ADH-DHAHABĪ’S RECORD
OF THE DESTRUCTION OF DAMASCUS
BY THE MONGOLS IN 699—700/1299—1301

I. Introduction

Never did Islām experience such a time of terror as in the second half of the 13th century A. D. when after a subsistence of five centuries the ʿAbbāsid caliphate was destroyed by the Mongols. Already the conquests of Jengis Khān had intimidated the Muslims, and their religious quarrels as well as the decadence of the political and military power of the last ʿAbbāsids actually enticed the Mongols to an easy invasion of the whole Near East. Within a few years the ʿAbbāsid caliphate was put an end to: in 1257 the Assassins were subdued, in the following year Baghdād was captured and harried1), then, in 1259, practically the whole of Syria, including Damascus and Ḥalab, was occupied. There, however, the Mongolian army was so far from its base of operation that in 1260 the Mamlūks of Egypt succeeded in vanquishing at ʿAyn Jālūt the army of Kebgūghā, general of Hūlāghū Khān, and thus prevented the Mongols from invading Africa.

After this victory Syria became a province, nay, the favourite province, of the Mamlūks of Egypt: as a matter of fact, she owed much of her prosperity to the Mamlūk Sūltān az-Zāhir Baybars (died in 676/1277-8). During his reign Damascus became the second city of the Mamlūk empire, and her governors were appointed from among prominent Mamlūks, which gave rise to a sort of rivalry between the Sūltān of Egypt and his dignitaries residing at Damascus. To intensify the influence of the former the commander of the citadel of Damascus was appointed by

1) For this event see my paper A āṣida on the Destruction of Baghdād by the Mongols, BSOS, London 1933, pp. 40—48.
the Sultân himself and independently from his Syrian governor. This state of affairs frequently resulted in collisions between the two dignitaries in Damascus, for the governors aimed at what may be termed a practical independence from Cairo, whereas the commanders of the citadel representing the power and interest of the Mamlûk sultâns, endeavoured to suppress all the contrary tendencies, as e. g. the revolt of the governor Sunqûr al-Ashqar in 678/1279-80.

It was due to such a revolt that the Mongols could take and destroy Damascus for the second time. After the assassination of the Mamlûk Sultân al-Ashraf Khalîl the Sultân Kelboghâ was invested in the citadel of Damascus by the troops faithful to the governor and forced to abdicate in 696/1297-98. It was a fugitive nâ‘ib of Damascus, Qypcháq, who induced the Mongol Khân Qâzân — or Ghâzân — to invade Syria2). In fact, he had some wrongs to avenge on Syria3): the attacks made by the Mamlûks on Cilicia, their capture of Qal‘at ar-Rûm, and the welcome they gave to the fugitive Uyrads and to Sulamish. His ambition was only increased by the advice of the Egyptian fugitives, by the distressed state of affairs in Egypt where the usual anarchy incident to a government of a military aristocracy prevailed, and, last not least, by the zeal of a recent convert of Islâm. Wâṣṣâf tells us4) that when he embraced Islâm, which happened on 4 Sha‘bân 694/19 June 12955), he sent word to the Egyptians as follows: "If my good fathers were the enemies of your country, it was because of the indifference of faith. Do not entertain for the future any fear that you will be attacked by our victorious troops! May the merchants of both countries freely traverse each! Contrary to what has been hitherto, consider peace with us as the principle of your eternal prosperity! Be assured that all countries now owe us obedience, and particularly Egypt, where the throne has


passed from kings to slaves, and where there is no longer any difference between masters and servants!

The last sentence of this message contains, in fact, the main justification of Qāzān's attack on Syria. To put down the turbulent Mamlūk dynasty might well be deemed worthy of a Muslim prince. All the imāms and 'ulamās whom Qāzān called together, declared in their fatwās that it was the duty of such a prince to repress violence exercised against the faithful by truculent oppressors.

Qāzān meditated an invasion of Syria in Muharram 698/9 October to 7 November 1298, and the nā'ib of Damascus and other amirs made preparations to resist, but, according to an-Nuwayrī⁶, the Mongol troops which were collected for the purpose of the invasion, were struck by lightning, many of them being killed and others dispersed. In the following year, however, a still greater army was ready for the invasion⁷, and in the autumn of 1299 Qāzān found the time appropriate for the war.

The second Mongol campaign in Syria is known to us from a number of Arabic, Persian, and Armenian authorities to which references are made in our notes. It is on their narratives that the records of C. Mouradja d'Ohssson and Sir Henry Howorth⁸) are founded. There is, however, a very important and hitherto unknown authority on this subject, the famous Damascene scholar Shamsaddin abū 'Abdallāh Muhammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān ibn Qā'imāz ibn 'Abdallāh adh-Dhahabī (from 673/1274 to 718/1318). He was a witness of the Mongol campaign in his own city, and all that he had experienced he described in a very detailed report which is at the end of his voluminous and hitherto unedited principal work, the Taʾrikh al-islām.⁹) He also gave a brief and succinct record of the

---


campaign in his compendious work, the *Kitāb duwal al-islām*.\(^{10}\)

Adh Dhahabi’s narrative in his *Ta’rīkh al-islām* begins with the battle in the Wādi al-Khazandār — or Khazandār — on 27 Rabi’ al-awwal 699/22 December 1299 in which Qāzān’s army of about 100,000 men beat the three times as small army of the Mamlūk king ‘Abd al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāṭūn. The defeat called forth great excitement at Damascus: many of her inhabitants fled to Egypt, while the nāṣir Arjawāsh with a body of defenders intrenched himself in the citadel. At the beginning of Rabi’ ath-thāni/the end of December 1299 Qāzān seized the city and proclaimed in his *farmān* that the Mongols invaded Syria in order to put an end to the Mamlūk governors’ misrule over their subjects: that is why he forbade his soldiers to commit any atrocities against the population.

Forsaken by the governor and higher officials, the inhabitants of Damascus behaved rather friendly towards the Mongols: Qāzān was even invested with kingly power by the nāṣir of the city. The situation, however, aggravated on 10 Rabi’ ath-thāni/4 January 1300 when the about 10,000 man strong army of Qypchāq and Bektemir began to sack and kill the inhabitants in the surroundings of the city. The commander of the citadel, Arjawāsh, was summoned to surrender: he, however, repeatedly declined to do so. In vain did the *shaykh* Ibn Taymiyya endeavour to protest with Qāzān against the Mongol atrocities: they plundered the whole district of as-Ṣāliḥiyya whose inhabitants took refuge in the convent of al-Muqādisa, where they, as well as the inhabitants of the villages of al-Mazza and Dārayyā, were plundered and taken prisoners by the Mongols. After the unavailing protest of the *shaykh* Ibn Taymiyya with Qāzān against these brutalities the Mongol occupation of the city was unavoidable: great requisitions *in natura* and the large sum of 3,600,000 *dirhams* were laid upon the inhabitants. At the same time the Mongols prepared to take by assault the citadel where Arjawāsh valorously defended himself. The siege lasted for ten days and was frustrated on 12 Jumādā ‘1-‘Ulā/4 February, but

---

\(^{10}\) See the edition of Hyderabad 1337/1919, vol. II, pp. 157—60.
the Mongols destroyed many fine monuments as well as the
district of al-ʿĀdiliyya. After their failure the Mongols
marched off from Damascus, the administration of which
was taken over by Arjawāsh. When on 17 Rajab/9 April
the khutba was said at the cathedral mosque for the sultan
of Egypt again, the hundred days long terror ended and
there were general rejoicings. One month later the Egyptian
army marched into the city and Mamlūks were
appointed to all the offices.

The cause of Qāzān’s retreat from Syria is not mentioned by adh-Dhahabī. According to the testimony of Ḥaythūnī this was caused by the invasion of his eastern borders by the Jagatai Mongols. Qāzān’s own historians attribute his hurried withdrawal to the approaching heats of summer, which is rather ridiculous as it was only February at that time. All the more detailed is adh-Dhahabī’s description of the terrible devastations of the Mongo’s. These horrors impressed upon the memories of the Muslims so deeply that even one and a half century later Kamāladdīn ibn Kamāladdīn ibn Qāḍī Shuhba said as follows: “The vicissitudes of fortune have let loose seven scourges upon us, and no one can protect us from their assaults: famine, Qāzān, war, pillage, perfidy, apathy, and a continual grief.”

