Abstract  Ḥalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) was a famous author of the Mamlūk period. He was a renowned scholar, especially for his great literary culture and for his encyclopedic knowledge, chiefly of biographies. This article approaches him as a reader and focuses on the link between his readings and his scholarly production. The sources of information tackled here are three-fold. First, the ownership statements found on manuscripts title pages are tracked and analysed, put in relation to his contemporaneous writings and life events. Second, his reading journal (taḏkira) is investigated and its various roles are specified; its extent, original number of volumes, contents and uses are all discussed and the preserved manuscripts are also cited. Third, the manuscripts preserved in his hand, whether holographs or copies of other authors’ works, are investigated. Indeed, these are part of his inner library, even if some of them were offered to others.
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1 Introduction

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Albakī al-Ṣafadī (696-764/1297-1363) was a well-known author of the Mamlūk period. The Mamlūk sultanate between 648/1250 and 923/1517 stretched over the lands of Egypt, Syria, Palestine and the Hejaz. The head of the state – the sultan – was normally a manumitted slave of Central Asian origin (a mamlūk), bought in his childhood and brought to Egypt to be educated and raised as a future military man, just like the other mamlūks, forming the army of the state. The Mamlūk army was organised under the authority of the sultan and of various amīrs, whose power varied according to the number of mamlūks they owned.

The Mamlūk sultans succeeded the Ayyubids and established themselves as the major power in the region, and then in all the Arabo-Islamic world, by putting an end to the Crusades and to the Mongol invasions. A peaceful period thus began, allowing the arts to flourish. Literature and scholarship benefitted from the situation as well, and the Mamlūk period is now recognised for its great intellectual vivacity: the sum of knowledge reached an unequalled level, notably thanks to the great cultural exchanges among different parts of the Islamic world, the multiplication of places of knowledge, the encouraging patronage from wealthy personalities – sultans, amīrs, and the civilian elite – and the possibility to travel and to make books and ideas travel easily. To master this growing knowledge, scholars would arrange it in encyclopaedias, manuals, anthologies and dic-
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1 GAL G II 39-42, S II 27-9. Biographical data are found chiefly in the account given by his friend al-Ṣubkī, Ṭabaqāt, 10: 5-32 (no. 1352), but also in al-Ḏahabī, Muʿjam, 91-2 (no. 107); Ibn al-ʿImād, Ṣaḥarāt, 8: 343-4; Ibn ʿAṣqalānī, Durar, 2: 87-8; Ibn al-ʿIrāqī, Daṭīl, 2: 134-6; Ibn Kaṭīr, Biḍāya, 14: 303; Ibn Qāḍī Ṣuhba, Ṭabaqāt, 3: 120-1; Ibn Ṣaḥāwī, Waġi, 1: 135 (no. 258); for secondary sources, see Lāšīn 2005; Little 1976; Rosenthal in EI2; Rowson 2019; Van Ess 1976; Van Ess 1977, etc.

2 ‘Normally’ because a tendency to transmit the sultanic power to one’s son is observed at various stages of the Mamlūk history. “Mamlūk”, literally “thing possessed”, hence “slave”, see Ayalon in EI2.

3 This training consisted in a military instruction, but not only: a religious education was also provided, as well as literacy and law classes, that could be rather advanced depending on the personal skills of the young mamlūk and on the wealth of his master. See Flemming 1977; Franssen 2017; Mauder 2021.

4 Behrens-Abouseif 2008, 10-11, 16; Manstetten 2018.
tionaries: the period is defined as an age of encyclopaedism.\(^5\) Summaries, commentaries and abstracts from this knowledge were also written, a kind of a secondary literature that made the knowledge more accessible.

A great system of knowledge transmission was in full vigor. It is known thanks to the written sources (annals, histories, biographical dictionaries...) and it is reflected in a number of annotations found in manuscripts: licences of transmission (iǧāzāt), i.e. authorisations given by an author (or a master) to transmit and teach a certain text to others and to provide them with such a licence afterwards; certificates of audition (samāʿāt), i.e. attestations that such persons assisted the lessons of a certain master or author about a certain text; and collation notes (balāġāt or tablīġāt), attesting the comparison of the manuscript in presence with another one or several others, older and/or nearer from the author of the text, this comparison possibly done in community, by several scholars gathered together for a number of meetings.\(^6\) All of these notes are extremely useful for our understanding of knowledge construction in the Mamlûk period and allow us to discern social practices in the study and elaboration of scholarship and expertise, as we will see in some examples.

al-Ṣafadī was one of these authors and scholars. Very prolific, he composed numerous books, some of them counting tens of volumes. His curiosity and expertise were multi-faceted as illustrated by the different fields in which he was active. He was and still is particularly reputed for his biographical dictionaries, mainly the Wāfī bi-l-wafayāt (The Comprehensive Book of Obituaries)\(^7\) and the Aʿyān al-ʿaṣr wa-aʿwān al-naṣr (Notables of the Age and Supporters of Victory),\(^8\) which are still used by researchers today. He was also a famous littérature, both in prose and in poetry, as well as a theorician and practician. For instance, in his Ḥinān al-ġinās (Gardens of Paronomasia) – a monograph about a specific literary device, namely paronomasia (a type of pun, or play on words) – he used for the first time a book structure he favoured, which is in two parts: the first one is theoretical (etymology, definitions, classifications of the stylistic device under study); and the second practical: an anthology of verses, often his own, using the literary device previously expounded. This book structure was implemented to treat three other literary devic-

---

\(^{5}\) van Berkel 2013; Muhanna 2013; Muhanna 2018.


es: *tawriya*, *istiḥdām* (two forms of double-entendre)\(^9\) and *tašbīḥ* (simile; see §§ 3 and 4.2). He was also a renowned literary critic (see his *al-Ḡayṭ al-musaţğam fi šarḥ Lāmiyyat al-ʿaţām*, Copious Showers of Commentary on the ‘Poem Rhyming in -*l*’ of the Non-Arabs).\(^10\) His *Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf wa-taḥrīr al-taḥrīf* (Correction of Misspellings and Rectification of Mispronunciations)\(^11\) or *Maʿānī al-wāw* (The Various Meanings of the Particle *wa-*)\(^12\) are a linguist’s oeuvres. History, linguistics, literature, but also tradition and religious studies: his wide gamut of knowledge reflects what was expected from a gentleman (*adīb*) and even more from a chancery secretary.\(^13\)

He was born in Ṣafad, Palestine, in 696/1297, his father being a Mamlūk *amīr*.\(^14\) As the son of a Mamlūk, he is part of what was called then the *awlād al-nās*, and, as it would often be the case for Mamlūk offspring after him, he worked as a civil servant at different ranks of the Mamlūk chancery.\(^15\) He worked and lived in different towns, in the two capital cities, Cairo and Damascus, but also in Ṣafad, Aleppo, Hamah and al-Raḥbah. He held different positions, beginning from the lowest rank for chancery secretaries, *kātib al-darḡ* (‘secretary of the roll’, responsible for the writing of everyday documents) from 717/1317-18, in his hometown, Ṣafad, to the highest: *kātib al-sirr* (‘secretary of the secret’, head of the chancery), in Aleppo, in 759/1358, skipping over the intermediary position of *kātib al-dast* (literally ‘secretary of the rostrum’, responsible for the important documents).\(^16\) In 745/1345, he worked for the *diwān al-inšāʾ* (central chancery) at the Cairo Citadel, the sultan’s al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl (r. 743-6/1342-5) own chancery. At the end of his life, from 760/1358, he was *wakīl bayt al-māl* (agent of the Mamlūk treasury) in Damascus. Contrary to other great scholars of the Mamlūk period, like al-Maqrīzī, for instance,\(^17\) he never left the administration to dedicate himself to his scholarly activities and he was still in his post when he died from the plague on 10 Šawwāl 764/23 July 1363.

A great number of autograph and holograph manuscripts of his were preserved until today, a fact often interpreted as material evi-

---

\(^9\) Bonebakker 1966.
\(^11\) Ed. al-Šarqāwī 1987b.
\(^12\) Unpublished.
\(^13\) Dekkiche 2011, 255-60; Martel-Thoumian 1992, 133-6.
\(^14\) For the bibliography about his biography, see fn. 1.
\(^15\) On this specific category, see Haarmann 1988.
\(^16\) This appellation comes from the fact that, in the central chancery of Cairo, this secretary was on the rostrum next to the sultan at various occasions. On the organization of the Mamlūk chancery, see Dekkiche 2011, 263-9; Martel-Thoumian 1992, 40-7.
\(^17\) See Bauden 2020, 144.
idence of the excellent reputation he and his work enjoyed during his lifetime, and until now (see §§ 4.1 and 4.2).  

In order to envisage al-Ṣafadī as a reader, different sources of information are available. First, the documentary evidence: notes he left on manuscripts because he owned them (ownership marks) or borrowed them. These are the subject of the first part of this article, together with consultation notes and note-taking attestation that were left by al-Ṣafadī in the manuscripts he used, perused, and read. All of these are paratextual elements; that is, small textual units unrelated to the main text of the manuscript but featured on its pages. The paratextual elements are a wealth of knowledge for the historian of the book, the historian of ideas, or the biographer, among others. Sometimes, they are dated and bear a direct or indirect indication of place, still improving their documentary value.

Another great source of information about al-Ṣafadī’s readings is his reading journal, his taḏkira. This document is the object of the second part of this contribution. The raison d’être of the taḏkira, its chronology, use, look and extent will all be discussed. Special attention will be given to the holograph fragments or volumes of the taḏkira that were preserved until today, two of them having been identified only recently.

Third, the manuscripts copied by al-Ṣafadī will be considered as well. Indeed, if these were not always his property, they were first owned by him, and in any case, they are part of his inner library, since he cautiously copied their text. The reasons for such copied works are varied – and not always known – but what we see of the care he took in doing them is always tremendous. Already in his early twenties, al-Ṣafadī showed a great concern for the exactitude of the text he copied. This concern had to do with his own copying, but also with the exemplar chosen to be reproduced. He took great care to respect the manuscript copied, re-read his work to make sure he did not commit errors or sauts du même au même. Even more, his concern was merely philological since he was looking for the best source to be copied or to collate his text with. This “best source” was a holograph, when

---


19 The term “paratexte” was coined by Gérard Genette. See Genette 1982, among others.

20 Happily, these paratextual elements are more and more used by scholars and several ongoing projects aim at gathering them, see ELEO (Ex-Libris ex Oriente) project in ULiège (http://web.philo.ulg.ac.be/islamo/ex-libris-ex-oriente/), the Refaiya project in Leipzig University (https://www.refaiya.uni-leipzig.de/content/index.xml) or the efforts of Berlin State Library to mention them in their online catalogue (http://orient-digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/content/index.xml). A double special issue of the *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* was devoted to them and gathered 12 studies about them, see Liebrenz 2018a. See also below fn. 24.
available, an authorial manuscript (checked by the author of the text) or an apograph, a direct copy of a holograph.\footnote{For terminology, see Bauden, Franssen 2020, 2-37, spec. 3, 20.}

For the same reason – the fact that his works are part of his inner library – holograph manuscripts of al-Ṣafadī’s that were preserved until today will be mentioned. On the contrary, even if they also reflect his readings, the licences of transmission and audition certificates mentioning his name or issued by him will not be systematically treated here.

2 **Documentary Evidence: The Paratextual Elements in Manuscripts**

Bibliophiles often leave a trace of their property in their books. It can be a seal impression, an ornate ex-libris, like the one of the late Seeger A. Bonebakker [fig. 1] in the twentieth century,\footnote{Seeger A. Bonebakker (1923-2005) was a Dutch orientalist who worked mainly for the University of California in Los Angeles. He had a special relation with Venice and the Ca’ Foscari University and bequeathed all his library (worth 70,000 €, as estimated in 2006, counting almost 8,000 books, 200 microfilms of manuscripts and thousands of printed articles), as well as nearly 230,000 € to finance the cataloguing of the collection and doctoral and post-doctoral projects about Arabic literature. See Franssen 2019.} or a few words scribbled on one of the first pages of a manuscript; the Italian humanist scholar and poet Poliziano (d. 1494), for instance, used to write this simple note: “Angeli Politiani et amicorum” at the beginning of his books, a way to testify to his intellectual history and to the intellectual milieu he was in.\footnote{Grafton 2001, 259-60.}

Similarly, the first pages of Arabic manuscripts are often filled with short notes by different hands, traced at different moments of the history of the book. Some of them are just a name jotted down on one corner of the page, but others contain additional details, like the date, place and price of purchase or the name of the lender and an expression of gratitude to him. Others are a bit more ornate, with the name of the owner written in a beautiful way. Others have been circled by a later bibliophile in order to draw attention to them and their value. Some are property marks, others are consultation statements. Whatever they look like, these marks and their context actually provide a great deal of information about a range of themes: at an individual level, about the readings of the person in presence, and, when the mark is dated, about the moment of this reading, thus more broadly, about the biography of the person and his intellectual history, or his methodology, about the peculiar handwriting of the person; at a collective level, about the history of the book, including...
the circulation of books and ideas (what was read where and when),
about the extent and status of libraries, either private or public; and
many other details particular to each case.\textsuperscript{24}

When the person who left the mark is a well-known scholar, these
pieces of information are even more valuable. In the case of al-Ṣafadī,
we are lucky enough, in the current state of research, to have fifteen
marks of different kinds.

