 32, 198-200 and 436; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 719-20 and 729-30; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 88-89: vol. II, pp. 190-93 and 306; vol. VII, pp. 7, 45-46 and 84-85: vol. VIII, pp. 92-95: vol. IX, pp. 13-14, 77-78, 143-44 and 214-16; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 75, 124, 290-91 and 334; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 80: vol. II, fols. 37 and 133; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. II, p. 58; idem, Badā'i' (U.P.), pp. 43-44. See also: Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VI, p. 292 and 322-23: vol. VII, pp. 148, 278 and 292.

²For details, see: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fol. 168a-70a: part II, fol. 363b; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 263, 379, 382, 390 and 392; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 90a and 134b; Ibn Taghri Birdī, Ḥawāḍith, vol. I, fols. 52, 111-12 and 272; idem, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 251a, 313b-14b, 331a and 344b-45a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 156, 160, 189, 198, 214, 217-18 and 263; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 90b; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 7-8, 11, 38 and 248; idem, al-Tuhfa, vol. I, fols. 845-46; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 289-90 and 320; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 22 and 127: vol. IV, p. 10; vol. VIII, pp. 281-82. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p. 217; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 8; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 105.

³This official was in charge of the construction works.

Several references in the sources concerning the activities of Nāzir al-Ḥaram show that it was his duty to prevent unauthorized persons from performing duties connected with the sanctuary, to provide certain facilities for the pilgrims such as drinking water, to supervise the repairs or cleaning of the sanctuary, especially after the entering of flood water and the rubbish it brought with it to the sanctuary.¹ In this task he was often helped by volunteers. The Nāzir enjoyed authority over the minor officials of the sanctuary and could dismiss, suspend or reinstate them.²

The Qaḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca not only enjoyed authority in various fields, but also a number of exclusive privileges. Each year,³ on the

⁴This official (described often as Mushidd) was entrusted with the collection of taxes in Jedda. The term Shādd is often used in connection with the officials appointed to carry out minor duties such as "Shādd al-Ghanam" (means roughly the supplier of sheep and goats). See: Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.210 and 215) or for the officials in charge of catering, bringing in the supply of water etc., see: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 134-38.

⁵For details, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 146-48, 218, 242, 272 and 276; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 272-73, 276-77 and 280; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 6, 45 and 61; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 320 and 344. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 219-20; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 8-9; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 107.

¹It is known that the sanctuary lies in the lowest part of the city and was - and is still - disposed to the entering of flood water after heavy rain.

²For details, see: Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part I, fols. 67a, 97a and 222b; idem, Shifā', vol. I, p.339; vol. II, pp. 267-69; Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 379; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 169b; vol. II, fols. 121a-21b, 126b, 128a and 172b-73a; Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 670a; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 485; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 52; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 188; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 45, 127, 166, 170, 182-83, 188, 223, 236, 267-70, 272, 276, 284, 288, 302, 308-9, 333 and 338; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 65b; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 7-8, 11, 30, 82, 123, 136, 289-90, 419, 426, 453-54 and 542; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 16-18 and 152-53; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 86-87; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 3, 26-29, 32, 45, 47, 50, 66-67, 72, 101-2, 104, 116, 140, 143, 147, 173-74, 179-82, 189-91, 196, 200-2, 222, 243-44, 248-49 and 251; vol. II, fols. 115, 133, 142, 242-43, 227-28 and 268; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.193 and 264; vol. IV, pp. 375-76. See also: Ibn al-Dayba, Qurra, fol. 208; Jazīrī, op.cit., p.21; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 216-19; Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 110; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 218, 294, 304, 306 and 346; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 4 and 8; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 103-6.

³The references in the sources to this effect are found in the late Burjī

night of 12th Rabi' I, he led a procession from the Meccan sanctuary to the birthplace of the Prophet Muhammad to celebrate the Prophet's birthday. In the procession many dignitaries, including occasionally the Sharifs of Mecca, participated. This was followed on the next morning by a feat (Simāṭ al-Mawlad) given by the Qāḍī Shāfa'i of Mecca.¹

The Qāḍī wore a white garment over his dress as a mark of distinction and strongly opposed the use of a similar garment by other Meccan officials.²

In his capacity of Nāzīr al-Awqāf he was entitled to rent a waqf or exchange it for a sum of money or another place.³

The Qāḍī was often entrusted with the legacies left to orphaned minors, and is said to have discharged this duty faithfully and efficiently. His influential position offered the best possible protection to the interest of these orphans. This is illustrated by the fact that, in 809 or 810/1407-8 Sharif Ḥasan paid the Qāḍī Shāfa'i 30,000 dirhams in compensation for an orphan's property which had been seized by the Sharif earlier.⁴ This sum may have been given voluntarily, but that the Qāḍī had used his influence to obtain it cannot be ruled out.

His honesty, even when deposed, was never doubted. In Shawwāl 875/ April 1471, for instance, a deposed Qāḍī Shāfa'i presented to the new appointee 16,000 or 20,000 dinars which belonged to the orphans but the newly appointed official left it under the care of the deposed.⁵

period. This indicates that this usage was not familiar in Mecca in the early and the middle part of the period.

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 333 and 343; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 425, 456 and 534; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 117, 127, 143, 153, 164, 174, 183, 189, 219, 221, 243 and 251; vol. II, fols. 39, 61, 89, 115, 133, 149-50, 165, 179, 194, 228, 245, 257 and 273. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., pp. 325-26.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 221.

³Fāsī, Shifā', vol. I, p.337; idem, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 408b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 152 and 272-73; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.354; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.52. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 202-3 and 219; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 77-78 and 107.

⁴Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fol. 404b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 136.

The beginning of certain months in the Islamic calendar, such as Ramaḍān,¹ Shawwāl,² or Dhu'l-Ḥijja³ is of particular importance for the beginning or end of certain occasions of religious significance. The timing of the lunar months was usually left to the decision of the Qāḍī Shāfa'i and was rarely questioned.⁴

As no proper courthouse for judicial functions appears to have existed in Mecca, the Qāḍīs presumably used their personal residences or the sanctuary for this purpose. The Qāḍī Shāfa'i alone seems to have used, as a mark of distinction, a dikka,⁵ for the performance of his judicial duties. The first clear reference to the dikka goes back to around 826/1423⁶ but it seems to have later fallen into disuse and was not re-introduced until 845/1441 when a new dikka was erected in the proximity of the Qāḍī's house and adjoining a gate of the sanctuary. However, owing to the opposition of Sultan Jaqmaq it was demolished after several meetings and heated discussions in 846/1442 or the following year.⁷

The respect enjoyed by the Qāḍī Shāfa'i of Mecca is well reflected in the fact that, in Rabi' I 871/November 1446 Sultan Khushqadam blamed Sharif Muḥammad for failing to take action against a Khaṭīb who was showing disrespect to the Qāḍī Shāfa'i and ordered the expulsion of the Khaṭīb in

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 198-200; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 94-95; vol. II, p. 191.

¹The month of fasting.

²It follows Ramaḍān and its first day is 'Id al-Fiṭr, the feast of the breaking of the fast.

³In this month the Muslims perform pilgrimage.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 259; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 16 and 18-19; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 68, 78 and 239; vol. II, fols. 45, 142, 201-2, 205-6, 239 and 269.

⁵A platform. For further details, see: J. Jomier, E.I.², art. "Dikka", p. 276.

⁶Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 186; see also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p. 211; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 83.

⁷Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 236, 240 and 244-45; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 16 and 47.

question from Mecca.¹

In sources and edicts of the last years of the Burjī period, the title "Shaykh al-Islām"² is often used for the acting or preceding Qaḍī Shāfa'i of Mecca.³ It was occasionally used by the Māliki Qaḍī⁴ but the Shāfa'i seem to have protested and it remained exclusively reserved for them.

Indicative of the fact that the Qaḍī Shāfa'i's dominant status was accompanied by considerable wealth is the fact that he was often obliged to pay substantial sums of money to the Egyptian Sultans. Sultan Barqūq appears to have introduced this policy for new appointments, or in return for confirmation in their posts.⁵ Similar practice is reported with regard to later Sultans.⁶

Qaḍī Muḥammad b. Zuhayra (d. around 819/1416) is reported by Sakhāwī to have been the first Meccan Qaḍī to secure his appointment in return for an unspecified amount of money.⁷ But, in reporting the payment of 500 dinars by a Meccan Qaḍī in 841/1438, Maqrīzī states that such extortion was unprecedented.⁸ Commenting on this figure, Sakhāwī remarks that, in his time, such an amount would not even satisfy a servant of the Egyptian Sultan.⁹ From 861/1457 onwards the amounts paid by the

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 314.

²This is one of the honorific titles reserved for 'Ulamā' which first appear in the second half of the fourth century A.H./second half of the tenth century A.D. For further details, see J.H.Kramers, E.I.¹, art. "Shaikh Al-Islam", pp. 275-79.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 36, 42, 46, 54-55, 60, 62, 64-65, 68-69, 76-77, 80, 101, 115, 123, 127, 139, 161, 176, 222, 245 and 250. See also: Nahrwālī, al-I'lām, p.233; Ṭabarī, op.cit., voll I, fols. 128-29.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 72. See also: 'Iṣāmī', op.cit., vol. IV, p.309.

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.12; idem, al-Ḍaw', vol. III, p.12.

⁶Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 401; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII,

Meccan Qādis to the Egyptian Sultans or their officials were fairly large. In 861/1457, a candidate for the post of Qaḍā' al-Shāfa'iyya in Mecca secured his appointment by paying Mushidd Jemma together with other gifts 2,500 Ashrafi.¹ This was presumably paid in return for the intercession of this official on behalf of the applicants with the Sultan, but part of the sum at least must have gone to the Cairo treasury.

Qā'it Bāy, before becoming Sultan, is reported to have criticized this practice, but continued in it himself after his accession to the throne.² It was during his rule that in 876/1471 the brother of a deposed Qādi Shāfa'i of Mecca went to Cairo to pave the way, evidently on a financial basis, for the re-appointment of his brother.³ At the end of 877/May 1474, the deposed Qādi in the company of Sharif Barakāt II and several Meccan dignitaries went to Cairo. These took with them the Irāqī captives and appear to have used this incident successfully to their advantage. The Qādi was re-appointed and Barakāt II was granted the co-emirate with his father. Among the sources only Sakhāwī (in al-Daw') and Ibn Iyās clearly mention that a payment of money was made. Ibn Iyās specifies the figure of about 100,000 dinars but without giving the individual shares of these Meccan dignitaries.⁵

fol. 20; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 95-96; vol. IV, pp. 204-5; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. III, p.86. Various evidence to this effect is to be found in the following pages.

⁷Al-Daw', vol. IX, pp. 77-78.

⁸Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 401.

⁹Al-Daw', vol. IX, p.78; idem, al-Dhayl, fol. 103b.

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 288-89.

²Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VI, pp. 204-5.

³Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, p.95; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 200 and 206; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. III, p.59.

⁴See supra, pp. 84 and 139-40.