In the following year 700/1300-1 Qāzān reiterated his attack on Syria. The army of the Mamlūks proved entirely inefficient this time also and returned to Egypt, so that in Rabi’ ath-thānī/14 December to 11 January the Mongols could easily cross over the Euphrates and invest the city. At this news a general panic broke out at Damascus: whoever could fled to Egypt or the surrounding fortresses, while into the citadel only such were admitted as were willing to fight. People were relieved on hearing that on 17 Jumādā ʿI-Ūlā/28 January a Mongol troop near Ḥalab was defeated by the Syrian post of Ḥamāt. The shaykh ibn Taymiyya resumed his diplomatic activities: he went to Egypt to ask for help, but before the Mamlūks could

11) See his chronicle, chapter XLIII; d’Ohsson, vol. IV, p. 256.
send relief the Mongols had already quitted Syria. When the Mamlūks returned to Damascus again, they divested of their offices the non-Muslims protected by the Mongols, and imposed restrictions upon them.

The cause of Qāzān's retreat is not given by adh-Dhahabi. Rashīd ad-Dīn diplomatically covers it by the excuse that Qāzān did not wish to shed the blood of true believers, but it is more probable that he was greatly troubled to hear of the death of Satilmish, the son of Burdighi and a relative of Altaju Aka.  

The Mongols' second campaign on Syria is known to us from the Ḵhīṭāṭ of al-Maqrīzī and other sources too. It is, however, related by adh-Dhahabi with the vivacity of an eye-witness and the care of a citizen anxious of the destiny of his own city. All that he relates was his personal experience, which accounts for the fact that he does not quote any authority with the exception of a certain Dānu ibn Ṣabāh az-Zubaydī who witnessed the battle of Himā. The lack of references is striking with an author like adh-Dhahabi whose strong side is the careful quotation of his literary sources. As a matter of course, he put down his narrative shortly after the campaign when he could not yet have any written records at hand. But his record is all the more interesting and important. It clearly appears from it that but for the rivalry between the Mamlūk sultāns of Egypt and their governors at Damascus the Mongols would have never ventured upon such an attack on the most important city of Islām after the fall of Baghdād. Nor were they ignorant of the disorganisation and inefficiency of the Mamlūk army; in fact, the failure of their attempt in taking Damascus was due solely to the heroic defence of the citadel by its commander, Arjawāsh. It is also

---

16) See the MS. of the British Museum Or. 1540, fol. 124, 1. 13.
17) It is characteristic in this connection that when on 5 January 1300 Qāzān encamped at Marj Rākit, the notabilities of Damascus called on him to do him homage. Qāzān, never weary to express his contempt for the parvenu ruler of Egypt, asked his visitors who he himself was. After hearing them
evident from adh-Dhahabi’s narrative that although the Mongols favoured the non-Muslims, they were not hostile to the Muslims for all that. They proclaimed their king to be a Muslim, and there can be no doubt whatever that but for their atrocities they would have easily gained possession of Syria, the more so as the Christian West followed their venture with sympathy\(^ {18} \). Qâzân sent envoys to Edward I, King of England, and other European sovereigns, summoning them to join in his venture on the Mamlûks. Many people in Western Europe expected from such an alliance the liberation of the Holy Land from Islam and its passing over to Christianity again\(^ {19} \).

Incomplete as adh-Dhahabi’s narrative is of the Mongol invasion of Syria, it is very important for us, being a reliable diary of the reign of terror Damascus lived through in consequence of Qâzân’s campaign. In very lively tones it describes the apprehensions of the population from the approaching Mongol army, their hurried flight, the exertions of the leading men to save their city from destruction, and the heroic defence of the citadel by Arjawâsh. We learn from adh-Dhahabi the names of the persons who filled the chief posts in the city at that time. He regularly records also the prices of victuals and commodities during the siege.

Thus adh-Dhahabi’s record as an eye-witness’s account is a valuable contribution to the history of the Mongol invasion of the caliphate and, at the same time, a true descrip-

\(^{18} \) How much so, it appears from the Chronicle of Cyprus by Florio Bustron where we read that on the demand of Qâzân the King of Cyprus actually helped him against Egypt, first with two galleys and two frigates, later with a fleet of fifteen frigates. See Howorth, vol. III, pp. 769—70. — Qâzân’s conquest of Syria also brought him a letter of congratulation from James II, King of Aragon. See Howorth, vol. III, p. 488.

tation of the conditions of Damascus at the end of the 7th century A. H. The fact that adh-Dhahabî’s narrative, as a whole, corroborates and, in details, supplements our information of this period, testifies to his trustworthiness in selecting and using his references. For this reason his record can justly be considered as an important addition to the history of that mournful period of Muslim past.  

II. The Translation of adh-Dhahabî’s Record

(From the MS. of the British Museum Or. 1540, fols 123—34).  

1. A. H. 699/28th September 1299 to 15th September 1300.

On 8 Rabi' al-awwal/3 December the Sultan al-Malik an-Nâsîr 22) marched into Damascus and the city was decorated (on this occasion). He had stayed in front of Ghaza 23) for a long time, and there came into Damascus refugees from Halab, Hamât, and those districts, who endured cold weather and mire. The situation became difficult and the confusion great. The Sultan, after staying nine days at the citadel, went out to meet the enemy. The Tatars under King Qâzân crossed over the Euphrates with 60,000 men and even more: so that they

20) That as such it was ever appreciated in the Orient, is evident from an interesting reference of Péris de la Croix in his Histoire du Grand Genghizcan, Paris 1710, to the Persian translation of an extract from the Ta’rikh al-islâm, treating of the history of the Mongol kings. See my paper in JRAS, 1932, pp. 829—30.

21) See the British Museum Supplement Catalogue, No. 486. This MS. was rather carelessly copied by a later hand. With the help of other pertinent sources I have tried to correct many corrupted names and passages.

22) Brother of al-Malik al-Ashraf who was assassinated on 13 December 1293. He ascended the throne twice: first in 1293 at the age of 9, when he was deposed by Ketboghâ and this latter succeeded by his vice-roy, the Amir Mansûr Lašhin; and secondly in 1299 at the age of 14, when he was made king by the Mamlûks. (See d’Ohsson, vol. IV, pp. 212—24, and Howorth, vol. III, pp. 429—33.)

23) Laying siege to it.
were said to be 100,000, which was not correct. Many prayers were said and people recited the qunūt-prayers in the divine service, and at the mosque recitals of the Qur'ān were held. The Muslim armies forgathered at Himṣ while people presented themselves at Damascus to recite al-Bukhārī. The Shayk of the Dār al-ḥadīth took a special copy of it and, accompanied by the qādīs, carried it on his head to the mosque where they placed it under the (cupola of) an-Naṣr. On 24 Rabīʿ al-awwal/19 December they made the procession round it, praying and imploring; the school-teachers (also) took the children and made processions with them in the mosques, invoking and imploring Him who be blessed and sublime! The Jews and the Christians did the same, carrying their Thorahs and Gospels with them.

As for the army, they were drawn up in battle-array and remained equipped on their horses on Tuesday, but nobody came up to them. It was reported to them that the Tatars were near Salamiyya and wanted to withdraw: this was, however, an ignominious stratagem. The Sultān rode out on Wednesday at day-break, and they marched off from Himṣ to the Wādī al-khazandār. (The sun was shining already when the battle took place at 5 o'clock in the morning on Wednesday, the 27th of the month.

21) According to Rashidaddin, this happened on 16 October 1299, and according to Wāṣṣāf, Ilkhāns, II, 85—86, on 22 November.

22) Customary in times of hardships.

23) The Qubbat an naṣr, now very dilapidated, is on the summit of the Jabal Qāsyūn. See Th. Wiegand, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des Deutsch-Türkischen Denkmalschutzkommandos, Heft 5: K. Wulzinger & C. Watzinger, Damaskus die islamische Stadt, Leipzig 1924, p. 139.

24) See al-Maqrīzī, II (part II), pp. 141—44.

25) Or al-khaznadār or al-khazindār, i. e. "the Valley of Treasures", called also Mujma' al-murūj, i. e. "Union of Meadows". It was situated at a distance of a half-day's march from Himṣ between the Mausoleum of Khalīd ibn Walīd at the foot of the so-called "Victory Hill" and a river called Āb Barīh by the Persians and Nārin su by the Mongols. See Abulfidā, V, p. 165.
December, 29) in the Wādi al-khazandār north-east of Ḥims, at a distance of about 2 or 3 farsaks from Ḥims. The combat raged violently: there was continual fighting with lances and duelling, and the massacre of the Tatars became vehement. The marks of victory appeared already, and the Muslims stood firm until the afternoon, as also the Sultan and the body-guard held their own completely. However, the right wing of the Muslims was broken through, and there happened something with them that they had never experienced before, for the army was not complete at that time: they were 20,000 and odd whereas the enemy was three times as strong 30). They began to flee, — the matter was predestined for "we belong to Allāh and to Him shall we return!" 31). The officers taking the Sultan with them, returned, and were at their wits’ end, and trying to cover their retreat, passed Ḥims, and proceeded on the way to Ba‘labakk to the road leading to al-Biqā‘. People from the army passed Damascus, overburdened with shame and pain. As for us, on Thursday at noon there dropped a note carried by a messenger-pigeon to the effect that the overseer 32) Aqjabā and a number of wounded men had arrived at Qāra, that the battle-array had still held together and that nobody knew what would happen after their departure. For Arjawāsh, the commander of the citadel 33), concealed that, so that it was not until evening that the rumour of the breaking through

29) According to al-Maqrīzī, II (part II), pp. 147—49, the battle lasted from 9 o’clock in the morning till 2 o’clock in the afternoon.


