

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

IBN KANNĀN

Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad
al-Ṣāliḥī al-Dimashqī al-Khalwatī
(b. 1071/1663 d. 1153/1740)

Though not among the most memorable intellectuals of the 18th century in terms of his contributions to scholarly discussions of doctrinal, legal, or spiritual matters, I.K.'s written legacy, biographical (even auto-biographical) in nature, caught the attention of modern scholars, particularly of cultural historians. I.K.'s works, more specifically his chronicle and topographies, have been utilized to detect new cultural patterns in the 18th century, including those related to education,¹ to new sociabilities,² and to the construction of early modern subjectivities.³

This entry focuses on I.K.'s historical and geographical works, the spatial-temporal aspects of which reveal a deeper dynamic than assumed by generic categorizations of history versus geography: a chronicle of the events of Damascus (*al-Ḥawādit al-yawmiyya*); a topography of the entire Levant with specific focus on Damascus (*al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*); and a topography of al-Ṣāliḥiyya (*al-Murūj al-sundusiyya*), a suburb of Damascus where I.K. resided.

I.K.'s chronicle is not just about the passage of time in Damascus, but also about the spatial connection of Damascus to the Ottoman imperial domain and its cultural and administrative center, Istanbul. Conversely, I.K.'s topographies are not singular moments of spatial mapping of beloved geographies, but constitute decided attempts at historicization and simultaneous possession of these places. Taken collectively, therefore, these works reveal complex representations by, and desires of, a Damascene citizen and Ottoman subject. On the one hand, they expose how provincial subjects willfully integrated their region firmly into the Ottoman domain. On the other hand, they reveal the existence of a civic discourse, through which subjects negotiated with the powers that be for a place in the social space of the city.

At the juncture of time and space in I.K.'s works is the author's own persona. His unusually loquacious chronicle, and to a limited extent his topography of al-Ṣāliḥiyya, are exercises in unabashed exhibition of the social self. Propelling I.K.'s narrative is not only the apparent will to self-immortalization, but also a relentless ambition of a practical and urgent nature, namely the acquisition of an academic position at a local madrasa. This ambition not only informs I.K.'s chronicle and topography of al-Ṣāliḥiyya, but also constitutes, quite literally, the intention behind his topography of the Levant, which was dedicated to the provincial governor and was composed as a "gift," in which I.K. requested the academic position he so desired and ultimately received towards the end of his life.

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

LIFE

In the chapter enumerating the original inhabitants of the Damascene suburb of al-Şālihiyya, I.K. places his family, the “Kannānīs,” at the top of the list of the suburb’s trading families,⁴ which included the most illustrious households of the city (such as the °Asākirs, the Bāqillānīs, the Khallikāns, and the Tūlūnīs).⁵ In addition to a distinguished pedigree and evident wealth,⁶ I.K.’s family also occupied the prestigious position of the leadership of the Khalwatiyya Sufi order in Damascus. While it is not clear whether I.K. himself was a merchant on the side, he obviously received the full training of a scholar and studied with the most reputable °ulamā’ of the time, including °Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī (d. 1143/1731) and Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī (d. 1101/1690). By choosing knowledge as a career, and thus adding scholarship and erudition to venerability of descent, old wealth, and spiritual authority, I.K. seems to have aimed to achieve nothing less than absolute notability.⁷

Despite his impeccable credentials, however, I.K. is accorded a surprisingly modest entry in Muḥammad Khalīl al-Murādī’s (d. 1206/1792) *Silk al-durar*, the most important biographical dictionary of the 18th century, wherein he is described simply as “one of the pious, righteous, and practicing °ulamā’.”⁸ This is despite the fact that I.K.’s chronicle, by the admission of al-Murādī himself, was an important source for the compilation of the latter’s biographical dictionary.⁹ Considering that I.K. spent much of his life attempting to secure a permanent teaching position in Ḥanafī jurisprudence at the Khadijiyya-Murshidiyya madrasa, the brevity of al-Murādī’s biographical entry on I.K. as well as his omission of I.K.’s teaching position can be regarded as an *ex-post facto* reflection of the latter’s career frustrations. While I.K.’s life seems representative of the thwarted ambitions that often characterized the early modern period of Ottoman history,¹⁰ his relentless employment of an assortment of strategies to get the position that he so coveted is also demonstrative of 17th- and 18th century politicking by provincial aspirants for a position in the Ottoman system.