⁵For further details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 340-43;

In 891/1486, a dispute between a Khatīb and Qāḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca resulted in the involvement of Sharif Muḥammad who supported the Qāḍi and suspended the Khatīb. But the dispute continued until the death of the Qāḍi whose son, at the request of the Sharif, was appointed. Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd relates that the Sharif paid 10,000 dinars to Sultan Qā'it Bāy; the circumstances in which this payment was made indicate that the intention was to secure the appointment of the Qāḍi's son. Other sources agree on the main point but do not refer to this payment clearly.¹

In 894/1489, the Qāḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca paid 2,000 dinars either to the Sultan or the Sharif. The doubt arises because Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd uses the word "al-Dawla" (i.e. state) instead of naming the ruler.²

In 903/1497 Sharif Barakāt II and others were ordered by an edict to pay 10,000 dinars to an Egyptian Amir who was visiting Mecca. The prospective share of the Qāḍi Shāfa'i in this payment was to have been the 2,000 dinars, but the sudden death of ^{the} Egyptian/Amir made the payment superfluous.³

Following the tragic death of a Qāḍi Shāfa'i of Mecca in 908/1502⁴

Sultan al-Ghawrī authorized Sharif Jāzānī to appoint a successor to the office, provided that the appointee gave 15,000 dinars to the Sultan.⁵ The next year a son of the deceased Qāḍi was appointed, but the sum he paid at the time amounted to only 5,000 dinars.⁶ The remainder

Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 95-96; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 200 and 218-19; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. III, pp. 86 and 89-90. See also: Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 12; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 125; Dahlān, op.cit., p. 44.

¹Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 329-32, 337-38 and 362; idem, al-Daw', vol. II, pp. 168-70; vol. IX, pp. 193-94; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 70-73, 76-80, 84 and 89; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. III, pp. 229-30 and 229-300. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 342.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 115.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 230.

⁴See supra, pp. 89 and 252-53.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 26.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 37-38.

was apparently left unpaid since, in 914/1508, the Qāḍī was warned that unless he paid a further 10,000 dinars he would be brought in custody to Cairo. Unable or unwilling to pay he was taken to Cairo,¹ and the Sultan appears to have reduced the debt to 5,000 dinars in Rabi' II 915/August 1509. This amount was lent to the Qāḍī by an Egyptian Amir and the Qāḍī was allowed to leave for Mecca.² A later reference indicates that the Qāḍī had paid the whole 10,000 dinars, as in 921/1515 a servant of the Sultan had claimed and obtained 500 dinars from the Qāḍī as the usual 5^o/o share of any offering to the Sultan.³

The wording of some sources creates the impression that the Qāḍī, after being taken to Cairo, was kept as a semi-captive until released by the Ottoman Sultan Selim I in 923/1517.⁴

Modest sums of money were occasionally paid by the Qāḍīs of other schools. Thus, in 899/1494, a Ḥanbalī Qāḍī paid 300 or 500 dinars in return for his appointment.⁵ which, however, is mentioned by another source without reference to a payment.⁶ In 919/1513, a Mālikī Qāḍī secured his appointment for 500 dinars, but payment was not enforced owing to the intervention of Sharif Barakāt II.⁷

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 160-61. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.357.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 167, 169, 175 and 181.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 270-71.

⁴Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. V, pp. 78-79; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p.284; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.318; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 51; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.50.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 171.

⁶Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.297.

⁷Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 229 and 234-35.

C. Muhtasib

From what has been said earlier,¹ it is evident that the office very seldom had an incumbent who had no other responsibilities. References to officials who held no post apart from the Hisba are rare: and usually occur from 883/1479 onwards.²

Among the traditional responsibilities of the Muhtasib was the prevention of improper behaviour and the supervision of affairs connected with the local market such as correctness of scales and prices. This gave the Muhtasib considerable authority over the traders. References are made to the effect that the Muhtasib punished those who were guilty of using incorrect scales or who failed to observe the official exchange rates of the currencies.³

The Muhtasib was helped in his duties by subordinate officials. Should any of the latter act with undue harshness, he could be deposed and even imprisoned.⁴

Whether or not the Sultānī Muhtasib in Mecca was officially entitled to collect taxes from the trader is uncertain. But the Muhtasib in Cairo seems to have been authorized to do so,⁵ and the Meccan Muhtasib may have felt encouraged to emulate him and is reported to have imposed a tax on traders in Mecca.⁶ However, the amounts or percentages are not made clear; nor is it known whether it was done with the approval of the Sultan. In fact there is evidence to suggest that such collection was opposed by the

¹See supra, pp. 242-45 and 260.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 369 and 374; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, p.273; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 3-5, 7-8, 41-44, 49-50, 56-58, 63, 68,79, 87-89, 118, 122, 133, 144, 157, 159, 172-73, 185, 196, 198, 204, 214, 216, 233, 256, 258, 260 and 262: vol. II, fols. 5-6, 15, 26-27, 270 and 273; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. IV, pp. 454-55.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 38, 245, 253 and 258.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 272.

⁵Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 135a and 167a.

⁶Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 233.

Egyptian Sultan. In 904/1498, for instance, a Sultānī Muhtasib was ordered by an edict not to collect taxes but the official failed to comply and was deposed.¹

Should the decision of the Muhtasib in some matters be opposed by a proper authority, it was the view of the latter which prevailed. In 905/1499, for instance, the matter of a debt was settled in accordance with the wishes of a Qādi Shāfa'i which seems to have been against the desire of the Muhtasib.²

The Muhtasib was allowed reasonable freedom to inspect goods but in the presence of its owners. In 905/1499, the Muhtasib of Mecca opened a warehouse to be inspected in the absence and without the knowledge of the merchant, who complained to Sultan Qānṣawh or Janblāṭ claiming that he had suffered material loss, and the Muhtasib was deposed.³

Despite the above stated action against the Muhtasib the Egyptian Sultans did not oppose the exploitation when it was for the benefit of the royal treasury. In Ramaḡān 906/May 1501, for instance, a recently appointed Muhtasib of Mecca is reported to have extorted money from some merchants, apparently in accordance with the Sultan's wish, and to have sent the amount to Cairo.⁴

D. Bāsh al-Mamālīk

This is the title most frequently used for the commander of the Mamlūk garrison in Mecca. There is some uncertainty about the year from which the sending of these soldiers dated. Nahrawālī, referring to the

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 233 and 236-37.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 242.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 247-48.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. ~~247-48~~. 256-57.

distribution of charity in Mecca in 818/1415, by an Egyptian Amir, Taghri Barmash (d. 823/1420), describes him as Bāsh of the Mamlūk soldiers stationed in Mecca.¹ But several contemporary and late sources, which refer to his reforms in socio-religious customs do not describe him as Bāsh al-Mamālīk.²

The sending of military contingents to Mecca, for one reason or another, was not rare. But these returned to Cairo after performing their specified duties. Thus, for instance, in 827/1424, a force led by Amir Qarqmās reached Mecca to support Sharif 'Alī³ and it was their persuasion which led Ibrāhīm to anchor at Jedda.⁴ But this force was not sent as garrison and, though reinforced in the end of 828/October 1425, was recalled to Cairo in the following year and was not immediately replaced.⁵

Most likely it was in 831/1428 when Barakāt I's brothers, resenting the reduction of the former's share in the revenue,⁶ adopted a threatening attitude towards their brother and began to endanger the safety of the merchants and the Sultānī officials that Sultan Barsbāy sent to Mecca a body of fifty Mamlūk soldiers to remain there for a year and form the garrison of the city.⁷ From this year onwards regular references are found in the sources to the arrival of a new Bāsh at the head of a cavalry soldiers to replace the contingent of the previous year. The sources often simply refer to their departure from Cairo or arrival in Mecca without

¹ Nahrwālī, al-I'lām, p. 204.

² Fāsī, al-'Iqd, vol. I, part II, fols. 362b-64b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 161, 163 and 178; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fol. 87a; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 31-33; see also: Ibn al-'Imad, op.cit., vol. VII, pp. 159-60.

³ See supra, pp. 73-74.

⁴ See supra, p. 173.

⁵ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 334 and 342; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 80a; Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 650b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 192-94 and 196.

⁶ See supra, pp. 75-76, 175 and 228.

⁷ Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 354; Ibn Hajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 95a; Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fol. 656b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 202.

giving further details. But from time to time other references permit the inference that they usually numbered fifty. As far as can be ascertained, their number never fell below this level but was occasionally increased. The presence of this garrison not only enhanced the authority of the Egyptian Sultan but also often gave great assistance to the Sharifs of Mecca in the maintenance of law and order.¹

But the services of the Bāsh and his soldiers to the Sharifs were rendered, not by subordinates to a superior, but by representatives of the Egyptian hegemony. Thus, for instance, in Sha'ban 845/January 1442, the Bāsh supported Sharif 'Alī² but in the following year, when he forfeited the favour of Sultan Jaqmaq, the Sharif was arrested and sent to Cairo.³ Likewise, in 910/1504 they fought and expelled Humayda, a rival brother of the ruling Amirs Barakāt II and Qa'it Bay.⁴

¹For the relevant details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 354, 375, 390-92, 429-30 and 432; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. I, fols. 91b and 137b: vol. II, fols. 76a, 80a, 95a, 136a-36b, 141a, 162a, 172b and 173b-74a; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 650b, 656b, 670a and 686b; Khazrajī, op.cit., fol. 438; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 125-27; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 5, 12 and 276: part III (ed. W. Popper), pp. 444 and 557; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 181a: vol. II, fols. 120a, 123b and 164a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 121, 125-26, 128, 187-88, 202, 204, 206-7, 209, 212-14, 217-19, 226, 238-40, 255, 277-78, 281 and 305; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 14-15 and 40-43; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 459 and 541; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 103-4; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 172 and 194: vol. II, fols. 5-6, 27-30 and 130; Ibn Iyas, Bada'i', vol. III, fol. 199: vol. IV, pp. 480-81; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, pp. 223 and 225; idem, al-Fadl, fol. 116b. See also: Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, p. 216; Janābī, op.cit., fols. 304a-4b and 306b; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 40, 60, 252, 265-67, 284-85 and 304; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 331-33: vol. II, fols. 3-4 and 21; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 62-63, 103 and 163; Daḥlān, op.cit., pp. 35-36 and 41-42.

²See supra, pp. 84-85, 78-79.

³For details, see: Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 177b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 181a and 237a; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 127-28; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 14; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 241; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 14-15 and 45-46. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p. 329; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 306b; 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, op.cit., fol. 70; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 267-68; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 5-6; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 104; Daḥlān, op.cit., p. 42.

⁴See supra, pp. 94-95.

Occasionally, on the deposition of a ruling Sharif and the absence of the newly appointed Amir of Mecca, the Bāsh took control of the city to maintain law and order until the arrival of the appointee.¹ Similarly, some of the official responsibilities connected with a certain post were, at times, temporarily assigned to the Bāsh when the current official was dismissed or when doubts were raised concerning his legal position.² The Bāsh, from time to time, took keen interest in tracking down wrong doers and bringing them to justice. At times, however, he acted with undue cruelty and even hanged some offenders without previous consultation with the local authorities.³ Fully aware of his powerful position, the Bāsh interfered in matters which were not among his responsibilities. Thus, for instance, in Rabi' I 832/January 1429, a Meccan who had secured the Qādi's permission to build his residence on a piece of endowed land was prevented by the Bāsh from so doing.⁴

Likewise, in Rabi' I 900/January 1495, the Bāsh arrested a Mu'adhdhin, on the suspicion of drinking wine, had him beaten and suspended. The accused, possibly innocent, sought the help of the Nāzir al-Haram who was, as explained earlier, in charge of all such officials, but the Nāzir could do no more than mediate. The Bāsh, impressed by the rather polite approach, responded positively and restored the suspended official to his post.⁵ In the same year a dispute over a joint property assumed such proportions that it could not be settled without involving a higher authority, and the parties concerned took the case to the Bāsh. The mere fact that a judiciary

¹Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 261-62.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 333.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 222-23; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 10, 41-42, 118, 126, 215 and 239.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 208.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 174.

case was taken to the Bāsh instead of the Qādis proves the degree of his influence and authority in local matters. He called the four Qādis to his residence, and the matter was settled after prolonged negotiations.¹ It is also noteworthy that the Qādis responded to the Bāsh's summons without objection. Shortly after, it so happened that the Bāsh's men arrested a number of professional entertainers who appear to have been guilty of disturbing the peace in the city and the Bāsh again invited the Qādis to his house to decide the fate of these prisoners. Only the Qādi Shāfa'i showed reluctance but was compelled to follow in their footsteps.²

In Sha'ban 910/February 1505, the Bāsh compelled the merchants to contribute to the costs of a road which cut across a residential area in Mecca.³

In addition to the interference referred to earlier, the general conduct of the Bāsh and his soldiers was far from praiseworthy. Maqrīzī, reporting the return of a body of Mamlūk soldiers from Mecca to Cairo in 842/1438, accuses them of a number of offences.⁴ Evidently it was the objectionable interference of the Bāsh and his soldiers in the local affairs of Mecca which led Sultan Jaqmaq to send an edict in 848/1444, explicitly limiting the authority of the Bāsh to Mamlūk military affairs, and restraining him from interfering in other matters.⁵ The main objections seem to have been directed against the personal involvement of the Bāsh and his soldiers in local trade and the special protection they

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 174.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 180.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 70.

