

## Damascene Ḥanbalī Continuities between Manuscript and Print Culture

Known as *al-naḥḍa al-‘arabiyya* (the Arab renaissance), the period between the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the eve of the First World War was characterized by momentous economic and socio-political changes in Arab regions, including reforms in urbanization, industrialization, commercialization, and the growing popularity of ideas about nationhood. [...] Although the regional significance of the Arab press during the late 1800s is well recognized, the press’s earlier history was also a transformative moment in book production, one where nascent printing practices interfaced with centuries-old scribal ones.<sup>1</sup>

Research by Hala Auji, Kathryn Schwartz and others has demonstrated forcefully that the emergence of print as the prevalent medium of publishing had many sites and was subject to a plethora of contentions and competitions.<sup>2</sup> Nadia al-Bagdadi has cautioned “not to overrate the effects of the technological innovation [of print] itself” but to investigate “the politics and strategies underlying the coexistence of print and manuscript in the realm of intellectual and artistic production.”<sup>3</sup> To achieve a fuller understanding of the eventual shift to print we have to look beyond the literary discourses and examine market forces as well as legal, political and status-related inhibitors.

This contribution adds to this research by investigating the roles, on the one hand, of kinship and family networks and, on the other, of the concurrent emergence of institutional libraries and a global market for Arabic manuscripts. The example of the Damascene Ḥanbalī al-Shaṭṭī family indicates that the shift from manual to industrial book production was not as sudden a watershed as has often been claimed. Rather, the publications of different Shaṭṭīs between the early 19th and the mid-20th century came to form a tradition in itself, which transcends this supposed rupture.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hala Auji, *Printing Arab Modernity: Book Culture and the American Press in Nineteenth-Century Beirut* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 1.

<sup>2</sup> Kathryn A. Schwartz, “Did Ottoman Sultans Ban Print?,” *Book History* 20 (2017): 1–39; idem., “The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo, As Told from a Commissioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 49, no. 1 (2017): 25–45.

<sup>3</sup> Nadia al-Bagdadi, “Print, Script and the Limits of Freethinking in Arabic Letters of the 19th Century: The Case of al-Shidyāq,” *Al-Abḥāth* 48–49 (2000–1): 99–122, here 101.

Manuscripts produced in the early 19th century (and which contained works of earlier authors) might become part of a personal or family library by the mid-century, and edited and printed by the early 20th century. While there is not always a direct line from one activity to the other, these engagements with writing and manuscripts created a diachronic network which connects the books' perusers, the Shatṭīs themselves, across time and space. In turn, this network only emerged through the Shatṭīs' own engagement with those manuscripts, whether they authored, copied, compiled, collected or annotated them. I would argue that this network also extends to the printed editions which one member of the Shatṭī family published in the early 20th century.

In particular, I examine continuities between the different contributions of three family members: Ḥasan's (1790-1857/58) authorship and penmanship (1830s-1847), 'Abd al-Salām's (1840/41-1878) collecting activities (1853-1869), and Muḥammad Jamīl's (1882/83-1959) publishing activities of works of his ancestors (1910s-1940s). As we will see in the following, early modern authorities, in particular, loomed large in their corpora and collections. While they still were an essential element in madrasa curricula of the 19th century, a certain swerve becomes apparent in Muḥammad Jamīl's corpus, as his editing choices moved from an immediate engagement with those authorities to an emphasis of his ancestors' elaborations or summarizations of those authorities. It almost seems as if his own family, embodied by manuscripts in which they left traces, continued to establish a meaningful connection between his own printing activities and the early modern manuscript heritage.

Secondly, Muḥammad Jamīl's printing activities were affected by certain ruptures in textual transmission, which resulted from contemporary developments in the infrastructure of manuscript circulation and/or preservation. Between around 1850 and 1950, Damascus in particular experienced a tumultuous phase of manuscript musealization and extraction. Ahmed El Shamsy describes the latter as a "book drain" through which thousands of manuscripts, among them many of the ones considered here, entered an increasingly global market for manuscripts and, eventually, ended up in repositories all over the world.<sup>4</sup> The establishment of the first Public Library in Damascus (later Zāhiriyya Library, now Asad National Library) can be understood as either a reaction to or a cause of

---

<sup>4</sup> On the term, see Ahmed El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics: How Editors and Print Culture Transformed an Intellectual Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 10.

these movements.<sup>5</sup> However, research into this elusive market is still in its infancy.<sup>6</sup> As we will see, Muḥammad Jamīl accessed manuscripts mostly at the Zāhiriyya Library, but did not have access to other manuscripts which had been removed from Damascus due to the book drain.

