



Al-Maqrīzī' s Biography of Tīmūr

Ito, Takao

(Citation)

Arabica, 62(2-3):308-327

(Issue Date)

2015

(Resource Type)

journal article

(Version)

Accepted Manuscript

(Rights)

©2015 Brill

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/90003877>



Abstract

Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda fī tarāğim aʿyān al-mufīda is an Arabic biographical dictionary by a famous historian of the Mamluk Sultanate, al-Maqrīzī, of his contemporaries. This recently published work contains a long biography of Tīmūr, or Tamerlane, the founder of the Timurid dynasty. In discussing the biography, this article presents some interesting and original details: First, it reviews the editions of *Durar al-ʿuqūd* that have been published to date; second, it gives an outline of Tīmūr's biography; after that, it scrutinizes al-Maqrīzī's sources for Tīmūr's life and then the relations between his and other Arabic biographies of Tīmūr; lastly, it considers the value of the work.

Key words

Tīmūr; al-Maqrīzī; biography; historiography; Mamluk Sultanate

* This is part of the results of the research supported by the Inamori Foundation.

Much has been written about Tīmūr, or Tamerlane (r. 771–807/1370–1405). While the studies on him and the Timurids are mainly based on Persian sources, little attention has been given to Arabic ones except for the case of a well-known biography of Tīmūr by Ibn ‘Arabšāh (d. 854/1450).¹ Nevertheless, many other contemporary Arabic works are also available. This article deals with an Arabic biography of Tīmūr by a famous historian of the Mamluk Sultanate, al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), which is included in his recently published biographical dictionary of his contemporaries, *Durar al-‘uqūd al-farīda fī tarāğim a‘yān al-muḥīda*. The purpose of this article is to examine al-Maqrīzī’s sources for Tīmūr’s life as well as the relations between this and other Arabic biographies of Tīmūr and so to consider the value of this work.

Editions of *Durar*

To date, three editions of *Durar* have been published. One is edited by Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Alī, another by ‘Adnān Darwīš and Muḥammad al-Miṣrī, and the third by Maḥmūd al-Ġalīlī.²

The edition by ‘Alī contains biographies of 300 individuals, whose names (*ism*) begin with the letter *alif*. There are 382 biographies in the edition by Darwīš and al-Miṣrī; among them, 353 names begin with *alif*; the remaining names all begin with *‘ayn*, with one exception.³ These two editions are based on the autograph kept in the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Germany (FBG, MS. orient A 1771).⁴ Unfortunately, this autograph is incomplete. Although the edition by Darwīš and al-Miṣrī also contains the biographies of the individuals whose *isms* do not begin with *alif*, al-Maqrīzī wrote them not for *Durar* but for another biographical dictionary, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā l-kabīr*. Only the *alif* section of *Durar* is included in the Gotha autograph.⁵

¹ Ibn ‘Arabšāh, *‘Ağā’ib al-maqdūr fī nawā’ib Timūr*, ed. Aḥmad Fā’iz al-Ḥimṣī, Beirut, Mu’assat al-Risāla, 1986; *id.*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar, Cairo, Maktabat al-Anğlū l-Miṣriyya, 1979; *id.*, Cambridge University Library (CUL), MS. Add. 3237.

² *Al-Maqrīzī wa-kitābuhu Durar al-‘uqūd al-farīda fī tarāğim al-a‘yān al-muḥīda*, ed. Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Alī, Beirut, ‘Alam al-Kutub, 1992; *Durar al-‘uqūd al-farīda fī tarāğim al-a‘yān al-muḥīda: Qiṭ‘a minhu*, ed. ‘Adnān Darwīš/Muḥammad al-Miṣrī, Damascus, Wizārat al-ṭaqāfa, 1995; *Durar al-‘uqūd al-farīda fī tarāğim al-a‘yān al-muḥīda*, ed. Maḥmūd al-Ġalīlī, Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2002.

³ This exception is Dāwūd b. Miqdām b. Muḥaffar. See al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. Darwīš and al-Miṣrī, II, p. 302.

⁴ Darwīš and al-Miṣrī do not reveal, what manuscript(s) they consulted. However, they must have based themselves on the Gotha autograph. See Donald P. Little, “Review of al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. Darwīš and al-Miṣrī”, *Mamlūk Studies Review*, 3 (1999), p. 231–233.

⁵ See ‘Alī’s introduction to his edition of *Durar*, I, p. 38–39, n. 1; al-Ġalīlī’s introduction to *Durar*, I, p. 10–11; see also Little, “Review of al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. Darwīš and al-Miṣrī.”

The basis of al-Ğalīlī's edition is a manuscript that was written in 878/1474 and belongs to al-Ğalīlī privately.⁶ This manuscript should be complete. Already in 1966, al-Ğalīlī presented the manuscript and published a biography of Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406) from it.⁷ However, he refused to make it available anymore.⁸ He then edited, however, the text, allegedly comparing his manuscript with the Gotha autograph, and published the work in 2002. This edition contains 1473 biographies from Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Bahādur b. ʿAbd Allāh, Šayḫ Burhān al-Dīn Ibn Zuqqāʿa to Yūnus b. Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā l-Wāhī.⁹

The biography of Tīmūr is found only in the last edition. According to al-Ğalīlī, this biography is the second longest in the work and consists of thirty-five pages in the manuscript,¹⁰ which takes up fifty-nine pages in the edition.

Content of the biography of Tīmūr in *Durar*

In the biography, the name comes first, i.e. Tīmūr Kūrkān (Kūrāgān) b. Taraġāy b. Abaġāy. Al-Maqrīzī then refers to another genealogy of Tīmūr – discussed later – and states that Tīmūr was born around (*taḥmīnan*) 728/1327–28.¹¹

Following that, an overview is given of the history of the Turks and the Mongols, particularly the Salġuqs, the Ḥwarazm-Šāhs, and the Čingizids.¹²

⁶ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. al-Ğalīlī, I, p. 8; II, p. 201, n. 2; Maḥmūd al-Ğalīlī, “*Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda fī tarāġīm al-aʿyān al-mufīda li-l-Maqrīzī*”, *Maġallat al-Maġmaʿ al-ʿilmī l-ʿirāqī*, 13 (1966), p. 201–214, see p. 205-206; see also al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. ʿAlī, I, p. 38–39, n. 1.

⁷ Maḥmūd al-Ğalīlī, “*Durar al-ʿuqūd*”; *id.*, “*Tarġamat Ibn Ḥaldūn li-l-Maqrīzī*”, *Maġallat al-maġmaʿ al-ʿilmī l-ʿirāqī*, 13 (1966), p. 215–244.

⁸ Aymān Fuʿād Sayyid, *Le manuscrit autographe d'al-Mawāʿiz wa-al-Iʿtibār fī Dhikr al-Ḥiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār*, London, al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 1995, p. 52.