⁴Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 410-11.

⁵Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 255.

granted to certain merchants for financial remuneration.¹ The extortion of money by illegal means was by no means confined to Mamlūks stationed in Mecca. By the end of 861/1457, the Mamlūks had become so strong in Egypt itself that the people sought their support in return for money in regaining their rights from the others, instead of resorting to the proper authorities.² Likewise, a body of Mamlūk soldiers, who were sent as escort to the Egyptian pilgrim caravan in 862/1458, committed various offences including the forcible extortion of money.³

The atrocities of the Bāsh and his soldiers often went unpunished but occasionally were brought to account. In Rabi' I 866/January 1462, for instance, a Bāsh, guilty of harmful activities, was deposed, degraded to the rank of an ordinary Mamlūk and ordered to serve under the command of his successor. The Mamlūk soldiers too were rebuked and ordered to abstain from taking part in the local trade.⁴

The unruly behaviour of Mamlūk soldiers increased, particularly from 868/1433, which may have been due to the fact that from this year onwards the Mamlūks sent to Mecca were mostly those exiled by Sultan Khushqadam.⁵ This policy may have been followed by his successors. Obviously, these resentful soldiers were bound to indulge themselves in various atrocities. It is interesting to note that between 866-79/1461-74 several edicts reached Mecca in which the conduct of Mamlūk soldiers were criticised and the portion which contained rebuke was not read in public.⁶

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 435; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 229.

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith (ed. W.Popper), part II, pp. 307-8, 324, 327, 330 and 334-36.

³Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 249.

⁴Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 305.

⁵Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, (ed. W.Popper), part III, p. 444.

⁶Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 305, 314-15, 334, 345 and 347.

This indicates clearly that these soldiers became a menace rather than a help to the Meccan authorities. Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd reports several confrontations between the Bāsh and his soldiers. Frequently it was the former who suffered personal humiliation and had to accept the demands of his soldiers in order to avoid a further deterioration of military morale and even insubordination.¹

The successive Bāsh were not only unwilling or unable to control their soldiers but themselves became involved again in the local trade and some even had compelled many traders to sell their goods near his house, apparently to secure personal financial gain. This appears to have aroused such resentment on the part of the traders that they complained to Sultan Qā'it Bāy. In Dhu'l-Hijja 882/March 1478, by a decree the Bāsh was forbidden to do so but he failed to comply and was deposed. The new Bāsh was instructed to refrain from committing the same blunder.²

The temptation of material gain led the Mamlūk soldiers to interfere in commercial transactions in Jedda as well and sometimes so harassed the indigenous and foreign merchants that they had to be prevented from going to Jedda.³ From a version of Varthema it appears that around 1503 A.D. the commander of the Mamlūk escort of a pilgrim caravan had the right to take spices from Mecca without paying the usual dues imposed on the merchants,⁴ but this is not supported by other sources. Should this have been the case, the Bāsh of the Meccan garrison would have been entitled to this privilege in the first place and there is no evidence to support this.

Though the interference of the Bāsh in local trade was mainly for personal gain, it must be admitted that this was not always unjustified.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 172-73, 181, 211 and 214.

²Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 365 and 369.

³Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 281; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 92 and 182.

⁴Varthema, op.cit., p.51.

His assignment, at times, to the post of Hisba had given him wide authority over the traders, and it was only right that he should exercise it when necessary. There is evidence to prove that he occasionally intervened in the interest of the buyer to foil the extortionate demands of the traders or money exchangers.¹

The Bāsh always enjoyed a great measure of influence in Mecca but in the closing years of the Burjī period this rose^{to} an unprecedented level, and in 899/1493 he was given, probably for the first time, formal reception by the Sharif of Mecca and other notables at the outskirts of Mecca. Similar receptions are reported for later years, which indicates that the practice was not allowed to lapse.²

Obviously it was the favour of Sultan Qā'it Bāy which permitted the Bāsh in these years to act as if he were a regent, rather than a garrison commander. The extent of this favour is reflected in an edict of 900/1495 sent to the Bāsh, in which the Sultan signed with the word "wāliduhu" (his father). It is no wonder, therefore, that the Bāsh noticed with displeasure, at the very ceremony at which the decree was read, that his seat was placed below the seats of the Sharif and his brother, which detracted from his dignity.³ It is not surprising to notice that in these years the Bāsh had personal servants and assistants at his disposal.⁴

One of the most surprising aspects of the arrogance of the Bāsh and his soldiers is observed in closing years of the period when they proved their ability to insult the Sharif. In Jumādā II 900/April 1495, for instance, a trivial dispute between a slave of the Sharif and a pilgrim

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 139-40 and 248.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 170, 195 and 198.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 177.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 180, 211-12, 214-15 and 228; vol. II, fols. 191, 199 and 219.

led the Bāsh to imprison a man of Sharif Muḥammad. To make matters worse, the Bāsh went to the extent of uttering insulting remarks about Sharif Muḥammad, to whom he referred to as "one-eyed cripple". The Sharif was informed about it, but he acted with amazing humility and sent a flattering message to the Bāsh describing him as the ruler, entitled to do as he pleased. This obviously delighted the Bāsh and he released the prisoner.¹ Two years later, the Bāsh hired from a group of Arabs twenty camels for the transport of some goods. Shortly after, three of these camels were taken by the Sharif's men, apparently without the consent of their owners, to be used by the Sharif's wife for a journey. Informed of this, the Bāsh sent ten of his soldiers to bring back the camels. On their arrival, the lady had already mounted one and the other two were laden with her luggage, and she was ready to depart. The soldiers insisted on taking the camels immediately but the Sharif's men refused, and only the Sharif's wife prevented an armed clash by solemnly descending from her mount and ordering her escort to hand over the camels. The Sharif, though then absent from Mecca, was obviously notified of the incident, but no action, not even a protest by him, is reported.²

The internal clashes between Barakāt II and his brothers³ appear to have increased the importance of the Bāsh and his soldiers. To a large extent, the occasional assignment of several posts such as Hisba, Nazr al-Haram, the supervision of the endowments, and many others, accounted for his growing authority in Mecca.⁴ This is best illustrated in the

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 179-80.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 205.

³See supra, pp. 86-94.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 34.

assassination of Sharif Jazān by a number of Mamlūk soldiers and the appointment of Sharif Ḥumayda by the Bāsh on the emirate of Mecca.¹ In Dhu'l-Ḥijja 910/June 1505, during a skirmish between some of the men of Barakāt II and some Mamlūk soldiers in which both the Sharif and the Bāsh did their best to prevent the fight from spreading, some soldiers attacked the Sharif who, however, escaped injury but left the city, possibly in both anger and fear, as the assassination of Jazān in the near past must have made him rather apprehensive. The Sharif, sometime later, returned to Mecca and neither he nor the Bāsh took any punitive action against the offenders.² The Sharif's relative weakness in face of the unruly behaviour of the Mamlūk soldiers is mirrored further by an incident in Ṣafar 911/July or August 1505, when he turned to an Egyptian Amir for help in preventing them from harming the people. An announcement made in Mecca to this effect invited the victims of Mamlūk soldiers to bring their cases before the Bāsh.³ But such an announcement was hardly expected to influence the conduct of the Mamlūks. Some of them, only shortly after, abducted a Meccan youth out of motives which appear to have been immoral. Indignant, some Meccans complained to the Bāsh, whose response was, to say the least, deplorable. He not only failed to take action against the offenders but insulted the plaintiffs arrogantly asserting that the Meccans were nothing but servants of the Turks, and forced them to disperse. Dismayed and angry, they returned to the sanctuary which resounded with the protesting and indignant voices of many Meccans, where prayers and other forms of worship came to a temporary halt. Though this upheaval eventually resulted in the culprits

¹ See supra, pp. 92-93.

² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 83.

³ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 87.

releasing their captive, the slight punishment - light caning - to which they were subjected was quite incommensurate with the gravity of their offence.¹ The most regrettable aspect of this deplorable affair was that the indigenous authorities did not bring the offenders to account. Not even the Egyptian Sultan took any action, apart from a mild reprimand, without clearly referring to the incident, in Ramaḍān 911/March 1506.²

As time progressed, the behaviour of the Bāsh and his soldiers got more and more out of bounds. The sources contain several references to the oppression and exploitation by the Mamlūks, and almost always with impunity.³ Thus the main purpose of their presence in Mecca, namely the maintenance of law and order, proved self-defeating.

In the closing years of the period under examination the Bāsh, who often held the post of Hisba too, appears to have imposed on traders in the Meccan market a tax of around one Muḥallaq for each mount entering Mecca with a load of fruit and vegetables. Early in 917/April or May 1511, this tax was increased to five Muḥallaq per mount. The traders refused to pay and subsequently trading activities in the market came to a halt. The Sharif intervened and eventually a compromise tax, roughly half-way between the old and the newly imposed one, was agreed upon.⁴

The relation between the Sharif and the Bāsh seems to have improved in the final years of the period. Thus, for instance, in 919/1513, the Bāsh ^{at the request of the Sharif} was allowed to remain in Mecca for another year.⁵ In Jumādā II 921/August 1515, the Sharif's influence was enhanced further when the posts

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 87-88.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 104.

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 123-24, 162, 172-73, 175, 199, 212 and 229; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. IV, pp. 288 and 297. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., p.26.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols.198-99.

⁵Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 235.

of Bāshiyya and Hisba were placed under the supervision of Sharif
¹
 Barakāt 11.

The last of the officials to fill the posts of Bāsh and the Sultani
 Muhtasib in Mecca, named Baybardi and Qaraqur respectively, arrived there
 in Dhu'l-Qāda 921/January 1516.² In 923/1517, they went to Cairo with Sha-
 rif Abū Numayy 11 to pay homage to the Ottoman Sultan Selim 1, who is
 reported to have intended to put these Mamlūk officers to death, but
 spared their lives at the request of Sharif Abū Numayy 11 and sent them
 together with others to Istanbul.³

¹ Al-ʿIzz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., Vol. 11, fols. 261-62.

² Al-ʿIzz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. 11, fol. 270.

³ Ibn Iyās, Badāʾiʿ, vol. V, pp. 185-86, 189 and 212-13. See also: Al-Bakarī, op. cit., fols. 49-50.