This article is the result of extensive research using divergent primary sources. Muḥammad Jamīl’s corpus has been reconstructed using the online catalogues of the Hathitrust and Arabic Collections Online as well as Princeton and Harvard University; materials found at archive.org, the Institute of Islamic Manuscripts in Cairo and at Hamburg University complemented this survey.<sup>7</sup> The sections on Ḥasan and on ‘Abd al-Salām’s personal library have relied on the identification of their handwriting in manuscripts and has greatly profited from the work done at some of the above-mentioned libraries and, in particular, from the information collected in the authority file on ‘Abd al-Salām accessible at the State Library in Berlin.<sup>8</sup> Unfortunately, I was not able to look at the collections of the Syrian National Library or the Arab Academy, both of which might hold manuscripts which Muḥammad Jamīl edited and printed (I am very certain about the former).

The article proceeds in four sections: the first section introduces the Shaṭṭī family through the lens of Muḥammad Jamīl’s biographical dictionary, *Mukhtaṣar ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila* (“The Abridgment of the Generations of the Ḥanbalīs”; henceforth: *Mukhtaṣar*), which is the central source on their family history. It emphasizes the aspects on which he focused in presenting his ancestors’ written production. The following three sections are each dedicated to Ḥasan, ‘Abd al-Salām, and Muḥammad Jamīl. Section 2 demonstrates how important penmanship was for manuscripts to serve as stand-ins in a diachronic social network. Section 3 examines ‘Abd al-Salām’s collecting and editing practices with regard to manuscripts. In this section, we also return to the “book drain” as it affected local knowledge production. The final section elaborates on how these processes affected Muḥammad Jamīl’s editing practices.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Hirschler, *A Monument to Medieval Syrian Book Culture*, 64–67.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Eryn Kropf, “The Yemeni manuscripts of the Yahuda Collection at the University of Michigan: Provenance and acquisition,” *Chroniques du manuscrit au Yémen* 13 (2012) [<https://journals.openedition.org/cmy/1974>] (last accessed 21 May 2020); Konrad Hirschler, *A Monument to Medieval Syrian Book Culture: The Library of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019), especially 161–65; Torsten Wollina, “Tracing Ibn Ṭūlūn’s Autograph Corpus, with Emphasis on the 19th–20th Centuries,” *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 9 (2018): 308–40.

<sup>7</sup> The online catalogues are accessible here: Hathitrust: <https://www.hathitrust.org>; Arabic Collections Online: <http://dlib.nyu.edu/aco/>; Princeton University Library: <https://catalog.princeton.edu>; Harvard University Library: [https://hollis.harvard.edu/primo-explore/search?vid=HVD2&sortby=rank&lang=en\\_US](https://hollis.harvard.edu/primo-explore/search?vid=HVD2&sortby=rank&lang=en_US).

<sup>8</sup> See [http://orient-digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/receive/CommonVIAF\\_viaf\\_00003484](http://orient-digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/receive/CommonVIAF_viaf_00003484). I thank Boris Liebrecht, who collected this information, for pointing me in this direction.

## 1 The *Mukhtaṣar* and the Shaṭṭī Family in/as History

In total, Muḥammad Jamīl wrote three biographical works, his major work *Rawḍ al-baṣhar fī a'yān Dimashq fī al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar* (1946) (“The Garden of Humankind regarding the Notables of Damascus in the 13th Century”), its supplement *Tarājim a'yān Dimashq fī niṣf al-qarn al-rābi' 'ashar al-ḥijrī* (1948) (“Biographies of the Notables of Damascus in the Middle of the 14th Century”), and his earliest work, *Mukhtaṣar ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila* (1921).<sup>9</sup> Although the *Mukhtaṣar* is the smallest of those, it is most comprehensive in terms of family history. The *Mukhtaṣar* continues the genre of the biographical dictionary, which collects biographical information on large numbers of people from a specific time, place, school, occupation or family. In order to encapsulate the history of the Ḥanbalīs, the work is divided into three “generations” (*ṭabaqāt*), the limitations of each defined by its respective source. Whereas the first two generations summarize works by the Jerusalemite historian al-'Ulaymī (d. 1522) and the Damascene biographer Kamāl al-Dīn al-Ghazzī (d. 1799) respectively, the final generation relies heavily on “a historical/biographical rough draft” by his uncle Murād (d. 1896, sometimes: Muḥammad Murād). This third “generation” is concentrated on Damascus, and only here does the Shaṭṭī family make its appearance with nine biographies (out of 33, which amounts to 27% of the total). These cover a period from the Shaṭṭīs' arrival to Damascus in the 18th century to the generation of the author's father.