\subsection*{2.1 Ex-libris and Consultation Marks}

al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris and consultation marks currently identified can
be classified in three different groups. First, we will concentrate on
simple marks, which merely attest to his ownership, and of which nine
were found. Second, we will mention one mark featuring supplen-
tary information about the author of the text of the manuscript. Third,
consultation marks will be discussed; these five marks are also in-
structive in terms of working methodology, since they always spec-
ify the fact that notes were taken from these readings. We will also

\textsuperscript{24} On the historical value of these notes, see Görke, Hirschler 2012. Studies taking
into account these paratexts are happily more and more numerous, see for instance
and in addition to the references cited in fn. 20: Daaïf, Sironval 2013; Krimsti 2018;
Liebrenz 2018b; Zouache 2018 etc. See also Bauden in this volume.
mention al-Ṣafadī’s son’s ownership marks, written on manuscripts inherited from his father’s library and of which there are four.

2.1.1 Simple Ex-libris

Simple ex-libris marks are short marks, just a few words, always written parallel to the spine, usually from the bottom up saying Min kutub Ḫalīl b. Aybak [al-Ṣafadī] (‘from among the books of Ḫalīl b. Aybak [al-Ṣafadī]’). This inscription generally occupies two or three lines, the first featuring solely min kutub, the final bā’ being elongated so that these two short words occupy the same space as his name.

This is the case in the manuscript of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (henceforth BnF) Arabe 2061 (see fig. 2). This manuscript is a copy of the Tali kitāb wafayāt al-aʿyān, the continuation of Ibn Ḫallikān’s Kitāb wafayāt al-aʿyān, by al-Muwaffaq Faḍl Allāh Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Aḥmad b. Tāḡ al-Dīn b. Abī al-Faḥr Ibn al-Ṣuqāʿī (d. 726/1325), more precisely the obituaries for the years 660/1262-725/1325. We know that Ibn al-Ṣuqāʿī served as a secretary in different dīwāns related to crimes of fraud in the Mamlūk administration. He had thus access to sensitive information that other biographers did not know about. Jacqueline Sublet adds that his integration in the Damascene intelligentsia granted him of witty and unheard anecdotes and stories about his peers of the administration. It is no wonder at all that such a text was part of al-Ṣafadī’s library: it is often cited in the Wāfī and must have been one his main sources for the obituaries of those years.

As ex-libris, al-Ṣafadī simply wrote Min kutub Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī on the title page, parallel to the spine and facing upward, in two short lines [fig. 3]. We also know that al-Ṣafadī had a personal copy of Ibn Ḫallikān’s opus (see § 4.1).

---

25 His nisba “al-Ṣafadī” is not always mentioned and there is no apparent logic explaining its presence or absence.

26 The ex-libris is cited in the catalogue: Mac Guckin de Slane 1883-95, 367. The MS is freely available online: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11001646v.image.


28 al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 4: 459 (no. 1586); al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 3: 139 (no. 1082); GAL G I 328; ed. Sublet 1973.

29 Sublet 1973, XVIII-XXVIII.

30 Sometimes verbatim, see Sublet 1973, XII, 183 fn. 253 et passim. See also van Ess 1976, 256-7.
Another example of such simple ex-libris is found on the title page of a manuscript kept in the Turkish Islamic Arts Museum in Istanbul (Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, henceforth TIEM), under the shelf mark 2014T. In this case, it is a text of *adab* by al-Ǧāḥiz (d. 255/868-9), “the father of *adab*”, the famous *littérateur* of the ʿAbbāsid period, described as a “bibliophile and sometimes bibliomaniac”. This short epistle is entitled *Risāla fī madḥ al-kutub wa al-ḥathṭ ʿalā ḡamʿi-hā* (see the title page, fig. 4), hence an epistle about bibliophilia, but one should not trust this title: the text is actually a portion of the *Kitāb al-ḥawayān* by the same author. I did not have the chance to consult this manuscript, but Frédéric Bauden procured a copy of its microfilm for me and it seems to be an exceptional manuscript. The twenty-six folios display a very regular and large handwriting, in only five lines per page, a masterful example of calligraphic *ṯuluṭ*. The colophon is

---

31 GAL G1 158-160, S1 239-247; Pellat 1956; Montgomery 2013; 2018; Ghersetti 1994.
32 “al-Ǧāḥiz, la cui passione di bibliofilo, e talvolta di bibliomane, traspare da ogni riga” (Ghersetti 1994, 67 et passim).
33 More precisely, an abbreviated form of a passage of the first volume of 1947 edition (by ʿAbd al-Salām b. Hārūn), from p. 50, as already shown by Rice 1955, 27. Note that the shelf mark given by Rice is TIEM 1024, but he is describing the manuscript we now know under the shelfmark TIEM 2014T.
34 About *ṯuluṭ*, see Gacek 2009, 274-5; Blair 2006, XXIII, 167.
signed “Alī b. Hilāl”, a fact that lets us suppose the manuscript was penned by the great calligrapher Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 255/868-9), one of the two eminent calligraphers who have developed the five calligraphic styles still in use today. Nevertheless, D.S. Rice has convincingly shown it was a forgery: “The paper, ink, and script indicate that the manuscript is probably a Mamlûk forgery attributable to the fourteenth century.”

The ex-libris stands in two lines [fig. 5], in this case with the nisba (“al-Ṣafadī”). A bit further, indications of place and date are added: bi-Dimašq al-mahrûsa sana 761 (‘in Damascus the safeguarded, year 761/1359-60’). Had al-Ṣafadī been fooled by the forger? I could not answer, but since the manuscript is written on “thick salmon-coloured paper,” a paper often used by al-Ṣafadī for his own holographs (see below §§ 3 and 4.2), one may wonder if he had not recognised it as a common commodity...

35 On Ibn al-Bawwāb, see Sourdel-Thomine in EI2; Rice 1955, 5-9; Blair 2006, 160-73 et passim. al-Šanṭī 2007 develops the idea that this MS was actually penned by Ibn al-Bawwāb.
36 Rice 1955, 27.
37 Rice 1955, 27.
An interesting thing to add is the fact that the ownership marks have all been circled. Besides this, a new page has been pasted down on the title page and cut so that the ownership marks, the title and the author name are nevertheless visible. As it is often the case, the title page of the manuscript was probably very damaged, and a careful bibliophile must have wanted to restore his acquisition. Actually, we know this book collector is Abū Bakr b. Rustam al-Širwānī (d. 1135/1722-23): his ex-libris is the only one that was directly written on the new f. 1 (in the upper right corner). He gathered an impressive library and seems to have had a habit of circling the previous ex-libris of his books, especially those by famous scholars or characters.\(^{38}\)

al-Šafādī was fond of adab, of works with a literary character, and, as we will demonstrate, he was fond of books so it is no wonder that such a book was part of his library: the theme it claims to cover, its conscientious calligraphy, and the name of its author are all reasons to covet such a book, even if it is not as old as the calligrapher’s name in the colophon makes us think.

Two other examples of simple ownership statement are found in two manuscripts of the Fazīlāhmed Pasha collection of the Köprülü Library: 1518 and 1519, the two volumes of the Kitāb al-afʿāl, by Abū ‘Uṯmān Saʿīd b. Muḥammad al-Maʿāfirī al-Qurṭubī ṭumma al-Saraqusṭī, also known as Ibn al-Haddād (d. after 400/1010) [figs 6, 8].\(^{39}\) The date and place of each ex-libris are noted a bit farther down: bi-Dimašq al-mahrūsa sana 758 (‘in Damascus the safeguarded, in the year 758/1356-57’) [figs 7, 9].

According to the colophon, the manuscript was copied in Damascus in 670/1271-72, by a certain Yaḥyā al-Muṭarriz al-Ḥanafi.\(^{40}\) The book in question is about linguistic matters (more precisely verb morphology), one of al-Šafādī’s numerous interests. It is striking that three of his works about lexicography, namely the Ġawāmid al-Ṣiḥāḥ (Problems in [the Lexicon Titled] ‘The Sound’),\(^{41}\) the Nufūḏ al-sahm fī mā waqaʿa li-l-Ǧawharī min al-wahm (The Penetrating Arrow, on the Errors of al-Ǧawhari [in his Lexicon Titled ‘The Sound’])\(^{42}\) and the Ḥālī al-nawāhid ʿalā mā fī al-Ṣiḥāḥ min al-Šawāhid (The Adornment of the Full-Breasted, on the Poetic Citations in [the Lexicon Titled ‘The Sound’])\(^{43}\) were written in this same year.\(^{44}\) For the first two,

---

38 On al-Širwānī, see Fuʿād Sayyid 2003, 19-24 (who cites this particular ms); Richard 1999; Bonmariage 2016.
40 Ms Fazīlāhmed Pasha 1518, f. 245.
42 Ed. ʿĀyiš 2006.
43 Unpublished.
44 Rowson 2009, 339.

we know that al-Ṣafadī had finished his drafts in Ǧumādā I 757/May 1356\textsuperscript{45} and 21 Ramadān 757/17 September 1356, respectively. \textsuperscript{46} We have here one of his reference books for the composition of the different works about linguistic and phonologic correctness he wrote during that period.\textsuperscript{47}

In a manuscript now in Bursa, in the İnebey Yazma Eser Kutuphanesi, under the shelf mark Hüseyin Celebi 764, one reads Min kutub | Ḥalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī, on f. 2a (the title page), parallel to the spine, in the inner margin [figs 10-11]. The book is a copy of al-Rawḍ al-unuf fī šarḥ al-sīra al-nabawīyya li-Ibn Hišām, by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185).\textsuperscript{48} The author is from al-Andalus, where he studied with the traditionalist Abū Bakr Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 543/1148),\textsuperscript{49} a specialist in religious studies, among others. The book in question is a commentary on a biography of the Prophet Muḥammad (sīra), mainly on the biography originally written by Ibn Hišām (d. 218/833 or 213/828). Ibn Hišām’s sīra relies on the lost text of Ibn Isḥāq (d. ca. 150/767),\textsuperscript{50} son of a ḥadīṯ transmitter and grandson of a contemporary of the Prophet.

The manuscript is an apograph: it was collated with a manuscript that had been read aloud and checked by the author. It was copied on 10 Šawwāl 607/27 March 1211, in Jerusalem (al-Bayt al-maqdis), by Ḥusayn b. Faḍl b. Ḥalaf al-Maqdisī. A contemporary and acquaintance of al-Ṣafadī, Muġulṭāy b. Qilīǧ (d. 762/1361), had written a critical commentary of al-Suhaylī’s biography of the Prophet,\textsuperscript{51} a subject that was in vogue during the Mamlūk period. The Prophet’s birthday, the mawlid al-nabī, was celebrated more and more widely, and Muḥammad’s biography was recited for the occasion. al-Ṣafadī composed such a text to celebrate the Prophet’s birthday, entitled al-Faḍl al-munīf fī al-mawlid al-šarīf (The Overwhelming Merit of the Noble Birthday), and hence we have here, with this manuscript, one his sources.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{45} Note that a fair copy, dedicated to the head of the chancery, was realised the same year by al-Ṣafadī as well. al-Ṣafadī, Gawāmiḍ, 35-6.

\textsuperscript{46} According to the colophons of the two scribal copies realised on the basis of the draft of the first volume, which is lost. al-Ṣafadī, Nufūḏ, 25-6.

\textsuperscript{47} The Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf wa taḥrīr al-taḥrīf was finished only a couple of years later, if we trust the date of the iǧāza: 759/1358. See § 4.2 and al-Ṣafadī, Taṣḥīḥ, 34.


\textsuperscript{49} Robson in \textit{EF}; GAL G I 525, S I 632-3, 732-3.


\textsuperscript{51} Entitled al-Zahr al-bāsim fī sīrat Abī al-Qāsim, see GAL G II 48, S II 47-8 and Hamdan in \textit{EF}: The two men knew each other and exchanged letters, see al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 2: 321 (no. 99); al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 5: 433-8 (no. 1865); al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 26: 145 (no. 109).