Although I.K. mentions having first taught at the Khadijiyya-Murshidiyya madrasa in 1102/1690, it is not clear what subject he taught and in what capacity.¹¹ However, it seems that his first official appointment to that madrasa happened eighteen years later, in 1120/1708, when I.K. mentions specifically that he was appointed to teach Ḥanafī *fiqh* there. In the next few years, I.K. mentions that he taught at the same madrasa several times.¹² In 1130/1717, nine years after his official appointment, however, I.K. concludes his otherwise usual listing of madrasas and their appointees by stating, with a noticeable tone of disappointment, that he continued his teaching career at home.¹³ It appears that for the following twenty-one years, aside from a one-year replacement appointment at the Muqadimiyya madrasa, I.K. had to content himself with teaching at home (and once even outdoors, for he loved picnics).¹⁴ It was not until 1151/1738, only a couple of years before he died, when I.K. finally got the permanent appointment he desired.¹⁵ A court record from Damascus bearing a date with the year of I.K.’s death testifies that the author’s veritable reward occurred

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

only posthumously when his children “inherited” his teaching position.¹⁶ As such, I.K. appears to have managed to inaugurate a family monopoly over a madrasa position, a practice shared by other prominent Damascene scholarly families.

Still, I.K.’s ultimate success was not a fortunate coincidence, but a result of twenty-one years of relentless maneuvering and strategizing. To begin with, he was born a Ḥanbalī, a definite disadvantage in a city whose teaching positions were overwhelmingly designated for, and staffed by, Shāfi‘īs and Ḥanafīs, the latter being the Ottoman state’s official legal rite.¹⁷ The logical strategy for I.K. to follow was to employ the usual trick of *madhab*-switching, at which Damascene professorial aspirants were adept.¹⁸ Based on I.K.’s work on the biographies of the companions of Imām Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), the eponymous founder of the Ḥanbalī school, and on al-Murādī’s identification of I.K. as a Ḥanbalī in biographical dictionary, some modern scholars have insisted that I.K. remained a Ḥanbalī.¹⁹ While I.K. does not mention having switched to Ḥanafism in his chronicle, in a Berlin autograph copy of his topography of Damascus, he adds the sobriquet “Ḥanafī” to his name, a fact that did not escape the attention of the editor of the manuscript.²⁰

I.K.’s bold move of *madhab*-switching, however, seems not to have worked. Thus, forced to employ the strategy of gratuitously offering the powerful a piece of his mind, and with a sentiment akin to that found in *Naṣīḥatnāme* (mirrors for princes) literature, I.K. instructed the new Mufti of Damascus to look after the affairs of the teachers and ensure their placement in their proper positions.²¹ When his self-serving advice went unheeded, however, I.K. finally got the idea, purportedly in a dream, to approach none other than Sulaymān Pasha al-‘Aẓm (r. 1146-1151/1733-1738), the governor himself.²² In realization of his vision, I.K. dedicated to Sulaymān Pasha his topography of the Levant, *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*, praised the governor, and asked him to intercede with the imperial authorities in Istanbul to get him reinstated at the Khadijiyya-Murshidiyya madrasa.²³

The dedication of the book to Sulaymān Pasha must have taken place around the year 1150/1737, during which I.K. mentions meeting with the governor for whom he composed two panegyric poems.²⁴ In 1151/1738, an order came from Istanbul “instructing teachers to go to their schools” upon which I.K. started teaching at the Ḥanafī Khadijiyya-Murshidiyya in al-Ṣāliḥiyya.²⁵ I.K. finally prevailed.

WORKS

Works attributed to I.K. range in number from fifteen to twenty-eight and include books on topics including history, geography, poetry, rhetoric, Sufism, jurisprudence, biography, Hadith, medicine, botany, and zoology.²⁶ In *al-Ḥawādith al-yawmiyya*, I.K. mentions only three of his other works: an epistle on rhetoric which was praised and copied by other scholars *al-Risāla al-mushtamila ‘alā anwā‘ al-badī‘ fī al-basmala*;²⁷ a work on Arabic grammar the excellence of which a colleague of I.K.’s certified in rhymed prose *al-Sham‘a al-muḍiyya fī ‘ilm al-luġha al-‘arabiyya*;²⁸ and a

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

commentary on *al-Qaṣīda al-munfarija*, a poem on Arabic grammar which I.K. read with fellow scholars at one of their outings.²⁹ The modern editor of *al-Hawādiṭ al-yawmiyya* has doubted I.K.'s authorship of the topographies of the Levant and al-Şālihiyya (*al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya* and *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya*, respectively) as these were not mentioned by I.K. himself in his chronicle. The existence in Berlin of two autograph copies of *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*, however, proves that the editor's suspicion is unfounded. Besides, the subject matter of *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya*, namely the topography of al-Şālihiyya, is completely harmonious with I.K.'s interest in the history of his neighborhood which is apparent in his chronicle. Moreover, I.K.'s approach in *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya*, as it will be seen below, is strikingly similar to that in *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*. Thus, we can safely assume that, in addition to those works mentioned by the author himself, at least the historical works, the chronicle and two topographies, were indeed authored by I.K.