Fig. 1.1: Family tree of the Shaṭṭī family, structured by male lineages between the mid-18th and mid-20th century.<sup>10</sup>

The *Mukhtaṣar* offers a selective depiction of a family, excluding certain family members (especial-

---

<sup>9</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila* (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqī, 1921); idem., *Rawḍ al-baṣhar fī a'yān Dimashq fī l-qarn al-thālith 'ashar* (Damascus: Maṭba'at Dār al-Yaqza al-'Arabiyya, 1946); idem., *Tarājim a'yān Dimashq fī niṣf al-qarn al-rābi' 'ashar al-ḥijrī* (Damascus: Maṭba'at Dār al-Yaqza al-'Arabiyya, 1948).

<sup>10</sup> The family tree is an elaboration of the one developed by Schatkowski-Schilcher which only takes into account Shaṭṭīs about whom biographies were written. See Linda Schatkowski-Schilcher, *Families in Politics: Damascene Factions and Estates of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden, 1985), 178. Admittedly, her interest in this family is limited, and it is treated on only three pages (177–79). The family tree has been created with the assistance of Sophie Cabanas, Sofiya Ropot, and Mona Sliti in a reading course at Hamburg University in July 2019. For comparison, Schatkowski-Schilcher's family tree can be accessed at <http://menadoc.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/ssg/content/pageview/234639> (last accessed 20 May 2020).

ly women) and creating hierarchies between those included (Fig. 1.1).<sup>11</sup> In the family tree (see above) family members who received their own biographies are marked in bold. Additional relatives are mentioned within their biographies. Among the latter is the only Shaṭṭī woman, who, although unnamed, creates a direct connection between Muḥammad Jamīl—as his mother—and ‘Abd al-Salām—as his daughter.<sup>12</sup> As Muḥammad Jamīl frequently calls ‘Abd al-Salām his maternal grandfather, this connection might indeed have had as much influence on him as the one to his paternal grandfather, Muḥammad b. Ḥasan (d. 1889/90), who, in turn, creates a connection between Ḥasan and Muḥammad Jamīl.

The *Mukhtaṣar* is also a valuable bibliographical source, as it draws on manuscripts and complements Muḥammad Jamīl’s editions, guiding the reader through the legacy of the Shaṭṭī family. In it, Muḥammad Jamīl frequently praises his ancestors’ authorship and penmanship, most pronouncedly in a *tadhīl* (“supplement”) within the biography of ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. Khidr (d. 1834/35).<sup>13</sup> In addition to ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ, the copyist of al-‘Ulaymī’s biographical work as used in the *Mukhtaṣar*, and his son ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 1779/80), the calligraphic skills of five more Shaṭṭīs are mentioned.<sup>14</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl further emphasizes in the biography of his uncle Murād:

[Murād al-Shaṭṭī] spent a long time on the crafts of writing in *naskh*, *ta’līq* and *kūft* which he learned from al-Faḍl/al-Fāḍil (?) Nāzīm Bey, resident in Damascus, and from the versatile Muṣṭafā al-Faddī (?) al-Sabā’ī. Then he wrote in his precious handwriting a multitude of books and *risālas*, and the most beautiful of his praiseworthy heritage is the “Imām ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Andalusī” preserved in the Zāhiriyya Library.<sup>15</sup>

The quote suggests that Muḥammad Jamīl’s emphasis on penmanship was closely tied to his engagement with his ancestors’ handwriting in the Zāhiriyya Library. Muḥammad Jamīl sought to

---

<sup>11</sup> See Torsten Wollina, “The Banu Qadi ‘Ajun: Family or Dynasty?”, *DYNTRAN Working Papers*, n. 19, online edition (December 2016) available at: <http://dyntran.hypotheses.org/1623> (last accessed 21 May 2020). These ideas are further developed in an upcoming book chapter, “Family and Transmission of Knowledge in Mamluk and Early Ottoman Damascus.”

<sup>12</sup> Ruth Roded has termed this phenomenon in naming practices *semimatrilinearity*. Ruth Roded, *Women in Islamic Biographical Collections: From Ibn Sa’d to Who’s Who* (Boulder: L. Rienner, 1994), 140.