⁹ This edition is missing the biographies of two women, Amat al-Qāhir bt. Raḍī l-Dīn Qāsim al-Baʿlabakkiyya and Asan(?) bt. Aḥmad Umm ʿAbd Allāh, which are found in the manuscript (FBG, MS. orient A 1771, ff. 146a–b) and the edition of *Durar* by Darwīš and al-Miṣrī (II, p. 285–286). However, al-Ğalīlī's edition – probably his manuscript as well – contains the biographies of Asandamur al-ʿUmarī and Asanbuġā l-Maḥmūdī (*Durar* by al-Ğalīlī, I, p. 425), which are not in the Gotha autograph and the edition of *Durar* by Darwīš and al-Miṣrī. Furthermore, al-Ğalīlī says that the *alif* section of the autograph covers only up to Alṭinbuġā Šaqal (*Durar* by al-Ğalīlī, I, p. 10), although in fact the biographies of not only the two women but also four persons follow, i.e. Amīr Ġālib b. Amīr Kātib, Anas b. ʿAlī l-Anšārī, Anaš al-ʿUthmānī (Mamluk Sultan Barqūq's father) and Īdkū (Edigü) (FBG, MS. orient A 1771, ff. 146a–150b; al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, ed. Darwīš and al-Miṣrī, II, p. 285–297). It seems that al-Ğalīlī got a deficient microfilm copy of the Gotha autograph, or that he did not investigate it thoroughly.

¹⁰ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, IV, p. 29 (unless otherwise stated, *Durar* refers hereafter to the edition by al-Ğalīlī); al-Ğalīlī, “*Durar al-ʿuqūd*”, p. 210.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 501.

¹² *Ibid.*, I, p. 501-506.

Thereafter, al-Maqrīzī describes the life of Tīmūr in detail: his origin and early days;¹³ a series of his campaigns and wars,¹⁴ including the war in Syria in 803/1400–01¹⁵ and the battle with the Ottomans;¹⁶ a splendid wedding feast of his grandson Ulūg Beg in Samarkand;¹⁷ and Tīmūr’s march to China and his death on the way in 807/1405.¹⁸

Finally, the author reconstructs Tīmūr’s character using many anecdotes and enumerates his building activities, wives, children, grandchildren, scholars, and so on.¹⁹

Al-Maqrīzī’s sources

Although he refers to Ibn ‘Arabšāh only once at the end of Tīmūr’s biography, al-Maqrīzī’s main source is Ibn ‘Arabšāh’s biography of Tīmūr, ‘*Ağā’ib*, as Joseph Drory points out.²⁰ This will be clear from a comparison of the two texts (see Appendix 1).²¹

Indeed, al-Maqrīzī mentions in the biography of Ibn ‘Arabšāh in *Durar* that he summarised the latter’s work on Tīmūr (*laḥḥaṣtu*), though he calls it *Umūr Tīmūr* (The Affairs of Tīmūr).²² It seems certain that the biography of Tīmūr in *Durar* was based on this summary of ‘*Ağā’ib*. A further comparison of the two texts reveals that al-Maqrīzī even followed the narrative sequence of ‘*Ağā’ib*.

However, Tīmūr’s biography in *Durar* contains details that are lacking in ‘*Ağā’ib*. For example, Ibn ‘Arabšāh does not mention the year of Tīmūr’s birth explicitly, although he states that Tīmūr died around the age of eighty²³ and quotes the following episode from Ibn al-Šiḥna (d. 815/1412):

¹³ *Ibid.*, I, p. 507-511.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, I, p. 5111-538.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, p. 526-533.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, p. 531-534.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, p. 539-544.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, I, p. 545-548. Tīmūr’s death is dated 19 Ša‘bān 807 in al-Ġalīlī’s edition (*Durar*, I, p. 547). However, according to Ibn ‘Arabšāh, it should be 17 Ša‘bān 807/18 Feb. 1405 (Ibn ‘Arabšāh, ‘*Ağā’ib*, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 393). This difference is probably due to a mistake made during the copying of the manuscript. For the different dates of Tīmūr’s death given by sources, see Eiji Mano, “Amīr Tīmūr Kūrāgān: Tīmūr ke no keifu to Tīmūr no tachiba (=Amīr Tīmūr Kūrāgān: The Timurid Genealogy and Tīmūr’s Position)”, in: *id.*, *Bābur to sono zidai (=Bābur and His Times)*, Kyoto, Shōkadō, 2001, p. 317–336, see p. 319, n. 2.

¹⁹ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 549-559.

²⁰ Joseph Drory, “Maqrīzī in *Durar al-Uqūd* with regard to Timur Leng”, in: *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras VII*, ed. U. Vermeulen/ K. D’hulster/ J. Van Steenberghe, Leuven, Peeters, 2013, p. 393–401, esp. p. 394.

²¹ Al-Maqrīzī quotes ‘*Ağā’ib* also for the biographies of the Ottoman sovereign Bayazid I (r. 791–805/1389–1403) and the khan of the Ğučid *ulus*, Tuqtamiš (r. ca. 780–797/1378–95), but he mentions its author only as ‘*ġāmi’ sīrat Tīmūr* (collector or writer of Tīmūr’s biography)’ (*Durar*, I, p. 446–450, 499–500).

²² Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 287–288.

²³ Ibn ‘Arabšāh, ‘*Ağā’ib*, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 451; J. H. Sanders (tr.), *Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir*, London, Luzac, 1936, p. 295.

Tamurlank (Tīmūr) asked me (i.e. Ibn al-Šiḥna) about my age. I said, ‘I was born in the year 749, so I am fifty-four years old.’ He asked Qāḍī Šaraf al-Dīn (Mūsā b Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ğum‘a l-Anšārī), ‘And you, how old are you?’ He replied, ‘I’m one year older than he.’ Then, Tamurlank said, ‘You are of the age of my children. I am now seventy-five years old.’²⁴

This conversation took place in the year 803/1400, when Tīmūr conquered Aleppo. Hence, it can be mathematically concluded that Tīmūr was born in 728/1327–28, for $803 - 75 = 728$. Al-Maqrīzī must have calculated in this way and come to the year 728, as his expression here ‘*taḥmīnan* (around, approximately)’ indicates.

In any event, there are other details that do not appear in ‘*Aḡā’ib*’ but in *Durar*. Al-Maqrīzī dates Tīmūr’s march from Samarkand to Multan in dū l-ḥiḡḡa 800/Aug.–Sep. 1398, but Ibn ‘Arabšāh does not refer to any date.²⁵ Two verses are inserted in the description of the wedding feast of Ulūḡ Beg in *Durar*, while all the verses given in ‘*Aḡā’ib*’ are omitted; in addition, many sentences and phrases about this festival in *Durar* differ from those in ‘*Aḡā’ib*’.²⁶

Did Ibn ‘Arabšāh’s biography of Tīmūr, which al-Maqrīzī had access to, include the details and passages missing in the current edited text of ‘*Aḡā’ib*’? Two persons met in 840/1436–37 and mainly on the basis of the above-mentioned fact that al-Maqrīzī called Ibn ‘Arabšāh’s work *Umūr Tīmūr*, R. D. McChesney infers that the revision of ‘*Aḡā’ib*’ may have been in progress at the time of al-Maqrīzī’s death (845/1442).²⁷ Some researchers suppose, however, that it was completed earlier. Franz Babinger maintains that Ibn ‘Arabšāh finished his work on 17 Muḥarram 839/ 12 Aug. 1435.²⁸ He must have obtained this information from the manuscript catalogue of Cambridge University Library. It records a manuscript of ‘*Aḡā’ib*’ kept there under Add. 3237, whose writing ended allegedly on 17 Muḥarram 839. This date does not seem, however, to mean the completion of the work, as

²⁴ *Id.*, ‘*Aḡā’ib*’, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 216; Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Šiḥna, *Rawḍat al-manāzīr fī aḥbār al-awā’il wa-l-awāḥīr*, in: Ibn al-Athīr, *Ta’rīḡ al-Kāmil*, Būlāq, 1873, IX, p. 217–218; Ibn ‘Arabshāh, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 129.