\textsuperscript{52} Franssen, forthcoming; al-Ṣafadī’s Faḍl al-munīf was edited by ‘Āyiš 2007. About the mawlid, see Katz 2007, and for the mawlid texts from Mamlūk Damascus, partic. 54-61, 216.
Another simple ex-libris is found on the title page of MS Raḡīp Pa-
sha 1078 [fig. 12]. This manuscript is a copy of the Taḥrīr al-tahbīr fī ṣināʿat al-šiʿr wa-l-naṭr wa-bayān iḡāz al-Qurʾān53 (The Composition of the Writing in the Art of Poetry, Prose and Exposition of the Im-
itability of the Qurʾān), by Zakī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm b. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid, commonly called Ibn Abī al-Iṣbaʿ (d. 654/1256).54 As the title implies, it is a work of stylistics. This manuscript was commissioned for the library of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, as attested by the cartouche with the ornate chrysography visible on the title page.55 The Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī family counted several important chancery secretaries of the Mamlūk period.56 This manuscript was commissioned for Muḥyī al-Dīn Yahyā, head of the chancery (kātib al-sirr) successively in Da-
mascus and Cairo. According to the mark, al-Ṣafadī acquired the manuscript in 738/1337-8, the year of Muḥyī al-Dīn Yahyā’s death. The

53 Ed. Ḥifnī 1963.
54 Harb in EI’.
55 We will discuss further this particular MS a bit later (see § 4.1), as well as anoth-
er manuscript commissioned for the same library.
56 Salibi in EI’ (1).
ownership mark is simple, written parallel to the spine; it says only Min kutub | Ḫalīl b. Aybak ‘afā Allāh ‘an-hu | sana 738 (‘from among the books of Ḫalīl b. Aybak, may God forgive him, year 738’) [fig. 13]. Other ownership statements are visible on the same page, four of them written beneath al-Ṣafadī’s and in the same direction. Another ownership mark is written in the opposite part of the page from al-Ṣafadī’s; it is in the name of Aḥmad b. Yāḥyā b. Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī al-ʿAdawī al-Qurašī, the son of the first owner of the manuscript. At the time of his father’s death, this Aḥmad was in prison for having displeased the sultan al-Naṣir Muḥammad, and this is probably why al-Ṣafadī was able to acquire the manuscript. All of the five ownership marks written in the lower part of the page have been circled in red, probably by al-Širwānī (see fn. 38), whose ownership statement is in the superior margin, next to the spine. A short taqrīz (blurb) was added inside the spine and seems to be in al-Ṣafadī’s hand.

In addition to manuscripts, albums of paleography can also be a source for the discovery of paratextual elements. It is the case with al-Munajjed’s, since several ownership marks cited above are dis-

57 Salibi in EI² (2).
played on its pages. On plate 66, we see another example of al-Šafadī’s simple ex-libris, undated [fig. 14]. The plate shows the title page of a poetic anthology by Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. al-Muṭahhar al-ʿAdawī al-Šimšāṭī (third/ninth c.), the Kitāb al-anwār wa-maḥāsin al-ašʿār, a manuscript that was dedicated to the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Muʿtaṣim bi-Llāh (d. 227/842). The manuscript is preserved in Topkapi palace (henceforth TKS) under the shelf mark Ahmet III 2392. al-Šafadī was extremely fond of poetry and this manuscript is old and prestigious; he must have been happy and proud to have it in his collection.

Sometimes, the catalogues of manuscripts do specifically mention the paratextual elements. This is the case, although not systematically, of Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭāʾiq al-Miṣrīyya’s (henceforth DK). For instance, under the entry about al-Kāšif ʿan riǧāl al-kutub al-sit-ta, by Šams al-Dīn al-Ḍahabī (d. 748/1348), one finds the mention of al-Šafadī’s ownership statement dated 763/1361-62. I did not have

59 On al-Šimšāṭī, see Heinrichs in EF².
60 Fihrist al-maḥṭūṭāt 1956, 278, MS 17 mīm. On al-Ḍahabī, see GAL G II 46-8, S II 45-7; Ben Cheneb, Somogyi in EF². See also Romanov’s works on the computational treatment of the information taken from al-Ḍahabī’s Taʿrīḫ, for instance Romanov 2017.
the chance to consult the manuscript, or to have access to it digitally, but one may think it is an alternative title for al-Ḍahabi’s *al-Kašif fī ma’rifat man la-hu riwāya fī al-kutub al-sitta*. In any case, the book must be a biographical dictionary of the transmitters (*riǧāl*) of the six most important *ḥadīṯ* collections. Hence, this is the first book on religious sciences that we have found in what remains from al-Ṣafadī’s library, and an important source for his redaction of biographies.

2.1.2 Simple Ex-Libris with Details About the Author of the Text

The second category deals with more detailed ex-libris. In a *maǧmū‘* preserved in the Ayasofya collection under the shelf mark 3711, one finds, from what is now f. 64, a *risāla* supposedly by Ibn al-Bayṭār. Ibn al-Bayṭār (d. 646/1248) is an Andalusian author originally from Málaga who studied botany in Seville and then left the Iberian Peninsula to carry out a study trip to the East, ending up as chief herbalist for the Ayyubid Sultan al-Malik al-Kāmil. His *opus major* is the *Ǧāmiʿ li-l-mufradāt al-adwiya wa-l-aġḏiya*, a dictionary of natural history, where he synthesised the knowledge of his time about plants, vegetables, animals and minerals. He is also known for his commentary on Dioscorides, listing drugs and medicines in various languages (Arabic, Latin, Berber).

In the manuscript Ayasofya 3711, no title was written on the title page – we can only read paratextual elements by several owners and readers – but the beginning of the text, f. 64b, says in red that this is the *Risālat Hunayn b. Ishāq al-mutaṭabbib fī al-awzān wa-l-akyāl* (Ḥunayn b. Ishāq’s Epistle on the Weights and Measures of Capacity) [*figs 15-16*]. Ḥunayn b. Ishāq (d. 260/873) was an outstanding translator of the ʿAbbāsid period, specialised in Greek scientific literature. It is mostly thanks to him that Galen’s and Hippocrates’ works were transmitted to the Arab and then to the Latin worlds. He used to work as a genuine philologist, gathering as many manuscripts as possible and collating them in order to translate a faithful text. He was also an author and various texts of his are preserved, on subjects as varied as linguistics, philosophy, anecdotes attributed to Greek philos-

---

61 Ed. ‘Atiyya, al-Mawṣī 1972. His *Riǧāl al-kutub al-sitta*, cited in GAL G II 48, with a MS in Patna, in the Khuda Bakhsh oriental public library, may well be the same work with another alternative title.

62 See Juynboll, Hendrik in *EF*; Robson in *EF*.

63 al-Ṣafadī cites abundantly al-Ḍahabi *opus magnum*, the *Taʿrīḥ al-İslām*, in the *Wāfī*, as shown by van Ess 1976, 260-1.

64 GAL G I 492, S I 896; Vernet in *EF*.

65 GAL G I 205-7, S I 366-9; Strohmaier in *EF*; Bergsträsser 1966a; 1966b; Sezgin 1999.
ophers, meteorology or religious subjects (he was a Christian Nestorian). Nevertheless, I have not found any trace of such an epistle.

The annotations we can read on what should have been the title page are interesting in various respects. Next to the simple ownership mark of al-Ṣafadī, of the same kind as those we have already seen, several other marks insist that the following pages are in Ibn al-Bayṭār’s own handwriting. For instance, the following inscription occupies the place normally intended for the title of the book:

\[
\]

These quires are in the hand of our šayḥ the wise man, the eminent Diyā’ al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh the herbalist from Málaga, may God sanctify his spirit and illuminate his grave. Ibn Suwaydī the doctor wrote this lauding [God] and praying [saying the taṣliya].

---

\[Figure 15-16\] Hunayn b. Ishāq, *Risāla fī al-awzān wa-l-akyāl*. Handwritten by Ibn al-Bayṭār, with a commentary by Quṣṭā b. Luqā al-Baʿlabakkī. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, MS Ayasofya 3711, f. 64 and detail (courtesy Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi)
Is that truly a manuscript in the hand of Ibn al-Baytār? Without another sample of his handwriting it is difficult to assert this with a good degree of certainty. Nevertheless, Ibn al-Baytār was born and raised in al-Andalus and we know that the Arabic handwriting in use in the Western parts of the Islamic world is different from the one used in the East. In this text, various features of what we call maġribī script are effectively visible, the most straightforward being the dot under the fāʾ (instead of above) and the single dot above the qāf (instead of the double dot); the small tail crossing the written line in the alif's is another clear feature. One could add the description of the dāl, forming an angle of broadly 45 degrees, with its upper part curved, or the kāf, which is smaller than usual and presents, in its mabsūṭa form, a vertical upper part. Such features are an argument in favour of the identification of the hand.

Another commentator, a certain ʿUṯmān b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān..., indicated that this is a risālā by al-Baʿlabakkī, that is Qustā b. Lūqā al-Baʿlabakkī, another outstanding translator of the ʿAbbāsid period (see the upper outer corner of the same f. 64). al-Ṣafadī seems convinced of the hand identification: next to the inscription that occupies the title place, he added three lines of text, in diagonal in the outer margin [fig. 16]:

Qultu huwa Ibn al-Baytār | šāhib Kitāb al-mufradāt al-mašhūr | wa-kataba Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī

I said: he [i.e. the person mentioned in the previous inscription] is Ibn al-Baytār, the author of the well-known book about the simples.

If al-Ṣafadī is right, we have here a working document penned and used by an outstanding scholar of the Ayyūbid period, owned and used by another outstanding scholar, of the Mamlūk period. al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris is, as always, written parallel to the spine, in the inner margin, and includes his nisba: Min kutub | Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (‘from among the books of Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī’). A bit farther, he wrote bi-Dimašq | sana | 763 (‘in Damascus, 763/1361-62’).

The reason why such a book was part of al-Ṣafadī’s library may be linked to his last position as Damascus wakīl bayt al-māl (from

---

66 On the identification of handwritings, see Bauden, Franssen 2020; more specifically Franssen 2020.
67 On maġribī script features, see Déroche 1994; Houdas 1886; van den Boogert 1989; on the andalusī more precisely, see Gacek 2009, 8-9; Bongianino 2017a; Bongianino 2017b and his bibliography.
68 About the kāf mabsūṭa, see Gacek 2009, 318-19.
69 Hill in EF; GAL G I 204-5.
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2.1.3 Consultation Marks with Note-taking Attestation

Consultation marks with note-taking attestations are another type of personal marks. These are a bit longer and more informative than the simple ex-libris. For instance, on the title pages of four manuscripts of the Fazilahmed Pasha collection, shelf marks 1161 to 1164, there are two lines in the hand of Ṣafadī, explaining that he “finished or consulted [the book] and what was before it, selecting and choosing the best parts of it”. These manuscripts are four volumes of the geographical dictionary Kitāb Muʿğam al-buldān by Yāqūt al-Rūmī al-Ḥamawī (d. 626/1229), the reference work at that time in geography and toponymy, which also includes biographies of prominent figures of the places cited, as well as poetry and literary subjects.

Yāqūt al-Rūmī, the author, was born into a Byzantine family and sold as a slave. His master was a merchant, who provided him with an outstanding education and took him along during his numerous travels. Yāqūt took advantage of these travels to visit libraries and to meet local scholars and study with them. After a disagreement, the merchant manumitted Yāqūt, who decided to earn his life as a warrāq, copyist and bookseller, and went on travelling extensively and composing his various books.

The manuscripts preserved are volumes two to five. The marks are, as usual with the ex-libris, written alongside the spine, from bottom to top, in two lines, and the wording is very similar though never exactly the same:

---

70 On this position, see Martel-Thoumian 1992, 62.
72 I.e. the first volume of the work, which apparently has not been preserved.
73 Gilliot in EF²; GAL G I 479-81, S I 880. Ed. Wüstenfeld 1866-73.
Ḫalil b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī studied it [i.e. this book] and what stands before it, selecting [best passages], lauding [God] and praying [the Prophet].

Ḫalil b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī finished it [i.e. this book] and what stands before it, studying it and selecting [best passages], lauding [God] and praying [the Prophet].
Halil b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī finished it [i.e. this book] and what stands before it, choosing and selecting [best passages], lauding [God] and praying [the Prophet].

This book was extremely useful to al-Ṣafadī as a source of first-hand information for his greatest biographical dictionary, the *Wāfī*, and is abundantly cited in different biographies. The considerations on literature must have particularly pleased him.

The next mark is featured on the title page of another manuscript in a Western handwriting: Ibn al-Bayṭār’s was not the only *mağribî* hand in al-Ṣafadī’s library. As attested by two volumes now preserved respectively in the DK under the shelf mark *ta’riḥ mim* 103, and in the Ma’had Balaṣfūra al-dīnī, near Sūhāǧ (no shelf mark number), at least another *andalusî* hand was represented. These manuscripts are volumes four and six of ʿAlī b. Mūsā b. Saʿīd al-Andalusī (or al-Maḡribī)’s (d. 685/1286) *Kitāb al-Muḵrib fī ḥulā al-Maḡrib*.    

---

**Figure 20**

al-Ṣafadī’s consultation mark in Yāqūt. *Kitāb Mu‘ǧam al-buldān*. Köprülü Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS Fazilahmed Pasha 1163, f. 1a, detail (courtesy Köprülü Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi)

**Figure 21**

al-Ṣafadī’s consultation mark in Yāqūt. *Kitāb Mu‘ǧam al-buldān*. Köprülü Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS Fazilahmed Pasha 1164, f. 1a, detail (courtesy Köprülü Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi)

---

74 van Ess 1976, 96.
ally, the book is the result of the work of four generations: this description of events in al-Andalus since the time of its conquest was begun by an acquaintance of ʿAlī b. Mūsā’s great-grandfather, Abū Muhammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥiḡārī (d. after 530/1135), and was continued by different ancestors of Ibn Saʿīd al-Andalusī or al-Maḡribī (grandfather, granduncle, and father). The book’s fame preceded the arrival of its last author in the East, so that when Ibn Saʿīd al-Andalusī arrived in Cairo on his way to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca, he was already well-known. According to the colophons of the remaining volumes, the holograph was finished in 657/1250 in Cairo. Volumes four and six are not the only ones preserved, but they are the only ones to show al-Ṣafadī’s handwriting. On the title page of volume four [fig. 22], one can read an inscription in his hand, for once written horizontally, perpendicular to the spine, which is the usual way, but which is also contrary to al-Ṣafadī’s habit, as we have seen. It says [fig. 23]:

\[
\text{Tāla’a-hu wa intaqā min-hu māliku-hu | Ḫalīl b. Aybak b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣafadī ʿafā Allāh ʿan-hu.}
\]

Its owner, Ḫalīl b. Aybak b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣafadī, may God forgive him, consulted it and selected [passages] from it.