31) Qur’ān 2:151, much used for expressing the highest degree of horror.

32) Al-mushidd means 'overseer' or 'architect': here it is either the name of a functionary or Aqjabā’s family-name derived from it.

33) According to al-Maqrīzī, II, 155, his name was ‘Alamaddin Sinjār Arjawāsh.
of the right wing was circulating. Later it was even said that the whole army was crushed, and we spent a night God knows what sort it was. The minds were comforted by the praying, and on the following day the festive drums were beating for calming (the minds): then their deception became evident. Thereupon Arjawāš ordered the moats of the city to be inundated with water: then on Friday in the afternoon the festive drums were beating (again): people, however, cared nothing for it, but remained upset in disorder and confusion. At that time there came men from the army and officers whose horses were stopped and whose equipments were lost: they tore their clothes and threw off their shields. A great number of men in the battle array fell as witnesses of the faith, and people began to flee to Egypt. People spent the night of Saturday in great confusion, and they were near the difficult situation (i.e.: anxiety). It was reported that five thousand were killed of the Tatars, (according to others even) ten thousand, whereas in (our) army only about two hundred men were killed.

Dau ibn Šabāḥ az-Zubaydī related to me as follows: "Never did I see the courtiers more useful than (they were) when I saw them at the gate of Ŧims at sunset making a sudden onslaught on the Tatars and slaughtering among the Tatars, then returning to the Sultān. And somebody else said: "Allāh struck them with flight, and they took to flight after sunset with their backs turned (towards us). There remained the equipments and implements jumbled up (on the ground); they filled that ground as well as the lances, weapons, and spears.

As for us, people began to talk about the affair of the Tatars and relate a great deal about them: (thus) that their king was a Muslim, that their army spared the lives of the deserters and did not kill anybody, but if they found anybody they only took his horse and weapon.

---

34) I. e.: it soon appeared that there was no reason whatever for rejoicings.
35) According to an-Nuwayrī, the Mamlūks lost 1,000 men and the Mongols 14,000 men: see Howorth, vol. III, p. 439, and al-Maqrīzī, II (part II), pp. 149—50 who also estimates the losses of the Mongols at 14,000 men; he also enumerates the Damascenc notabilites who fell in the battle.
36) So also in Wāsāf, loc. cit.
from him and let him go. Suchlike tales\textsuperscript{37} increased (i. e. circulated) so much that a man of high rank said: "Hush! they are better than our soldiers."\textsuperscript{40} Yet people did not notice that.

On Saturday\textsuperscript{38} at noon there was much rumour and disquieting alarm in the city: the men rushed out and the women tore their clothes asunder. It was said: "The Tatars have entered!\textsuperscript{41} At the Bāb al-Faraj\textsuperscript{39} people thronged together so that about ten of them died: among them was an-Najm al-Baghdādī who recited the stories of the Prophet's campaigns under the cupola of 'Ā'īsha.\textsuperscript{42} Then in a moment (he) became silent without any good reason. The notabilities of the city gathered and deliberated on the affair: they were Fakhraddīn ibn ash-Shiraji, nāzir of the city, 'Īzzaddin ibn ad-Qalānīst, Wajihaddīn ibn al-Minjā, 'Īzzaddin ibn az-Zakt, and the sharif Zaynaddīn ibn 'Adnān. And with the fugitives there left that night the qādī of the city Imāmaddīn, the Mālikite qādī, the muḥtasib, and the wāli ibn an-Naḥhās. The roads were filled with people from al-Ghauṭa and al-Ḥawādīr, and the people (i. e.: the convicts) of the prison of the Bāb aṣ-ṣaghīr\textsuperscript{43} set the prison on fire and left it all: they were above two hundred\textsuperscript{44}, and broke through the Bāb al-jābiya\textsuperscript{45} and went out by it. On Sunday, 2 Rabi' ath-thānī/27 December people started to put out (the fire) and restore (the gate); among them there was such a one who fled to Egypt with his children, and also such a one who relied on the righteousness of the Tatars and (said) that at that time the lieutenants of Hūlāghū, who together with their king were yet infidels, treated them fairly well: how much more so now that they have embraced Islam!\textsuperscript{46}"

\textsuperscript{37} See also in Howorth, op. cit., vol. III, p. 440—41.

\textsuperscript{38} I. e. on 1 Rabi' ath-thānī/26 December.

\textsuperscript{39} For the gates of Damascus see H. Sauvare, Description de Damas, JA, IXe série, pp. 372—76 and p. 409, note 23, and Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, pp. 182—87. For the Bāb al-faraj see pp. 184—85.

\textsuperscript{40} It was the Eastern cupola of the mosque, built in 160/776—7. See ibid., p. 163.

\textsuperscript{41} See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 183.

\textsuperscript{42} According to Howorth, vol. III, p. 441, they were 150.

\textsuperscript{43} See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 185.

\textsuperscript{44} This is the sense of a defective phrase in the text.
Then the notabilites assembled in the Masjid ‘Alī ᵃ) and conferred on their going to the king and asking safety of him. There were present Ibn Jamā‘a, al-Fāriqi, Ibn Taymiyya, Wajihaddin ibn al-Mīnjā, the qādi Najmaddin ibn Ṣaṣāri, Izzaddin ibn al-Qalānisi, the šāhib Ibn ash-Sharaqi, Sharafaddin ibn al-Qalānisi, Aminaddin ibn abi Shuqayr, Izzaddin ibn az-Zaki, Najmaddin ibn abi Ṭayyib, Shihābaddin al-Ḥanafī, and others. They, about two hundred persons, went out with presents of food on Monday at noon. It was proclaimed in the city on behalf of Arjawāsh: "Nothing should be sold from the equipments of the army since your Sultān remains (here)!" Nevertheless, horses and equipments were sold at lowest prices. The country remained without a wāli and without a qādi. As for the Shāfficite qādi, he fled as well as the Mālikite (qādi); as for the Ḥanafite qādi, he was present at the battle-array, and joined it and disappeared. As for the Ḥanbalite (qādi), he stayed with the inhabitants of as-Ṣālihiyya ᵇ) and they hoped for a good outcome. As for the muḥtasib of the city and his clerk, they fled both. The price of bread rose, and evil and tumult increased, and we remained so till Thursday night. The prices of flour and bread advanced for want of mills and fire-wood which (latter) was insufficient for the ovens.

The sharīf al-Qumayy ᶜ) hastened to the Tatars and returned on Thursday. There were four Tatars with him, one of them wore a Muslim robe with a cap (calotte) with (turban-cloth) of muslin... They entered and passed by ornately-clad people.ᵈ)

When the morning of Friday dawned, no gate was opened in the city. Later the lock of the Bāb Tūmā ᵈ) was broken — it was done by the nā‘ib of the wāli ash-Shajjā’ Ḥimām and Ibn Ṭā‘ūn, — and the Sultān was not mentioned in the sermon. After prayer there arrived a number of Tatars at the outside of the city, among them

ᵃ) See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 156.
ᵇ) Western suburb of Damascus, see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., p. 34.
ᶜ) Or al-Qamī.
ᵈ) Here follows a corrupted phrase in the text.
ᵈ) I. e. Thomas Gate, see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 184.
King Ismāʿīl, the relative of Qāzān, and descended by a garden on the outside, which is at at-Ṭarn. He brought with him the decree of the king in which safety was promised. It was proclaimed in the city: "Open your booths, and reassure yourselves, and pray for King Mahmūd Qāzān! ⁵⁰)" There arrived the notabilities of the city and related that they met Qāzān at an-Nabī; he stopped for them and ate of what they offered him. He who addressed him was the șāḥib Ibn ash-Shirājī, and he who prayed for the king was the khaṭīb Ibn Jamāʾa, and they said to them (I. e. to the Damascenes): "We have sent you safety in advance before you came (here)."* They said that the king would take up his quarters at al-Marj ⁵¹) and that only one gate would be opened.