Chapter X

THE OFFICIALS SENT FROM CAIRO
TO COLLECT TAXES IN JEDDA

Initially, the number of Egyptian officials sent to Jedda in 828/1425 to exact/dues does not seem to have exceeded four or five.¹ Some points relevant to their methods of collection and details of the revenue obtained have been dealt with in previous chapters.

The use of alternative titles for the official in charge of Jedda is common in the sources. The titles most frequently used are Nā'ib Jedda,² Nāzīr Jedda,³ Shādd Jedda, Mubāshir Jedda,⁴ or simply collector of taxes. This is sometimes so confusing that it is difficult to establish the identity of their official capacity, apart from their general field of competence and common task of collecting the taxes. Especially as often the sources refer to a certain official by several titles, without indicating that a change of appointment has taken place in the meantime. Thus it is not easy to draw a dividing line between the ranks and responsibilities of various officials. The title Nā'ib Jedda was by rights only applicable to the official of the highest rank but was in practice sometimes used for those described elsewhere in the same source, or in other

¹G. Wiet seems to suggest that the tax collectors in Jedda belonged to the Egyptian administration alone. See: E.I.², art. "Barsbāy", p.1054. But as already discussed there were many officials appointed by the Sharifs of Mecca for the same task and they not only shared the revenue and administration but had their own pier, called Furqat al-Sharīf.

²This title denotes the deputy of the Sultan in Jedda and the official referred to as such was supposed to be of highest rank among those sent to Jedda.

³This title, like the Shādd, refers to the official entrusted with the supervision of the process of collecting 'Ushr (tithe) as well as the general administration of the port.

⁴This is used, as explained earlier, as a general term for the official appointed to conduct certain duties in one field or another.

sources of the corresponding period, as Nāzīr, or Shādd, or even as Mubāshīr whose ranks were lower than Nā'ib Jeddā. It could be argued, therefore, that there was no fixed well defined title for these officials according to their rank and that the sources seem to have been at liberty to choose the description or title they regarded as best fitted for the activities of the official in question.¹

Apart from the principal officials, references are found to other officials of lower rank. The most important among these were the Sayrafi,² Mu'allim al-Qabbanīn,³ Mu'allim al-Kayyālīn,⁴ and Dallāl.⁵ All these offices provided facilities necessary for the conclusion of commercial transactions and for the determination of the correct amount of 'Ushr to be levied, in cash or kind, on the merchants. Unfortunately, the information available about these officials and their posts hardly exceeds data such as names, approximate date of appointment in Cairo and arrival in Jeddā.⁶ Nevertheless, a reasonably correct inference of what their

¹For various phrases and alternative titles used in the sources for the Sulṭānī officials in Jeddā, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 334-35, 339-40, 354, 357, 362, 369, 371-72, 375 and 390-91; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fols. 95a, 102a, 107a, 119a, 127b, 134b, 136a and 140b; 'Aynī, op.cit., vol. IV, fols. 665a and 674b; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 25, 132-33, 154, 157, 159 and 231; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 53, 79, 160, 204, 237, 276, 311, 331-32 and 347: part II (ed. W. Popper), p.319; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 251b and 254a: vol. II, fols. 75a, 473b and 474a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 192-93, 196-97, 202-3, 208, 210-11, 216, 219, 258, 281-82, 286, 288, 321, 325 and 335; Sakhāwī, al-Tuhfa, vol. II, pp. 100 and 263-64; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 95, 208 and 457-58; idem, al-Tibr, pp. 243-44; idem, al-Daw', vol. I, p.184: vol. III, pp. 43-44, 56-59, 126 and 293-94: vol. IV, pp. 30-31 and 86; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 175; vol. II, fol. 149; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. III, pp. 8-9, 38-9, 111 and 264; idem, Bada'i', (U.P.), pp. 14, 22 and 33. See also: Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 322-3 and 325-6; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 349-50: vol. II, fols. 3-4.

²Money changers.

³Inspector of weight (Qabḥān is the singular form).

⁴Inspector of measures (Kayyāl is the singular form).

⁵Broker, agent. For further details, see: C.M.Becker and G.S.Colin, E.I.², art. "Dallāl", pp. 102-3.

⁶For details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 383; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 215, 229, 268 and 312; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 210 and 231: vol. IV, pp. 306-7: vol. V, pp. 220-21: vol. VII, p.238;

duties were can easily be made from the meaning of their title and our knowledge of the manner in which similar functionaries in our day perform their duties.

Some of the officials of lower rank, like their superiors, were able to accumulate considerable fortunes. Thus, a Ṣayrafī in Jedda who was assigned some other duties as well was able to secure considerable material gains.¹ The post of Ṣayrafī was important enough to be assigned occasionally to the high ranking officials in Jedda.² The Ṣayrafī or other officials of secondary rank had to be on good terms with the official in charge, otherwise their ability to perform their duties was severely impaired, and there was a likelihood of their suffering ill-treatment from ^{their} superiors.³

The title Shāh Bandar-Jedda⁴ is used with reference to a number of wealthy merchants in Jedda who were often granted a robe of honour sent from Cairo. These are sometimes mentioned with the title "Malik al-Tujjār" (King of the merchants) and seem to have possessed certain commercial privileges and may have carried out occasional commercial transactions on behalf of the Egyptian Sultans.⁵ This hypothesis is supported by the

vol. VIII, p. 231; vol. XI, p.51; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 300, 308, 457-58, 494-95, 540-41 and 546; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 21, 36, 38-9, 48, 53, 74, 106-8, 119-20, 122, 135, 142, 144-46, 156, 168, 181-82, 196, 204, 212-13, 239 and 255-57; vol. II, fols. 1-2, 19, 113, 118, 133, 188 and 209; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', (U.P.), p.173; idem, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 96 and 268.

¹ Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. IV, pp. 306-7; vol. V, pp. 220-21. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.170; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i' (U.P.), p.173.

² Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 156-57, 181-82 and 195-96; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.96.

³ Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VII, p.238; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 457-58; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 74.

⁴ The word "Bandar" is a Persian word denoting a seaport. The term Shah Bandar, in Persian, means customs officer. See: Cl. Huart /H.Masse/, E.I.², art. "Bandar", p.1013. But in Jedda, the bearer of this title does not seem to have had any direct connection with the process of collecting taxes.

⁵ For details, see: Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 179 and 212; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. II, p.43; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols.

the fact that in 899/1494 a merchant secured this title in return for twenty or thirty thousand dinars.¹ Obviously such an amount of money was not paid for a mere honorific title, and the merchant in question was aiming at enhancing his commercial interest.

A. Financial obligation of the officials towards the Egyptian Sultan

Some of the Sulṭānī officials in Jedda do not appear to have been sent simply to obtain the 'Ushr and other dues and to bring back the revenue or transmit it to Cairo. There is sufficient evidence to the effect that many of them were under injunction or even pressure to amass for the treasury as much revenue as possible. Several others seem to have been sent on the clear understanding or under the explicit obligation to pay in return a certain minimum, in cash or in kind, without which they were to suffer unpleasant consequences. Thus, it was not a simple appointment but rather a sale of offices which may have been initiated earlier but increased greatly during the reign of Sultan Bārsbāy, who also showed little reluctance in the confiscation of fortune and monopolization of trade.² Those who bought the office, or were appointed, did not necessarily secure their expected gains and could even suffer financial loss. Thus, for instance, in 833/1430, Sultan Barsbāy appointed a certain dignitary his wazīr and the official in question accepted the post against the advice of his father, who had held that very post earlier and had lost 50,000 dinars of his own fortune.³ This was in Egypt but, as will be seen, many officials in Jedda were to suffer a similar fate.

Evidently many officials in Jedda could not come up to the expectations of the Sultan by virtue of the circumstances beyond their control and,

3, 34, 38, 80, 82, 120, 149, 168, 210 and 216-17: vol. II, fols. 65-66, 102, 149, 210, 231 and 235; Ibn al-Dayba', al-Faḡl, fol. 156b.

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 168.

²G. Wiet, E.I.², art. "Barsbay", 1054.

³Ibn Taghribirdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fols. 74b-75a.

dreading to face his anger, sometimes had to bring considerable financial sacrifices out of their own resources to eke out the amounts collected. The other most obvious - and by no means rare - alternative for these officials was to collect, by fair means or foul, as much payment as was feasible. In their desire to please the Sultan, these officials sometimes sent goods to Cairo without paying their prices to the merchants,¹ and imposed an arbitrary addition to the usually levied taxes.² It was to the same end that some of these officials sold goods sent from Egypt rather forcibly and at a price above their market value.³ Obviously, the profit thus secured was sent to the treasury in Cairo.

How closely the performance of these officials to further the material gains for the Sultan was watched is reflected by the fact that, in 895/1490, a consignment of pepper to Sultan Qā'it Bāy was found to contain an undue amount of dust. The Sultan ordered the officials to investigate to discover the person or persons responsible and bring them to account.⁴ Should they fail to satisfy the Sultan, they aroused his displeasure and were often to suffer personal humiliation as well as material loss. In 839/143, for instance, the revenue brought back by a Shādd Jedda was found unsatisfactory by the Sultan, Bārsbāy, and the official was deposed and his fortune confiscated.⁵ This case was not unique for several

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 36-37.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 50.

³For details, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 254a-b; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 264-66; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 175-76 and 186; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 52.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fol. 120.

⁵Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 134b.

others had to face displeasure of the Sultans, and occasionally, imprisonment, fines and confiscation of their property.¹

But these officials obviously did not suffer as a rule, and they seem to have been entitled to a certain percentage of dues,² apparently to meet their financial obligations, and many were able to amass quite considerable wealth for themselves.³ There are occasional references to a special official being sent to Jedda to claim from the official in charge there the full amount destined for Cairo.⁴ This cannot but be taken to mean that the official in question must have been sent under obligation to send a fixed sum to Cairo.

It was evidently this obligation and the fear of harsh treatment which had deterred Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, who previously had been sent to Jedda as an assistant to the Nāzīr and Ṣayrafī from accepting these posts. He even paid a considerable amount of money to be relieved of the appointment. In 887/1482, however, he found it impossible to decline and was sent to Jedda to keep watch on a Nāzīr Jedda and, in the following year, was appointed to this post. The number of vessels was smaller than he had expected and he sent the news to Cairo, obviously to exonerate himself in advance for the unavoidable reduction in revenue. However, he did not live to see the end of his predicament, as he died in Jumādā II 888/August 1483 before receiving a reply.⁵ In 896/1491, again, an appointee to the post of Nāzīr Jedda is said to have accepted his appointment with marked reluctance.⁶

¹See details in: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 96; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VIII, p. 44; vol. X, pp. 35-36; vol. XI, p. 164; idem, al-Tibr, p. 266; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 257, 308, 357-58 and 377; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vols. 51, 78 and 95-97; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 200, 240, 247 and 359.

²See supra, p. 177.

³Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 132-33; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 254a; idem, Ḥawādith (ed. W. Popper), part III, pp. 495 and 534-36; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. I, pp. 184-85; vol. III, pp. 57-59; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 95.