Again, other inscriptions are displayed on this same page, among others a consultation mark by al-Maqrīzī, located in the upper left corner of the page, dated 803/1400-1 (see chap. 6, Bauden’s contribution in this volume). Like in the case of the pseudo-Ibn al-Bawwāb’s manuscript, with the text by al-Ǧāḥiẓ, some ownership and consultation marks have been circled. Only two marks, both consultation marks, were highlighted this way: al-Šafadī’s and the one just beneath it, by another Ḥalīl, Ḥalīl b. ʿUmar b. Muḥtāǧ al-Ašʿarī. His handwriting is similar to al-Šafadī’s: a very regular and professional handwriting, very respectful of the calligraphic standards and thus close to the theoretical nasḫ,76 influenced by tawqīʿ, a chancery script characterised by a “liberal use of hairlines” (see the ligature between the tāʾ and the alif).77 Two sound differences immediately visible reside in the final loops, more ample and less regular in al-Ašʿarī’s hand, and in the blanks between the words, much more reduced in al-Šafadī’s handwriting. Such handwritings are tricky: they are so impersonal that they can be difficult to identify.78 Nevertheless, a precise analysis of the combination of their peculiar features, on the basis of the objective criteria developed by forensic scientists, can help a lot to distinguish even such regular chancery secretaries’ hands.79

The title page of vol. six [figs 24-25], now preserved near Suhāḡ, in the Maʿhad Balaṣfūra al-dīnī, presents the same kind of annotation, at roughly the same place. It says:

Ṭālaʿa-hu wa ʿallaqa min-hu mā ihtāra-hu | māliku-hu Ḥalīl b. Aybak ʿafā Allāh ʿan-hu.

Its owner, Ḥalīl b. Aybak, may God forgive him, studied it and copied [the passages] he selected.

We thus see that al-Šafadī does not designate himself the same way on these two volumes of the same book, which he probably acquired at the same time. It proves that adding his nisba or not, and completing his name with his father’s kunya or not, are not significant, nor instructive of the moment of the inscription.

---

76 The term nasḥ is so imprecise – almost any Mašriqi script can be qualified as nasḥ – that it should be used very cautiously. See Witkam 1978, 18; Franssen 2017, 321-2. About the characteristics of nasḥ, see Gacek 2009, 163; for illustrations of the calligraphic nasḥ dating back to the end of the Mamlūk period (holograph dated 908/1503), see al-Ṭayyibi, ed. al-Munajjed 1962, 64-6.
77 On tawqīʿ, see Gacek 2009, 263-5.
78 Gacek 2020, 69.
79 For an example of such an analysis on a scribe’s handwriting, see Franssen 2020. See also here fn. 131.
Other ownership marks are also visible on the title page of this manuscript. The work can be classified in the field of history, specifically of al-Andalus, and was useful to al-Ṣafadī for the composition of Andalusians’ biographies in his Wāfī.

2.1.4 Muḥammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s Library

If we know nothing about al-Ṣafadī’s wife (or wives?), we can gather information about his children from documentary sources, namely licences of transmission of his works (iǧāzāt). We thus know that he had two sons named Muḥammad – “the Muḥammadān”, as al-Ṣafadī calls them (with the dual suffix), specifying afterwards their kunya, respectively Abū ʿAbd Allāh and Abū Bakr – but also, and this is not a well-known fact, at least three daughters, Fāṭima, Salmā and Asmā.

---

80 For a more complete account of the different readers’ marks present on the various volumes of the work, see the edition: Hasan 1953, 59.  
81 Another work of the same author is cited among the sources effectively used by al-Ṣafadī for some biographies of the Wāfī, see van Ess 1974, 259.  
82 Fāṭima is cited in the iǧāza dated 759/1358 of MS Ayasoya 4732 (a holograph of the Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf wa-taḥrīr al-taḥrīf), Salmā and Asmā, in the iǧāza dated 757/1356 of MS Çorum, Genel Kitaplık 1906 (a holograph of the Ġawāmiḍ al-Ṣaḥāḥ), see § 4.2. Note that several of his personal mamlūks are also cited in iǧāzāt: Asinbuğā al-Turkī, Murād
One of the Muḥammads inherited al-Ṣafadī’s library and we can find his ex-libris on various manuscripts. The mark is usually very similar to his father’s: the localisation and the direction are the same (in the inner margin of the title page, parallel to the spine), the handwriting is also similar (harmonious chancery hand), but bigger and inscribed with a wider qalam, almost always saying ṣāra min kutub | Muḥammad b. (Ḫalīl) al-Ṣafadī (‘became part of Muḥammad b. [Ḫalīl] al-Ṣafadī’s books’). Here are three examples.

Ms Ayasofya 4732 is a fragment of the holograph of al-Ṣafadī’s Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf wa-taḥrīr al-taḥrīf. The title page shows Muḥammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ownership statement, which states: ṣāra min kutub | Muḥammad b. al-Ṣafadī (‘became part of Muḥammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s books’), and below: min sana arba‘ wa sittīn wa-sab‘i mi‘a (‘from the year 764/1363’), that is the year of his father’s death [figs 26-27]. This ownership mark was circled, and the book was also part of al-Širwānī’s collection (see § 2.1.1 and fn. 38, and the upper right corner of the title page).

al-Turkī or Arġūn al-Ḫiṭāʾī. I have found a trace of a possible fourth daughter of his in an iǧāza not directly related to al-Ṣafadī: Leder et al. 1996, 119 mention a certain Bilqīs bint Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī as part of the attendees to the reading of a ḥadīṯ by Hibat Allāh al-Akfānī (m. 524/1129-30) in 748/1348 in a Damascus mosque, the masǧīd Barānī al-Qaṣṣā алін.
This manuscript appears to be a draft of the beginning of the text. It comprises many inserts and blanks, the beginning of a section often coincides with the recto of a folio. The fair copy of the same text is said to be kept in Riyadh University Library. As a matter of fact, according to a description by al-Šarqāwī, the editor of the text, the Riyadh manuscript also presents an ownership mark in the name of Muhammad b. al-Šafadī and dated 764 as well. This manuscript must be the fair copy of the text.

Mss Staatsbibliothek Berlin (henceforth SBB) Wetzstein II 150-151 are the four tomes in two volumes of al-Šafadī’s Alḥān al-sawāğī’ bay-na al-bādī’ wa al-murāğī (Tunes of Cooing Doves Between the Initiator and the Responder [in Literary Correspondence]). This is the holograph of the text, and it shows several traces of work in progress (see § 4.2). The title page of the second volume (that is tome three, MS SBB Wetzstein II 151) bears the ownership statement of one of al-Šafadī’s sons Muhammad. The inscription is written in red ink and has been partially scratched, but we still can read min kutub | Muhammad b. Ḥalîl al-Šafadī (‘from among the books of Muhammad b. Ḥalîl al-Šafadī’), written parallel to the spine, and a bit further, perpendicular to the spine, we read min sana arba’ wa sittîn wa sab’î mi’a (‘from the
year 764/1363’), again the year of al-Ṣafadī’s death. Note that the title page of the first volume (ms SBB Wetzstein II 150) has been scratched and the surface erased by this scratching corresponds to the one of Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ownership mark on volume three [figs 28-29]. On the MS Ayasofya 1970 (a fragment of the holograph of the tenth volume of the biographical dictionary Aʿyān al-ʿaṣr wa aʿwān al-naṣr), the ownership mark of Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī has been scratched away as well, but is still decipherable. It appears on f. 108b (the first folio of this text: the manuscript is a miscellany), under the iǧāza [fig. 30].

2.2 A Word of Conclusion

This sampling is mere coincidence and cannot be considered representative of al-Ṣafadī’s library: it is only what has survived during the almost seven centuries separating al-Ṣafadī’s lifetime from today, 2022. It is what was spared from worms, fires, floods, carelessness and any other of the many threats to a manuscript’s preservation. Moreover, these small annotations are located on one of the most fragile part of the manuscripts: the first folio. Hence, other manuscripts that were al-Ṣafadī’s property may well be preserved but without any mark attesting they were his, without us knowing he kept them on his bookshelves. Besides, a more systematic search for his ownership or consultation annotations could lead to new discoveries: there can be many other marks in his name scattered in diverse libraries. Still, it is nevertheless interesting to sum up the information this sample provides us.

Out of the fifteen marks by al-Ṣafadī, one-third (five) are displayed on works of literature, poetry, stylistics or linguistics. Besides this, almost half of the total (seven manuscripts) can be said to belong to the biographical literature, among which two of them are about religious figures (the Prophet Muḥammad himself and the transmitters of the six main ḥadīṯ collections), and four of them are not only biographies but also works on geography. These last four manuscripts also enter the sciences section, which comprises only one other work, for a total of five volumes (but only two works). The volumes dealing with history number three in total, one of them being a biographical history.

The works represented in this view of al-Ṣafadī’s library mainly date back to the Ayyūbid period, just before al-Ṣafadī’s times, and to
the Mamlûk period (five of them, in eight volumes), with the notable exception of the two ‘Abbasid texts (by al-Ǧâhîz and al-Šîmşâṭî), one text of the fifth/eleventh century (by Ibn al-Haddâd) and two works by contemporaries of al-Ṣafadî, al-Ḍâhabî and Ibn al-Ṣuqâʾî.

Five manuscripts are valuable manuscripts, philologically and/or codicologically speaking: there is one apograph (a copy of a manuscript checked by the author, the manuscript by al-Suhaïyi, from Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Hüseyin Çelebi 764); one manuscript copied by a famous scholar of the Ayyûbîd period, Ibn al-Baytâr (ms Ayasofya 3711), which could be the only surviving copy of a risâla by the famous ‘Abbâsîd translator Ḥunayn b. Išhâq; one calligraphed manuscript (pseudo Ibn al-Bawwâb, MS TIEM 2014T); two manuscripts dedicated to important figures, one manuscript dedicated to the ‘Abbâsîd caliph al-Muṭâṣim bi-Llâh (ms TKS, Ahmet III 2392, by al-Šîmşâṭî) and the second dedicated to the library of Ibn Faḍl Allâh, with a chrysographed cartouche.

In the current state of research, all the manuscripts bearing al-Ṣafadî’s son’s ex-libris are holographs of the father.

Table 1  Recap chart of the ownership and consultation marks in the name of al-Ṣafadî and of his son. NB: the dates followed by a * are dates featured in the iǧâza, which means they are dates of transmission of the text, not exactly dates of composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Rağıp Pasha</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>Ibn Abî al-İṣba’</td>
<td>Taḥrîr al-taḥbîr fī ṣinâ‘at al-ši‘r wa al-naḍr wa bayân i‘ğâz al-Qur’ân</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>adab</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed Pasha</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Ibn al-Hidâd</td>
<td>K. al-af ‘âl (vol. 1)</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed Pasha</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Ibn al-Hidâd</td>
<td>K. al-af ‘âl (vol. 2)</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TIEM</td>
<td>2014T</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Ǧâhîz</td>
<td>R. fi maḍḥ al-kutub al-Kâšîf an riğîl al-k. al-sitâa</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>adab</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>17 mîm</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Ḍahabî</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>bio of ḥadîth transmitters</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Ayasofya 3711</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥunayn b. Išhâq</td>
<td>R. fi al-ʾawzân wa al-ʿâkûl</td>
<td>bef. 646</td>
<td>sciences</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TKS</td>
<td>Ahmet III 2392</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Šîmşâṭî</td>
<td>K. al-anwâr wa maḥâsin al-asâr</td>
<td>bef. 227</td>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BnF</td>
<td>Ar. 2061</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn al-Ṣuqâ’î</td>
<td>Tālî K. waḥfât al-a‘yân</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>biography</td>
<td>ex-libris</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed Pasha</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>Yaqût al-Rûmî</td>
<td>Muğam al-buldân</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>geography toponomy</td>
<td>bio consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed</td>
<td>Yaqūt al-Rūmī</td>
<td>Mu’ğam al-buldān</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed</td>
<td>Yaqūt al-Rūmī</td>
<td>Mu’ğam al-buldān</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Fazilahmed</td>
<td>Yaqūt al-Rūmī</td>
<td>Mu’ğam al-buldān</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>ta’rīḥ mim</td>
<td>Ibn Sa’īd al-Andalusī</td>
<td>K. al-Muğrib fi ḥulā al-Mağrib (vol. 4)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>ex-libris, consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Suhāğ</td>
<td>Ma’had al-Dīnī</td>
<td>Ibn Sa’īd al-Andalusī</td>
<td>K. al-Muğrib fi ḥulā al-Mağrib (vol. 6)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>ex-libris, consultation &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Ayasofya 4732</td>
<td>al-Ṣafadī</td>
<td>Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf wa taḥrīf</td>
<td>759*</td>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SBB</td>
<td>Wetzstein II 150</td>
<td>al-Ṣafadī</td>
<td>Alḥān al-sawāǧī bayna al-bādī’i wa al-murāǧī’</td>
<td>758*</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>[Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris] [764]</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SBB</td>
<td>Wetzstein II 151</td>
<td>al-Ṣafadī</td>
<td>Alḥān al-sawāǧī bayna al-bādī’i wa al-murāǧī’</td>
<td>758*</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Süleymaniye K.</td>
<td>Ayasofya 1970</td>
<td>al-Ṣafadī</td>
<td>Aydān al-asr wa awān al-naṣr</td>
<td>758*</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>Muhammad b. al-Ṣafadī’s ex-libris</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another source of information about al-Ṣafadī’s readings is his taḏkira. Etymologically, a taḏkira is something that sustains memory.\(^\text{84}\) In some respects, it is similar to Western Renaissance florilegia or commonplace books: it is “a collection of quotations culled from various authoritative sources”, “serving as an aid to memory by building and preserving a storehouse of acquired knowledge”, which was also “central to the presentation and composition of literary works”.\(^\text{85}\) The commonplace books appeared in a context of overabundance of information, and of books, such a context being the one of the Mamlūk period as well. They are sometimes called bibliothèques portables (‘portable libraries’), a locution that perfectly renders their raison d’être.\(^\text{86}\) Nevertheless, the examples from the Islamic world that have reached us or mentions of these examples that have reached us,\(^\text{87}\) do not feature the “organizational pattern”\(^\text{88}\) that is so important for Renaissance commonplace books; rather, they were completed in a chronological order, following the readings of their owner or, and this is