On Saturday in the afternoon ⁵²) there repaired to the preacher’s maqṣūra ⁵³) Ismāʾīl with the amīr Muhammad and a body of Tatars who were in ordinary with both of them, and they both sat down there. There appeared the khaṭīb, Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Ibn ash-Shirājī, Ibn al-Minjā, Ibn Șaṣārī and many others, and people assembled to give a hearing to the fārmān which was read aloud by a man from among the helpmates of the Tatars and transmitted (to the listeners) by the muʿadhhdhin reciting with a loud voice. It was worded as follows: . . . ⁵⁴)

When he had done reading, gold and silver were cast on him in the maqṣūra, and the sharīf Zaynaddīn who was befriended with them cast about ten dinars on him, despite of the penury. People were alarmed, (but after) they had prayed for the king their excitement became allayed a little. King Ismāʾīl was made nāʿīb of the city ⁵⁵): he

---

⁵⁰) The prayer for him would have involved his acknowledgment.
⁵¹) Or al-Marja, a plain south of the river Barada. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 103.
⁵²) I. e. on 8 Rabiʿ ath-thānī/2 January.
⁵³) An enclosed place in the mosques for princes and other notabilities.
⁵⁴) See an-Nuwayrī in Quantremère’s Noten zu Makrizi, II (part II), pp. 151—54. I omit the translation of this fārmān that is known to us from other sources also; see the English translation of it in Howorth, vol. III, pp. 441—43. and the French translation of it in d’Ohsson, vol. IV, pp. 245—49.
⁵⁵) See also in d’Ohsson, vol. IV, p. 249.
put up at al-Qaymariyya\textsuperscript{56}, was clever and peacable (or also: a good Muslim), and, generally speaking, was not too bad.

Then on Sunday they (i.e.: the Tatars) required goods and horses from the people. On 10 Rabi‘ ath-thāni/4 January the army approached al-Ghauṭa\textsuperscript{57}; confusion and disaster began, and a number of the inhabitants of the country (were) killed (by them), and those who remained over on the estates were plundered. Qypchäq and Bektemir\textsuperscript{58}) and their retinue arrived and took their quarters on the Maydān\textsuperscript{59}). They conferred with the mutawalli of the citadel, 'Alamaddin Arjawāsh al-Mansūri, and prevailed on him advising him to surrender the citadel, but he did not accept (this advice) and was firm, and this was good\textsuperscript{60}). Then the notabilities of the city were ordered to repair to him on the following morning. They assembled with him and begged (him to yield to the Tatars) and said: 'There is saving of the blood of the Muslims in this (i.e.: in the surrender).' He, however, did not yield to them but fortified the citadel, arranged all its affairs, and concealed them. A number of the population of the country came up into it.

On 12 the month/6 January the Sultān marched into Cairo, and his army accompanied him. On the same day Qypchäq entered the city and stayed at al-'Azīziyya \textsuperscript{61}).

\textsuperscript{56}) Certainly the alms-house al-Qaymariyya is meant here, see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{57}) According to Howorth, vol. III, p. 443, and d'Ohssoon, vol. IV, p. 250, Qāzān pitched tents at the Marj Rākit, in the eastern part of al-Ghauṭa, frequently styled "a second paradise" by the Orientals for its magnificent trees, gardens, vineyards, waters, etc.

\textsuperscript{58}) According to d'Ohssoon, vol. IV, p. 250, also al-Begui and A'zaz.

\textsuperscript{59}) This was the Maydān al-khāṣṣa, with which Qāzān was so delighted that he ordered it to be preserved from damages and seven of its gates to be shut, and on the 8th of the month/2 January he commanded a guard to be mounted at the Bāb Baghdād. See d'Ohssoon, vol. IV, pp. 249—50; al-Maqrizi, II (part II), p. 155.

\textsuperscript{60}) See also d'Ohssoon, loc. cit., and al-Maqrizi, loc. cit.
and ordered the notabilities to remonstate with Arjawāsh. They talked with him but he did not yield to them and (even) offended them. They all stopped at the gate of the citadel and asked him for a messenger; however, on his refusing (to comply with their demand), they sent someone to talk with him. He spoke harshly to him and said: "You hypocrites! You have met the Tatars and have delivered the city up to them and emboldened them!" Besides that, here is the letter of the lord of Egypt (saying that) they gathered on Ghaza and defeated the troop that pursued them, and the leader Būlāy had stimulated behind the soldiers who were about 10,000, and arrived at Ghaza, devastating the country, taking prisoners, and plundering.

On Thursday, the 13th of the month Ḥ January people talked about Qāzān’s saying his prayer in the city on Friday: people became alarmed and blocked the roads and blocked up the doors with clay and stones. The Tatars (began to) frequent the houses of the inhabitants, searching for horses and taking them away, and doing (much) damage. Qypc̄aq spent his night at ʿIzzaddin ibn al-Qalānisī’s. In the city the khaṭīb speaking on Friday said the prayer for the Sultan Muzaffar ad-Dīn Mahmūd Qāzān, 62) who was presented in the cupola, which (happened) in the presence of a great many Mongols. Then after prayer Qypc̄aq and Ismāʿīl mounted the pulpit, while the muʿadhhdhin ʿAbdalghānī shouted out and enumerated the surnames of Qāzān. Then it was promulgated to the people that Qypc̄aq was invested with the office of the nāʿīb of Damascus and the appointment of the qādīs and nāʿībs would be due to him. 63) (These decrees) were transmitted by the muʿadhhdhin ʿAbdalghānī to the multitude, and gold and (silver) coins were scattered among the inhabitants. Rejoicings were manifested at the

61) This was the Madrasat ʿAziziyya, founded by Malik al-ʿAziz, where the Sultan Saladdin was buried; see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, pp. 63 and 65.
62) Which involved his acknowledgment as legal overlord; see d’Ohsson, vol. IV, pp. 251—52.
63) See these decrees in more detail in al-Maqrizī, II (part II), pp. 156—59 in Quatramère s’Noten; in the Notes to Ilkhāns, vol. II, p. 94; and in Howorth, vol. III, p. 444.
investiture of Qypchâq. Qypchâq took very much pains with the Tatars, but he was clever, artful, self-willed and experienced, who knew their policy (too well).

There came down the shaykh ash-shuyûkh of Qâzân, whose name was Nizâmaddîn Mahmûd ibn 'Ali ash-Shaybânî, to the Madrasat al-'Adîliyya. He was angry with the leaders because they did not pay their respects to him, and claimed to arrange their affair and deliberate with them on what would be done in the matter of the citadel, and he demeaned himself as if Qypchâq and people like him were under his orders.

As to the inhabitants of aṣ-Ṣâlihiyya, they became confused, and there came a superior to them whom a shîhna had appointed: he 'ate them and milked them' (i. e.: extorted money from them). The qâdî married a young girl to him but he could not avert (the extortions) from them. The Tatars (thereupon) began to plunder aṣ-Ṣâlihiyya and do harm and destruction there, and their disaster aggravated and their harm increased each day they remained there. From there they took a great deal of wheat, grains, clothing-materials, and supplies; they took out the windows, and broke and scorched (what they could find), and took the carpets of the mosques with them. The inhabitants fled to the Dayr

---

64) Because Qâzân's generals desired to plunder the city under the pretext that the citadel had not surrendered to them. See Weil, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 233, Note, and d'Ohsson, vol. IV, pp. 252–53.

65) The great Madrasat al-'Adîliyya is north-west of the cathedral mosque, east of the convent of the Shihâbiyya dervishes, and opposite the gate of az-Zâhirîyya. It was constructed by the Ayyûbid al-Malik al-Mu'azzâm who in 619/1222–23 ordered his father to be interred in it. See Sauvage, op. cit., JA, IX, 3, pp. 423–24, and Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 61.

66) At the foot of the Mount Qâsyûn, one hour from Damascus, and famous for the gardens and country-seats of its surroundings. See d'Ohsson, vol. IV, p. 253, and Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, pp. 34 and 36.

67) Certainly Bûlây who is mentioned above.

68) An official title, see Dozy. Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes, s. v.
al-Muqādisa\(^\text{69}\) and gathered in it. The Tatars surrounded it on the 18th of the month/12 January, entered it and harried what was there, and captured the women and children. The shaykh al-mashāyikh an-Nizām went out to them in company of Tatars with what they amassed. A troop repaired to (the village of) Dārayyā, the inhabitants of which took shelter in the mosque,\(^\text{70}\) and surrounding and entering it, sacked, killed, and dispersed the inhabitants of Dārayyā. They continued to loot the mountainous districts and capture their inhabitants by and by, whilst one troop went away and another troop came up. They took possession of rolls of stuffs and household utensils, and punished and tortured (people). The last that they attacked was the convent which they considered as allowed and in which they left nothing but the old women in cold, hunger, and nakedness. The men entered naked and barefooted in worn-out clothes, as if they had been beggars, nay, even weaker than beggars, for these are not in such painful punishments, hunger, severe cold, sleeplessness, and loss of children and wives. "Verily, we belong to Allāh and to Him shall we return!"\(^\text{71}\)

A troop went to al-Mazza\(^\text{72}\). Most if its inhabitants were deceived and remained (at home); they overcame them with intimidation, plunder, and annihilation. In those days the shaykh Taqiaddūn ibn Taymiyya went to see such persons as he hoped could be useful; the shaykh al-mashāyikh, the mu'allim Sulaymān, and Qypchāq; then, accompanied by a party, on the 20th of the month/14 January he went to Qāzān who stayed at Tall Rāḥīt.\(^\text{73}\) He was admitted to him, but was not permitted to tell Qāzān what the Tatars had committed, for they dreaded that he would fly into a passion and kill people from among the Mongols\(^\text{74}\). (At last) he was granted to say a prayer in

\(^{69}\) One of the many convents in as-Šalihīyya.