⁴For details, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 541; Al-'Izz Ibn

Indian rulers usually sent gifts for the Egyptian Sultans via Jedda, and may occasionally have sent some for his officials who often went to Cairo in the company of these envoys.¹ The greed of the Egyptian Sultan and his officials in Jedda occasionally brought about a political crisis. In 890/1485, for instance, an Indian envoy reached Jedda with valuable gifts, including a dagger ornamented with precious stones, which had been sent for the Ottoman Sultan. Shādd Jedda took the gifts to Cairo and presented them to Sultan Qā'it Bāy. Consequently, the Mamluk-Ottoman relations became strained for a while and eventually the gifts were returned to the Ottoman Sultan with an apology.² Evidently the official, once appointed, had to acquit himself of the full obligation to remit the dues or imposed amount to the treasury whether he collected them in full or not. Equally, he possessed the privilege to collect his percentage of the taxes, whether he had performed the duties of his office personally or not. In 907/1502, a Nāzir and Şayrafī in Jedda was deposed, but his successor was unable to take over in time and the duties were performed by the deposed official. Nevertheless, the new appointee claimed, on his arrival, the amount obtained and acquired 4,000 dinars.³

The financial obligation originally imposed on an official in Jedda could be increased in certain circumstances. Thus, for instance, in Sha'bān 900/June 1495, Sultan Qā'it Bāy imposed on the official in charge of Jedda and some of his subordinates the obligation to pay an additional amount of 13,000 or 14,000 dinars.⁴ In Rabi' II 902/January 1497, the inspector

Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 17 and 168; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 8-9.

⁵Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VIII, pp. 43-44. See also: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.300; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 26, 32, 34 and 36; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, pp. 194 and 198.

⁶Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.494.

¹As token references, see: Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl, fols. 100a-b; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), p.297; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, p.280; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.153. See also: Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VII, p.225.

²Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. III, p.210.

⁴Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit.,

³Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 1-2.

vol. I, fol. 182.

of weights and the chief broker in Jedda were called to Cairo, probably for their failure to fulfil their financial obligations. Their journey to Cairo, on payment of a total sum of 3,000 dinars, was dispensed with.¹

Usually, the figure of the financial obligation of the officials towards the Sultan is not mentioned in the sources, which implies that it was not disclosed. That the sums in question were very substantial can be inferred from the few occasional figures, mentioned in the preceding pages, and from a statement of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, who says that in 917/1511, Sultan Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī imposed on the Nāzir and a Mubāshir in Jedda the obligation to pay to the treasury the sums of 15,000 and 10,000 dinars respectively.² Since, as has been seen, the port of Jedda was in decline in the closing years of the Burjī period, and these amounts were by no means insignificant, it can be assumed with perfect safety that the financial obligation imposed on officials of this rank would have been considerably higher in its heyday when the commercial activities of the port were at their peak.

B. The influence and authority of the principal official in Jedda.

The influence enjoyed by these officials was - by reason of the importance of the port as well as his being the representative of the Egyptian Sultan - great both locally and abroad. On the local level they regarded all matters connected with the port and the commercial activities their exclusive prerogative and resented any intrusion. The first most important construction work in Jedda by the Sulṭānī officials was to build a new pier in 831/1428, thus raising this port to the standard of Aden.³ It was evidently this which is referred to as Furḍat al-Sulṭān, while the old pier of Jedda⁴ was called Furḍat al-Sharif.⁵

¹Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 204-5.

²Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 203.

³Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 95a.

⁴See supra, p. 245.

⁵See supra, p. 249.

The authority of the principal Sulṭānī official, judging by several direct or indirect references, was not confined to his staff but included other local officials. His ascendancy, in spite of the occasional disputes, was never questioned while he was present in the city.¹ He was strong enough to put an end to some harmful local practices. A Maṣṭaba² was built in Jedda by a group of Quwwād known as Dhawī 'Umar. They used it as their meeting place and granted their special protection to all those who climbed over it. Since this occasionally enabled criminals to escape the consequences of their crime, the local authorities seem to have opposed this custom as interfering with the processes of justice, but failed to prevail. In 840/1436, however, when the Shādd Jedda demolished the Maṣṭaba, this practice ended but there ensued a clash between the Shādd's men and the Quwwād's, which ended in favour of the former. Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥajar mention the clash itself but without attributing it to the demolition of Maṣṭaba, which is mentioned explicitly by the other sources.³

The influence of the Shādd or Na'ib Jedda in the Meccan region was a natural outcome of the favourable position enjoyed by most of them with the Egyptian Sultan. Obviously, it was precisely this which often enabled them to appoint, suspend, or depose a number of local officials. In 851/1447, for instance, the Shādd Jedda's displeasure with the Khaṭībs of the Meccan sanctuary resulted in their deposition.⁴ In 853/1449, a deposed Qāḍi was restored to his post in Mecca on the intercession of the Shādd Jedda.⁵ Two years later, a candidate for the post of Khiṭāba in the Meccan sanctuary secured his appointment on the recommendation of the

¹Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fols. 392; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 218, 235, 347 and 350; Sakhāwī, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), p. 530; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 74, 167 and 195-96; vol. II, fols. 105-6 and 142.

²Stone bench, fixed seat of masonry.

³For further details, see: Maqrīzī, Sulūk, vol. II, fol. 400; Ibn Ḥajar, Inbā', vol. II, fol. 143a; Ibn Taghri Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fol. 251b; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 73; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 220 and 240-41.

the Shādd Jedda.¹ In or around Rajab 859/July 1455, Sharif Barakāt I fell seriously ill and secured, thanks to the help of the Shādd Jedda, the appointment of his son Sharif Muḥammad to the emirate of Mecca before his death.² In 861/1457, a candidate for the post of Qada' al-Shāfa'iyya in Mecca secured his appointment with the help of the Shādd Jedda.³ By the end of 866 or early 867/1461-62, Sharif Muḥammad's exiled wazīr, Bu^ḥdayr,⁴ was, on the intercession of the Shādd Jedda, allowed to return to Mecca.⁵

The ascendancy of the Shādd or Nā'ib Jedda is further manifested by the ceremonial respect with which he was surrounded on his approach to Mecca in a formal reception at which the Sharif himself and many of his and other Sulṭānī officials and local dignitaries were present. Moreover, all these officials and the Sharifs of Mecca were repeatedly instructed by the Sulṭānī edicts to cooperate with these principal officials in the execution of their duties.⁶

⁴ Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.186.

⁵ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. II, fol. 512b.

¹ Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 351-52.

² Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 347; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fol. 239; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 283; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. VII, p.152; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. II, p.53; idem, Bada'i' (U.P.), p.33. See also: Ibn Zuhayra, op.cit., p.321; Janābī, op.cit., fol. 307a; Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, pp. 41 and 276-76; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fol.110.

³ See supra, pp. ~~262-263~~ 265.

⁴ See supra, p. 238.

⁵ Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 307-8.

⁶ For details, see: Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 181a and 237a; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 240-44, 268, 288-89, 311, 319, 321, 325, 334-5, 347, 350, 354, 364, 368 and 371; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 45-46; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 357 and 543; Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 14, 35, 52, 63-64, 120, 135, 147, 156, 168, 182, 196, 213, 239 and 260; vol. II, fols. 103 and 111.

The influence of the principal Sultānī official in Jedda also extended to foreign countries. This is best exemplified in the following episode. In Jumādā II 854/August 1450, the Shādd Jedda Timrāz escaped to India with the entire revenue of the port, reported to have been between 30,000-50,000 dinars, and tried in vain to anchor at several Indian ports. This was so strongly opposed by the local Muslim merchants, who were thus protecting their own interest, that their rulers denied Timrāz permission to land, not even to purchase provisions. The sources and particularly Ibn Taghrī Birdī attribute this clearly to the influence of Amir Janbek, who had succeeded Timrāz in the very post and was on good terms with several Indian rulers. Timrāz kept cruising in his ship for six months and eventually, exhausted and despairing, anchored at Calicut without permission. The local ruler, under pressure from the merchants, contemplated arresting Timrāz, but he avoided this by pretending that he had come to buy pepper for Sultan Jaqmaq. Timrāz did in fact buy a large quantity of pepper, shipped part of the freight on a commercial vessel, loading the rest aboard his own ship, and departing. He had deliberately created the impression that he was heading for Jedda but in fact had decided to stay in the Yemen. On reaching Aden, he took possession of the pepper which he had sent by the commercial vessel and remained in the Yemen as guest of a Yemenite chief and, ^{involved} having become/in local politics, lost his life in battle in Ramaḡān 855/November 1451. Amir Janbek received the news and managed to bring the pepper and other belongings of Timrāz back to Jedda and, hence, to the Sultan's satisfaction, to Cairo.¹ Amir Janbek

¹ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 145, 154-55 and 207; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 237a-b and 254a-55a; idem, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fols. 158-60, 180-81, 191-92, 195 and 202-4; Al-Najm Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 270-72; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, pp. 270, 321, 347-8 and 357; idem, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 35-36; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A. Al-Ḥassu), pp. 43-44.

was probably the ablest and most successful of the Sultani officials in Jedda. His shrewdness is well illustrated by the ease with which he foiled Timrāz's attempt to get away with his ill-gotten gains, and is further supported by the fact that he was used by the Sultan as a political negotiator. In 854/1450, Sultan Jaqmaq received the news that the Christian ruler of Ḥabasha was contemplating the invasion of the Ḥijāzī coast. Amir Janbek, on the Sultan's instruction, approached a Muslim ruler in that region in a counter-move with the suggestion that he should enter into an alliance with the Mamlūk Sultan. Whether the attempt was successful or not, an envoy of the Muslim ruler of Ḥabasha reached Cairo in 856/1452 and was well received. The Christian ruler, probably apprehensive of the possible outcome, thought it wise to normalize his relations with the Egyptian sultan in 857/1453.¹ Amir Janbek not only received friendly letters and gifts from the foreign rulers, particularly those of India, and possessed immense wealth, but also began to play a very important role in the local politics of Egypt, especially in the accession of Khushqadam to the throne in 865/1461, and after that practically ran the affairs of state. His ever-increasing influence and lavish expenditure excited the suspicion and jealousy of Sultan Khushqadam and Janbek was consequently assassinated in Dhu'l-Ḥijja 867/September 1463.² His sudden and tragic end had its repercussions to his men in Jedda who were arrested and taken to Cairo in Muharram 868/September 1463.³

¹Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith, vol. I, fol. 163 and 213; Sakhāwī, al-Tibr, p.386. See also: Darraj, op.cit., pp. 65 and 69.

²Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith (ed. W.Popper), part II, pp. 319, 321, 324, 327, 338 and 397-98; part III, pp. 566-69; idem, al-Nujūm, vol. VII, fols. 321 and 340-42; idem, al-Manhal, vol. I, fols. 254a-55a; Sakhāwī, al-Daw', vol. III, pp. 57-8; idem, al-Dhayl (ed. A.Al-Ḥassu), pp. 43-44, 95 and 137-38; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. II, pp. 72-73 and 76-77; idem, 'Uqūd, vol. II, fol. 211b; idem, Bada'i', (U.P.), pp. 14-15, 22, 76, 99-100 and 128-30.

³Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādith (ed. W.Popper), part III, p.441.

Among the successors of Janbek in Jedda was 'Alī b. Ramaḡān who was sent earlier, about 849/1446, as Ṣayrafi and performed his duties under Janbek himself. In 869/1465, 'Alī was sent to Jedda again as tax collector, and seems to have enjoyed considerable influence which he used for personal gains. His exploitation of the local merchants as well as those of the Yemen and India secured him considerable wealth - estimated to have been about 500,000 dinars - which enabled him to live a princely life until his death in Jumādā I 871/January 1467.¹

C. The problems confronting the last Nā'ib of Jedda and some of his achievements

The last Nā'ib Jedda appointed by the last Mamlūk Sultan, Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī, was Amir Ḥusayn al-Kurdī. He was the only high ranking official of Kurdish origin. From a version of Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, it appears that Amir Ḥusayn considered himself a Turcoman² and resented being called a Kurd.³ Nahrawālī states that Amir Ḥusayn was disliked by the Mamlūks by reason of his Kurdish origin. Aware of this, Sultan al-Ghawrī decided to give Jedda as Timār⁴ to Amir Ḥusayn to keep him away from Cairo.⁵

Amir Ḥusayn's arrival in Jedda in Ramaḡān 911/March 1506 was in a period of serious internal instability, commercial decline and grave external danger on the part of the Portuguese. He, shortly after his arrival, paid full attention to fortifying Jedda, on the instruction of

¹ Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Ḥawādiṡh (ed. W. Popper), part III, pp. 495 and 534-36.