\(^{84}\) The word is used in different titles of works, often with the meaning of handbook, in the sense ‘what should be recorded in term of’. For instance, one can think of ‘Alī b. ʿIsā’s Taḏkirat al-kahḥālīn (GAL G I 236, S I 884), a handbook of ophthalmology; or of al-taḏkira al-Hamdūniyya, the adab encyclopaedia of the thirteenth-century Ibn Hamdūn (GAL G I 1281, S I 493). In the Ottoman and Persian traditions, the taḏkiras, often called safīnas, are poetic anthologies or biographical dictionaries of poets. They deal exclusively with poetry and they are edited books: they are meant to circulate. See Dufour, Regourd 2020 for Yemenite examples and the bibliography.


\(^{86}\) Blair 1996.

\(^{87}\) The chancery secretary al-Qalqašandī cites, in his chancery manual, Ibn Fadl Allāh’s taḏkira (Ṣubh, 7: 29) and Ibn Manẓūr’s taḏkira, entitled Taḏkirat al-labīb wa nuẓhat al-adīb (Ṣubh, 14: 70), both being the repositories of letters and documents written by chancery secretaries. Besides, Aḥmad b. Mubārakšāh was keeping a taḏkira entitled Safīna, where for instance, otherwise lost zaḡals by Ibn Quzmān were recorded, see Hoenerbach, Ritter 1950, 267. Another chancery secretary, ‘Alī b. Muzaffar al-Kindī al-Wadāʿī (d. 716/1316) was also keeping a taḏkira; it was known as al-taḏkira al-kindīyya (see, among others, al-Ṣafadī’s Aʿyān, 3: 546-55, no. 1237) and is said to have counted thirty volumes (al-Ziriklī 2002, 5: 23). Kristina Richardson recently identified several volumes of the Ottoman Damascene judge Ibn Mufliḥ’s taḏkira (Richardson 2020). Other authors are reputed to have used a taḏkira, now lost, for instance al-Maqrīzī (see Ibn Quṭlubuġa, Tāǧ, 85; note that al-Maqrīzī himself never uses the word taḏkira, but mentions his maǧāmiʿ. I am grateful to Frédéric Bauden for providing me with these information).

\(^{88}\) Even if, according to al-Šaḥāwī, Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī used to keep two taḏkiras, one for belles-lettres (al-taḏkira al-adabiyya) and the second one for the traditions (al-taḏkira al-ḥadīṭiyā). al-Ṣaḥāwī adds that, since it was not arranged in chapters, it contained many repetitions; a student of Ibn Ḥaḡar decided to organise it. al-Ṣaḥāwī, Gawāhir, 2: 694-5, 771; Ritter 1953, 81-2.
a second major difference, its composition activities, for instance in the frame of his duties at the chancery.\footnote{Bauden 2019, 36 fn. 171.}

Thus, al-Ṣafadī’s taḏkira, al-Taḏkira al-Ṣalāḥiyya or al-Ṣafadiyya,\footnote{“al-Ṣalāḥiyya” refers to his īaqab Ṣalāh al-Dīn.} is a multi-volume work, arranged chronologically, containing results of his readings, parts of his writing activities and correspondence, some of his works as a composer of official documents for the chancery, first drafts of (or parts of) some of his books, and notes jotted down about a particular subject. It was for his personal use that he kept it, even if he lent several volumes to friends and colleagues, as attested in various biographies of the Wāfī and of the Aʿyān. For instance, the mamlūk Tašbuḡā, dawādār (executive secretary) of al-Nāṣir Muhammad, who had a beautiful handwriting and a penchant for erudition, used to borrow al-Ṣafadī’s taḏkira, volume after volume, to study it, when both men were in Damascus (wa-kāna yaktubu kitāba ḥasana mansūba wa-kāna fi-hi mayl ilā al-fuḍalāʾ. Wa-kāna bi-Dimašq yasīru yastaʿīru minnī al-taḏkira allatī lī ḡuʿzan baʾd ḡuʿzin yuṭāliʿuhā).\footnote{al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 2: 585.}

The biographical dictionaries are not the only works where al-Ṣafadī cites his taḏkira. Since the taḏkira contains part of his correspondence, it is no surprise that various volumes are cited in al-Ṣafadī’s book of correspondence, his Alḥān al-sawāǧiʿ bayna al-bādiʾ wa-l-murāğiʿ (Tunes of Cooing Doves Between the Initiator and the Responder [in Literary Correspondence]).\footnote{Ed. Sālim 2005.} This book is arranged like a biographical dictionary as well. Under the name of his addressees, we find the details of letters sent and received. For instance, the record about his friend – and then nemesis - Ibn Nubāta (d. 768/1366) is instructive in more than one regard.\footnote{al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 2: 180-268, partic. 253 (no. 87). On Ibn Nubāta, see Bauer 2009.} Indeed, we read that Ibn Nubāta had borrowed a book from al-Ṣafadī, namely the Kitāb al-tašbīhāt (also known under the title al-Manāqib al-nūriyya), by the adīb and chancery secretary Ibn Ẓāfir (d. 613 or 623/1216 or 1226).\footnote{GAL G 321, S I 553-4; Ed. in EI2.} When returning the book, Ibn Nubāta wrote a letter of thanks in which he would ask at the same time for a text in prose he had read in al-Ṣafadī’s taḏkira. His request is very ornate and his short note in praise of the taḏkira contains a Qurʾānic quotation (al-Kahf 76), but sadly he does not specify the volume number of the taḏkira.

This anecdote is interesting for several reasons. First, it teaches us that al-Ṣafadī had a copy of the Kitāb al-tašbīhāt.\footnote{The particular manuscript that was al-Ṣafadī’s property has not been found. The only recorded MS of the text is MS Escorial 425 (Derenbourg et al. 1884, 2: 283). I have}
firms that al-Ṣafadī was lending books to friends and gives the assurance that al-Ṣafadī’s friends knew what was in his taḏkira. Hence the image of the taḏkira as a personal tool must be nuanced: it was public to a certain extent.

Another argument for this status of availability of the text of the taḏkira lies in Ibn Dāniyāl’s entry in the Aʿyān. There, al-Ṣafadī mentions various poems, giving their type and the volume number of his taḏkira where he had recorded them, namely the first, third and twenty-fourth. Why would al-Ṣafadī give this information if his taḏkira were not available for readers?

Still another example is found in Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī’s entry in the Alḥān al-sawāği’i. Taqī al-Dīn and Tāǧ al-Dīn al-Subkī were close friends of al-Ṣafadī; they knew each other when al-Ṣafadī was studying with Taqī al-Dīn, Tāǧ al-Dīn’s father. The three men exchanged numerous letters in the course of their lives, and on one occasion al-Ṣafadī explains that he wrote a reply letter to Taqī al-Dīn; he cites the verses included in the letter in the Alḥān and explains that the part of the letter which is in prose is integrally recorded in the twenty-ninth volume of his taḏkira, showing us again that the taḏkira was available. The same goes with other scholars and colleagues of al-Ṣafadī, like Ğamāl al-Dīn Ibn Ğānim (d. 744/1344), who wrote laudatory lines about the fifth volume of the taḏkira, and about Ibn Qāḍī al-Mawṣil (born in 698/1299), who wrote such eulogistic verses in the ninetenth volume of the taḏkira, a volume al-Ṣafadī had sent to him at his request.

What is even more interesting is the mention of the taḏkira in al-Ṣafadī’s biography by Tāǧ al-Dīn al-Subkī, Taqī al-Dīn’s son. After giving al-Ṣafadī’s titles, birth date, specialities, and the name of two

---

96 al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 4: 431.
97 al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 2: 5-18, partic. 9 (no. 56). On al-Subkī’s family, counting several important scholars, see Schacht, Bosworth in EF.
98 al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 1: 392-424 (no. 52).
99 This text is recorded by al-Ṣafadī in the section of the Alḥān devoted to Ibn Ğānim, see al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 1: 357-76, partic. 361 (no. 45). On Ibn Ğānim, see al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 2: 696-707 (no. 883); or al-ʿUmarī, Musālik al-abṣār, 12: 461-8 (no. 27).
100 Muḥammad b. Ṭānīb al-Qāḥir Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Šahrazūrī al-Mawṣilī, see al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 3: 275-7 (no. 1317), where one of his poems, asking al-Ṣafadī some verses from the taḏkira, but without specifying the volume number, is recorded. See also Ibn Ḥaǧar, Durar, 4: 21.
101 al-Ṣafadī, Alḥān, 2: 129-32, partic. 132 (no. 80).
102 al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt, 10: 5-32 (no. 1352). See also Frenkel’s chapter in this volume.
of his masters – Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī and Ibn Sayyid al-Nās – he explains that al-Ṣafadī was prolific in the fields of adab and history: he himself claimed to have authored more than 600 volumes. Then comes the statement of friendship between both men, friendship begun during the frequent visits by al-Ṣafadī to Tāḡ al-Dīn’s father and which lasted until al-Ṣafadī’s death. Later, Tāḡ al-Dīn lists several of the official posts held by al-Ṣafadī, preceding all of them by sāʿadtu-hu fa- (‘I favoured him and then he became...’), and then giving the date and cause of death of al-Ṣafadī. Afterwards, once again, al-Subkī emphasises his own importance for al-Ṣafadī, this time for his writing process: he states that al-Ṣafadī would not write a book without asking him advice on fiqh, hadīth and grammar and that he was the one to urge al-Ṣafadī to write the Aʿyān al-ʿaṣr. A bit later in the text, al-Subkī shows that this assistance was actually mutual: he goes on explaining the role of al-Ṣafadī in the elaboration and diffusion of his book Gam’ al-ḡawāmī: al-Ṣafadī copied it, took part in the study sessions and read it aloud himself, taking pleasure in its elaboration and thus he is associated with part of its importance. Then, al-Subkī recalls several anecdotes and gives verses written by al-Ṣafadī and his responses. Here he mentions the taḏkira:

Once, he lent me a volume of his taḏkira. He had authored a book about description and imitation [al-waṣf wa al-tašbīh] and he had inspected the taḏkira searching for description and imitation; he wrote on all the volumes he had finished to inspect this way ‘[search for] imitation from [this volume] is finished’ [naġiza al-tašbīh min-hu].

al-Subkī is alluding to al-Ṣafadī’s al-Kašf wa al-tanbīḥ ʿalā al-waṣf wa al-tašbīh (Revelation and Instruction about [Poetic] Description and Simile). We thus see again that al-Ṣafadī was lending volumes of the taḏkira to friends and colleagues. But here, in addition, we have the demonstration that the taḏkira was really a tool for al-Ṣafadī as an author, a reservoir of examples he had read elsewhere for future works: he was perusing his reading journal in search of appropriate verses, passages or text excerpts when he needed them. We have seen that many of his works are composed of two parts, theoretical and practical. In the latter, he would list hundreds of examples of the stylis-

---

103 Fatḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Sayyid al-Nās (d. 1334), outstanding scholar from a young age, who had inherited a great library from his family, see Rosenthal in EI².
104 As already noted, see § 1, and al-Subkī, Tabaqāt, 10: 6.
105 al-Subkī, Tabaqāt, 10: 7.
106 Not in GAL, but preserved: the holograph is kept at the BnF, under the shelf-mark Ar. 3345, see § 4.2.
tic device dealt with, which supposes the gathering of such excerpts and a place to store them. This reservoir is clearly the taḏkira. It is also interesting to see that he was keeping track of his work on the pages of the taḏkira itself, to make sure he would not use the same excerpt in the same book more than once. We thus have the confirmation that the taḏkira was a major methodological tool for al-Ṣafadī, even if it was less personal than first thought.