²⁵ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 524; Ibn ‘Arabshāh, ‘*Aḡā’ib*’, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 162–163; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 95.

²⁶ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 542–544; Ibn ‘Arabshāh, ‘*Aḡā’ib*’, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 377–381; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 218–221.

²⁷ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 287; R. D. McChesney, “A Note on the Life and Works of Ibn ‘Arabshāh”, in: *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East*, ed. Judith Pfeiffer, Sholeh A. Quinn, and Ernest Tucker, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2006, p. 205–249, see p. 208, 237–238; p. 237–238, n. 103.

²⁸ Franz Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*, Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1927, p. 22. See also Walter J. Fischel, *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1952, p. 1; U. Nashashibi, “‘Ajā’eb al-Maqrīzī”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. 17 muḥarram 839 does not, however, correspond to 12 July 1435, as Nashashibi writes, but 12 August.

references to the year 840/1436–37 are found in this manuscript.²⁹ According to Aḥmad Fāʿiz al-Ḥimṣī, an editor of *ʿAğāʾib*, another manuscript that is stored at Dār al-kutub, Cairo, was finished on 1 rabīʿ I 841/ 2 Sep. 1437.³⁰ Although the latest date mentioned in a printed text of *ʿAğāʾib* is 843/1439–40, it may be, as al-Ḥimṣī thinks, a note added later by a copyist or a reader.³¹ In short, the date of 17 Muḥarram 839 probably refers to the date of a draft or an earlier version, and Ibn ʿArabshāh must have continued to revise or supplement it until at least the end of the year 840. The older manuscripts of *ʿAğāʾib* need to be examined more critically. For the moment, however, the textual differences between the manuscripts do not appear so large. It is more likely that al-Maqrīzī extracted some pieces of information that are not found in *ʿAğāʾib* from other sources.

Without doubt, al-Maqrīzī’s source for the prehistory, i.e. the history of the Turks and the Mongols, is Ibn Ḥaldūn’s history *Ibar*.³² Three examples will show how al-Maqrīzī used *Ibar*. The first concerns the origin of the Turks and their tribes (see Appendix 2); the second regards the Čingizids (Appendix 3). In both cases, the two texts resemble each other.

For the Mongols, Ibn Ḥaldūn relied mainly on the encyclopaedic work of al-ʿUmarī (d. 749/1349), *Masālik*.³³ On them too, al-Maqrīzī essentially follows Ibn Ḥaldūn,³⁴ but he seems, at least in one case, to have consulted *Masālik* (see Appendix 4). The phrases in *Durar* look similar to those in *Ibar* even here. However, Ibn Ḥaldūn mistook Mūdunğah (< Būdunğar) for a woman named Alan Quwa. Al-Maqrīzī did not repeat it, although he mentioned Čingiz Ḥān’s brother, Učigin Nuyan, mistakenly as the former’s son. Thus, he relied on Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *Ibar* but did not accept it uncritically and corrected the mistake probably with the latter’s source, *Masālik*.

Al-Maqrīzī is for the most part silent about his sources – for which he is ‘notorious’ – but in four passages, he notes Ibn Ḥaldūn as his source.³⁵ Nevertheless, those passages cannot be found in *Ibar* nor in Ibn Ḥaldūn’s autobiography *Taʿrīf*.³⁶ Because al-Maqrīzī employs in them the expression

²⁹ Ibn ʿArabshāh, *ʿAğāʾib*, CUL. MS. Add. 3237, ff. 26b, 63a. Cf. *id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 139, 336; ed. ʿUmar, p. 83, 204; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 78, 187. More dates after 17 muḥarram 839 are referred to in the edited texts. See *id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 227, 373, 450, 466; ed. ʿUmar, p. 146, 233, 314, 332; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 135, 214, 294, 311.

³⁰ *Id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 494; p. 494, n. 2; also p. 343, n. 2. Nevertheless, al-Ḥimṣī himself did not see this manuscript. He relied on *ʿAğāʾib* by ʿUmar. See *id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. ʿUmar, p. 366; also p. 7 (introduction).

³¹ See *id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 343; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 191. See also *id.*, *ʿAğāʾib*, ed. ʿUmar, p. 208, n. 1.

³² Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Taʿrīḥ al-ʿallāma Ibn Ḥaldūn: Kitāb al-ʿIbar*, Beirut, 1966–78.

³³ *Id.*, *Ibar*, V, p. 1117–1118; Klaus Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1965, p. 71–73; Walter J. Fischel, “Ibn Khaldūn’s Sources for the History of Jenghiz Khān and the Tatars”, *JAOS*, 76/2 (1956), p. 91–99, esp. p. 96.

³⁴ Compare Appendix 3 with al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār*, in: Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich*, p. 14.

³⁵ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 551–552, 554, 555. Drory refers to one of them as an example of the episodes which do not appear in *ʿAğāʾib* (Drory, “Maqrīzī in *Durar al-ʿUqūd*”, p. 401).

³⁶ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-Taʿrīf bi-Ibn Ḥaldūn wa-riḥlatihī ġarban wa-šarqan*, ed. Muḥammad Tāwīt al-Ṭanġī, Cairo, Laġnat al-taʿlīf wa-l-tarġama wa-l-našr, 1951.

‘*aḥbaranī* (he told me)’ or ‘*qāla lī* (he said to me)’, we can suppose that he heard them from Ibn Ḥaldūn orally. In any case, al-Maqrīzī does not seem to have used Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *Taʿrīf* for Tīmūr’s biography in *Durar*, whereas his biography of Ibn Ḥaldūn was based on this autobiography.³⁷

It is more difficult to identify where Tīmūr’s genealogy that al-Maqrīzī mentions comes from. That is³⁸

تيمورلنك كوركان بن انس قتلغ و قبل بل هو تيمور بن سرخننه(?) بن زكي بن سبغا بن طارم بن طغرل بن قليج بن سنقور بن كنجك بن طوسيقا بن التان خان
 In his chronicle *Sulūk*, there is a similar genealogy, apart from a variant of his father’s name:³⁹

This is completely different from the generally known genealogy, *i.e.* Tīmūr b. Ṭaraġāy (Ṭurġāy) b. Burgul b. Īlangīr (Aylangir) b. Iĉil b. Qaraĉar Nuyan and so on.⁴⁰ Ibn Ḥaldūn calls Tīmūr’s father Ṭaraġāy as well.⁴¹ Ibn ‘Arabšāh names Tīmūr b. Taraġāy b. Abaġāy, and so begins, as mentioned above, the biography of Tīmūr in *Durar*. Elsewhere, al-Maqrīzī refers to Tīmūr’s father as Taraġāy and his grandfather as Abaġā (< Abaġāy).⁴²

About Īsan (Isan) Qutluġ, or Esen Qutluġ/Quitluq, whom al-Maqrīzī refers to as Tīmūr’s father once each in *Durar* and *Sulūk*, there is, to my knowledge, no information in Arabic sources except for in one. In his Arabic biographical dictionary, Ibn al-Fuwaṭī (d. 723/1323), a historian and librarian of the Ilḥānate, who met Isan Qutluġ in 716/1316, gives an account of the latter: He was a powerful, just,

³⁷ See al-Ġalīlī, “Tarġamat Ibn Ḥaldūn li-l-Maqrīzī”, p. 217; al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, II, p. 383, n 1. It should be noted that al-Maqrīzī does not refer to the famous meeting between Ibn Ḥaldūn and Tīmūr in Damascus in Tīmūr’s biography in *Durar*, whereas he does so in his chronicle *Sulūk* and in the biography of Ibn Ḥaldūn in *Durar* (al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-maʿrīfat duwal al-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ziyāda and Saʿīd ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ ‘Āšūr, Cairo, 1934–1973, III, p. 1052, 1056; *id.*, *Durar*, II, p. 397–398). However, Ibn ‘Arabšāh gives a detailed account of this meeting (Ibn ‘Arabšāh, *Aġāʿib*, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 252–255, 452–454; *id.*, *Tamerlane*, transl. Sanders, p. 143–145, 296–298).