² A Turkish people in Central Asia. For further details, see: W. Barthold and Köprülüzāde Fu'ād, E. I.¹, art. "Turkomans", pp. 896-99.

³ Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op. cit., vol. II, fol. 210.

⁴ Timār, a grant of land for military service; the term is the Turkish equivalent of iqṭā'. For details, see: J. Deny, E. I.¹, art. "Timār", pp. 767-76.

⁵ Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 245-46. see also: Ibn al-'Imād, op. cit., vol. VIII, p. 115.

the Sultan, and built a wall. To judge by the reports of contemporary sources, and especially Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, the wall was built in two stages. The work started on three landward sections which were completed early in 913/May or June 1507. This wall, as is obvious, did not encircle Jedda, which remained accessible from the coast. The seaward part of the wall was added later, around 917/1511. The sources do refer to the towers and gates built in the wall, but without sufficient detail. Ibn Faraj, a late source, states that six towers, two on the seaward and four on the landward sides, were built and that the wall had two gates - one called Bāb al-Naṣr (Victory gate) and the other Bāb al-Futūḥ, which has a similar meaning. Of later sources, Ibn Faraj mentions 911/1505-6 as the year in which the entire work was completed. Nahrawālī (al-I‘lām) refers to the completion of the whole work in 917/1511-12. Ibn al-‘Imād seems to suggest a far later completion around 920/1514-15.¹ Amir Ḥusayn used forced labour, extortion under threat, the exploitation and victimization of many innocent people during and after the completion of the work. His arrogant attitude and harsh treatment of the various sections of the local community, as well as of his own men, had made him extremely unpopular. Most sources mention that the Sultan contributed to the expenditure but give no exact figure for the total expenditure or the contribution of the Sultan. Only Ibn Faraj, a late source, mentions that the total amount spent was about 100,000 dinars and seems to suggest that most, if not all, was paid by the Sultan himself. Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd and Ibn Iyās refer to similar fortifications in Yanbu‘ too but give little further information about their construction or expenditure.²

¹It seems that the version of these late sources confused some of the modern scholars. R.Hartmann, for instance, reports the construction of a wall around Jedda in 917/1511 and considers thereport of al-Batnūnī, who states that it was built in 915/1509 as erroneous. See: R.Hartmann, E.I.², art. "Djudda", p.572. In fact, neither of these years is quite accurate for the completinn of the wall which, as reported explicitly by Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, was built in two different stages.

²For details, see: Al-‘Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 98,101-9, 111-12, 114-21, 120-21, 132, 134-35, 140, 196, 199, 201, 203, 205-6, 209-10, 212,

Amir Ḥusayn was sent not only as Nā'ib of Jedda but also as the commander of the Egyptian naval expedition. The discovery in 1497 A.D. (902-3 A.H.) of the route to India, via the Cape of Good Hope, by Vasco da Gama, was a shattering blow to the Egyptian monopoly of the spice trade and had changed - shortly after - the existing pattern of east-west trade and soon Lisbon became an important centre of this trade at the expense of Jedda, Mecca, Cairo, Alexandria and other places within the Egyptian domain. Sultan al-Ghawrī, mainly for his own reason and partly in response to the cry for help from the Indian rulers, prepared a naval expedition against the Portuguese. In that, the Sultan received some help from the Ottoman Sultan and verbal encouragement from Venice. In the end of 913/May 1507 or early in 914/May 1508, Amir Ḥusayn departed from Jedda with a fairly strong naval force. There is some uncertainty about the exact number of soldiers and ships under his command in this expedition. The maximum reported number is fifty but this is given by the later sources rather ambiguously which does not make it clear whether this was in this or the second expedition. But from the account of contemporary Meccan sources, it is clear that this expedition consisted of at least fifteen vessels of various sizes. Amir Ḥusayn reached Gujrat (India) in the first half of 914/1508 and seems to have secured some help from the ruler of Gujrat, Sultan Muẓaffar II, and his governor in Diu¹, Malik Iyās. The first naval engagement took place near Chaul² and Amir Ḥusayn gained the upper hand, but in the following year the Portuguese

214-19, 236 and 246; Ibn Iyās, Badā'i', vol. IV, pp. 84-85, 94-96, 109, 116, 131, 287 and 326; vol. V, p.93. See also: Ibn al-Dayba', al-Baḍl, fol. 137b; Ibn Faraj, op.cit., fols. 307b-10a and 16a; Nahravālī, al-I'lām, pp. 244-46; idem, al-Barq, p.19; Al-Bakarī, op.cit., fols. 29 and 31; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, p.115; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.53; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 38; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 158-59; Darrāj, op.cit., p.137; R.B.Serjeant, op.cit., appendix VI, pp. 160-62.

¹Diu, an island off the southern point of Saurashtra (Sawrāshtra, Sōrāth), India, with a good harbour clear of the dangerous tides of the Gulf of Combay. See: J.B.Harrison, E.I.², art. "Diu", p.322.

²Near modern Bombay.

viceroy Francisco d'Almeida inflicted a crushing defeat and the Egyptian fleet was almost destroyed. In 917/1511, Amir Ḥusayn reached Cairo, via Jeddah, with few survivors. The Portuguese, after this victory, increased their activities in the Indian Ocean, the Arabian Gulf, and even in the southern part of the Red Sea area, and around 919/1513-14 attacked Aden twice and places on the eastern coast of Africa, and occupied for a period the island of Kamarān. Thus they posed a serious threat to all the ports on the Red Sea and particularly Jeddah, but no Portuguese attack on Jeddah took place within the period in question. Meanwhile, a second Egyptian naval force gathered together and in Shawwāl 921/December 1515 it left Jeddah, under the joint command of Amirs Ḥusayn and Salmān al-Rūmī, supposedly to attack the Portuguese. Whether any encounter with them during the remaining part of the Burjī period took place or whether this expedition went to India is not clear.¹ Possibly the Ottoman threat had compelled Sultan al-Ghawrī to decide to occupy the Yemen and thus secure his own domain, for the time being, from the Portuguese threat. This may have become known to the Yemenite Sultan and it is no wonder that, when the Egyptian naval force reached the Yemen, it was not only denied a cordial reception but even its supply of provisions was withheld. The Yemenite sources, particularly Ibn al-Dayba', mention the withholding of supplies as the principal reason for the Egyptian attack on the Yemen, but surely there must have been more serious political and military considerations behind the Egyptian onslaught. There were several fierce clashes and virtually the whole of the Yemen fell to the Egyptian invaders. It was one of the strange coincidences that while the Mamlūk soldiers were putting an end to the Ṭahirid rule in the Yemen, their own régime was overthrown by the Ottomans. Meanwhile, Amir Ḥusayn had to return to Jeddah in

¹This uncertainty is mainly due to the fact that certain sources, such as Ibn Iyās, refer to the departure of this expedition to India, but at the same time describe places such as the isle of Kamarān and Zabīd in the Yemen itself as part of India. (Bada'i', vol. V, p.81). The word used is "Ḍay'a", estate, which generally means a rural property of a certain size. See:

early 923/1517 only to be drowned off the coast by the order of Sultan Selim I.¹

Cl.Cahen, E.I.², art. "Ḍay'a", pp. 187-88. Describing the Yemen as being "Ḍay'a" of India, Ibn Iyās is not only inaccurate but rather amazing too.

¹It was not possible - in this reference in passing - to consult all the sources and to mention various local and international aspects relevant to this expedition or to single out the sources for each point. The sources are given - rather unconventionally - in two groups, the first includes those sources which are particularly useful for the events within the Egyptian domain, including the Ḥijāz, and in the Yemen, while the second group contains sources or works which provide information about the general course of events or those not directly related to the areas mentioned above.

i) Al-'Izz Ibn Fahd, op.cit., vol. II, fols. 101-3, 110, 113, 121, 124, 134-35, 138, 140, 142, 154, 163, 177, 181, 183, 209-12, 214, 217, 225-31, 233-38, 240, 244-45, 247-48, 250, 255, 265-68 and 271-73; Ibn Iyās, Bada'i', vol. IV, pp. 82, 84-85, 96, 109, 116, 124, 284, 286-87, 307-8, 322-23, 326 and 383; vol. V, pp. 81, 113, 185-86 and 199; Ibn al-Dayba', Qurra, pp. 224 and 226-34; idem, al-Faḍl, fols. 121a, 135b, 137b-38b, 161b-62a and 168a-75a; See also: Abū (Bā) Makhrama, op.cit., vol. I, pp. 16 and 21; Ibn Faraj, op.cit., fols. 8a-b; Jazīrī, op.cit., pp. 360-61; Nahrawālī, al-I'lām, pp. 244-48 and 284; idem, al-Barq, pp. 18-25 and 27-31; Janabī, op.cit., fols. 315a-15b; Ibn al-'Imād, op.cit., vol. VIII, pp. 60 and 115; 'Iṣāmī, op.cit., vol. IV, p.53; Sinjārī, op.cit., vol. II, fol. 53; Ṭabarī, op.cit., vol. I, fols. 159, 170-71 and 177; Daḥlān, op.cit., p.51; R.Hartmann, E.I.², art. "Djudda", p.572.

ii) Varthema, op.cit., pp. 59-60, 91-92, 105-7, 111, 121-25, 178, 179, 258-62, 265-90 and 297-98; Heyd, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 427, 443, 448-49, 475, 492, 510-14, 517-29, 533-37, 539-40 and 547-50; B.Lewis, "Egypt and Syria", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 228-29; Halil Inalcik, "The rise of the Ottoman Empire", in The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. I, pp. 317-18; R.B.Serjeant, op.cit., pp. 2, 12-18, 24-25 and 41-51; Darrāj, op.cit., pp. 7, 10-11, 127-29, 132-34, 136-38, 146, 148, 150-51 and 154-56; J.B.Harrison, E.I.², art. "Diu", p.322; S.Maqbūl Ahmad, E.I.², "Ibn Mādjid", pp. 856-59; G.Rentz, E.I.², art. "Djazīrat Al-'Arab", p.553.

CONCLUSION

It would be a repetition of the obvious to state that the foregoing study treats numerous aspects of the history of Mecca. This makes it rather difficult to mention here each conclusion relevant to all the aspects discussed without repeating many of the stated or easily deducible points from the discussion of various topics and thus prolonging this conclusion to the length of a miniature thesis. Obviously, the case would have been quite different if the theme of the thesis has been confined to a specific single issue.

However, some of the main conclusions drawn from the political aspect of this study are as follows:

1. The region of Mecca, like other parts of the Ḥijāz, had long been without any great political significance in its own right. But this had not and could not deprive the region of its unique religious importance. This rested on its being the cradle of Islam and containing al-Ḥaramayn. Paradoxically, this advantageous position of the region did not enable the local Amirs to extend their influence in other parts of the Muslim world and instead caused them to suffer foreign domination for centuries. Various Muslim rulers established their hegemony mainly to secure personal prestige, but also for economic considerations.
3. During the period under examination the region was under the firm control of the Burjī Sultans. Their sovereignty and exclusive privileges were acknowledged by the successive Sharifs of Mecca as well as by other Muslim rulers and remained practically unchallenged.
3. The Sharifs of Mecca retained, however, reasonable autonomy

in local matters but not without frequent and effective intervention by their Egyptian overlords.