In this particular case, al-Subkī does not give the number of the volume of the taḏkira he had borrowed. We have already seen quoted volumes 5, 19, and 29. How many volumes were there originally? According to al-Ṣafadī’s biography by al-Maqrīzī, the taḏkira stood in thirty volumes. But then, how can we explain the existence of volumes 48 and 49? And especially of volume 44, which is a holograph, the original volume handwritten by al-Ṣafadī, not a later copy?

In fact, by the time of al-Maqrīzī, at least one complete set of the taḏkira was in circulation and it was a scribal copy of the original in thirty volumes. We can estimate that the holographs originally numbered a maximum of fifty volumes; indeed, the last date featured in volume 49, the last known volume, is 18 Šumādā I 762/26 March 1361, only a year and three months before al-Ṣafadī’s death, on 10 Šawwāl 764/23 July 1363. The preserved volumes are not equally distributed, but we still can estimate the time needed to complete one volume, which seems to be more or less a year on average, even if a certain level of variation is observed (see table 2). To explain the difference between the number of volumes of the copy and the original, we can check the number of folios of the original volumes of the taḏkira. For instance, volume 44, a complete holograph, counts 95 ff. This is not much for a manuscript, probably because it had to be portable: we can imagine that al-Ṣafadī was carrying the in-progress volume with him, to record on the spot the texts he composed, read or heard. The limited dimensions of the manuscript also support a claim for portability – 186 × 128 mm is less than the usual in-quarto format (220 × 150 mm) – as well as the orientation of the page:

---

107 Quotations or mentions of many other volumes of the taḏkira can be found in different biographical notices by al-Ṣafadī. An exhaustive survey, preferably realised with the help of digital tools, would be useful.

108 al-Maqrīzī, Durar, 2: 77-8 (spec. 77).

109 Ms cited by GAL G II 32, British Library (henceforth BL) India Office (henceforth IO) 3799. This puzzle has already been solved by Frédéric Bauden during a keynote speech in Chicago in 2010, titled “A Neglected Reservoir of Mamlūk Literature: al-Ṣafadī and his Taḏkira”. I warmly thank him for providing me access to his text, presentation and material.

110 Ms Princeton University Library (henceforth PUL) Garrett 3570Y.

111 al-Maqrīzī, Durar, 2: 77.

112 Ms BL IO 3799.
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Figure 31
al-Ṣafadī, al-Taḏkira, vol. 44. Princeton University Library, MS Garrett 3570Y, f. 30b, 31 (courtesy PUL)

Figure 32
al-Ṣafadī, al-Taḏkira, vol. 5, 6 or 7. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, ms Landberg 812, f. 2, with the date 731 (line 3) (courtesy SBB)
the format is a safīna, a book where the spine is parallel to the text, not perpendicular to it as usual, like modern notebooks (see fig. 31).\footnote{On this particular format, see Déroche et al. 2005, 53; Gacek 2009, 34.}

The Arabic name of this format also means ‘boat’: the safīna-books are meant to circulate.\footnote{See Dufour, Regourd 2020 about Yemenite safīnas.} It is particularly meaningful that at least one taḏkira is entitled Safīna – ʿAlī b. Mubārakšāh’s (d. mid-ninth/mid-fifteenth century) – and that the manuscripts of the Persian and Turkish genre called taḏkira (volumes of poetry or biographies of the Prophet) are safīna-shaped manuscripts.\footnote{See Heinrichs et al. in EI2 and chap. 8 here, by Vatansever.}

The newly discovered fragment of al-Ṣafadī’s taḏkira is a safīna-shaped manuscript as well [fig. 32]. Ms Landberg 812, from the Berlin State Library, is only a fragment, without any indication of the number of the volume. There are three dates in the manuscripts, all of them of from the year 731/1331.

The first and second volumes of the taḏkira feature the years 728 and 729, respectively, so that one could think that al-Ṣafadī was filling a volume within a single year. But the next date available is 735 for vol. 13. Apparently, at that time al-Ṣafadī was filling more than one volume per year. If we imagine he was completing two or three volumes per year, it means that during the year 731, he was using volume five, six or seven. The allusion to volume five in the Aʿyān al-ʿaṣr does not help us: none of the texts preserved in the few folios from Berlin are cited.

The information available in the current state of research are as follows [table 2].
Table 2  The volumes of al-Ṣafadī’s *taḏkira*, their date of composition and their mention in other works by al-Ṣafadī. NB: the dates in *italics* are not documented but deduced from the overall distribution of the volumes; the MSS in *bold* are holographs or contain holograph folios; CB stands for Chester Beatty Library; ÖNB stands for Österreichische Nationalbibliothek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mss</th>
<th>Mention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>BL IO Isl. 3829</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>BL IO Isl. 3829</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>729–730</td>
<td>BL IO Isl. 3829 (f. 89)</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>SBB Landberg 812 (731)</td>
<td>Alḥān; Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>730–731</td>
<td>SBB Landberg 812 (731)</td>
<td>Alḥān; Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>731–732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>732–733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>733–734</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>734</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>DK Adab 420.1</td>
<td><em>Nuṣrat al-ṭāʿir</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>735–736</td>
<td>DK Adab 420.2</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK Adab 9796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB Ar. 3861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>736–737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>737–738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>738–739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>FB Gotha 2140</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB Ar. 5178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>739–740</td>
<td>FB Gotha 2140</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Beşir Ağa Eyüp 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>CB Ar. 3861 (f. 56)</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>741–742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>742–743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>743–744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>744–745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>745–746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>746–747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>747–748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>748–749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>749–750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>750–751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>751–752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Tehran 3209</td>
<td>Aʿyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>752–753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>753–754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>754–755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>755–756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>756–757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>757–758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>758–759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>759–760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>760–761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>761–762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>762–763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>763–764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>764–765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>765–766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>766–767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>767–768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>768–769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>769–770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>770–771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>771–772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>772–773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>773–774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>774–775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>775–776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>776–777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>777–778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>778–779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Mss</td>
<td>Mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>BL IO Isl. 3799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK Adab 420.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>BL IO Isl. 3799 (f. 69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BnF Ar. 3339i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>FB Gotha Ar. 2141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Oman nat. Lib. 1384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>729-732</td>
<td>ÖNB Cod A F 395ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[i\] This MS and the following one (FB Gotha Ar. 2141) remain to be investigated. No date was found on their pages (Mac Guckin de Slane 1883-95, 584, says the MS BnF Ar. 3339 is dated 874/1469-70, but it is actually the date of one of the consultation marks, by a later reader). The handwriting is extremely similar to al-Ṣafadī’s, but much faster than the examples found till now: the influence of tawqīʿ, especially for the abusive ligatures, is much more salient and the lack of many dots is observed. These two MSS would deserve further study. Regarding the MS from Oman, it seems to be a holograph as well, as pointed out to me by Benedikt Reier, whom I warmly thank for the information.

\[ii\] Known under the title Diwān al-fuṣahā’ wa tarqumān al-bulaḡā’ (GAL G II 40; Flügel 1865, 365-7, no. 389), this safīna-shaped MS is actually most likely a copy of a volume of al-Ṣafadī’s Taḏkira. Indeed, it comprises a sample of all the texts usually found in the taḏkira: letters, poetry by him and by others, copies of chancery documents and copies of texts he read. For instance, two texts by Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, the Yaqaẓat al-sāhir and the Damʿat al-bākī (till now lost, apart from the last folio of the Damʿat, see Rice 1951, 856; Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, Taʿrīf, 40-1), are recorded in extenso; in al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 8: 255, cited in Van Ess 1976, 259, al-Ṣafadī assures he read these texts to Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā Ibn Faḍl Allāh and we have here the confirmation that he copied them as well. This MS deserves thorough further study.
Ms SBB Landberg 812 only counts nine folios. The first two folios present letters, both dated 731: f. 1, a letter from Šihāb al-Dīn Abū al-Ṭanā‘ Mahmūd (d. 725/1325),¹¹⁶ one of al-Ṣafadī’s masters, also a chancery secretary, to Ibn Ġānim;¹¹⁷ f. 2, a letter by al-Ṣafadī, sent to the Head of Damascus chancery. On f. 3b, we can read a tawqī‘ (decree) for the nomination of the šayḥ Šalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalîl al-ʿAlā‘î (d. 761/1359) as mudarris (teacher) at the Madrasa al-Ṣalāḥiyya in Jerusalem.¹¹⁸ On f. 4b, there is a waqf certificate for Ibn Ġānim’s Egyptian house (diyār al-miṣriya), and from f. 8b to the end, we can read verses that were recited in al-Ṣafadī’s presence by Ṣāfī al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl al-Ḥillī (d. 749/1348)¹¹⁹ and others by Ibn Ḥamdīs al-Ṣiqillī (d. 527/1132).¹²⁰ Such a brief description of the contents of this short fragment eloquently shows the variety of the contents, but also the personal character of the taḏkira: when al-Ṣafadī cites texts he has not composed, it is because he received them as a listener or as reader.

Another type of content found in the taḏkira is the first drafts of books by al-Ṣafadī. Ms PUL, Garrett 3570Y, another holograph of the taḏkira, the volume 44, offers a great example of this latter category. From f. 8 to f. 31, we can read the very first (and only?) version of al-Faḍl al-munīf fi al-mawlid al-šarīf (The Overwhelming Merit of the Noble Birthday [of the Prophet Muḥammad]),¹²¹ al-Ṣafadī’s treatise about the Prophet’s birthday. The circumstances of its composition are explained in a short statement at the beginning of the text. It echoes al-Subkī’s account of the composition of the Ġamʿ al-ḡawāmi’ mentioned earlier: at “closest friends’ request” (al-aṣḥāb al-aʿazz), al-Faḍl al-munīf was recited and improved in the course of a maǧlis precisely held during the night of the Prophet’s birthday in Rabīʿ I 759/February 1358. The first version of the text was ready a bit earlier, since the iǧāza literally attached to the text – on a fly leaf added in the binding of the manuscript, thanks to a stub – is dated 23 Ṣafar 759/4 February 1358.¹²²

¹¹⁷ Already mentioned here, because of the laudatory lines he wrote about al-Ṣafadī’s taḏkira.
¹¹⁸ The madrasa was established by Šalāḥ al-Dīn, the Ayyubid sultan, when he conquered Jerusalem. It is now Saint-Anne church. On Šalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalîl al-ʿAlā‘î, see al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 2: 328-36, partic. 333 for his nomination at Jerusalem madrasa al-ṣalāḥiyya.
¹²⁰ Rizzitano in EF.
¹²¹ Ed. ʿĀyiš 2007.
¹²² A more detailed account and analysis of the text is forthcoming in Mamlūk Studies Review, see Franssen, forthcoming.
Finally, the same manuscript provides us with the third type of contents found in the taḏkira: the book excerpts. For instance, from f. 33 to f. 47b, we find the Kitāb al-itbāʿ wa al-muzāwağa, by Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004), an alphabetically arranged collection of pairs of words that present the same pattern. al-Ṣafadī copied the text carefully, even leaving a large blank space under the title, later filled by a reader [fig. 33].

It is striking to note that even in his taḏkira, al-Ṣafadī leaves blank spaces under the titles of the book excerpts he takes note of, beginning the proper text on the verso, just like in manuscripts meant to be published. Similarly, he uses red ink for the titles and his page layout clearly distinguishes the different parts of the text, respecting its articulation, especially in the case of poetry. Surely, this would help him to find information later when needed. The quires were numbered, a small “۴۴” in the upper left extremity of the first folios of the quires (see fig. 33) showing that the number of the volume of the taḏkira was added to the number of the quire. The fact that the beginning of the quire coincides most of the time with the beginning of the text excerpt comes as no surprise. An exhaustive codicological study of the four (or five, if the Oman MS enigma is solved) holographs of the taḏkira is forthcoming.

123 GAL G I 130, S I 197-8; Fleisch in EF.
124 Ed. Brünnow 1906.
4  **Al-Ṣafadī as a Reader and as an Author: The Holograph Manuscripts and the Manuscripts with Autograph Interventions**

As clearly explained by Adam Gacek,\(^{125}\) and as recalled in the introduction of the recently published *In the Author’s Hand*,\(^{126}\) a holograph is a manuscript entirely handwritten by its author, whereas an autograph bears an inscription in the hand of the author of the text, the main part of the text being handwritten by someone else (or being a typescript). If the term ‘holograph’ was first only used for manuscripts in Arabic script,\(^{127}\) it is now used to describe manuscripts in Latin or Greek script, as shown by the title of the European Society for Textual Scholarship (ESTS) 2022 conference in Oxford: *Histories of the Holograph. From Ancient to Modern Manuscripts and Beyond*. The ESTS defines the holograph as “a manuscript that is written by the person named as, or presumed to be, its author”\(^{128}\).

In this section, I claim that a scholar’s library can be understood in a wider acceptation: not merely the books physically owned, bought or received by a scholar, and the books read, studied or used for one’s work and for which, for instance, an *iǧāza* was granted; but also the books the scholar wrote, working as a scribe, or copying them for his own use. al-Ṣafadī is acknowledged for the great number of manuscript volumes he handwrote, these being his own opus or not: he worked as a scribe more than once and was praised for his beautiful handwriting, something mentioned by most of his biographers.\(^{129}\) As stated earlier, I consider these manuscripts as constitutive parts of his library, even if we know that some of them were kept elsewhere, in great libraries of the time, for instance, as we will see. Indeed, his writing of (and sometimes, commenting on) the texts brought these into his inner library, his mental bookshelves. The manuscripts treated here are thus holographs and manuscripts of another author’s work handwritten by al-Ṣafadī.