① *al-Hawādiṭ al-yawmiyya min tāriḫ aḥad ʿashar alf wa miyya*³⁰

A chronicle of events between 1111-1153/1699-1740, in which I.K. maintains a strictly chronological approach by never deviating from the annalistic, and within it a monthly, arrangement. In other words, the work is not driven by events, but systematically by time. The importance of this will become clear below.³¹

In terms of content, the chronicle contains the standard repertoire of political, social, and natural occurrences. In addition to an expected interest in appointments, depositions, arrivals and departures of officials, and conflicts in and around the provincial capital, I.K. keeps an eye out for significant political developments in Istanbul and jealously reports the empire's military exploits and defeats, thus coming across as a truly loyal Ottoman subject. Perhaps the most noticeable aspect of the work is I.K.'s obsessive interest in the judicial-academic hierarchy, and the news of its staffers, practitioners, and employees. This content-related aspect of the chronicle is intimately connected to its form and its strict temporal organization as evidenced by the following.

I.K. starts the first year and every year of his chronicle by naming the incumbent political and religious authorities beginning with the Sultan himself, the religious and jurisprudential functionaries in Istanbul, the corresponding officials in Damascus, and ending with the teachers in his city. By reiterating the clearly demarcated hierarchy of authorities, I.K. establishes the chain of authority that links the province of Damascus to the imperial center, thereby revealing the "circulation system" of the judicial-academic institution that connected the parts of the empire.³² It is only after he has introduced the community of Damascene teachers, and thereby located himself in the hierarchy of the empire, that he goes on to record the year's events.

The intersection of content and form in this particular chronicle adds a spatial dimension to an otherwise temporally defined genre. As such, I.K.'s work not only demarcates the geographical borders of the Sultan's domains, but also, perhaps more

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

importantly, provides a continuous and repetitive spatial link between Damascus and Istanbul.

I.K.'s chronicle reveals another interesting juncture between content and form. As a narrative starting in 1111/1699 and continuing until 1153/1740, shortly before I.K.'s death. *al-Hawādiṭ al-yawmiyya* is a contemporary history *par excellence* dealing exclusively with the events that occur during its author's lifetime. The significance of the contemporariness afforded by the genre is that it allows the author to insert himself in his own narrative (i.e., to become the content) rendering the history a sort of "ego-document".³³ I.K. takes full advantage of the open capacity of the genre to employ it as a vehicle of unabashed exhibition of the social self to expose his sociability. The reader is inundated with vivid reports about the dinner and circumcision parties, weddings, funerals, picnics, literary salons, and Sufi soirees I.K. attended.³⁴ I.K.'s chronicle thus serves as a display of his social and cultural credentials wherein the author also emphasizes the respect that he commanded among his contemporaries.³⁵

It was these same scholars and social elites who constituted the audience for I.K.'s chronicle, parts of which were read out to a group of colleagues, as the author himself reports in the very same composition.³⁶ What is striking, however, is that this reading event took place outdoors, bringing us to the last content-related aspect of the chronicle that warrants discussion, namely I.K.'s sharp focus on nature, on which modern scholars have commented and from which they drew new conclusions regarding 18th century sociabilities.³⁷

I.K. loved the gardens and the parks of Damascus, and it was there, particularly towards the end of his life, that he spent most of his springs and summers.³⁸ He composed poetry in praise of the beauty of Damascus' rivers.³⁹ His enchantment with nature is illustrated not only by his interest in botany but also in the fact that he sometimes marked time according to the seasonal fruits and flowers.⁴⁰ I.K.'s outings functioned as scholarly salons within the context of which I.K. and his fellow teachers exchanged knowledge and discussed topics outside their teaching curricula.⁴¹ This dimension of I.K.'s sociability colored his reconstruction of his city, which he described as a verdant Garden of Eden.