4. The Sharifs of Mecca had no independent foreign policy of their own but were not prevented from establishing friendly relations with non-Egyptian rulers. This, however, had to be in line with the external policies of their Egyptian sovereign. The latter never allowed such relations to develop to such an extent that they formed a threat to their political hegemony and financial interest in the region.

5. The Sharifs of Mecca were the most powerful and capable among the local Amirs from the political, military, administrative and financial points of view. They succeeded in extending and retaining their authority over several small principalities such as al-Qunfudha, Ḥaly and Jazān. Moreover, they alone were intermittently elevated to the status of Nā'ib al-Sultān and thus enjoyed some authority over the entire region of the Ḥijāz.

6. The biggest set back for the Sharifs of Mecca, in local politics, was their failure to persuade various local groups to give up their petty rivalries and to accept the idea of peaceful co-existence. Consequently, the region remained without much desired political stability and/ was almost continuous internal strife, triggered off there by rivalry, greed and ambition, which often led to the breakdown of law and order causing difficulties for the merchants, pilgrims and inhabitants.

7. The division of local forces was such that, despite frequent confrontations between the ruling Sharif and his opponents, the Sharif was often unable to subdue his antagonists by force of arms. Therefore, the Sharif was compelled to adopt a policy of appeasement

and often paid his opponents substantial amounts of money to secure temporary truces.

8. The principle of hereditary succession to the emirate was - on the whole - recognized and practised in Mecca. But the succession itself was seldom without family dissension which occasionally developed into an armed clash. To avoid this, the ruling Sharif of Mecca usually secured, during his lifetime, the appointment of his eldest son as his co-Amir. The latter, following the death of his father, was normally confirmed by the Egyptian Sultans as the official Amir of Mecca unless his rival brother managed to secure the emirate for himself.

The main conclusions concerning the general economic condition and the financial position of the Sharifs of Mecca are:

1. The Sharifs of Mecca enjoyed exclusive right to the entire revenue until 828/1425. In that year, following the desertion of Aden by the Indian merchants and their selection of Jedda for commercial activities, Sultan Bārsbāy sent officials to take charge of the port and the revenue. From then onwards most of the revenue was reserved for the royal treasury in Cairo.

2. The region of Mecca has always been a centre of commercial activities but this increased tremendously during the Burji period. Though not exclusively, much of the commercial activity was connected with the annual ceremony of the pilgrimage. This was an occasion of great religio-economic significance and intense commercial activities developed almost parallel with worship. The economic growth of the area reached an unprecedented level after 828/1425 for the reason mentioned earlier. This, however, proved to be less in favour and more against the financial interest of the Sharifs of Mecca who,

after this year, forfeited, in one way or another, a considerable portion of their revenue in favour of the treasury in Cairo. Despite this, the financial position of the Sharifs of Mecca remained fairly strong. The bulk of their revenue was obtained from the tax paid by the Indian and Yemenite merchants but a further amount of money was secured from local tolls, occasional dues, escheat, tribute, gifts and the customary share of the Sharifs in charities.

3. The economic growth of the area also had social implications. How far the common people benefited and to what extent the lower classes prospered as a result of intense trade in the area is difficult to ascertain. The historians in those days showed little, if any, interest in circumstances of life of the man in the street. But it may be supposed that small commission agents or brokers, carriers of goods or porters, owners of camels and other mounts and providers of accommodation benefited in a more or less modest proportion.

4. The distribution of various charities in Mecca not only benefited the needy but also played a considerable part in the economic life of the city, as it accounted for a considerable part of its total influx of money, grain, and other necessities of life. Strange as it may appear, the fact remains that the ruling Sharif of Mecca, officials, and other Meccan dignitaries benefited more from the donations sent to Mecca than the poor, the supposed beneficiaries.

5. Though no exact figures for the various expenditures of the Sharifs of Mecca - like the revenue - are given in the sources, this much is certain, that not only the greater portion of the Sharifs' revenue was diverted to Cairo but much of the remaining part of their income was used to meet other financial obligations. In addition to the huge amounts paid to the Egyptian Sultan or his Amirs, the

Sharifs spend a considerable part of their various financial gains on the upkeep of their families, slaves, soldiers and other members of the household. The salaries or maintenance allowances paid to the officials, Ashraf and Quwwad must also have been substantial. Moreover, hospitality to the visiting Sultan, members of the royal family, Egyptian Amirs, tribal chiefs, envoys and other guests must have been a heavy expense. All these and other expenditures such as the amount spent in financing benevolent works and in appeasement to dissident groups must have absorbed a considerable portion of their total revenue and kept them under continuous financial pressure. In view of this it is not surprising that they, at times, resorted to illegal means to secure additional material gains to meet their several obligations and expenditure.

The main conclusion drawn from examining the local administration could be summed up as follows:

1. The Sharifs of Mecca were able to establish, from the early part of the Burji period, a fairly organised system of administration. All the officials—with the exception of those related to the Meccan sanctuary—were appointed by and responsible to the Sharifs, who practically controlled the entire administration until 828/1425. From this year onwards almost all the key posts were held by the Sultani officials.
2. References to most Sharifi officials in both Mecca and Jedda are either anonymous or refer to named officials without specifying their responsibilities. Thus, their ranks or duties are extremely difficult to identify. Information on these officials and even on those referred to under mention of their titles, hardly goes beyond confirming the appointment/^{and}

functioning of these officials.

3. Many of the Sharifi officials were - or had been - slaves of the ruling Sharif or his father. Their appointment to various posts was a deliberate policy of the Sharifs who preferred them for their reliability and personal loyalty. Obviously, the Sharifs regarded the assigning of these important posts to his relatives or other prominent Ashrāf - who could and often did become disloyal - unsafe and decided not to take the risk.

4. The dominant position of the Sharifs and his officials in local administration came to an end in 828/1425 when Sultan Bārsbāy sent officials from Cairo and assigned to them several posts in Jeddā related to the collection of taxes. Shortly after, several other high ranking officials, such as Muhtasib and Bāsh al-Mamālīk, were sent to Mecca. Henceforth, the Sultani officials enjoyed dominant positions in local administration.

5. Information concerning the Sultani officials - like those appointed by the Sharifs - is generally inadequate. Most often it is confined to the names of the officials and their posts, the date of appointment or deposition. Consequently, what could be ascertained about the functions, official responsibilities, mutual relationship and extent of their influence amounts to little and is usually indicated by the terms denoting their posts and general duties. Even this is not an easy task, as several high ranking officials held more than one post and interfered in various other fields, and it is often difficult to distinguish between acts performed in a specific official capacity and those purely personally motivated.

6. That the Sharifs of Mecca owed allegiance to the Burjī Sultans, and to what extent, is reflected in their relatively modest share in

the administration and the rather narrow limits of their authority over the Sultani officials. Some of these, for example, the Bāsh al-Mamālīk and Nā'ib Jedda enjoyed such great influence that they, at times, rivalled if not over-shadowed the authority of the ruling Sharif of Mecca.

7. The Sharifi officials were able - on the whole - to discharge their duties without direct intervention by the Egyptian Sultan or his officials, but the authority of the Sharifi officials was far less than that enjoyed by the Sultani officials in judicial, financial and administrative fields.

8. The dominant position of the Sultani officials did not mean that the Sharifi officials no longer played a significant role in local administration. In fact, their services were indispensable to both the Sharifs and ^{the} indigenous population and they remained active throughout the period under consideration.

9. The responsibilities of the Sharifi officials in Mecca were easily distinguishable from each other but in Jedda were more difficult to distinguish. This is due to the fact that the responsibilities of the officials there were of dual administrative-financial character. Though some officials were appointed to purely administrative posts and others for the collection of taxes, their activities were so interlinked that both groups cannot be effectively separated.

10. The deposition or arrest of a certain Sharif of Mecca did not necessarily imply that his officials were also to suffer unless their behaviour was exceptionally objectionable.

11. The Sharifs of Mecca occasionally exercised a fairly strong influence over the Sultani officials but this never reached direct control.

12. Though the encroachment of the Sultani officials on the authority

of those appointed by the Sharifs was common in both Mecca and Jedda, due to the clash of financial interests this was more obvious in Jedda.

13. The simultaneous presence and functioning of two groups of officials - one appointed by the Egyptian Sultans and the other by the Sharifs of Mecca - many with similar responsibilities, cannot but have resulted in occasional friction. Obviously, some arrangements were made to facilitate their peaceful co-existence but unfortunately no details of these are given in the sources. Needless to say, often, if not always, in cases of dispute it was the views of the Sultani officials which prevailed and the matter was settled in their favour.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Some sources used in manuscript form in the collection of data for this thesis have subsequently been published, but too late for the author of this thesis to have been able to make use of the published editions.

1. Contemporary Hijāzi sources (in chronological order)

Al-Marāghī, Abī Bakr b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 816/1413), Ṭahqīq al-Nuṣra bi Talkhīs Ma'ālim Dār al-Hijra (Cairo, 1374/1955).

Ibn 'Uqba, Ahmad b. 'Alī (d. 828/1425), 'Umdat al-Ṭālib fi ansāb Abī Ṭālib (Beirut, undated).

Al-Fāsī, Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Ḥasanī (775-832/1373-1429), Shifā' al-gharām bi akhbār al-Balad al-Ḥarām, 2 vols (Cairo, 1375/1956).

--- Al-'Iqd al-thamīn fi Ta'rikh al-Balad al-Amīn, 2 vols - each consisting of two parts - (MS. Kop. No. 247-48).

Al-Najm (Najm al-Dīn) Ibn Fahd, 'Umar (known also as Muḥammad) b. Muḥammad (812-85/1409-80), Ithāf al-warā' bi akhbār Umm al-Qurā', 2 vols. (MS. M.H.M. No. 2 - Ta'rikh).

Al-Samhūdī, 'Alī b. Abdullah (844-911/1440-1505), Wafā' al-wafā' bi akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafa, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1326/1908).

--- Khulāṣat al-wafā' bi akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafa (Mecca, 1316/1898).

Al-'Izz ('Abd al-'Azīz) Ibn Fahd, Muḥammad b. 'Umar (850-922/1447-1516), Bulūgh al-Qira fi Dhayl Ithāf al-warā' bi akhbār Umm al-Qurā', 2 vols. (MS., M.H.M.No. 1 - Ta'rikh).

Jar Allah Ibn Fahd, Jar Allah b. 'Abd al-'Azīz (891-954/1486-1547), Tuhfat al-Laṭā'if fi faḍā'il al-ḥibr b. 'Abbās wa masjid al-Ṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 15 - Ta'rikh).

2. Contemporary Egyptian sources (in chronological order)

Ibn al-Furāt, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm (735-807/1334-1404), Ta'rikh Ibn al-Furāt, 3 vols. (ed. Q. Zurayq and N. 'Izz al-Dīn, Beirut, 1936-42).

Ibn Khaldūn, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (732-808/1332-1406), Kitāb al-'Ibar wa Diwān al-Mubtada' wa'l-Khabar fi ayyām al-'Arab wa'l-'Ajam wa'l-Barbar, 7 vols. (Bulaq, 1284/1867).

Al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad b. 'Alī (756-821/1355-1418), Ṣubḥ al-A'sha fi Ṣinā'at al-Insha, 14 vols. (Cairo, 1332-38/1913-19).