A last point remains to be addressed: how to identify a holograph?\(^{130}\) The researcher working on the oeuvre of an author can generally recognise his handwriting at first sight, without needing any further confirmation, but without being able to rationally explain exactly how.

---

\(^{125}\) Gacek 2009, 14-16; 2020.

\(^{126}\) Bauden, Franssen 2020, 1-25.

\(^{127}\) This is why Marganne exclusively used the term “autograph”, even when referring to ancient Greek fragments wholly handwritten by their author, in her contribution in Bauden, Franssen 2020; see Marganne 2020. See also Goyens here, chap. 4.


\(^{129}\) See the list of his biographers in fn. 1.

\(^{130}\) The question has been addressed in Bauden, Franssen 2020.
In the case of al-Ṣafadī, his great respect of the model of ideal calligraphic styles may be an impediment, but his handwriting nevertheless shows a number of peculiarities and distinctive features. A precise, exhaustive and objective analysis of his handwriting is forthcoming and will be the most useful way to demonstrate this.\textsuperscript{131}

4.1 al-Ṣafadī as a Scribe

For different reasons, al-Ṣafadī copied texts by other authors. It could be for his own use in the course of his work, because he could not acquire any copy of a work, for pecuniary reasons or because the work in question was not easily available, or because he deemed it better to take care of the copy by himself, thus already studying the whole work once, and thus trusting the version of the work at his disposal.\textsuperscript{132}

It could also be to please a friend, or to act as “registerer” during a reading and study session of a work with its author, after which audition certificates were issued – like al-Subkī’s \textit{Ǧamʿ al-ǧawāmiʿ}, mentioned earlier – or as a gift, for instance to Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmārī, the chancery secretary, as we have seen.

In the case of MS BnF Arabe 3127, we do not find any specific information regarding the motives of its copy by al-Ṣafadī. The text is a commentary by ‘Abd al-Malik b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Badrūn (608/1211)\textsuperscript{133} about the \textit{qaṣīda} by the Andalusian poet and \textit{adīb} ‘Abd al-Maǧīd b. ‘Abdūn al-Yāburī al-Fihrī (d. 529/1134 or 520/1126),\textsuperscript{134} who has worked for the Aftāsid chancery.\textsuperscript{135} The \textit{qaṣīda} is entitled \textit{al-Bassāma}\textsuperscript{136} and is a long poem lamenting the fall of the Aftāsids, following more gen-

\textsuperscript{131} Such an analysis will be realised on the model developed in Franssen 2020. I speak in favour of such analyses for any important author. These would be helpful in the discovery of unknown and unsigned holographs and autographs, and for the confirmation of signed ones, or the eviction of forgeries. The creation of a database gathering the salient points for many authors and specimens of their handwriting is a must for tomorrow’s research.

\textsuperscript{132} I have not come across any disparaging remarks from al-Ṣafadī about scribes’ works, but some of his fellow authors are well-known for their disdain regarding scribal copies of manuscripts, which they describe as careless and full of errors. al-Maqrīzī’s comments in the margins of MS Leiden University Library Or 560, the copy of his small treatises that he ordered from a scribe at the end of his life, are particularly eloquent in this regard. See Bauden, forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{133} al-Ṣafadī, \textit{Wāfī}, 19: 176-7 (161); GAL G I 271, 340, S I 579-80.

\textsuperscript{134} al-Ṣafadī, \textit{Wāfī}, 19: 129-36 (115); GAL G I 271, S I 480.

\textsuperscript{135} The Aftāsids being one of the dynasties of the \textit{Tawāʾif}, the small principalities that flourished in many cities of al-Andalus between the fall of the Umayyads and the advent of the Almoravids. See Lévi-Provençal in \textit{EF}.

\textsuperscript{136} Or \textit{al-Baššama} – bi-aṭwāq al-hamāma. This text was edited and commented upon by Dozy 1848, mainly on the basis of this specific manuscript, that he recognised as handwritten by al-Ṣafadī, see Dozy 1848, 11-13.
eral considerations about other sovereigns’ violent death and the adversity of one’s destiny. al-Ṣafadī’s manuscript presents two different styles of handwriting: the original text of the qaṣīda, the text by Ibn ʿAbdūn, is written in a large ṭuluṭ, while the text of the commentary, by Ibn Badrūn, is mainly in a more usual style of handwriting, that we could call mašriqi, and is also in a more usual size [fig. 34]. The colophon (p. 250) is introduced by a line in ṭuluṭ as well and says the manuscript was finished mid-Ramaḍān 717/end of November 1317, in Ṣafad [fig. 35].

By then, al-Ṣafadī was in his early twenties and working as kātib al-darǧ for the governor Ḥusayn b. Ǧandar Bak, in Ṣafad, but regularly travelling to Damascus. This manuscript is the earliest dated trace of al-Ṣafadī’s handwriting and work known today. We know that Naǧm al-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn al-Aṯīr (d. 737/1336), a contemporary of al-Ṣafadī working in the Mamlūk chancery in Cairo, wrote a commentary on this qaṣīda as well, relying much on Ibn Badrūn’s text but

137 The manuscript was paginated.
augmenting it slightly with parts of his own composition. Hence, we can deduce that the qaṣīda and its commentaries were in favour at that time, and were probably deemed to be known by learned people, adībs and by those versed in literature.

In the chronological order of preserved manuscripts copied by al-Ṣafadī next comes a collection of sermons by ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Nubāta (d. 374/984), an ancestor of Ğamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Nubāta, the Mamlūk poet, friend and later nemesis of al-Ṣafadī. The manuscript is entitled al-Ḫuṭab al-mubāraka. It is part of the collections of the PUL and preserved under the shelf mark Garrett 298B. Its

---

139 Dozy 1848, 25-35.
140 GAL G I 92, S I 149-50; al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 18: 388-90 (no. 399). The manuscript contains some texts by some of the author’s descendants as well; his son Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad, his grandson Abū al-Farağ Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad and his great-grandson Abū al-Qāsim Yaḥyā b. Ṭāhir. This collection was gathered around 629/1223, see PUL digital library, MS Garrett 298B, accessible from http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/kp78gg43d. And see the manuscript itself: the authors of the sermons are cited on the title page.
141 Hitti 1938, 566-7 (no. 1907); Rosenthal in EF.
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Figure 38 al-Ḥarīrī. Maqāmāt. Danmarks Kongelige Bibliotek, MS Cod. Arab. Add. 83, f. 1a (courtesy DKB)
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Figure 39 al-Ḥarīrī. Maqāmāt. Danmarks Kongelige Bibliotek, MS Cod. Arab. Add. 83, f. 154 (courtesy DKB)
colophon explains this copy was realised in Ṣafad in Muḥarram 718/March 1318 by Ḥalīl b. Aybak ‘for himself’ [fig. 36]. The manuscript is acephalous as almost a whole quire is missing: the second quire begins with f. 2, as attested by the quire signature (ordinal number in full) observed in the upper outer margin. The copy is carefully rendered and a number of marginal glosses in red ink are referred to with the letter kāf, written in the text and in the beginning of the marginal gloss [fig. 37]. The meaning of this abbreviation is found in the author’s biography by al-Ṣafādī in the Wāfī bi-l-wafayāt: these are Tāǧ al-Dīn al-Kindī’s comments, which were carefully added to the Ḥuṭab text, by al-Ṣafādī.142 Other marginal glosses are introduced by the letter sād.

The text is fully vocalised and the titles of the sermons are written in bigger letters, as are a few articulating words inside the text. An interesting system of foliation and quire numbering is present, but it has probably been realised at a later period by one of the bookbinders who have taken care of this volume. This manuscript is thus a careful copy in every sense of the word: the handwriting is regular and conscientious and the manuscript shows evident traces of careful study.

The manuscript of al-Ḥarīrī’s Maqāmāt preserved in the Danish Royal Library under the shelf mark Cod Arab Add 83 is more renowned [fig. 38].143 It is a hybrid manuscript: the main text is not by al-Ṣafādī, having been written by the famous al-Ḥarīrī (d. 516/1122),144 but the marginal glosses, explanations and digressions are al-Ṣafādī’s own production and everything is handwritten by him. This copy is a very ornate: the title and the colophon are surrounded by an illuminated frame and the titles of every maqāma are written in gold ink outlined in black and in “a formal calligraphic tawqīʿ”.145 several medallions, illuminated or traced in red ink, stress the rhythm of the text. The orthoepic signs, such as the vowels, are traced in colour as well: in total, five colours are observed in the whole manuscript: black, gold, red, light blue and dark blue.

The colophon [fig. 39] confirms that the illumination is al-Ṣafādī’s work, as well as the copy and the commentary; all of this (except for some of the marginal glosses, but we cannot tell which ones are later) was done in Ṣafad in 720/1320-1. To me, this manuscript can be seen as a kind of a business card, displaying some of al-Ṣafādī’s skills: he is a talented scribe, who chooses well his exemplar, who

---

143 Perho 2007, 1416-21.
144 GAL G I 326, S I 486-9; Margoliouth, Pellat in EI2.
145 Gacek 2010; 2020, 70.
does not make major mistakes, whose handwriting is legible and skillful and confines to calligraphy; he is a dexterous illuminator, who is able to produce masterful compositions and to use wisely different kinds of textual dividers; he is also an extremely cultivated adīb, capable of understanding and glossing one of the most demanding texts of Arabic culture. At that time, al-Ṣafadī was in his early to mid-twenties, and he was still living in Ṣafad but may have wanted to upgrade to a better position in the administration, or to a more important chancery, leaving his regional hometown for one of the capital cities of the Mamlūk sultanate. All these skills are validated, as attested by the display of collation statements and ījāzāt (licences of transmission), directly on the pages of the manuscript (ff. 1-4), dated 724/1324-758/1357. One specific collation statement eloquently displays the philological consciousness and the importance granted to the transmission of faithful texts that motivated al-Ṣafadī and many of his peers. Unfortunately, this statement is incomplete and scattered around ff. 3b and 1a. It testifies, in the hand of al-Ṣafadī, to three reading sessions organised in the Ğāmiʿ al-Aqmar in Cairo in 729/1328, during which not less than 13 other manuscripts of the Maqāmāt, including a holograph by al-Ḥarīrī, were read and collated. This was an event and was even reported by al-Ṣafadī in his Wāfī in the entry about Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī (d. 745/1344), who countersigned the certificate and added a few words in his hand (fig. 38, f. 1a). This particular manuscript is a witness of the transmission of al-Ḥarīrī’s Maqāmāt in the Mamlūk period, and more generally, as already said, of the importance given to the transmission of exact texts.

If we continue to follow the chronological order of preserved manuscripts in the hand of al-Ṣafadī, the next one was copied more than twenty years later. It is now kept in Erfurt-Gotha Forschungsbibliothek (henceforth FB Gotha) under the shelf mark Orient. A 1731. It is a fragment of the eighth volume of Ibn Ḫallikān’s (d. 681/1282) biographical dictionary, the Wafāyāt al-aʿyān wa-anbāʾ abnāʾ al-zamān. According to the colophon (f. 145, see fig. 40), al-Ṣafadī copied it for himself and finished the copy of this volume on 3 Šawwāl 741/22 March 1341.

\[146\] For the detail of the collation statements and reading certificates, see Gacek 2010, 151-65.

\[147\] On this regard, see the interesting Talib 2019.

\[148\] al-Ṣafadī, Wāfī, 5: 276-81.

\[149\] On the transmission of al-Ḥarīrī’s Maqāmāt, see Keegan’s work, especially Keegan 2017.

\[150\] Pertsch 1878, 3: 318-19. This manuscript is cited in al-Ṣafadī’s entry by Rosenthal in the EI2.

\[151\] GAL G I 327-8, S I 561. Fück in EI2.
The handwriting appears quickly done yet it is very legible and carefully placed. The beginnings of the biographies are highlighted in red ink and most of the time pointed out in the margins as well, under the usual name of the biographees (see fig. 41, f. 97). Few corrections are visible in the margins. The margins are straight, the text being justified. The copy of this work is emblematic of al-Ṣafadī’s interest in history and biography. If our partial information is correct, in the first part of his career as an author, al-Ṣafadī’s works dealt exclusively with literature: lexicography (Maʿānī al-wāw, ‘The Various Meanings of the particle wa-’), specific stylistic devices (Ǧinān al-ǧinās, ‘Gardens of Paronomasias’), poetic anthologies (Muntaḥab ǧi’r Muǧīr al-Dīn Muhammad b. ‘Alī b. Yaʿqūb b. Tamīm, ‘Selected Poetry of Ibn Tamīm’), textual criticism (Ǧawāmiḍ al-Ṣiḥāḥ, ‘Problems in [the Lexicon entitled] “The Sound”’), linguistic corrections (Taṣḥīḥ al-ṭaṣḥīf wa taḥrīr al-ṭahrif, ‘Correction of Misspellings and Rectification of Mispronunciation’) and textual commentaries (al-Ǧayt al-musaǧjam fī šarḥ Lāmiyyaṭ al-ʿaǧam, ‘Copious Showers of Commentary on the “Poem Rhyming in -l” of the non Arabs’). The first biographical dictionary he undertook to compose is also the most extensive, the Wāfī bi-l-wafāyāt. We know that he was already dealing with the biographees whose names began with qāf in 745/1345, as attested by a list of works for which he granted an iǧāza to his colleague at Cairo
chancery, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad. Ibn Ḥallikān’s work is a major source for al-Ṣafadī’s Wāfī and we may wonder if he would have begun its composition before having at his disposal a complete copy of this biographical dictionary.

al-Ṣafadī’s philological concern is already clear, but here is still additional evidence of it: more than once he copied previous colophons found in the manuscript he was copying, especially if the colophon contained crucial information about the quality and precision of the current text. This is not only the case with Ibn Ḥallikān’s manuscript just mentioned, but also with MS Rağip Pasha 1078 [fig. 42].