³⁸ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 501.

³⁹ *Id.*, *Sulūk*, IV, p. 26.

⁴⁰ Mano, “Amīr Tīmūr Kūrāġān”— this article was first published in: *Toyōshi Kenkyū*, 34/4 (1976), p. 591–615; John E. Woods, *The Timurid Dynasty*, Bloomington, Indiana University, 1990, p. 9; *id.*, “Timur’s Genealogy”, in: *Intellectual Studies on Islam*, ed. Michel M. Mazzaoui and Vera Basch Moreen, Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1990, p. 85–125. On the genealogical claims connected with Tīmūr, see also Denise Aigle, “Les transformations d’un mythe d’origine: L’exemple de Gengis Khan et de Tamerlan”, *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 89–90 (2000, *Figures mythiques des mondes musulmans*), p. 151–168.

⁴¹ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Taʿrīf*, p. 363–364, 382. In *Ibar*, Ibn Ḥaldūn states that he does not know whether Tīmūr is really a descendant of Čaġatāy, a son of Čingiz Ḥān, and does not name Tīmūr’s father (*id.*, *Ibar*, V, p. 1083, 1129). In a manuscript of *Ibar*, however, he noted that Tīmūr’s father would be Ṭaraġāy (Fischel, *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane*, p. 115, n. 224).

⁴² Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*: I, p. 507; II, p. 66 (biography of Tīmūr’s grandson Ḥalīl Sulṭān [r. 807–811/1405–09]); II, p. 120 (biography of Tīmūr’s son Šāh Ruḥ [r. 811–850/1409–47]).

and learned emir, who established in Hamadan a *ḥānqāh*, a *madrasa*, and a hospital (*dār al-ṣifāʿ*) for *ṣūfīs*, and so on.⁴³ Particularly noteworthy is his genealogy:

معز الدين ركن الاسلام ايسن قتلغ بن زكي بن سينا بن طارم بن طغرل بن قليج بن سنقور بن كنجك بن طوسبوقا بن اکتان خان

From Persian histories, we learn more about him, and at least two refer to his genealogy. One of them, *Simṭ al-ʿUlā* is a history of the Qarā-Ḥiṭāy of Kirmān by Nāṣir al-Dīn Munṣī Kirmānī (fl. early 14th century), who served Isan Qutluḡ and dedicated his work to him. According to it, Isan Qutluḡ's genealogy is as follows:⁴⁴

ايسن قتلغ نويان بن الامير السعيد زنگی بن ساس نارم بن طغرل بن قليج بن سنقور بن كيجك بن بوسوقا بن التان خان
The other work, *Taʿrīḥ-i ʿUlğāytū* of Abū l-Qāsim al-Qāṣānī (fl. early 14th century) is a history of the reign of the Ilḥān Ulğaytu (r. 704–716/1304–16), under whom Isan Qutluḡ was one of the great emirs. In it, his genealogy is described as:⁴⁵

اميرمعظم خسرو عادل معز الدين ايسن قوتلوق پسر زکی بن سينا بن طارم بن طغرل بك بن قلع بن سنقور بن گنجشك بن طوسبوقا بن التان خان

Setting aside the little differences of the names in these three works, it is obvious that the genealogy of Tīmūr that al-Maqrīzī refers to is based on that of Isan Qutluḡ. Because al-Maqrīzī states that someone (*baʿduhum*), one of Tīmūr's followers (*ḡamāʿatihi*) dictated this genealogy to him (*amlā ʿalayya*), he must have been informed of it orally.

Assuming that it was not an unintentional mistake,⁴⁶ this genealogical connection of Tīmūr with Isan Qutluḡ must have been invented. Why were these two connected? As mentioned above, Isan Qutluḡ was one of the great emirs under Ulğaytu and Abū Saʿīd (r. 717–736/1317–35) as well. He had a son named Tūkal (Tökel) whose daughter ʿĀdilšāh Ḥātūn was a wife of Abū Saʿīd.⁴⁷ In addition,

⁴³ Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, *Maḡmaʿ al-ādāb fī muḡam al-alqāb*, ed. Muḥammad al-Kāzīm, Tehran, 1995, V, p. 333–334; Devin DeWeese, “Cultural Transmission and Exchange in the Mongol Empire”, in: *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*, ed. Linda Komaroff, Leiden-Boston, Brill («Islamic history and civilization», 64), 2006, p. 11–29, see p. 22–23.

⁴⁴ Nāṣir al-Dīn Munṣī Kirmānī, *Simṭ al-ʿUlā li-l-ḥaḍra l-ʿulyā dar taʿrīḥ-i Qarāḥitāʿiyān-i Kirmān*, ed. ʿAbbās Iqbāl, Teheran, Širkat-i Sahāmī-i Čāp, 1949, p. 9. On the relation of the author with Isan Qutluḡ, see Introduction to the *Simṭ al-ʿUlā*, p. h (=5); Ann K. S. Lambton, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia*, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1988, p. 369–370.

⁴⁵ Abū l-Qāsim al-Qāṣānī, *Taʿrīḥ-i ʿUlğāytū*, ed. Mahīn Hambalī, Teheran, Bungāh-i Tarḡama wa-Našr-i Kitāb, 1969, p. 9.

⁴⁶ It is possible that this was simply a mistake. For instance, as Isan Qutluḡ was, according to Ibn al-Fuwaṭī (see n. 43 supra), interested in history (*ʿilm al-tawārīḥ*) and the biographies of past kings and sultans, he may have known of Tīmūr's father and transmitted information about him, and then, for some reason, al-Maqrīzī or his source may have believed mistakenly that Isan Qutluḡ was Tīmūr's father. However, it is unlikely that Isan Qutluḡ could have been Tīmūr's father since he died in 718/1318, long before Tīmūr's assumed birth (see below; on Isan Qutluḡ's death, see Charles Melville, “Abū Saʿīd and the Revolt of the Amirs in 1319”, in: *L'Iran face à la domination mongole*, ed. Denise Aigle, Tehran, Institut français de recherche en Iran («Bibliothèque iranienne», 45), 1997, p. 89–120, esp. p. 95).