② *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya al-fasīḥa fī talkhīṣ tārīkh al-Ṣāliḥiyya*⁴²

al-Ṣāliḥiyya suburb of Damascus, which was first colonized by Muslim refugees fleeing the Crusader occupation of Jerusalem, is probably the only neighborhood (as opposed to a city) to which belongs a historical-topographical tradition. I.K.'s topography of the city quarter is an effort of compilation, collation, abbreviation, and updating, in which are preserved earlier histories and topographies that are now entirely lost⁴³ or partially missing.⁴⁴

The value of this work, however, is not limited to its preservative aspect. Constituting a combination of the genres of *faḍā'il* (religious virtues), *maḥāsin* (beauties),

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

history, and biography, *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya* is divided into twenty-four sections, which include what is expected of a topography: a survey of natural landmarks (e.g., rivers, gardens) and man-made monuments (e.g., mosques, madrasas, bathhouses) as well as the accustomed narratives and lore of sacred places and spaces (e.g., the various caves and pilgrimage sites on Mount Qāsyūn). Above and beyond the sacred topography, however, the compilation significantly offers a deeply historicized narrative, which foregrounds the processes of colonization and Islamization of al-Şālihiyya.

The very first section of the book starts with the phrase “Know, that the history of *Islamic Şālihiyya*”⁴⁵ and proceeds to offer the various reports about the stories of the first Muslim refugee-settlers of the area (who, having fled the war-torn Jerusalem, were not particularly welcomed in Damascus and moved up the hill to Mount Qāsyūn) and the structures they built. The second section entitled “*fi mā kāna qabla waḍ‘ihā min al-ātār*” (“concerning the traces/ruins before its [i.e., al-Şālihiyya’s] establishment”),⁴⁶ returns to al-Şālihiyya’s “pre-history” and tells, among other places, the story of a Christian monastery. Thus, the first two sections constitute a strikingly realistic or “historicized” history, a straightforward story of refugees seeking a new home and of a series of events taking place in historical time, which is almost devoid of the triumphalism and/or mythology usually found in foundational narratives.

Another interesting formal aspect of I.K.’s topography is the bricolage of methodologies that it evinces. As a mostly verbatim compilation of previous works, the book proffers different notions of authority with regards to the transmission of information.⁴⁷ Reminiscent of classical historical works, contradictory reports of the same event are juxtaposed without any clear indication of authorial preference with regard to veracity. In contrast, when I.K. himself is surveying a site or structure, he relies entirely on his own authority and refers to the structures themselves.⁴⁸

I.K.’s role, thus, was not limited to keeping and investigating an archive consisting of works on the history and topography of his neighborhood. Since he also engaged in fieldwork, observation, and comparison in the manner of an archeologist, his topography can be classified as a truly “early modern” work (with emphasis on both terms). I.K.’s work continues and preserves a medieval literary tradition and practice, namely, topography and abridgement, respectively. However, in as much as I.K. allows himself the authority to observe, compare, and pass judgment, he arrogates for himself the final word and thus emerges as an author in the modern sense of the term.

③ *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya fi al-mamālik wa al-mahāsin al-Shāmiyya*⁴⁹

Ignati Ulianovich Krachkovski, the historian of Arabic geography, characterized this remarkable work of six chapters as superior to the general geographical output of the period.⁵⁰ One of the more striking aspects of this composition is that it unusually provides a bibliography of approximately fifty “works cited” at the beginning of the

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

book, including works of history, geography, medicine, Quranic exegesis, language, horticulture, and even travelogues. The variety of topics in the list reflects the unusual content of I.K.'s creatively hybrid "topography," which, like his work on al-Şālihiyya, combines the methodology of compilation from older historical and geographical works with direct observation.

The title of the book, which includes three elements (namely, processions, Levantine provinces, and beauties) is accurately reflected in the content, albeit with unequal emphasis. In the section on "Levantine Provinces," which constitutes about 21% of the book, I.K. specifies the limits of the administrative divisions of all Levantine provinces, districts, and sub-districts. He enumerates the official positions attached to these divisions, lists the official processions, and mentions the participants and the procession routes. As a topographical work, therefore, *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya* acknowledges the political presence and administrative will of the Ottoman state, while simultaneously positing the Levant as a political unit.

Deliberately or not, I.K. commits what seems to be a *faux pas* by providing the delimitations of the Mamluk, not Ottoman, state as even the most basic provincial divisions do not correspond to Ottoman realities. Although I.K. attempts to offer an updated topography, his efforts are not geographical but temporal. Rather than providing the accurate Ottoman delimitations of the Levant, I.K. infuses the topography with events, not spaces, Ottoman.⁵¹ It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conjecture that I.K. had used one or more Mamluk texts as stencils for his topography as he had intentionally done in his topography of al-Şālihiyya.