Ma'āthir al-Inafā fi Ma'ālim al-Khilafa, 3 vols. (Kuwait, 1964).

Al-Maqrīzī, Aḥmad b. 'Alī (766-845/1374-1442), Al-Sulūk li Ma'rifat Duwal al-Mulūk. This source has been used in the following order:

- a) The portion edited by M. Ziyada (Cairo, 1934-42) has been consulted in relation to some points relevant to pre-Burji period.
- b) For the events in the Burji period until 812/1409, vols. III and IV (MS. A.S. No. 3371-72 respectively).
- c) For the period between 812-44/1409-41 (MS. M.H.M. No. 6 - Ta'rikh).

Nubdha Laḥifa fi Umūr al Nuqūd al-Islāmiyya (MS, A.H.K., No. 264).

Ibn Ḥajar, Aḥmad b. 'Alī (773-852/1372-1449), Inbā' al-Ghumr bi abnā' al-'Umr, 2 vols. (MS., FAT. No. 4190-91). The copy used was written in 872/1467 and was chosen for its being the oldest among several copies consulted. However, in the 2nd vol. the portion covering the events between 812-16/1409-13 was missing and for this period MS. Kop. No. 1006 is used.

Al-Durar al-Kāmina fi A'yān al-Mi'at al-Thāmina, 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1348-50/1929-31).

Al-'Aynī, Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad (762-855/1361-1451), 'Iqd al-Jumān fi Ta'rikh ahl al-Zamān, 4 vols. (MS., B.A. No. 454-57).

Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Abu'l-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf (812-74/1410-70), Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa'l-Mustawfa ba'd al-Wāfi, a portion has been edited and published by A.Y. Najati (Cairo, 1375/1955) and is used in that form. But this source is used mostly in its manuscript form, 2 vols. (MS, N.OS. No. 3428-29).

Ḥawādith al-Duhūr fi mada al-Ayyām wa'l-Shuhūr, vol. I (MS, A.S.No. 3185), and parts II and III (ed. W. Popper, California, 1930-32).

Al-Mujūm al-Zāhira fi Mulūk Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira, on certain points, the published part of this source was used, 12 vols. (Cairo, 1929-56). But mainly the manuscript form is used, vol. VII (MS., A.S.No. 3499).

Al-Sakhāwī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān (831-902/1427-97), Al-Daw' al-Lami' li ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi', 12 vols. (Cairo, 1353-55/1934-36).

--- Al-Dhayl al-Tamm 'ala Duwal al-Islām, a portion covering the events between 745-850/1344-1446 has been used in its manuscript form (MS., Kop. No. 1189). The latter part of this source which deals with the events between 850-98/1446-92, edited by Mr. Aḥmad 'Abdullah Al-Ḥassu (submitted to the University of 'Ayn Shams (Egypt) for the degree of M.A. in August 1968) has been used with his kind permission.

--- Al-Tibr al-Masbūk fi Dhayl al-Sulūk (Bulāq, 1315/1896).

--- Al-Tuḥfa al Laṭifa fi Ta'riḥ Fuḍalā' al-Madina al-Sharifa, used partly in its published form, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1376-77/1956-58) and the remaining part in its manuscript form, 2 vols. (MS, Top. No. 6481-82/527 and 512 M respectively).

Al-Suyūṭī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abi Bakr (849-911/1445-1505), Ta'riḥ al-Khulafā' al-'Abbāsiyya, 3rd ed. (Cairo, 1383/1963).

--- Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍara fi akhbār Miṣr wa'l-Qāhira, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1299/1882).

Ibn Iyās, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (852-930/1448-1524), 'Uqūd al-Jumān fi waqā'i' al-Zamān, vol. II (MS., A.S.No. 3311).

--- Badā'i' al-Zuhūr fi waqā'i' al-Duhūr, vols. I and II (Bulāq, 1311/1893), vols. III-V (Istanbul, 1931-36). A portion of this work dealing with the events between 857-72/1453-67 which was omitted from the Istanbul edition is published by one of its editors under the title: Ṣafḥat lam tunshar min Badā'i' al-Zuhūr (i.e. unpublished pages of Badā'i') by M. Muṣṭafa (Cairo, 1951) and is used.

3. Contemporary Yemenite sources (in chronological order)

Ibn Wahhaṣ, 'Alī b. Ḥasan (d. 812/1410), Al-'Uqūd al-Lu'lu'iyya fi Ta'riḥ al-Dawla al-Rasūliyya, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1329-32/1911-14).

Al-Khazraji, 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan (d. after 858/1454), al-'Asjad al-Masbūk fi man tawalla al-Yaman min al-Mulūk (MS. M.H.M. No. 48 - Ta'riḥ).

Ibn al-Dayba', 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī (866-944/1461-1537), Bughyat al-Mustafid fi akhbār Madinat Zabid (MS, A.S.No.2988).

Ibn al-Dayba', 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Alī, Al-Faḍl al-Mazīd 'ala Bughyat al-Mustafīd (MS., A.S.No. 2988).

Qurrat al-'Uyūn fi akhbār al-Yaman al-Maymūn
(MS., M.H.M. No. 71 - Ta'rikh).

Abū (Bā) Makhrama, 'Abdullah b. 'Abdullah (870-947/1465-1540),
Ta'rikh Thaghr 'Adan, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1936).

4. The contemporary travellers

Varthema, Ludovico De (d. after 1508), The travels of Ludovico Di Varthema in Egypt, Syria, Arabia deserta and Arabia felix, in Persia, India, and Ethiopia A.D. 1503-8. (published by Burk Franklin, reprinted by permission of Hakluyt Society, London, 1863).

5. Sources prior to or later than the Burjī period.

Pre-Burjī sources:

Ibn Jubayr, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (540-614/1145-1217), Tadhkira bi'l-akhbār 'an ittifaqāt al-Asfār (or simply Rihla), 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1907).

Ibn al-Mujāwir, Yūsuf b. Ya'qūb (601-90/1204-91), Ta'rikh al-Mustabṣir (or al-Mustansir), 2 vols. (Leiden, 1951-54).

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (or Ibn Baṭūṭa), Muḥammad b. 'Abdullah (703/1304-770 or 779/1368 or 1377), Tuḥfat al-Nuẓẓār fi Gharā'ib al-Amsār wa 'Ajā'ib al-Asfār, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1357/1938).

Post-Burjī sources:

Ibn Faraj, Muḥammad (?) b. Aḥmad (d. after 951/1544), al-Silāh wa'l-Udda fi Ta'rikh Bandar Jidda (MS., L.U.I., Adbiyat Kūṭṭhanesi, No. 7415-127).

Ibn Zuhayra, Muḥammad b. Jar Allah (d. after 960/1553), al-Jāmi' al-Laṭīf fi faḍā'il Makka wa bina' al-Bayt al-Sharīf (Cairo, 1340/1921).

Al-Jazīrī, 'Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad (d. after 976/1568), Durar al-Fawā'id al-Munazzama fi akhbār al-Hajj wa Tariq Makka al-Munazzama, (Cairo, 1384/1964).

Al-Nahrawālī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (917/1511-988 or 990/1580 or 1582), Al-I'lām bi I'lām Bayt Allah al-Haram, ex. pub. by F. Wüstenfeld in Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka (Leipzig, 1857).

Al-Barq al-Yamāni fi al-Fatḥ al-'Uthmānī (ed. Ḥamad al-Jasir, Riyāḍ, 1387/1967).

- Al-Janābī, Muṣṭafa b. Ḥasan (d. 999/1590), Ta'riḥ or al-Baḥr al-Zāḥir fi Aḥwāl al-Awā'il wa'l-Awākhir (MS., A.S. No. 3033).
- Al-Ḥanbalī, Marā'ī b. Yūsuf (d. after Muḥarram 1031/Nov. or Dec. 1621), Qalā'id al-'Uqyān fi faḍā'il Al 'Uthmān (MS., E.E. No. 2340).
- Al-Bakari, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (d. after Dhu'l-Qa'da 1031/Oct. 1622), Fayḍ al-Mannān bi dhikr dawlat Al 'Uthmān (MS., A.S. No. 3345).
- 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, 'Alī b. 'Abd al-Qādir (d. after 1045/1635), Al-Arj al-Miskī fi al-Ta'riḥ al-Makki (MS., M.H.M. No. 3-Dihlawi).
- Ibn 'Alān, Muḥammad b. 'Alī (d. 1057/1647), Tayf al-Ṭā'if fi faḍl al-Ṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 120 - Ta'riḥ).
- Ibn al-'Imād, 'Abd al-Ḥayy b. Aḥmad (1032-89/1623-79), Shadharāt al-Dhahab fi akhbār man Dhahab, 8 vols. (Cairo, 1350-51/1931-32).
- Al-'Iṣāmī, 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥusayn (1049-1111/1639-99), Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awāli fi Anbā' al-Awā'il wa'l-Tawālī, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1380/1960).
- Al-Sinjārī, 'Alī al-Ḥanafī (d. 1125/1713), Manā'ih al-Karam fi akhbār al-Bayt wa wulāt al-Ḥaram, 3 vols. (MS., M.H.M. No. 30 - Tar'ikh).
- Al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. 'Alī (d. after 1141/1728), Ithāf Fuḍalā' al-Zaman bi Ta'riḥ wilayat Bani al-Ḥasan, 3 vols., (MS. M.H.M.No. 126 - Ta'riḥ).
- Al-'Ujaymī, Ḥasan b. 'Alī (d. around 1179/1765), 'Ihdā' al-Laṭā'if min akhbār al-Ṭā'if (MS., M.H.M. No. 14 - Ta'riḥ).
- Daḥlān, Aḥmad b. Zaynī (d. 1304/1886), Khulāṣat al-Kalām fi Bayān Umarā' al-Balad al-Ḥaram (Cairo, 1305/1887).

6. Modern works and articles

Works in Arabic

- Al-Anṣārī, 'Abd al-Quddūs, Tahqīq Amkina fi'l-Hijāz wa Tihama, a supplement to the magazine al-Manhal, Mecca, Rajab 1379/Jan. 1960 (Jedda, 1379/1960).
- Al-Basha, Ḥasan, Al-Alqāb al-Islāmiyya fi al-Tar'ikh wa'l-wathā'iq wa'l-Athar (Cairo, 1957).
- Darrāj, Aḥmad, Al-Mamālīk wa'l-Franj fi al-Qarn al-Tāri' al-Hijri (Cairo, 1961).

Karmly, Anistas Māri, Al-Nuḡūd al-'Arabiyya wa I'lm al-Nummiyyāt, (Cairo, 1939).

Works in other languages

Heyd, W., Histoire du commerce du Levant au mōyen-âge, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1923).

Holt, P.M.; Lambton, A.S., and Lewis, B., The Cambridge History of Islam, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, London, 1970).

Lewis, B., The Arabs in History (Hutchinson University Library, London, 1960).

Serjeant, R.B., The Portuguese off the South Arabian Coast (London, 1963).

Wiet, G., 'Les marchands d'épices sous les Sultans Mamlouks', editions des Cahiers d'histoire Egyptienne (Le Caire, 1955, 5 Juin).

Other works consulted

Numerous articles from E.I.¹ and E.I.² have been used to explain certain terms or specific issues.

The tables used for the conversion of Muslim and Christian dates are those provided by:

Freeman-Grenville, G.S.P., The Muslim and Christian Calendars (London, 1963).

In ascertaining the location of certain places the following maps were consulted:

Saudi Arabian Map, published by the Ministry of Information, The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (printed by Al-Mutawa Press, Dammām).

Atlas of the Arab world and the Middle East (Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1960).