⁴⁷ *Muʿizz al-ansāb=История Казахстана в персидских источниках: Муʿizz al-ansāb*, Almaty, Daik-Press, 2006, f. 76a/p. 98, f. 78a/p. 101, f. 78b/p. 100 – this is a facsimile of the so-called Paris manuscript of *Muʿizz al-ansāb* (Bibliothèque

one of Tīmūr's wives, a daughter of the ruler of Moghulistan, Ḥiḍr Ḥwāḡa (d. ca. 802/1399–1400), was also named Tūkal (Tökel).⁴⁸ This Tūkal (Tīmūr's wife) might have been confused with the homonymous son of Isan Qutluḡ and then with Tīmūr. Whatever the case may be, it might have been convenient to connect Isan Qutluḡ with Tīmūr, for the former was the grandfather-in-law of Abū Sa'īd and had a long pedigree; it could hence look as if Tīmūr had been from a splendid old family connected with the Ilḡān. Thus this genealogy of Tīmūr, as long as it is supposed to have been invented, seems to reflect an attempt to bring him in connection with the Mongols or the Ilḡānid dynasty to legitimate his and his successors' rule.⁴⁹

Relation of the biography of Tīmūr in *Durar* to other Arabic ones

In *Sulūk*, al-Maqrīzī places a short obituary of Tīmūr in the year 808/1405–06 – not 807 – and relates that he died in Āhankarān (Angren) – not Utrar/Otrar.⁵⁰ Broadly speaking, al-Maqrīzī describes Tīmūr in his chronicle from the viewpoint of the locals of the Mamluk Sultanate or the Egyptians, as Drory points out.⁵¹ His sources for Tīmūr in *Sulūk* are not clear, although among them are not only oral communications and his own experiences but probably written works, such as the chronicles of Ibn Furāt (d. 807/1405), Ibn Duqmāq (d. 809/1407), and Ibn Ḥiḡḡī (d. 816/1413).⁵² In any case, he does not seem to have known much about Tīmūr himself or his life in writing *Sulūk* – around the

nationale de France, Ancien fonds, person 67) with Russian translation, commentary, and indices. *Mu'izz al-ansāb* is a genealogical work written in Persian by order of Šāh Ruḡ, which includes Tīmūr's generally known genealogy (see above); on this work, see Sholeh A. Quinn, "The *Mu'izz al-Ansāb* and *Shu'ab-i Panjgānah* as Sources for the Chaghatayid Period of History: A Comparative Analysis", *Central Asiatic Journal*, 33/3–4 (1989), p. 229–253; Shiro Ando, *Timuridische Emire nach dem Mu'izz al-ansāb*, Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1992, esp. p. 13–50; Tursun Ikamovich Sultanov, "*Mu'izz al-ansāb* and Spurious Chingizids", *Manuscripta Orientalia*, 2/3 (1996), p. 3–7.

⁴⁸ *Mu'izz*, f. 34b/p. 51, f. 97a/p. 116; Woods, *The Timurid Dynasty*, p. 18; Eiji Mano, "Tīmūr no *ordu* (=Tīmūr's *ordu*)", in: *id.*, *Bābur to sono zidai*, p. 345–367, see p. 350; Takushi Kawaguchi, *Timūr teikoku shihaisō no kenkyū* (=The Study of the Timurid Empire's Ruling Stratum), Sapporo, Hokkaido University Press, 2007, p. 41–42.

⁴⁹ Tīmūr wanted or tried to connect himself with the Ilḡānid line. '[I]n one of his letters to Bayazid he (*i.e.* Tīmūr) actually identified himself as an Ilkhanid. Another indication of Timur's desire to connect himself with the Ilkhanid dynasty is his official birthdate, set at 1336, which on the rare occasions when it is mentioned is always identified as the date of the death of Abu Sa'īd, the last Hülegüid Ilkhan' (Beatrice Forbes Manz, "Tamerlane and the Symbolism of Sovereignty", *Iranian Studies*, 21 (1988), p. 105–122, see p. 113). On the attempts to identify Tīmūr with the Ilḡāns by Šāh Ruḡ, see Beatrice Forbes Manz, "Mongol History rewritten and relived", in: *Figures mythiques des mondes musulmans*, p. 129–149, see p. 143–146.

⁵⁰ Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, IV, p. 26.

⁵¹ Drory, "Maqrīzī in *Durar al-Uqūd*", p. 394–399.

⁵² See Sami G. Massoud, *The Chronicles and Annalistic Sources of the Early Mamluk Circassian Period*, Leiden-Boston, Brill («Islamic history and civilization», 67), 2007, p. 49–53, 112–115, 158. Al-Maqrīzī claims, however, that Ibn Duqmāq transcribed an account about the conquest of Aleppo by Tīmūr from his(!) writing without acknowledging it and Ibn Furāt did so, although it was not clear whether the latter copied his or Ibn Duqmāq's writing (al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 102).

years 825–27/1421–23 according to Sami G. Massoud,⁵³ before meeting Ibn ‘Arabšāh and seeing ‘Ağā’ib in 840/1436–37 – nor to have used the same material for *Durar*. Thus, the two texts differ from each other.

The obituary of Tīmūr by Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-‘Aynī (d. 855/1451) in his chronicle *‘Iqd*⁵⁴ is too short to identify his sources. He states, however, that Tīmūr died at the age of 79. He seems to have learnt somehow that Tīmūr had been born in 728, as 807 – 79 = 728.

Al-Saḥāwī (d. 902/1497) admits his indebtedness to three sources for Tīmūr’s biography in his biographical dictionary *Ḍaw’*:⁵⁵ the works of Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya (d. 843/1440), Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852/1449), and al-Maqrīzī.⁵⁶ His biography of Tīmūr is largely identical with Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya’s *Durr*. He also cites Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī’s *Inbā’* and al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar*, although he does so from the latter not the biography of Tīmūr, but that of his grandson Ḥalīl Sulṭān. In addition, al-Saḥāwī notes that a man wrote a treatise on Tīmūr, which he extracted (*afradahā* [i.e. *aḥbār Tīmūr*: history of Tīmūr] *ba‘d man aḥadtu ‘anhu bi-l-ta’līf*). This treatise probably refers to Ibn ‘Arabšāh’s ‘Ağā’ib. It is not, however, evident whether al-Saḥāwī actually used ‘Ağā’ib for Tīmūr’s biography, whereas he clearly consulted *Sulūk*.⁵⁷

Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya’s biography of Tīmūr is, as mentioned earlier, in his local history of Aleppo, *Durr*.⁵⁸ He relates that he was, like Ibn al-Šiḡna, present at a gathering organized by Tīmūr in Aleppo, and that, based on Šaraf al-Dīn Mūsā l-Anšārī’s conversation with Tīmūr, the latter was estimated to be almost eighty years old when he died.⁵⁹ He relied, however, not only on his own experiences: until about 797/1395, he seems to have consulted Ibn Ḥaldūn’s *Ibar*.⁶⁰ Al-Maqrīzī knew of Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya’s work,⁶¹ but no textual relation between *Durr* and *Durar* is discernable.

⁵³ Massoud, *The Chronicles*, p. 160.

⁵⁴ Al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd al-ḡumān fī ta’rīḡ ahl al-zamān*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, MS. III. Ahmet 2911/a19, f. 75a (according to a modern numbering with a pencil). I am grateful to Nobutaka Nakamachi for kindly providing me with copies of this and other manuscripts of *‘Iqd*.