<sup>13</sup> Al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 153–54.

<sup>14</sup> ‘Abd al-Laṭīf and his brother Muḥammad Amīn (d. 1843/44), Maḥmūd Jalabī (d. 1786/87), his son ‘Abd Allāh (d. 1783/84), his uncle Muṣṭafā (d. 1852/53) and his nephew Khalīl Jalabī (d. 1837/38).

<sup>15</sup> Al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 172–73.

continue the tradition in which his ancestors had engaged, albeit in a different medium, so the respective texts could remain relevant for living textual practices. Whereas he could not transfer the handwriting itself into his print editions, his elaborations in the *Mukhtaṣar* verbalize them. In Muḥammad Jamīl’s corpus, family history, printing activities, and manuscript preservation converge and form a triad. We cannot understand one without acknowledging the others.

## 2 Ḥasan al-Shaṭṭī and a Ḥanbalī Manuscript Collection

Schatkowski-Schilcher describes Ḥasan as a middling scholar who “supported himself [financially] entirely through trade.”<sup>16</sup> He studied with several local “principal teachers” and others in Baghdad and the Hijaz. A resident of the Bāb al-Salām neighborhood, he also joined the Naqshbandī sufis and served as *khaṭīb* (“preacher”) in two institutions. Muḥammad Jamīl lists sixteen works to Ḥasan’s name, four of which were of book length, four shorter commentaries, and the remainder even shorter works.<sup>17</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl published five, perhaps six of his works (including one he does not mention in the *Mukhtaṣar*).

A more immediate and contemporary source on Ḥasan’s written production is Princeton, Ms. Garrett 784Y,<sup>18</sup> which contains a work later published by his great-grandson, Ḥasan’s abridgment *Mukhtaṣar lawāmi‘ al-anwār al-bahiyya li-sharḥ al-manzūma fī ‘aqd al-firqa al-marḍiyya* (“Abridgment of The Shimmering of the radiant Lights regarding the Commentry of the Versification of the Bond of the praiseworthy people”) of al-Saffārīnī’s commentary.<sup>19</sup> The manuscript belonged to one Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-‘Azūqī/‘Azūqa al-Nābulsī al-Ḥanbalī, who left his ownership note (dated 1263/1847) and book stamp on the title page.<sup>20</sup> Maḥmūd was

---

<sup>16</sup> Linda Schatkowski-Schilcher, *Families in Politics*, 177, 179.

<sup>17</sup> Three entries are concluded with “in one volume” (*mujallad*): *al-Nashshār ‘alā l-aḥḥār*; *Mukhtaṣar sharḥ al-‘aqīda li-l-Saffārīnī*; *Basṭ al-rāḥa li-tanāwil al-masāḥa*. The entry for *Sharḥ shaykhihi al-Suyūfī* states, however, that it was contained “in one big volume”, which might indicate that it was bound with *Minḥat mawlā al-fath fī tajrīd zawā‘id al-ghāya* and *al-Sharḥ ayy ghāyat al-shaykh Mar‘ī al-Karamī*, both of which are mentioned immediately before this work. See al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 158.

<sup>18</sup> Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 784Y. The manuscript is accessible online at <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/6267952> (last accessed 3 May 2020).

<sup>19</sup> In the *Mukhtaṣar*, this work is referred to by the descriptive title *Mukhtaṣar sharḥ al-‘aqīda li-l-Saffārīnī*.

<sup>20</sup> Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 784Y, fol. 1r. Maḥmūd’s lineage is mentioned with different levels of detail on fols. 78v and 79r.

also the creator of the manuscript and concluded the main text with two colophons.<sup>21</sup> The first one refers to the textual transmission stating that al-Saffārīnī's commentary was originally completed in 1175/1761–62 and the abridgment in 1247/1831. The second colophon dates Maḥmūd's copy to 27 Jumādā II 1263/1847. A short collation note affirms that the copy was made from Ḥasan's autograph (*nuskhat mu'allifihā*).