This manuscript is a copy of the Taḥrīr al-taḥbīr fī ṣinā‘at al-ši‘r wa al-naṭr wa bayān i‘ğāz al-Qur’ān (The Composition of the Writing in the Art/Skill of Poetry, Prose and Inimitability of the Qur’ān), by Zakī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-ʿAẓīm b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥid, commonly called Ibn Abī al-Iṣbaʿ (d. 654/1256). As the title implies, it is a work of adab. This manuscript was commissioned for the library of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmari,

---

152 The grandson of Šihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd, a former teacher of al-Ṣafadī; Rowson 2009, 351.
153 See van Ess 1976, 256.
154 GAL G I 306, S I 539. The text was edited in Cairo in 1583/1963.
as attested by the cartouche with the ornate chrysography visible on the title page (see a bit further for another example of such a dedication, in a holograph).  

The *exemplar* used by al-Ṣafadī is an apograph: it was copied on the holograph. Again, the colophon was copied by al-Ṣafadī, who did not add any more specific information about this particular copy [fig. 43]. The title page is adorned by illuminated cartouches. The first cartouche displays the title of the book and the name of its author in a thick golden frame, with floral and vegetal motifs surrounding the inscription, while the second one, beneath it, shows an inscription of dedication in thick *ṯulūṭ* in white ink, outlined in black, on a dark blue background adorned with golden vegetal motifs. As already said, the dedication is to the library (*ḥizāna*) of Ibn Faḍl Allāh, Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā, *kātib al-sirr* in Damascus and then in Cairo from 729/1329 until his death in 738/1338. The manuscript must have been copied between these two dates.

Finally, one can mention the manuscript of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī’s, Ǧamʿ al-ǧawāmiʿ preserved in the Jerusalem National Library, MS Ya-

---

155 The ex-libris of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī has already been mentioned, see § 2.1.1.
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huda Arabic 198. It was written by al-Ṣafadī in the course of maǧālis (sessions) with his friend, Ṭāqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, in 761/1360, for his own use. Yehoshua Frenkel deals with this particular manuscript in his contribution to this volume.

4.2 al-Ṣafadī’s Holographs

al-Ṣafadī’s holographs can be divided into two groups: fair copies and drafts or works-in-progress documents. Nevertheless, as we have already seen, almost all the manuscripts of al-Ṣafadī bear traces of corrections or additions: as was noted by Rowson, al-Ṣafadī showed a “tendency to keep revising and supplementing works after their publication”. In this case, the word ‘publication’ must be understood in its etymological sense, i.e. ‘to render public’. For our modern minds, the publication is the printed text, but printing and publishing are not exactly the same. The printed text can still be revised, but it is seen as fixed, and most of the time definitive. In premodern times however, the situation was different. First, the printing press did not yet exist, so each copy of a same work was different from the others: handwriting, page layout, number of folios, type of paper, number of volumes, scribal errors... are as many changeable elements. But the difference from our time is still more profound; the texts were considered fluid, and knowledge was ever-evolving, as well as literary expressions.

According to my current incomplete estimation, almost 60 volumes of al-Ṣafadī have been preserved. Some of them are only short fragments, but others are several volumes long. I will only mention here several fair copies, i.e. manuscripts that are nearly free of corrections, and will deal with this subject more extensively in the future.

The holograph of the first volume of al-Kašf wa-l-tanbīh ʿan al-waṣf wa-l-tašbīh (Revelation and Instruction about [Poetic] Description and Simile), MS BnF Arabe 3345 is a fair copy. The title page displays now a bizarre geometric composition, most likely designed in order to hide previous ownership statements or consultation notes [fig. 44]. The text is about a specific rhetorical figure, the tašbīh, ‘compari-
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Figure 44  al-Ṣafadī. al-Kašf wa-l-tanbih ‘alā al-waqf wa-l-tašbih, vol. 1. BnF, MS Arabe 3345, f. 1 (courtesy BnF)

Figure 45  al-Ṣafadī. al-Kašf wa-l-tanbih ‘alā al-waqf wa-l-tašbih, vol. 1. BnF, MS Arabe 3345, ff. 20b-21 (courtesy BnF)
son’ or ‘simile’, and al-Ṣafadī articulated his monograph as usual: two big introductions, about terminology and theoretical questions, and examples, verses displaying tašbih, by numerous authors of different ages, arranged thematically. Apart from a small insert between ff. 20b and 21, an addition, nothing diverges from the regular justified text [fig. 45].

Second, in the Danish Royal Library in Copenhagen, Cod. Arab 294 is a holograph of the Kašf al-ḥāl fī waṣf al-ḥāl (Revealing the Situation about Describing Beauty Marks). Just like MS Rağıp Pasha 1078 mentioned earlier, this manuscript was dedicated to the library of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, ṣāḥib dawāwīn al-inšā (f. 1a). The dedication is chrysographed and outlined in black, on the title page, under the elegant cartouche accommodating the title and a circular decorative composition, probably not the work of al-Ṣafadī [fig. 46].

---

160 On the tašbih as a rhetorical figure, see van Gelder in *EI*.

161 For instance, as already noted, he wrote monographs on two other rhetorical figures, namely the ǧınās ‘paronomasia, wordplay’ (Ǧinan al-ǧinās, see Heinrich in *EI*; ed. Ḥalabī) and the tawriya/istiḥdām ‘double-entendre’ (Faḍḍ al-ḥitām ‘an al-tawrīya wa al-istiḥdām, see Bonebakker in * EI* and Bonebakker 1966; ed. al-Ḥinnāwī).

162 Perho 2007, 1142-6. The MS is visible online http://www5.kb.dk/permalink/2086/manus/254/dan/1/.
Again, the text presents two introductions, the first one lexicographical and the second one concerning the meanings of moles and a list of persons presenting peculiar beauty marks; then comes a list of verses by different authors, including al-Ṣafadī himself, arranged alphabetically according to the rhyme letter and by subject. The manuscript only counts 58 folios, and finishes abruptly, without any conclusion or colophon, but the entire alphabet is covered, as the last chapter is about the letter yā'. What is extremely interesting is the presence of many blank spaces, left at the end of every chapter, in case the author found other examples to fit in (for instance see f. 22b, fig. 47, where one counts only ten lines on the page, instead of the usual 17 lines per page, like on f. 14, for instance). This could be interpreted as another clear demonstration of the fluidity of texts but it could also be understood differently: that al-Ṣafadī made sure to always begin a chapter (or section, for the introduction) in the upper part of a page, whether recto or verso. This is plausible, but is not a usual scribal practice. A last interesting thing to note is the numeration of the quires, with the feminine form of the ordinal adjective,
in letters, and the presence of catchwords on the versos of a continued text – there is no catchword if the next recto begins with the title of a new section or chapter. Finally, collation notes (balağa) are visible in the outer margin of several folios, always in the last folio of a quire, sometimes partially trimmed off, such as on ff. 8b, 18b and 28b (see fig. 48).

Third, the SBB fragment of the Sarf al-‘ayn ‘an sarf al-‘ayn fi wasf al-‘ayn (Avoiding Envy While Paying Cash Down for Descriptions of the Eye) MS or. Oct. 3806 is the third clean copy known.163 It consists only of a short fragment of 23 folios. Again, the title page is illuminated [fig. 49], the title inscribed in a rectangular cartouche finished on its outer side by a medallion, and on its lower side by a polylobed circle housing the name of the author. The title page was realised by another illuminator;164 it displays a heavily adorned title cartouche, filled with vegetal motifs in dark blue, red and gold, while the au-

---

163 Sellheim 1976, 1: 54.
164 According to Gacek 2020, 69.
The handwriting of the main text appears quickly done, the layout is simple but very regular, red ink is used to highlight or to write some words, giving rhythm to the meaning of the text. One chapter title is displayed on f. 2b, in black ink but with a bigger module [fig. 50]. Few indications are observable in the margins. Two different papers are observed, one white and one darker, a colour between saffron-yellow and reddish. The structure of both papers is similar to the structure of all the papers of al-Ṣafadī’s holographs.

The manuscripts showing traces of work-in-progress are more numerous.165 For instance, all of the holographs of the biographical dictionaries fit this category, as al-Ṣafadī continued working on them until his death. An exhaustive list of al-Ṣafadī’s surviving holographs, including details about the status of the text in presence (is it a working document? Does it contain many corrections and/or additions?) and about its materiality (al-Ṣafadī favours three specific papers) is in preparation.

5 Conclusion

The study of the three sources of information discussed in this paper – the paratextual statements, the reading journal, and the manuscripts in al-Ṣafadī’s own hand – provides us with a more precise picture of al-Ṣafadī as a reader, but also as a scholar. What is striking for me is the similarity of his working method with that of today.

This should come as no surprise, since it is very logical, but it is now clearly shown: al-Ṣafadī follows what could be called a reading agenda, in which he reads what he needs for the work in progress; this is particularly clear when the ownership and consultation statements are dated. For instance, his acquisition of the Kitāb al-afʿāl, by al-Saraqusṭī, a book on verb morphology, coincides with the period of his publication about linguistic and phonologic correctness. It is a pity that his ownership note on al-Suhaylī’s critic of Ibn Hišām’s biography of the Prophet Muhammad is not dated, but I would surmise that it was bought at the end of the 750s/1350s, when al-Ṣafadī was composing his al-Faḍl al-munīf fī al-mawlid al-šarīf to celebrate the Prophet’s mawlid. When he was appointed wakīl bayt al-māl of Damascus, al-Ṣafadī naturally would have required some help with

165 Benedikt Reier is working on the Aʿyān al-ʿaṣr holographs in the frame of his PhD Archive Fever in Egypt and Syria: The Social Logic and Use of Biographical Dictionaries in the Mamlūk Period (1250-1517 CE), prepared under the supervision of Konrad Hirschler, at the Frei Universität Berlin.
his new function: he bought Hunayn b. Ishāq’s epistle on weights and measures, handwritten by another recognised author in the field of sciences, Ibn al-Baytār, the herbalist of an Ayyubid sultan.

Another common point of al-Ṣafadī’s working method with ours, and contrary to some of his contemporary scholars, is the fact that he systematically cites his sources. This is true for the texts he mentions in his taḏkira, and it is also the case in his monographs and biographical dictionaries: as already shown, chiefly by Van Ess and Little, his biographical notices always feature information of provenance for the data he transmits, whether the name of the author from whom he read the information, or the name of the person from whom he heard it, but also very often the fact that he heard it himself.

The taḏkira appears as the perfect intermediary between the readings and the use of the readings, between the documentation and the synthesis, the heuristics and the citation. This tool is an ideal aid for both the conscientious philologist and the fecund anthologist, to efficiently find back useful examples and illustrations of a certain literary device when needed (as attested by his biographer al-Subkī about the tašbih, as we have seen) and their sources, but also for the chancery secretary, who finds examples of nomination decrees, contract marriages and other official documents (like in the volume of the taḏkira from Berlin, when he was still in his early career), and for the biographer of his contemporaries, who writes down any beautiful poem, clever riddle or interesting play on words he heard or he received in a letter, any interesting thing he heard or read and the circumstances under which he received the information.

The manuscripts in his hand are instructive in more than one regard. When he copied texts by other authors, it could be a gift (Ibn Abī al-Iṣbaʿ’s work of adab was commissioned to the library of Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī), or for his personal library (Ibn Ḥallikān’s Wafāyāt was very useful for al-Ṣafadī). Thanks to his son’s ownership statements, it appears that al-Ṣafadī used to keep not only the drafts or preparatory documents of his own works, but also the fair copies: both versions of his Taṣḥīḥ al-taṣḥīf are preserved and feature his son’s ownership statement. We also know that drafts could have been transmitted in their unfinished state, since some of them bear an ʿiǧāza. This is the case of several manuscripts of the Aʿyān (and this comes as no surprise, since many of the people mentioned in

---

166 See al-Maqrīzī (Bauden 2010), for instance, or the fact that al-Suyūṭī devoted a book to plagiarism (al-Suyūṭī, al-Fāriq), or even the recommendations by al-Subkī for the historian’s work (see Frenkel in this volume). The conflict between al-Ṣafadī and Ibn Nubāta should be mentioned, since the latter accused the former of plagiarism of some of his verses. The limit between emulation and plagiarism is sometimes very thin, see Rowson 2009, 349-50; Lāšīn 2005.

this work were still living and thus their achievements and activities, worth remembering, including their deaths, current), but it is also true of other works, for instance of the Ġawāmid al-Ṣiḥāḥ. This last point deserves further investigation and the future list of al-Ṣafadī’s holographs under preparation will shed new light on the question.
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