⁵⁵ Al-Saḥāwī, *al-Ḍaw’ al-lāmi‘ li-ahl al-qarn al-tāsi‘*, Beirut, Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt, n.d., III, p. 46–50.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁵⁷ Al-Saḥāwī points out that al-Maqrīzī mistook the year of Tīmūr’s death in his *Sulūk* (al-Saḥāwī, *Ḍaw’*, III, p. 49).

⁵⁸ Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya, *al-Durr al-muntaḡab fī takmilat ta’rīḡ Ḥalab*, Merton College, Oxford, MS. Or. xi–xiv, xi, ff. 206a–208b.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, ff. 207a, 208b. Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya mistakenly states, however, that Šaraf al-Dīn Mūsā l-Anšārī was fifty-seven years old at that time – not fifty-five. It is not clear how this mistake occurred. Al-Saḥāwī already repeated it (al-Saḥāwī, *Ḍaw’*, III, p. 50; cf. *ibid.*, X, p. 189–190).

⁶⁰ Compare Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya, *Durr*, xi, ff. 206a–b with Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ibar*, V, p. 1129–1130.

⁶¹ Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, II, p. 552.

In his chronicle *Inbā'*, Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī describes Tīmūr’s life concisely in the obituary, and he gives a detailed account of him in some other places as well.⁶² He used various sources, including the works of Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya, al-Maqrīzī, and Ibn ‘Arabšāh, for this chronicle.⁶³ While he clearly consulted ‘Aḡā’ib and maybe *Durr* for Tīmūr, it is difficult to judge whether he relied on *Durar*. Yet he states that Tīmūr was born in the year 728 and that he died at the age of seventy-nine,⁶⁴ as al-‘Aynī does. Whether from al-Maqrīzī or not, he was informed that Tīmūr was born in 728.⁶⁵

Taqī l-Dīn Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba (d. 851/1448) writes in his chronicle a relatively long obituary of Tīmūr.⁶⁶ According to him, Ibn Ḥiḡḡī, whose chronicle makes up a core of *Ta’rīḡ Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba*, said that Tīmūr had died on 4 ramaḏān 807, not on 14 ša‘bān.⁶⁷ He does not mention the other sources, but he seems to have based himself mainly on ‘Aḡā’ib. On Tīmūr, he may have consulted Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāṣiriyya’s *Durr* too, but probably not al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar*. Although some pieces of information are found only in *Ta’rīḡ Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba*, his sources for them must remain unknown for the moment.⁶⁸

It is already known that the biography of Tīmūr by Ibn Taḡrībirdī (d. 874/1470) in his biographical dictionary *Manhal* as well as in his chronicle *Nuḡūm* is a summary of Ibn ‘Arabšāh’s ‘Aḡā’ib.⁶⁹ At first sight, it appears natural because he studied under Ibn ‘Arabšāh and got an *iḡāza* from him.⁷⁰ This is, however, not the case. Rather, he must have relied on al-Maqrīzī’s *Durar* (compare Appendix 5 with 1).⁷¹ In one place, Ibn Taḡrībirdī names al-Maqrīzī and cites an anecdote

⁶² Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’ al-ḡumr bi-abnā’ al-‘umr*, Hyderabad, Maṭba‘at maḡlis dā’irat al-ma‘ārif al-‘uthmāniyya, 1967, V, p. 231–236; see also *ibid.*, I, p. 15–20; IV, p. 189 ff..

⁶³ Massoud, *The Chronicles*, p. 56–57, 164–165.

⁶⁴ Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī, *Inbā’*, I, p. 15; V, p. 225.

⁶⁵ According to John E. Woods and Tilman Nagel, there is in Istanbul a manuscript including a work entitled *Ta’rīḡ Tīmūr Lank* that is attributed to Ibn Ḥaḡar: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, MS. III Ahmet 3057 (John E. Woods, *The Aqquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1999, p. 291; Tilman Nagel, *Timur der Eroberer und die islamische Welt des späten Mittelalters*, Munich, Beck, 1993, esp. p. 471, n. 130. I am preparing a paper about this manuscript.

⁶⁶ Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba, *Ta’rīḡ Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba* ed. ‘Adnān Darwīš, Damascus, Institut français de Damas, 1977–1997, IV, p. 428–442.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 437. However, Ibn Ḥiḡḡī refers to the death of Tīmūr only in *ḏū l-ḥiḡḡa* of this year (*Ta’rīḡ Ibn Ḥiḡḡī*, ed. Abū Yaḡyā ‘Abd Allāh al-Kundarī, Beirut, Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003, p. 678). On Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba’s sources, see Massoud, *The Chronicles*, p. 82, where more works are given.

⁶⁸ For example, one of the pieces of advice or testaments that Bayazid I gave Tīmūr, and Tīmūr’s talk with one of his ‘ulamā’, ‘Abd al-Awwal over the *zakāt*. Compare Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba, *Ta’rīḡ Ibn Qāḏī Šuhba*, IV, p. 436, 442 with Ibn ‘Arabšāh, ‘Aḡā’ib, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 356–357, 467.

⁶⁹ Ibn Taḡrībirdī, *al-Manhal al-šāfi wa-l-mustawfi ba’d al-Wāfi*, ed. Muḡammad Muḡammad Amīn, Cairo, 1984–2006, IV, p. 103–138; *id.*, *al-Nuḡūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Mišr wa-l-Qāhira*, Cairo, 1929–72, XII, p. 253–270; XIII, p. 160–163.

⁷⁰ *Id.*, *Manhal*, II, p. 131–145 (biography of Ibn ‘Arabšāh).

⁷¹ The sentences in *Nuḡūm* (XII, p. 254–255) are almost identical with those in *Manhal*.

the latter transmitted from Ibn Ḥaldūn.⁷² He seems, however, to have based himself on *Durar* not only there but throughout his biography of Tīmūr. It is even questionable whether he really consulted ‘Ağā’ib. He claims that he cited an episode from a writing of Ibn ‘Arabšāh. Nevertheless, it is in fact a verbatim quote from *Durar*, in which al-Maqrīzī refers to Ibn ‘Arabšāh as his source.⁷³ Thus, Ibn Tağrībīrdī borrowed Tīmūr’s biography from *Durar*, summarizing and paraphrasing it.⁷⁴ He also tried to harmonize contradictions between *Sulūk* and *Durar*.⁷⁵

The biography of Tīmūr by Ibn al-‘Imād al-Ḥanbalī (d. 1089/1679) is composed of those in *Manhal* and in Ibn Ḥağar’s *Inbā’*. He quotes the genealogy and birth year of Tīmūr from *Manhal*.⁷⁶

For Tīmūr’s obituary, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ b. Ḥalīl al-Malaṭī (d. 920/1514) seems to have relied on *Sulūk* and *Inbā’*.⁷⁷ He gives, however, the following genealogy of Tīmūr:

تمرانك بن طرغاي بن الغاي (> ابغاي) بن سنباي بن طارم بن طغريل بن قليج بن سنقر بن كحك بن طورسومان بن القان خان المغلي

Thus, he did not simply borrow the genealogy from *Sulūk*, but changed or corrected the names of Tīmūr’s father and grandfather. Hence, it can be assumed that he used other sources. What they were, however, is not clear: maybe *Ta’rīḥ Ibn Qāḍī Šuhba* or ‘Ağā’ib or *Durar*.