\(^{70}\) This mosque was erected by Nūraddīn Māḥmūd ibn Zankī. See Sauvage, op. cit., JA, IX, 7, pp. 240–41.

\(^{71}\) Cf. note. 31.

\(^{72}\) Village in which the people of rank resided and all sorts of fine fruit was grown. See Sauvage, op. cit., JA, IX, 7, pp. 412–48, and Th. Wieband, op. cit., Heft 5, pp. 28 and 34.

\(^{73}\) Thus also in d’Ohsson, vol. IV, p. 254.

\(^{74}\) Which would have challenged the Mongol chieftains to treat the inhabitants of Damascus ruthlessly.
haste. The wazir Sa‘daddîn and the councillor of government ar-Rashîd al-Yahûdî advised him not to complain about the Tatars (but say as follows): "We are engaged in improving the conditions, but it is absolutely necessary to satisfy the Mongols because a great many of them have got nothing as yet." The shaykh returned to the city; then, on the following morning of the 22nd (of the month)/16 January, it came to be generally known that it was unavoidable that the Mongols would enter the city and harry it, and so it happened. The shaykh al-mashâyîkh scraped together a baggage from al-‘Adiliyya and went out to the Mongol camp; he advised those whom he knew to leave the city. Then the notabilities came to him in a hurry, and offered riches to ransom the city, and implored him to intercede in their favour. He was a covetous shaykh who had perhaps done so to deceive (them), but others maintained that Qâzân would be favourably inclined towards the Muslims. Then, in the course of the night, a decree was issued by him with the words: "Whoever appeals to me for the sake of Damascus shall die!" As for the people, they spent that night alarmed and were seized with violent tribulations and excessive cold. A multitude gathered at the shaykh al-mashâyîkh’s and induced him to beware of him (i. e.: qâzân); however, he was stubborn: he did not relieve their sorrows and had pity on no Muslim. Then Allâh was benevolent and frustrated that (i. e.: his intention). It was, however, doubled what was imposed upon the people, and the riches were damaged. People did penance on (receiving) the indication of many riches (which were to be delivered up to the Mongols). At that time 10,000 horses and all the asses that remained over were imposed upon the people: there was much scuffle, hanging, and exaction. There were imposed 100,000 dirhams upon the Sûq of the Wool-Carders, 100,000 (dirhams) upon the lance-makers, 60,000 (dirhams) upon the people of the Sûq ‘Ali and 70,000 (dirhams) upon each of the notabilities like Ibn al-Minjâ and Ibn al-Qalânîsî, (but) it reached (even) 100,000 (dirhams in some cases). Upon

---

75) Later called Sûq al-kumaila: see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 78.

76) Completely: Sûq ‘Ali pâshâ; see ibid., p. 52.
(people of) the second category 30,000 (dirhams) were imposed, and so on. They forced al-Mughīṭā into the jāmiʿ, into the Mosque al-Jadid, the notabilities were treated harshly, a number of leading persons were beaten; there was much plunder, and (even those) were destitute who supported them. The news of this spread on Friday, 28th of the month 22 January, and there was much unrest on top of the houses, and people wailed from their roofs. The shaykh Shamsaddīn ibn Ghanām was carried sick to the mosque and was demanded 100,000 (dirhams). Those who slept and those who reviled (the Mongols) were molested. He who made the demand publicly known was ʿAlāʾuddīn, the instructor (or: steward, ʿustādī) of the house of Qypchāq; he who fixed (the sums imposed) upon the people was as-Ṣafi as-Sinjārī: he arrived with the Tatars, and instructed and fed (literally: gave milk to) the children of al-Ḥarīrī. The (number of) accidents which became public increased, and villains appeared who caused much anger and made false accusations. The utensils and the houses of the amirs were sacked. The shaykh Wajīhaddīn ibn al-Minjā related that all that was carried to the treasury of Qāzān amounted to 3,600,000 (dirhams), except what was due to him by order and from bribery and what he extorted from the notabilities for other persons, so that the shaykh ash-shuyūkh got about 600,000 dirhams.

The distress increased and many people perished and became impoverished during the exactions up to this date: among them was Ruknaddīn. Taxes were imposed upon the heads of some people and their outfits. Then on the 29th/23 January it was made public in the city that the exactions were remitted, and the notabilities returned to their homes. By the end of the month Qypchāq resided at the Dār as-saʿāda, and used to go there from the district of the foreigners. He was flung with (stones of)

80) Adh-Dhahabī probably means the district of the Christians: it was the Eastern part of Damascus; see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 38.
the catapult and fire from the citadel, and it (i. e.: the Dār as-sā'āda) was set ablaze. At that time the investment of the citadel of Damascus\(^{81}\) was begun from both the inside and the outside of the city. The Mongols were ordered to enter (the city) for the investment. They took the Bāb al-Barīd \(^{82}\) as far as az-Zāhiriyya \(^{83}\) and the parts around al-Khāṭūniyya \(^{84}\) as well as the district of al-Balāṭa \(^{85}\), and remained there. In those days the catapults for the Tatars were set up at the mosque of Damascus: for them (i. e. the catapults) precious sorts of timber were felled from al-Chauta, and the large trunks of trees were carried into the mosque. The Turks spent the night watching over them, and the shops at the Bāb al-Barīd \(^{86}\) were broken in and sacked. All the people of those districts who were on the roofs surrendered during the night, lacking their belongings and provisions, and being befallen by and enduring hardships, (so that) nobody remained in that district from its inhabitants. At that time the Dār as-Sukkar \(^{87}\) was sacked and destroyed by the mob.

As for the (Mamlūk) armies they entered Cairo, and the Sultān happened to be among them. They began to buy horses and equipments, (consequently) the prices of these things rose, so that the breast-plate which

\(^{81}\) For a detailed description of the citadel see ibid., pp. 166—82.

\(^{82}\) The west gate of the cathedral mosque. See Th. Wiegand, \textit{op. cit.}, Heft 5, p. 66.

\(^{83}\) I. e. the Madrasat az-Zāhiriyya "extra muros" on the outside of the Bāb an-Nasr, east of the Ḥanafite Khāṭūniyya "intra muros" and west of the convent of the Hishāmiyya dervishes, between the rivers Bānyās and Qanawāt on the southern Sharaf: it was erected by al-Malik az-Zāhir ibn ʿAbdalmalik an-Nāṣir ʿalāhaddīn. See Sauvage, \textit{op. cit.}, \textit{JA}, IX, 3, pp. 418—20, and Th. Wiegand, \textit{op. cit.}, Heft 5, pp. 59—61.

\(^{84}\) This is the Madrasat al-Khāṭūniyya "extra muros" on the southern Sharaf, erected by the Princess Zumurud Khāṭūn, wife of Tājāmulūk ʿal-Tawrī (died in 557/1161—2). See Sauvage, \textit{op. cit.}, \textit{JA}, IX, 4, p. 526.

\(^{85}\) See Th. Wiegand, \textit{op. cit.}, Heft 5, p. 70.

\(^{86}\) There were fruit- and other food-shops there. See Sauvage, \textit{op. cit.}, \textit{JA}, IX, 7, p. 372.