The section on "processions," which makes up about a mere two percent of the composition, focuses on official processions, such as the "Pasha's Procession" and "the Qāḍī's Procession."⁵² Though treated rather concisely, the description of these rituals, in terms of participants and spaces traversed by the parades, is significant. Given the importance of processions as displays of power and establishment of order, I.K.'s exposition efficiently captures imperial signs of authority and their concurrent acceptance by the author. Thus, this section on the rituals of officialdom can be seen as, yet again, an attestation of Ottoman political presence. Gaffs and brevity notwithstanding, both sections discussed above have a strong political message in that they function as endorsements of Ottoman rule. This is especially important since the book under discussion was dedicated and presented to the highest-ranking Ottoman representative in the Levant, the governor of Damascus.

It is the "beauties" element of the book that constitutes the largest part of I.K.'s composition and consists of two interrelated parts. The first offers the customary topography of Damascus and focuses on the city's history and structure (the description and history of the main congregational mosque; the enumeration of its public buildings such as mosques, madrasas, hammams, Sufi lodges, and bazaars; and its natural resources such as rivers and creeks), while paying disproportionate attention to what may be regarded as the city's best-kept secrets, namely its gardens, orchards, parks,

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

and promenades. Indeed, compared to the first topography of the city by °Alī Abu al-Qāsim Ibn °Asākir (d. 571/1176), whose attention is overwhelmingly focused on religious structures and especially the Umayyad Mosque, I.K.'s account is devoted primarily to the city's natural diversions and pleasures. As such, this part of the book is in essence no longer a work of geography, but a guidebook to, and an advertisement of, picnic spots in the city.⁵³

In an effort to complement this topography of beauty and pleasure, I.K. supplements the geography with nothing less than an entire horticultural survey of the city's gifts: its trees, fruits, flowers, and vegetables. In this part, which occupies almost all of the second volume of the printed edition, I.K. enumerates the Damascene flora, describes its physical and medicinal attributes, cites relevant verses, and, only infrequently, offers rough angular visual illustrations.

By the time I.K. produced *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*, such a composition on the "beauties" of a city was not new. Damascus had already enjoyed an earlier treatment of the sort by Abū al-Baqā' °Abd Allāh al-Badrī (d. 902/1489), who, in his *Nuzhat al-anām fī mahāsin al-Shām*⁵⁴ depended heavily on Ibn °Asākir's predominantly religious topography to produce an overwhelmingly secular rendition. Including both a picnic guide and a horticultural survey, al-Badrī's work may have not only inaugurated a new genre of urban *mahāsin* but also facilitated a civic and secular discourse evincing the ownership of the city by its inhabitants.

Given this background, I.K.'s composition appears even bolder generically and politically. By combining political and religious processions, administrative boundaries and positions, historical anecdotes and updates, topography, religious virtues, and horticulture, I.K. produces a holistic unified Ottoman Levant that is legible politically, geographically, historically, and culturally.

By having composed a work which may have served the function of a manual or guide for the newcomer, and by offering this gift to Sulaymān Pasha, then, I.K. was harnessing his local and academic knowledge in the service of the new state representative. At the risk of reading too much politics into the history of the production of I.K.'s unique text, one could suggest that *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya* may be regarded as a sort of *Description de l'Egypte* of Napoleon's scientific team (published in Paris, 1809). Its production is intimately linked to the facilitation of governance, but a pre-modern one at that.

As a gift to the new governor in exchange for a teaching position by the author, *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya* is an act in politics *par excellence*. By utilizing his °ilm, his experience of and in Damascus, I.K. managed to be installed into the Ottoman judicial-academic institution and achieved the kind of notability he desired, even though some of his politicking towards that end took unusual routes, through the verdant promenades and gardens of his beloved Damascus.

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

BIBLIOGRAPHY

① *al-Ḥawādīṭ al-yawmiyya*

Manuscripts: (1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, 9479; 187 fol., 21 lines, naskh. (2) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, 9480; 189 fol., 21 lines, naskh. Autograph.

Editions: (1) *Yawmiyyāt Shāmiyya*. Ed. Akram Aḥmad al-°Ulabī (Damascus, 1994). The editor sadly omitted most of the poetry included in the manuscript.

② *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya*

Manuscripts: (1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, 9789; 79 fol., 36 lines, naskh. Autograph. (2) Dublin, Chester Beatty, Arabic Collection 3548 (Part 3 of 5 compositions by the same author); fol. 60-138, 23, naskh.

Editions: (1) I.K., *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya al-fasiḥa fī talkhīs al-Ṣāliḥiyya*. Ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Dahmān (Damascus, 1947). Based on a microfilm copy of a now lost manuscript, which the editor suspects is actually the Berlin manuscript. However, the editor of the next work, Ḥikmat Ismā°il who uses the same microfilm, which includes more than one work by I.K. concludes that the microfilm is of the Chester Beatty manuscript.