Ibn Iyās (d. ca. 930/1524) probably relied on *Nayl* of al-Malaṭī for his obituary of Tīmūr, although he names Tīmūr’s father not as Ṭarağāy but as ṬSN (< Īsan) Qutluğ in the genealogy.⁷⁸ He quotes from al-Maqrīzī that the latter learned of Tīmūr’s death with *kātib al-sirr* Faṭḥ Allāh through a letter from the Ottomans. However, such a story is not included in *Sulūk* or in the biographies of Tīmūr and Faṭḥ Allāh in *Durar*. It is not clear what he used besides *Nayl*, although *Sulūk* is likely to have been among his sources.

Conclusion

⁷² *Id.*, *Manhal*, IV, p. 133–134; cf. al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 551–552.

⁷³ Ibn Tağrībīrdī, *Manhal*, IV, p. 137–138; al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 558; cf. Ibn ‘Arabšāh, ‘Ağā’ib, ed. al-Ḥimṣī, p. 472–473.

⁷⁴ For the biography of Tīmūr, he might have also used that of his grandson Ḥalīl Sulṭān in *Durar*. Cf. Ibn Tağrībīrdī, *Manhal*, IV, p. 130, l. 18–19; al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, II, p. 66, l. 13; p. 66, l. 19–p. 67, l. 1.

⁷⁵ Ibn Tağrībīrdī explains that Utrar, Tīmūr’s death place in *Durar* would be near Āhankarān, where he died according to *Sulūk* (Ibn Tağrībīrdī, *Manhal*, IV, p. 130; *id.*, *Nuğūm*, XIII, p. 160). In *Nuğūm*, he first inserts Tīmūr’s biography in the year 803 and then puts, following *Sulūk*, his obituary in 808, although he adds that Tīmūr is also said to have died the previous year.

⁷⁶ Ibn ‘Imād, *Šaḍarāt al-ḍahab fī aḥbār man ḍahab*, Beirut, al-Maktab al-Ṭiğārī li-l-Ṭibā’a wa-l-Našr wa-l-Tawzī’, n.d., VII, p. 62–67.

⁷⁷ ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ b. Ḥalīl al-Malaṭī, *Nayl al-amal fī ḍayl al-duwal*, ed. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmurī, Sidon-Beirut, al-Maktaba l-‘Aşriyya, 2002, III, p. 114–115.

⁷⁸ Ibn Iyās, *Badā’i’ al-zuhūr wa-waqā’i’ al-duhūr*, ed. M. Muşṭafā, Wiesbaden-Cairo, 1960–1975, I/2, p. 709–711.

Al-Maqrīzī's biography of Tīmūr in *Durar* was mainly based on Ibn 'Arabšāh's *Ağā'ib* and partly on Ibn Ḥaldūn as well, but it counted among the most important sources for Tīmūr. To these are added one of Ibn 'Arabšāh's sources, Ibn al-Šiḥna's *Rawḍa*, as well as Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāširiyya's *Durr* and Ibn Ḥaḡar al-'Asqalānī's *Inbā'*.

Here, it is worth considering again the problem of Tīmūr's birth year and age at death. In general, or rather according to Persian sources, Tīmūr is said to have been born on 25 ša'bān 736/8 April 1336. Beatrice Manz and some other scholars suggest, however, that this date was fictitious and invented later.⁷⁹ Moreover, Tilman Nagel points out that several Arabic sources estimated Tīmūr's age at death to be about eighty.⁸⁰ Now, this can be confirmed with the most important sources, except for Ibn Ḥaldūn,⁸¹ and can trace back to two persons present at the gathering organized by Tīmūr in Aleppo, namely Ibn al-Šiḥna and Ibn Ḥaṭīb al-Nāširiyya. If Tīmūr had no particular motive – for example, unless he pretended to be much older than he actually was –, then there is no reason to doubt what he said. Furthermore, it is in broad agreement with the reports about Tīmūr's age by a Dominican Archbishop of Sulṭāniyya, Jean and an Italian merchant, Bertrando de Mignanelli.⁸² Hence it seems quite probable that Tīmūr was born not in 736 but in about 728, as al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Ḥaḡar al-'Asqalānī write.

In any case, al-Maqrīzī's biography of Tīmūr in *Durar* contains some interesting and original information, including Tīmūr's genealogy and birth year as well as the accounts that he heard from Ibn Ḥaldūn, probably orally, and which are not found in the latter's *Ibar* and *Ta'rif*. *Durar* is thus an important source not only for historiographical research on the Mamluk Sultanate but also for Timurid studies.⁸³

⁷⁹ See n. 49 supra; Manz, "Tamerlane and the Symbolism of Sovereignty", p. 113; p. 113-114, n. 33; Nagel, *Timur der Eroberer*, p. 175–176, 391–392; Michele Bernardini, *Mémoire et propagande à l'époque timouride*, Paris, Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes, 2008, p. 53–55.

⁸⁰ Nagel, *Timur der Eroberer*, p. 175-176; p. 471, n. 130 and 131. His sources are al-Saḡawī's *Ḍaw'*, Ibn Ḥaḡar al-'Asqalānī's *Ta'riḥ Tīmūr Lank* (see n. 65 supra), and Ibn Taḡribirdī's *Manhal*.

⁸¹ According to him, Timur was between sixty and seventy years old in 804/1401 (Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ta'rif*, p. 382; see also Fischel, *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane*, p. 47; p. 117, n. 237).

⁸² According to Jean of Sulṭāniyya, Tīmūr's age in 1403 was about seventy-five; Mignanelli heard from Tīmūr's men that he was seventy-four years old at the time of his siege of Damascus in 803/1400–01 (Manz, "Tamerlane and the Symbolism of Sovereignty", p. 113, n. 33).

⁸³ The biographies of the Timurids, such as those of Ḥalīl Sulṭān and Šāh Ruḡ, as well as of the related figures, such as Tuqtamiš, khan of the Ğučid *ulus*, deserve further investigation.

Appendix

1 و ولد تيمور في سنة ثمان و عشرين و سبع مئة بقرية تسمى خواجه ايلغار من عمل كش احدى مدائن ما وراء النهر و بعد هذه القرية عن مدينة سمرقند يوم واحد و قيل انه رؤي ليلة ولد كأن شيئاً يشبه الخوذة تراءى طائراً في عنان الجو ثم سقط الى فناء الدو ثم انبث على الارض و انتشر و تطاير منه مثل الجمر و الشرر و تراكم حتى ملأ البدو و الحضرة و انه عندما خرج من بطن امه وجدت كفاه مملوئين دما فزجروا انه تسفك على يديه الدماء.
[Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 507]

2 اعلم ان الترك من ولد غومر بن يافث بن نوح عليه السلام على ما وقع في التوراة و قيل من ولد طيرس بن يافث و قيل من ترك بن غامور بن سوسل فلم يذكره احد ممن يعتد به في بني يافث. و الترك اجناس و طوائف منهم الروس و الاغلان و يقال الان و المخفشاخ و هم القبقق و الهياطلة و الخنج و الغز و هي لفظة معربة اصلها الخوز و هي من اجناسهم بهذه الصيغة في لغتهم فعربت بها العرب الى صيغة الغز و من الترك الخطا و كانوا بارض كمغاج و هي بلاد تركستان و كاشغر و ما يليهما من وراء النهر ويمك و الغور و شركس و ازكش و الططر و هم الطغرغر و انكر و هم مجاورون الروم و لهم اجناس اخر.
[Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 501]