Figure 2.1: Maḥmūd al-Azūqī's book list, Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. 784Y, fols. 79v–80r

Maḥmūd al-'Azūqī is an elusive figure whose life dates I could not establish.<sup>22</sup> However, Ms. Garrett 784Y makes it clear that he was rather close to Ḥasan al-Shaṭṭī.<sup>23</sup> He calls him “my shaykh” in the title statement and in his colophon. The manuscript further contains a certificate by Ḥasan for Maḥmūd for the recitation of several books.<sup>24</sup> Finally, Ḥasan's name appears several times in a book list (fig. 2.1) Maḥmūd added to the very end of the volume.<sup>25</sup> The book list (*Bayān alladhī 'indanā min al-kutub lanā khāṣṣa li-l-faqīr Maḥmūd 'Azūqa...*) contains 114 entries.<sup>26</sup> Some overlaps with the books mentioned in the certificate notwithstanding, this list refers to physical books in Maḥmūd's possession either in or at some point after 1263/1847. It covers multiple disciplines of the contemporary educational canon, much of which relied on early modern authorities. We find some clusters of works by medieval authors (i.e. pre-1500): Ibn al-'Arabī (2), Zakariyā' al-Anṣārī (3), Ibn Hishām (6 works/7 vols.) but the focus of the collection is very much on the early modern period (1500–1800), for which we find more authors and often with several works by the same

---

<sup>21</sup> Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 784Y, fol. 78v.

<sup>22</sup> Maḥmūd's ownership of manuscripts is not acknowledged in current library catalogues even though his collection seems to have been larger than that of 'Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī (see below). An obvious reason is his absence from the biographical literature, most of all Jamīl al-Sgaṭṭī's works and 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Bayṭār's *Ḥilyat al-bashar fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar* (Damascus, 1961).

<sup>23</sup> I was unable to find more information on either this person or his father. One Muḥammad 'Azūqa imprinted a book stamp in Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ms. Fiqh Taymūr 31, p. 46.

<sup>24</sup> Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 784Y, fol. 79r. I am not entirely sure whether this page is in Maḥmūd's handwriting as well. While the writing is more zestful than in the main text, it does resemble the writing of the book list and the title statement to some degree.

<sup>25</sup> Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 784Y, fols. 79v–80r.

<sup>26</sup> On *bayān* as a term for catalogues and book lists, see Celeste Gianni, “Poetics of the Catalogue: Library Catalogues in the Arab Provinces During the Late Ottoman Period” (PhD diss., SOAS, University of London, 2017), 10, 49, 50, 174.

author or even copies of the same work. The most prominent examples are al-Suyūfī (6 works/9 vols.), Mar‘ī al-Karamī (5 works/7 vols.), al-Bahūtī (4 works/vols.), and ‘Uthmān al-Najdī (3 works/4 vols.).

Two titles are ascribed to Ḥasan. Whereas the first, *Al-Subul al-sawālik* [sic!] *li-bayān al-manāsik* (“The roads for the Travellers towards explaining the Devotions”) (no. 21), might be identical with the *Mansik kabīr* mentioned by Muḥammad Jamīl, the other entry (no. 24) could refer to this very manuscript (if we read *al-qaṣīda* instead as “*al-‘Aqīda wa-mukhtaṣar sharḥihā hādhā li-shaykhinā...*”). Finally, Maḥmūd mentions only Ḥasan, himself, and his father ‘Abd al-Karīm as copyists (*bi-khaṭṭ* ...). Maḥmūd and his father had copied fifteen of the 114 books. The above-mentioned attentiveness to penmanship thus resulted from a wider recognition of copying as an important contribution to written knowledge production.

Moreover, Maḥmūd had probably inherited not only his father’s copies but also other books.<sup>27</sup> Intra-familial textual transmission was relevant and important to textual continuity, particularly in smaller textual communities. How, then, were Ḥasan’s works preserved and reproduced so that they could be read by later generations? Was their preservation dependent on his students or did his family preserve his written legacy as well? How did Muḥammad Jamīl access his great-grandfather’s works several decades later?

### 3 ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī’s Manuscript Collection

In some ways, ‘Abd al-Salām’s (1840/41–1878/79) biography reads similar to that of Ḥasan. He traveled widely, occupied himself with poetry and versified prose, collected chains of hadith transmission, was taught by several of his older relatives and scholars in Syria, Egypt and the Hijaz, and joined a Sufī order. However, he was more than a middling scholar, receiving appointments as a professor in Edirne and as a Hanbalī imām at the Damascene Umayyad Mosque before his fortieth birthday.<sup>28</sup>

The *Mukhtaṣar* identifies only three publications to his name, none of which had book length: “(1) pleasantries and jests (*mizāḥ wa-du‘āba*) of which one’s companion does not tire; (2) a poem on *Ghāyat al-salāma*; (3) perhaps *al-Qaṣīda al-mawzūna* (“the Harmonic Qaṣīda”) is his work but no

---

<sup>27</sup> This was certainly the case for no. 7, which survives in Princeton, Firestone Library, MS Garrett 2538Yq. The title page (fol. 1r) contains several notes by Maḥmūd and his father ‘Abd al-Karīm (with stamp). Accessible online at <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/6262797> (last accessed 21 May 2020).