③ *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya*

Manuscripts: (1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, 6088 we-1116; fol. 64, 37-40 lines, naskh. Autograph. (2) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, 6088 we-1962; fol. 24, 21-27 lines, naskh. Autograph. (The editor of the printed edition believes that this is a clean but incomplete copy of the previous manuscript, which may have functioned as a rough draft. (3) Dublin, Chester Beatty, Arabic Collection 3548 (Part 4 of 5 compositions by the same author); fol. 140-230, 23, naskh.

Editions: (1) I.K., *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya fī al-mamālik wa al-maḥāsin al-Shāmiyya* (2 vols.). Ed. Ḥikmat Ismā°il (Damascus, 1992).

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad Khalīl b. °Alī al-Murādī. *Silk al-Durar fī a°yān al-qarn al-Ṭānī °Ashar*. 4 vols. (Cairo, n. d.), vol. 3, 84-86. Ignati Ulianovich Krachkovski. *Tārīkh al-adab al-jughrāfi al-°Arabī*. 2 vols. Trans. Salāḥaddīn °Uṭmān Hāshim (Cairo, 1963-1965), vol. 2, 756-757. John Voll. "The Madḥab of Ibn Kannān, The Damascene Historian." *al-Abḥāt*, vol. 24 (1971), 83-85. Madeline Zilfi. "Diary of a Müderris: A New Source for Ottoman Biography." *Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 1 (1977), 157-174. Sayyid °Alī °Alī Dāvūd. "Ibn-Kannān." *Dā'irat al-ma°ārif-e bozorg-e islāmī*, vol. 4 (1991), 527-528. Moshe Ma°oz. "Changes in the Position and the Role of the °Ulamā' in the 18th and 19th Century." *The Syrian Land in the 18th and 19th Century: The Common and the Specific in the Historical Experience*, ed.

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

Thomas Philipp (Stuttgart, 1992), 109-119. Stephen Tamari. *Teaching and Learning in 18th Century Damascus: Localism and Ottomanism in an Early Modern Arab Society*. Ph.D. Dissertation (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1998), 180-219. Osman Çetin. "Ibn Kennān." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 20 (1999), 129-130. Dana Sajdi. *Peripheral Visions: The Worlds and Worldviews of Ottoman Commoner Chroniclers in the 18th Century Levant* (New York, 2002), 90-112. Astrid Meier. "Perceptions of a New Era? Historical Writing in Early Ottoman Damascus." *Arabica*, vol. 51.4 (2004), 419-434. Muhannad Aḥmad Sālim. *Ahl al-qalam wa dawru-hum fī al-ḥayāh al-ṭaqāfiyya fī madīnat Dimashq, 1121/1708-1172/1758* (Damascus, 2005). Samer Akkach. "The Wine of Babel: Landscape, Gender and Poetry in Early Modern Damascus." *Literature and Aesthetics*, vol. 17.1 (2007), 107-124.

¹ Stephen Tamari, *Teaching and Learning in 18th Century Damascus: Localism and Ottomanism in an Early Modern Arab Society*, Ph.D. Dissertation (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1998); Muhannad Aḥmad Sālim, *Ahl al-qalam wa dawru-hum fī al-ḥayāh al-ṭaqāfiyya fī madīnat Dimashq, 1121/1708-1172/1758* (Damascus, 2005).

² Astrid Meier, "Perceptions of a New Era? Historical Writing in Early Ottoman Damascus," *Arabica*, vol. 51.4 (2004), 419-434.

³ Samer Akkach, "The Wine of Babel: Landscape, Gender and Poetry in Early Modern Damascus," *Literature and Aesthetics*, vol. 17.1 (2007), 107-124.

⁴ I.K., *al-Murūj al-sundusiyya al-fasiḥa fī talkhīṣ al-Ṣāliḥiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Dahmān (Damascus, 1947), 63. Henceforth *al-Murūj*.

⁵ I.K., *al-Murūj*, 62-63.

⁶ For a full treatment of I.K.'s life and evaluation of socio-economic status, see Dana Sajdi, *Peripheral Visions: The Worlds and Worldviews of Ottoman Levantine Chroniclers in the 18th Century Levant* (New York, 2002), 90-112.

⁷ I.K. himself puts it aptly by stating "if you encompass knowledge (*ʿilm*) and wealth, you will, by consensus, be the notable (*ʿayn*) of the age". See I.K., *Yawmiyyat shāmiyya*, ed. Akram Aḥmad al-ʿUlābī (Damascus, 1994), 19. Please note that the editor of the manuscript has changed the title from *al-Ḥawādīt al-yawmiyya* to *Yawmiyyat shāmiyya*. In order not to confuse the reader, I will refer to the printed edition also as *al-Ḥawādīt*.