3 فلما ملك قسم ممالكة بين اولاده فاعطى ابنه طوسي بلاد فيالق الى بلغار و هي دشت القفجاق و اضاف اليه اران و همذان و تبريز و مراغة و اعطى ابنه اوكداي حدود ايمل و قراباق و جعله ولي عهده و اعطى ابنه جقظاي من الانغور [sic] الى سمرقند و بخارى و هي ما وراء النهر و لم يعط طولي شيئاً و اعطى لابنها [sic] اوتكين نوين بلاد الختا...
[Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, p. 504]

1 و مسقط رأس ذلك الغدار قرية تسمى خواجه ايلغار و هي من اعمال كش فابعداها الله من حش و كش مدينة من مدن ما وراء النهر عن سمرقند بنحو من ثلث عشر شهر قيل رؤي ليلة ولد كأن شيئاً يشبه الخوذة تراءى طائراً في عنان الجو ثم سقط الى فناء الدو ثم انبث على الارض و انتشر و تطاير منه مثل الجمر و الشرر و تراكم حتى ملأ البدو و الحضرة و قيل لما سقط الى الارض ذلك السقيط كانت كفاه مملوءتين من الدم العبيط فسألوا عن احواله الزواجر و القافة و تفحصوا عن تأويل ذلك من الكهنة و اهل العيافة فقال بعضهم يكون شرطيا و قال بعض ينشأ لصا حراميا و قال قوم بل يكون قصابا سفاكا و قال آخرون بل يصير جلادا بتاكا و تظافت هذه الاقوال الى ان آل امره الى ما آل...
[Ibn ‘Arabšāh, *‘Ağā’ib*, ed. al-Ḥimšī, p. 39–42]

2 و انهم (الترك) من ولد كومر بن يافث احد السبعة المذكورين من بني يافث في التوراة... و زعم بعض النسابة انهم من طيراش بن يافث. و نسبهم ابن سعيد الى ترك بن غامور بن سويل و الظاهر انه غلط... و اما سويل فلم يذكر احد انه من بني يافث... و الترك اجناس كثيرة و شعوب فمنهم الروس و الاغلان و يقال ابلان و الخفشاخ و هم القفجق و الهياطلة و الخلج و الغز الذين منهم السلجوقية و الخطا و كانوا بارض طمعاج ويمك و القور و تزكس و اركس و الططر و يقال الطغرغر و انكر و هم مجاورون الروم...
[Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ibar*, V, p. 3–4]

3 فلما ملك جنكز خان البلاد قسم الممالك فكان لولده طوشي بلاد فيالق الى بلغار و هي دشت القفجاق و اضاف اليه اران و همذان و تبريز و مراغة و غيرلان وكتاي (> عين لابنه اوكداي؟) حدود آمد و قوباق و ما ادري تفسير هذه و جعله ولي عهده و عين لجقظاي من الايقور الى سمرقند و بخارى و ما وراء النهر و لم يعين لطولي شيئاً و عين لآخيه اوتكين نوي بلاد ابخت و لا ادري معنى هذا الاسم.
[Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ibar*, V, p. 1121]

4 فملك جنكز خان عامة البلاد و اصل نسبه الذي يرجع اليه الان قو و هي امراة تزوجت و ولدت ولدين هما بكتوت و بينكوت و مات زوجها و لم تتزوج بعده فظهر بها حمل بعد مدة فانكر عليها قومها فرعمت ان نورا دخل فرجها ثلاث مرات فحملت من ذلك و انها حبلى بثلاث ذكور فان صدقت و إلا فافعلوا ما بدى لكم فولدت ثلاث ذكور و هم يوقن و قوناغي و بوذنجر فسمواالنورانيين و من ولد بوذنجر جنكز خان و لذلك يقولون له ابن الشمس.

[Al-Maqrīzī, *Durar*, I, 503]

4 ان مودنجه (> بوذنجر) اسم امراة و هي جدتهم من غير اب. قالوا و كانت متزوجة و ولدت ولدين اسم احدهما بكتوت والآخر بلكتوت و يقال لولدها بنو الدولوكية ثم مات زوجها و تأيمت و حملت و هي أيم فنكر عليها قرباؤها فذكرت انها رأّت بعض الايام نورا دخل في فرجها ثلاث مرات و طراً عليها الحمل بعده و قالت لهم ان في حملها ثلاثة ذكور فان صدق ذلك عند الوضع و إلا فافعلوا (> فافعلوا) ما بدا لكم فوضعت ثلاثة توائم من ذلك الحمل فظهرت براءتها بزعمهم، اسم احدهم برقد والآخر قونا والثالث نجعو و هو جد جنكز خان الذي في عمود نسبه كما مر و كانوا يسمونهم النورانيين نسبه الى النور الذي ادعته و لذلك يقولون جنكز خان ابن الشمس.

[Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Ibar*, V, p. 1118]

ففقول و بالله التوفيق قيل ان جنكز خان ينتهي نسبه الى امراة تسمى الان قوا كانت متزوجة بزواج اولدها ولدين اسم احدهما بكتوت و الآخر بلكتوت و ابنا هذين الولدين يسميان عند المغل الدرلكين ثم مات زوجها و بقيت مرملة بغير زوج فحملت فانكر عليها الحبل و حملت الى من له الحكم بينهم لينظر في امرها فسألها ممن حملت فقالت ما حملت من احد إلا اني كنت قاعدة و فرجي مكشوف فنزل نور دخل في فرجي ثلاث مرات فحملت منه هذا الحمل و انا حامل بثلاثة ذكور لان دخول ذلك النور كل مرة بولد ذكر فامهلوني حتى اضع فان وضعت ثلاثة ذكور فاعلموا مصداق قولي و إلا فرأيكم في فولدت ثلاثة اولاد ذكورا في بطن واحد بوقن قوناغي و بوسن سالجي و بوذنجر و هؤلاء الثلاثة هم المسمون بالنورانيين نسبة الى النور الذي ادعت امهم انه نزل في فرجها ولهذا يقال عن جنكز خان انه ابن الشمس و بوذنجر عليه عمود النسب الى جنكز خان... فنقول جنكز خان بن... بن بوذنجر بن الان قوا الى هذه المرأة منتهى نسبهم.

[Al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik*, ed. Lech, p. 2–3]

5 تمر و قيل تيمور كلاهما يجوز بن ايتمش قنلغ بن زنكى بن سننبا بن طارم طرا بن طغريل بن قليج بن سنقوز بن كنجك بن طغرسبوقا بن التاخان الطاغية تيمور كوركان و كوركان معناه باللغة العجمية صهر الملوك.
مولده سنة ثمان و عشرين و سبعمائة بقرية تسمى خواجا ابغار[sic] من عمل كش احد مدائن ما وراء النهر و بعد هذه البلد عن سمرقند يوم واحد و يقال انه رؤي ليلة ولد كأن شيئاً يشبه الخوذة تراءى طائرا في جو السماء ثم وقع الى الارض في فضاء فتطايير منه جمر و شرر حتى ملأ الارض وقيل انه لما خرج من بطن امه وجدت كفاه مملوءتين دما فزجروا انه يسفك على يديه الدماء، قلت و هكذا وقع لا عفا الله عنه.

[Ibn Tagrībirdī, *Manhal*, IV, p. 103–104]