\(^{87}\) Correctly Dār al-Ḥadīth as-Sakariyya, of which also adh-Dahābī was prior. See Sauvage, \textit{op. cit.}, \textit{JA}, IX, 3, p. 276.
(usually) cost 10 dirhams (was sold) at 100 dirhams or so. There was vast expenditure, like which was never seen, especially among the Damascenes; it probably exceeded 1,000,000 dinārs. The shortcomings of the army were redressed by every possible means⁸⁸): Salār took pains about that and endeavoured (to do so) as much as he could. They sent away messengers to bring them news from Damascus: they provided them with plenty of money. The people remained in their houses and feared that the Tatārs would force upon them the filling of the moat of the citadel and other (works). On 2 Jumādā 1-Ūlā/25 January there remained at the Dayr al-Muqdādisa a few objects and a few women and men, (among them also) the Ḥanbalite qāḍī. A troop of Tatārs came up to it and ransacked it, plundering and taking prisoners. They took prisoner the Ḥanbalite qāḍī whom they took away bareheaded, and put a rope round his neck. Upon this the people of the Dayr (al-Muqdādisa) took to flight and entered the city depressed and denuded, (so that) whosoever saw them wept more than they themselves did. Then the qāḍī Taqīaddīn entered the city: his daughters and many of his relatives had already been taken prisoners; he saw the horrors, and perhaps that is why Allāh endowed him with mercy. The defenders of the citadel, seeing that the Tatārs invested them, cast firebrands into the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafīyya⁹⁰ and its surroundings, and into al-ʿĀdiliyya⁹⁰, the Dār al-Malik al-Kāmil, the Dār Maktāb al-ʿAlā⁹¹ and the greatest part of the surroundings of the citadel, whereas ad-Dammāghīyya,


⁸⁹) At the Eastern gate of the citadel, west of the Uṣrūniyya and north of the Ḥanafite Qāymaiyya, finished by al-Malik al-Ashraf Muẓaffaraddīn Mūsā, son of al-ʿĀdil (died in 625/1227—8), and opened in Shaʿbān 630/13 May to 10 June 1233. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 61, and Sauvaire, op. cit., p. 271.

⁹⁰) It is the Madrasat al-ʿĀdiliyya; see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 61.

⁹¹) Probably connected with the mosque al-ʿAlā, see Th. Wiegand, op. cit., pp. 43, 81.
al-ʿAmmādiyya, and al-Qaymāziyya\(^{32}\)) remained safe. The mosque was full of strangers, inhabitants, and peasants who were under the citadel. It was said that about 4,000 people were taken prisoners from as-Ṣālihiyya, and many from the other districts, and from Jerusalem to Nablus and al-Biqā’, whose number only Allāh knows. It was said that in as-Ṣālihiyya about 400 men were killed, and an indescribable and numberless (quantity of) things like doors, pieces of marble, windows, and other things, were carried away from the other places both inside and outside that were round the citadel: they were offered for sale at low prices. The rest of the population of the city wore scant clothes and old head-gears for fear of being plundered and of the recurrence of violent exactions and punishments. A great sum of about 100,000 (dirhams) were required from the madrasas, the inspectors and ‘āmilās were dealt harshly, and the prices rose\(^{33}\).

On Friday a farmān was read aloud at the jāmi’ ordaining to spare the mosque and preserve the waqt-estates. It also gave directions to the end that what was taken from the armouries should be employed in the way of Allāh and for the hajj, and that coins should be minted of pure silver.

On 12 Jumādā ʿ1-Ūlā/4 February Qāzān left al-Ghauṭa for home; his nā’ib Kutlugh Shāh with a troop remained back at the palace. On 13 Jumādā ʿ1-Ūlā/5 February the inhabitants of al-ʿĀdiliyya were ordered to evacuate it because they intended investing the citadel. They went out in trouble and misery, leaving (behind them) most of their belongings and provisions which were destroyed.

On 18 Jumādā ʿ1-Ūlā/10 February a number of Mongols entered the city and invested the citadel which they pierced through from its West (side). The inhabitants of az-Zāhirīyya\(^{34}\) remained there, full of misfortune and for fear of the camel-troops of the Tatars, and that they, fallen short of water, would perish; they feared lest the Tatars

\(^{32}\) See note 89.

\(^{33}\) See also in al-Maqrizi, II (part II), p. 163.

\(^{34}\) This is the Madrasat Malik az-Zāhir Baybars, see Th. Wiegand, *op. cit.*, Heft 5, pp. 59—61.
should deal with them in the same manner as they did with
(the inhabitants of) al-ʿAdiliyya. They cast fire on the houses
and its inhabitants who fled from the roofs with very much
grief. The Tatars, Georgians, and Armenians set fire to the
Jāmiʿ al-ʿUqayya 95), the mountain-hospital 96), ad-Dahsha 97),
the Madrasat aṣ-Ṣāhibiyya 98), the Ribāṭ an-Nāṣirī 99), and
other places of prominent beauty and many (inhabitants).
They burnt down al-ʿAdiliyya on the night of 21 Jumādā
1-Ūlā/13 February, on which occasion fled also those who
belonged to az-Zāhiriyya 100).

On Friday, the 19th of the month/11 February there
was promulgated the installation of Qyqhash in the office
of nāʿib, and the investiture of Nāṣiraddīn Yaḥyā ibn
Jalāladdīn ibn Ṣāḥib Khuttan with the mīshadd101).

In the (same) year we shall return to our country
after we have left 60,000 (men) from our army at Damascus;
we shall return to Egypt in autumn.

On the 22nd of it/14 February the investment of the
citadel was discomfited to the Tatars, and people
wandered (back) into these districts. There remained over
uninhabited stretches after the fire and devastation, and
the gates and wooden utensils vanished.

On the 23rd/15 February the work of the catapult
which was brought down from the precipice of the citadel
failed. They spread terror and did destruction to it, and
seizing the sharif al-Qumayy, took him prisoner and
brought him to the citadel. The two nāʿibs Kutlugh Shāh

95) On the slope of the Qāsyyūn, achieved by Muzaffaraddīn
Kūkuburī Zaynaddīn Kūchik, lord of Arbil. See Sauvare, op. cit.,
96) It was built by the amir Sayfaddīn abul-Ḥasan al-
Qaymāri in 646/1248–9 and 655/1257. See Th. Wiegand, op.
97) Probably miswritten from al-Baṣṣa; see ibid., p. 39.
98) On the slope of the Qāsyyūn, erected by Rabīʿa Khatūn
bint Ṣajjaddīn Ayyūb, sister of Ṣalāḥaddīn (died in 643/1245–
6), see Sauvare, op cit., JA, IX, 4, pp. 468–70.
99) Also on the Qāsyyūn; see Sauvare, op. cit., JA, IX, 5,
p. 379 as "le rebat d’et-Tekrity".
100) See also al-Maqrīzī, II (part II), pp. 163–4.
101) Originally it means 'corset, stays': here 'a kind of
dress of state'.
and the lord of Sis drove up to the city, whence the Tatars went away in great haste and struck their tents from their sites. People felt relief, and we went through the Bāb al Barīd, and lo, it was nicer than an inn as to its lodging; its shops carried on trade, on its soil there were baskets heaped up to about the height of the upper part of the arm. When we arrived at the Bāb an-Naṣr the festive drums were on that day beating in the citadel as a proof that it remained safe, for which the praise is due to Allāh (alone)! On that day as-Ṣaff al-Sinjarī and the amīr Yahyā went out of the city, in which it was proclaimed: "Go out to-morrow to meet your sultan Qypchāq! Allāh has already diverted the enemy from you!" The amīr Sayf addīn, Qypchāq, the silāhdār Bektəmir, al-Bakī, and a troop from the army returned: they arrived to him from the city, appeared before him, and the turbans from the tomb of the late al-Malik az-Zāhir Rank al-Malik as-Saʿīd were taken to him and were put upon his head by a lance, (whilst) swords were drawn before him. He put up at the palace, and people went out to al-Ghawāta and to the mountain, lamenting for their houses on the one hand, and rejoicing at their safety on the other hand.

Ibn Taymiyya related to us how he and the qāḍī Taqi ad-dīn al-Ḥanbalī and another person went up to Kutlugh Shāh to the palace, how they spent the night at al-Munaybī, and, jeopardising their lives, appeared before Kutlugh Shāh. He (Ibn Taymiyya) saw him grown old, lank-haired, pale, large-faced, enraged, and malign: he descended from the generation of Jengiz Khān. He saw that the lord of Sis was in his service, and told us (how) he was together with Qāzān of whom he asked peace: (how) he was together with the two wazīrs Saʿīd ad-dīn and Rashidaddaula at-Ṭabīb, the Jewish nobleman al-Kahhāl, the shaykh ash-shuyukh, the inspector of the treasury as-

102) South of the citadel and communicating with the palace of Barqūq. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 185.

103) This was the so-called "Baybars-turba" begun by al-Malik az-Zāhir Baybars (died in 676/1277—8) and finished by al-Malik as-Saʿīd (died in 678/1279—89). See ibid., p. 43.

Sayyid al-Qutb, and al-Usayl the son of an-Nasir at-Tus the inspector of the waqf-estates: these were Tatar wearing turbans, Christians and Jews 105), and such people as despised the hadith: (nevertheless) no one refrained from following their manners, except a few. 106)

The prices rose: the flour reached (the price of) 300 dirhams, and 2½ oqs of raisins (or also: figs) cost 1 dirham, 1 ratl of meat 9 dirhams, 1 oqa of cheese about 3 dirham or so.