⁸ al-Murādī, *Silk al-durar fī aʿyān al-qarn al-thānī ʿashar* (Cairo, n.d.), vol. 3, 84-85.

⁹ al-Murādī, *Silk al-durar*, vol. 3, 84.

¹⁰ In this context, the frustrated career of the famous historian Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī (d. 1008/1600) is seen as emblematic. See Cornell Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali, 1541-1600* (Princeton, 1985).

¹¹ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung 9480, 81a (henceforth MSS Berlin 9480); *al-Ḥawādīt*, 462-63. Please note that, unless otherwise indicated, the page numbers are based on the printed edition by Akram Aḥmad al-ʿUlābī.

¹² I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 196-7, 241, and 246.

¹³ "As for me, I busied myself with teaching at our house which is in the neighborhood of al-Amīr al-Muqaddam, and did not go the madrasa." See I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 282.

¹⁴ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 486.

¹⁵ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 505.

¹⁶ Cited by al-ʿUlābī, editor's introduction to I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, separately paginated, 28.

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

¹⁷ S. Tamari, *Teaching and Learning*, 127, Table 4.8.

¹⁸ On *madhhab*-switching, see Moshe Ma'oz, "Changes in the Position and the Role of the 'Ulamā' in the 18th and 19th Century," in *The Syrian Land in the 18th and 19th Century: The Common and the Specific in the Historical Experience*, ed. Thomas Philipp (Stuttgart, 1992), 110-111.

¹⁹ John Voll, "The Madhhab of Ibn Kannān, The Damascene Historian," *al-Abḥāt*, vol. 24 (1971), 83-85; S. Tamari, *Teaching and Learning*, 193, note 3.

²⁰ Editor's introduction to I.K. *al-Mawākib al-islāmiyya fī al-mamālik wa al-mahāsīn al-Shāmiyya*, ed. Hikmat Ismā'īl (Damascus, 1992), vol. 1, 163. This conclusive evidence renders obsolete the earlier argument of Muḥammad Dahmān (based on I.K.'s *nisba* as it occurs on the title page of the manuscript of *al-Mawākib*) and the rejection of Dahmān's argument by Voll (who has not seen the manuscript but is merely following the manuscript catalogue description of it). See Voll, "The Madhhab of Ibn Kannān," 84.

²¹ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 304-305.

²² I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, MSS Berlin 9480, 150a.

²³ "It is hoped that he [Sulaymān Pasha] might string us in the thread of his Sultanic proposals and mention to the High Porte a madrasa that had been assigned to us" ("wa al-marjū an yanzuma-nā fī silk ma'rūdātī-hi al-Sultāniyya wa yaḍkura madrasa kānat wujjihat la-nā ilā al-dawla al-'aliyya"). See *al-Mawākib*, vol. 1, 180.

²⁴ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, MSS Berlin 9480, 95b-96 (*al-Ḥawādīt*, 484). Folio 96a contains the conclusion of the panegyric for Sulaymān Pasha, which is largely omitted by al-'Ulabī in the printed edition (p. 78).

²⁵ In I.K.'s words: "[the Qādī] immediately sent after me. I obeyed and started teaching at my college, the Ḥanafī Khadījiyya-Murshidiyya in al-Šālihiyya." See I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 505.

²⁶ For the lists, see Osman Çetin, "Ibn Kennān," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 29 (1999), 129-130; Sayyid 'Alī 'Al Dāvūd, "Ibn-Kannān," *Dā'irat al-ma'ārif-e bozorg-e islāmī*, vol. 4 (1991), 527-528; and *al-Mawākib*, vol. 1, 148-152, respectively.

²⁷ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 271 and 387.

²⁸ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 40.

²⁹ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 371.

³⁰ *Daily Occurrences from Year 1111*. I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*.

³¹ The chronicle is so strictly and obsessively chronological that I.K. establishes the arrival of a month only each month. And when the month is "uneventful", I.K. states, "nothing worthy of recording happened in it" ("wa lam yaqa' bi-hi ma yu'arrakh"). I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 28.

³² I.K. uses the following formula: "And the Sultan of the *rūmī* [Turkish] *'arabī* [Arab] and some of the *'ajamī* [Persian] lands is ... the Grand Vizier [in Istanbul] is ... the Governor [of Damascus] is ... the *qādī* of Damascus is ... the *muftī* of Istanbul is ... the *muftī* of Damascus is ... the teachers [of Damascus] are ... and the Hajj commander [in Damascus] is ..." See I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 7.

³³ This ego-centrism, so to speak, seems to have become a trend in Ottoman literary culture as evidenced by, among other compositions, the Ottoman-Turkish memoir written by yet another teacher, Şidqī Muştafā (d. 1205/1791). See Madeline Zilfi, "Diary of a Müderris: A New Source for Ottoman Biography," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol. 1 (1977), 157-174.

³⁴ Too numerous to cite, here are a few examples: I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 23, 223, 237, 238, and 289.a

³⁵ For example, when I.K. ended a teaching cycle at his house, all of the Ḥanafī luminaries of the town, including the famous above-mentioned al-Nābulusī, ceremonially attended, as they would have done had he been teaching in a madrasa. I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 301-302.

³⁶ I.K., *al-Ḥawādīt*, 340.

³⁷ S. Akkach, "The Wine of Babel."

³⁸ Between 1136-1148/1723-1753, I.K. went on at least 41 picnics. His love for picnics earns him a section in the editor's introduction of *al-Mawākib* entitled "*wala'u-hu bi al-nuzhāt*" ("his passion for picnics"), 144.

HISTORIANS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

C. Kafadar H. Karateke C. Fleischer

³⁹ See I.K., *al-Hawādīt*, 442, 435, and 425.

⁴⁰ For example, “in the days of apples,” “in the days of the attack of the roses (*fī hujūm al-ward*),” “in the days of the apricots,” and “in the days of grapes and figs.” I.K., *al-Hawādīt*, 446, 643, 395, and 367, respectively.

⁴¹ See I.K., *al-Hawādīt*, 367, 371, 374, 375, and 383.

⁴² “The Silken Expansive Meadows Concerning the Abbreviation of the History of al-Šālihiyya.”

⁴³ For example, that of Yūsuf Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī (d. 909/1503).

⁴⁴ For example, Shamsaddīn Ibn Ṭūlūn’s (d. 953/1546) *al-Qalāʾid al-jawhariyya fī tāriḫ al-Šālihiyya* (*The Jeweled Necklaces with Regard to the History of al-Šālihiyya*), ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Dahmān (Damascus, 1949).

⁴⁵ I.K., *al-Murūj*, 2. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶ I.K., *al-Murūj*, 8.

⁴⁷ For example, the sections that are copied from Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī are composed of reports that are attached to chains of transmission (*isnād*).

⁴⁸ For example, in the discussion of a particular college, he quotes the brief description of a previous author, then proceeds to update the information: “I say: It is now a desolate place. Nothing is left of it except for the gate, which is made of stone and partly destroyed. On it is the image of the endowment deed: ‘this is the college of Dār al-ḥadīth built by Bint al-Naṣīḥ Ibn al-Ḥanbalī.’” See I.K., *al-Murūj*, 40.

⁴⁹ “The Islamic Processions in the Levantine Provinces and Beauties.”

⁵⁰ Ignati Ulianovich Krachkovski, *Tāriḫ al-adab al-jughrāfi al-ʿarabi*, trans. Salāḥaddīn ʿUthmān Hāshim (Cairo, n.d.), vol. 2, 756.

⁵¹ For example, I.K. mentions the sub-district of Karak and accurately describes the history of the town as a Crusader haven and headquarters, but adds an event of rebellion by its inhabitants in the Ottoman period and recounts its quelling through a nasty ruse by the Ottoman governor. I.K., *al-Mawākib*, vol. 2, 136-137.

⁵² I.K., *al-Mawākib*, vol. 2, 339-359.

⁵³ Consider the following passage: “al-Jabha: It is a square piece of land of about two *feddāns*, and has shelters for shade built among walnut and poplar trees and surrounded by streams of water on all four sides along with pools, ponds and fountains, [as] it is [located] by the Baradā river. It has waterwheels. It also has stands for the kebab sellers, cooks, and butchers, and for snack sellers, and ice cream and fruit vendors. It has a mosque and two colleges and a *khān*. There are also canteens for the service of the picnickers, which offer blankets, containers, pots and pans, mattresses and pillows for those who want to stay over night ...” I.K., *al-Mawākib*, 1:222-225.

⁵⁴ Abū al-Baqāʾ ʿAbd Allāh al-Badrī, *Nuzhat al-anām fī maḥāsīn al-Shām* (*The Picnic of Humankind in the Beauties of Damascus*) (Beirut, 1980). Curiously, the manuscript editor’s name is not mentioned, nor does the printed edition include the usual introduction.

Dana SAJDI
November 2009