Qypchaq remained behind to exercise full authority and he used to ride about with policemen and staves 107). About 100 horsemen gathered about him: we saw them clothe as the sharabish were. His ustadh dar 'Alaaddin was the wali of the city: he made him amir and fitted out about 1,000 Tatars to persecute robbers. Shamsaddin ibn as-Sa as-Sinjari exercised the office of the muhtasib of the city: he rode in order to bestow the robe of honour upon him. (On this occasion) the gates of the city were open with the exception of those which were round the citadel.

On Friday, 4 Jumada 'l-Akhira/26 February the am Ya'flya prayed in the mosque, at which time the festive drums were beating in the citadel and at the gate of Qypchaq, who lived at the Dar Bahadur As.

In the middle of the month/about 9 March wine and immorality were proclaimed to be prohibited at Damascus; this was begun in the house of Ibn Jarada at as-Saba', and was imposed upon about 1,000 (men) a day. A troop broke out of the citadel and drove to the vicinity of the Bab a Jabiya, and the Tatars fled from before them. The crow beat the Tatars whereby confusion arose, the Bab a

105) In the text birat al-kitab, ('the temple of the books') it certainly means 'the possessors of the books' (ahl al-kitab i.e. Christians and Jews.

106) The following phrase in the text is parallelism, which is — as so often in Oriental texts — immaterial for the context for this reason we have omitted the translation of it.

107) When Qazan left Damascus, Qypchaq was left behind first as a nominal ruler, the real one being Kutlugh Shakh, then ten days later, after the departure of Kutlugh Shakh, as the ruler of the city. See Howorth, part III, pp. 447—8.
Şaghur\textsuperscript{108} was closed, and a troop (or: number) of Tatars were said to be killed.

On the 20th of the month/14 March Bülāy returned with his vanguard from al-Ghūr: they went to the outside of Damascus. People became terrified, and from the city a sum was collected as a ransom for them (i.e. the Tatars). Then a troop went out of the citadel and secured the cattle of the Tatars and killed a number (of people), whereas a number of them were also killed: there was a riot in the city.

On the 25th of the month/22 March the khatīb Badraddīn marched into the citadel with a number of followers, among them with the nā'īb of the amīr Yahyā; they conferred with Arjawāsh upon the peace to be concluded between him and the nā'ībs of the Tatars and Qypchāğ, but no agreement was come to. On 2 Rajab/24 March Qypchāğ gathered the notabilities and the qādis into his house and made them swear in upon the dynasty of Qāzān in faithfulness and without (the intention of) misleading them. Ibn Taymiyya betook himself to the tent of Bülāy on account of the prisoners and the deliverance of them from his companions. He was absent for three days, then on 3 Rajab/25 March a number of chiefs in quest of him repaired to the tent of Bülāy and returned on the following day. They were plundered at the Bāb ash-Sharqī,\textsuperscript{109} and their turbans and clothes were taken away. They entered on the same day: some of them hid themselves, the rest went away. (When) Bülāy and the Tatars left, they took with them Badraddīn ibn Faḍlallāh, Amīnaddīn ibn Shuqayr, 'Alāāddīn ibn al-Qalānisi, and the child of Shamsaddīn ibn al-Athīr; by the Euphrates they released Ibn Shuqayr who arrived at Ḥalab.

On 4 Rajab/26 March people mounted the minārāts and told that they saw a multitude of Tatars go away from 'Aqaba Dummar.

Bülāy rode to Baṭlabakk and al-Biqā', and the environs of Damascus as well as the city (itself) were cleared of them. On 10 Rajab/1 April people went to al-Qatla and ash-Shammāl. On that day, on Friday, Qypchāğ

\textsuperscript{108} See Th. Wiegand, \textit{op. cit.}, Heft 5, p. 183.

\textsuperscript{109} See Th. Wiegand, \textit{op. cit.}, Heft 5, pp. 183—84.
prayed amidst a large and numerous congregation (whilst) the weapons were in the magšūra of the preaching.

On 13 Rajab/4 April the city was alarmed on account of the return of a troop of Tatārs to the outside of the Bāb ash-Sharqī. People were discovered in the quincey-groves: they hurried back, (but) some of them were struck down and some of the youths were taken prisoners. Then this was the end of the period (of the encounter) with the Tatārs: may Allāh suffice (i. e.: finish) their affair! As for Qyypchāq, on the day of the middle of Rajab/6 April he with his followers left the city, — Ḫazzāḏ al-Qalānīsī was with him, — and went to Egypt\(^{110}\). The city was administered by Ārjāwāsh\(^{111}\), who ordered the walls to be defended and the building on them\(^{112}\) to be fitted out. Whosoever spent the night in his house was hanged, and the city-gates were locked. Then after dawn people unlocked the Bāb an-Nāṣr and were terrified with the crowds.

On Friday, 17 Rajab/8 April at Damascus the khutbā was said for the lord of Egypt again, after it had been said for al-Ḥākim bi amr Allāh. People made noise and rejoiced at that: it (i. e.: the prayer for the Sultān) had been omitted for 100 days. At that time the houses of Ibn Taymiyya and of his companions were such that "the wine-shops were renewed, and the wine was shed, and the goblets cracked, and the wine-merchants were honoured"\(^{113}\). From Saturday morning on the city was decorated.

On 10 Sha'bān/1 May there arrived al-Afram, nā'ib of Damascus, with troops at Damascus\(^{114}\); then, two days

---

\(^{110}\) In order to swear allegiance to the Sultān again; see Howorth, vol. III, p. 449.

\(^{111}\) Who reconquered the city on 8 April; see ibid.

\(^{112}\) This is certainly the tower which was erected in 569/1173—4 and rebuilt in 699/1299—300, i. e. the year of our record. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, pp. 186—7.

\(^{113}\) The meaning of this parallelism is: there were general rejoicings.

\(^{114}\) He dealt harshly with such people as were agents of the Mongols; some of them were crucified, others hanged, of others again their hands, feet, or tongues were cut, or their
later, there arrived the amīr Salār and the Egyptian left wing; then the right wing entered, commanded by the ustādhdār al-Ḥisām; then, on 14 Sha'bān/5 May there marched the main body in, commanded by Salār, nāʿib of the realm; they all put up at al-Marja.

In that (month) there officiated as qāḍī of Syria Ibn Jamāʿa, as Ḥanafite qāḍī Ibn al-Ḥarīrī; there taught at the al-Aminiyya[115] Jalāladdīn, substituting his deceased brother. As overseer of the diwān there functioned Ibn ash-Shīrāzī, substituting the deceased Ibn ash-Shīrājī. As wāli of the city there functioned the amīr ʿIzzaddīn Ubayk ad-Dawidār an-Najībī.

On 8 Ramadān/28 May Salār returned with the army to Cairo. In Shawwāl (20 June to 18 July) the sharīf Zaynaddīn Ibn ʿAdnān was sent back from Cairo in chains: he was imprisoned in the jail of the Bāb aṣ-Ṣaghīr.

In Shawwāl/20 June to 18 July the mālik al-umarā al-Afrām repaired to Jibāl al-Jurd to their tribe, for in the army they had already learned the outcome of the defeat, and captured, killed, and robbed whatever was still possible. Their aim was to become deserters; moreover, people said: "They are heretics deviating from the religion", they were (however) subdued, became obedient, and were overcome. A large amount of property was imposed upon them, and they were compelled to render everything they had taken away for the army, and their estate was confiscated.

In Dhul-Qaʿda/19 July to 18 August people were compelled to hang out their equipments: they were ordered to learn archery. The heroic deeds were proclaimed among the people; that (proclamation) was sent by the chief qāḍī to all the madrasas and lawyers, and in the same sense the whole of Syria was informed of it in writing.

---

[115] The oldest madrasa in Damascus: it was founded by the amīr Aminaddaula in 414/1023—4. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 5, p. 72.
2. A. H. 700/16th September 1300 to 5th September 1301.

On the 1st of it/16 September the diwan held a meeting and ordered that four months should be fixed for all the estates and waqfs that were in Damascus and outside of it to be tilled (for public purposes). This weighed heavily on the people, many of whom fled and others kept in hiding. Then there were many rumours of the coming of the Tatars (again), and people began to flee to Egypt and the fortresses\(^{116}\). Conditions became (still) worse in Safar/16 October to 13 November, the charges for jobbing animals advanced so that the charge for a camel foal reached 500 dirhams, (whereas) implements and coppers were sold at low prices. Then it was proclaimed in the cities that no one should depart without a (special) permit. When the Muslim messengers came (with the news) that the Tatars would drive (into the country) the city was alarmed; then the festive drums were beating at the (news of the) riding of the Sultan from Egypt (to Syria). Later, however, there fled from the city the people of Ibn Fadlallah’s in a large number, then the people of the chief qādīs and the families of Ibn Ṣaṣarī, Ibn al-Qalānīsī, Ibn al-Minjā and many other people. In Rabi’ al-awwal/14 November to 13 December the (disquieting) news proved unfounded and the Sultan arrived at Ghaza.

But when Rabi’ ath-thānī/14 December to 11 January began, the disquieting rumours about the Tatars increased again, and some of them arrived at al-Bira. The whole Damascene army marched out, (in whose rank and file) the common folk as well as scholars and other (prominent) people were to be seen: their number reached 5,000. In Damascus there officiated as successor of Aqjābā the amīr Sayfaddīn Balbān al-Jaukandār al-Mansūrī al-Hājib. In it (i. e.: the same month) the forsaken (i. e.: by God) enemy crossed the Euphrates: the khaṭāb recited the qunāt-prayers and the amīr was locked in. The Tatars entered Ḥalab; their nā’ib, however, was too late to arrive at

Hamāt. The charge for a camel foal was 300 (dirhams). People fled pell-mell. Then it was proclaimed by the end of the month that the taxation proved insufficient, so that all the more taxes were imposed: everybody was exposed, weak, and flying, and Allāh did not make useful to them what they had taken away from the belongings (of the people) and (what) they ate up and deformed. The rainy weather and the mire increased enormously, and the fugitives suffered tribulations in the roads, so that the imām prayed for fine weather in his khutba. Al-Manṣūrī rode to the Sultān who camped at Bud'ūsh near Qāqūn117) in order to inform him that the enemy was in the country (already) and approached (them). The army, however, desisted from action and behaved cowardly. The Sultān went (back) to Egypt: his departure, however, did not prove beneficial. The hearts were intimidated, the city became alarmed, and people were vexed in the roads.

When Jumādā 1-ULĀ/12 January to 10 February began people were God knows in what condition. That time our shaykh Ibn Taymiyya went out to al-Marj and met the nā’ib of the Sultān who made him steadfast and firm: he spent two days with him, then he rode to al-Barid to the Sultān but could not meet him there, and the affair was frustrated. He then rode to Cairo which he entered on the day the army marched in.

On 7 Jumādā 1-ULĀ/18 January the silāhār Bektemir arrived with 1,000 horsemen. People were convinced that the Egyptians had returned to their country and remained in slumber, and there was a general leaving of and fleeing from the country.

On the 9th of the month/20 January people became exceedingly terrified: this was because the wāli of the city Ibn Nahhās himself startled the people by stepping up to the merchants in the sūqs and saying: "Why are you sitting (here)? Whoever can depart must make haste (to do so)!" Then this was proclaimed in the city that (day at) noon; the women and children shrieked, the sūqs were closed, and people remained in terror and excitement and

said: 'The Muslim soldiers have declined (to obey) the command.'

The Egyptians had (meanwhile) returned (home). The Syrian soldiers had not in mind how to meet Qāzān even if they had stood firm anyhow: they resolved on fleeing. The nā`ib al-Afram, whoever would have induced him for the encounter, even if the army had clung to him and had not relinquished him and gone away from before the enemy, would not have raised it (i.e.: the army).

People said that Qāzān would ride to us from Ḥalab on 10 Jumādā 1-Ūlā/21 January: many people entered the citadel that day with their provisions and belongings, so that it became close for the people and so crowded that many people were content to find enough room where to sit down, but sleeping was not possible in it, and they were restless in their crowds. Then on the 10th of the month/21 January it was proclaimed: 'Whoever intends to go to the Holy War should remain (here) and prepare himself for it; whoever is unable (to do so) should save himself!' Thereupon there left the citadel a crowd possessed with distress and affliction and fled to Egypt and to the fortresses. There left (also) those of the notabilities who had (formerly) remained in the city and had been denuded. There left the chief qāḍī Ibn Jamā'a, the qāḍī Najmaddin ibn Šāṣari, the qāḍī Shamsaddin ibn al-Harīrī, Sharafaddin ibn al-Qalānisī, Wajihaddin ibn al-Minjā who functioned as the deputy of Ibn Jamā'a in the qāḍī-and khaṭīb-offices, at-Tāj al-Ja'barī, and al-Burhān al-Iskandari. There went out to al-Marj: the shaykh Zaynaddin al-Fāriqī, the shaykh Ibrāhīm ar-Raqqī, the shaykh Muhammad ibn Qawwām, the shaykh Sharafaddin ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Jabbāra, and a number (of people) encouraging al-Afram to stand firm and complaining to him of what had descended upon the people and what they had extracted from them; he was greatly afflicted for that and promised good (i.e.: improvement of the situation). They, dispirited, intended (seeing) the amīr and rode after him into the desert for one or two days' march from the city; they met him and pressed him to return and encounter the enemy together with al-Afram. He answered them (i.e.: agreed with them), and they were seized with fear in the desert (because) Arab
robbers rushed upon them with swords drawn: Allāh (however,) saved them. Then the amīr ‘Izzaddin al-Ḥamawi arrived at Ḥabamāya (Ḥamidiyya?) from Ṣarhadd.

On the 17th (of the month) 28 January the sentry of the people of Ḥamāt pounced upon the horde of the Tatars and Allāh helped them to victory. There were killed about 100 from among the Tatars, according to others more than 200 men, and a few times ten people were taken prisoners from among the Tatars. A letter was caught reporting that the ringleader Qāzān had already returned from Ḥalab and crossed the Euphrates for his country on the 11th of the month 22 January. The qādi of Ḥamāt begged valour and temerity (of the people). People rejoiced; their first group arrived and implored Allāh to divert their unluck from them. Then, on the 19th of the month 30 January, al-Burayd arrived and verified that (report) to them. The Tatars who remained behind in the country round Ḥalab were numerous but were extremely afflicted with weakness, cold, and snowfalls. During this week (the price of) meat rose in Damascus so that it amounted to 9 dirhams a rial, and the sale of two head (of cattle) was effected at 500 dirhams. On the other hand (the prices of) grain lowered to 100 dirhams on account of the (general) flight (of people from home). (When) Shubāt/February began, there were a great many rainfalls.

On 25 Jumādā 1-Ūlā 5 February there arrived the letter of Ibn Taymiyya (informing) that he had entered Cairo after seven days and was together with the notabilities of the empire, and good was derived from his instigating (them), rousing (their) emulation, and intimidating (them), so that the concern of the amirs was awakened and they excused themselves (for the omissions). At Cairo the Holy War was proclaimed and the resolution (for it) became firmer. He put up at the citadel, then arrived to us on 27 Jumādā 1-Ūlā 7 February.

Thereupon people left the citadel, the minds were reassured, thank God, and on 3 Jumādā 1-Ākhira 13 February people recited the qunūt-prayers, and the (alarming) conditions were over.

Then on the 12th/23 February al-Afram entered the city from al-Marj after staying there for four months: there
entered with him the silāhdār Bektemir, ʿIzzaddīn al-
Hamawi and Bahāaddīn Yaʿqūb. The ignorants (i.e.: those who did not know what happened) began to come (back) from aṣ-Ṣabiyya and the fortresses. (When) this (happened) the Tatārs were descending on the district of Darīsāl and on Gharās118) moving to and from in the meadows and doing damages (while) there was nobody to prevent them or drive them away. They did not cross the Euphrates until 2 Rajab/13 March.

On 11 Rajab/22 March the destitute amirs entered Ḫims, and people learned of the Tatārs’ leaving Syria, and praised Allāh to whom (alone) thanks are due.

In Shaʿbān/11 April to 9 May at the appearance of al-
Afram and the qādīs the regulations concerning the non-
Muslims were promulgated. An agreement was made that they should be removed from the wāli-offices and prevented from riding on horse-back and leaving the country. They were compelled to wear yellow garments and blue turbans. They made haste (in enforcing) that (measure), which remained (in force) from that time on.

Im Ramaḍān (10 May to 8 June) Sayfaddīn Aqjabā
al-Manṣūrī entered the citadel and was appointed adjutant to Arjawāsh.

In Dhul-Qaʿda/8 July to 6 August there functioned as Ḥanafite qādī Jalāladdīn ar-Rūmī in lieu of Ibn al-Ḥarīrī: he was appointed by the nāʿīb, and as wāzīr the amīr Shamsaddīn al-Aʿṣar who had arrived already. Then he went to the north of the country for inspection and returned after a month.

The legate of the king Qāzān119) arrived (at Damascus) and made preparations (for going) to Egypt. May Allāh preserve the cause of Islām in good state and welfare!
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118) This is the ancient Gerasa. See Th. Wiegand, op. cit., Heft 4. Damascus die alte Stadt, pp. 34, 42, and 75.
119) This was Kamāladdīn Mūsā, the chief judge of Manṣīl, accompanied by Nāṣiraddīn Khoja from Tabrīz. For their mission see d’Ohsson, vol. IV, p. 286 ff.; Howorth, vol. III, p. 457; Wassāf, Ilḵāns, vol. II, p. 109 ff.