<sup>28</sup> Al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 162–64.

one knows who composed it”.<sup>29</sup> In addition, ‘Abd al-Salām had authored “fine risālas” and a Dīwān to be published by his grandson in 1906.<sup>30</sup> One omission in the list of ‘Abd al-Salām’s publications is noteworthy. Although technically not the author, he published a small print edition of *Awṛād al-ustādh ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī* (1864), which, it claims, was “the first book [ever] printed in Damascus by the Dūmāniyya Press under the Caliphate of [...] ‘Abd al-‘Azīz [r. 1861-76] [...] during the governorship of [...] Muḥammad Rushdī Bāshā al-Shirawānī [r. 1864-65]” (see fig. 3.1).<sup>31</sup> Why did Muḥammad Jamīl fail to mention this print publication? Was he ignorant of its existence? Was he only interested in manuscripts? In any case, it precedes Muḥammad Jamīl’s turn to print by almost forty years. Not much seems to have come out of this first experimental moment, however, and only Muḥammad Jamīl’s turn to print became a true watershed in the Shaṭṭī’s publishing practices.

Fig. 3.1: *Awṛād al-ustādh ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī* (Damascus: al-Maṭba‘a al-Dūmāniyya, 1864), 32

More importantly, ‘Abd al-Salām “collected books that nobody else had collected, and he endowed some of them for his family and sold more of them as part of his inheritance.”<sup>32</sup> Of this collection, to my knowledge, no catalogue or book list survives. Any reconstruction relies entirely on the identification of his manuscript annotations and the acknowledgment of such handwritten interventions in modern library catalogues. ‘Abd al-Salām made his earliest annotations when he was only fifteen or sixteen years old, and the vast majority of dated annotations stems from his early twenties (1278–80/1861–64) (see fig. 3.2). Overall, 32 manuscripts containing his handwriting could be identified. A considerable number of manuscripts contain more than one work, amounting to around 140 titles in total. Of these, eleven cannot be ascribed to an identifiable author, and for a

<sup>29</sup> al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 163.

<sup>30</sup> In one later biographical work, he cites two titles based on his uncle’s rough draft: “Tuḥfat ahl al-īmān bi-ad‘iyyat layout niṣf al-Sha‘abān” and an abridgment of Ibn Abī Dunya’s “al-Faraj ba‘d al-shidda”. Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a’yān Dimashq fī al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar* (Damascus: Maṭba‘at Dār al-Yaqza al-‘Arabiyya, 1946) 173.

<sup>31</sup> He gives his name on the final page of this 32 page publication as “Ibn al-Shaṭṭī ‘Abd al-Salām”, a juxtaposition that he also frequently used in his manuscript notes. ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī, *Awṛād al-Ustādh ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī*, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī (Damascus: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Dūmāniyya, 1864, 32). Accessible at <http://id.lib.harvard.edu/alma/990027885370203941/catalog>. A second work by ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī, “Kifāyat al-ghulām fī jumlat arkān al-Islām ‘alā madhhab al-Imām al-A‘zam Abī Ḥanīfah al-akram”, was published by the same press in 1866 but I have not been able to identify who edited it; see <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/1149126> (last accessed 1 May 2020).

<sup>32</sup> Al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 164.

few more authors I could not establish when they lived (see table 3.1).

Table 3.1: Manuscripts containing ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī’s annotations

Fig. 3.2: Timeline of ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī’s annotations. In blue: ownership notes in which the date of acquisition is indicated. Created with Palladio, <http://hdlab.stanford.edu/palladio-app/>.

The early modern period accounts for the bulk of ‘Abd al-Salām’s collection with around ninety texts. Within this period, we find large clusterings of works by the same author: four works each by al-Nābulṣī (d. 1731) and Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 1546), six treatises by Kemalpaşazade (d. 1534), thirteen writings by Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Bakrī (d. 1749), and a full 23 works by al-Suyūfī (d. 1505). In comparison, only eighteen works were written by authors who died before 1500. Among those, only al-Jurjānī, Ibn ‘Arabī, and Ibn Taymiyya are represented with more than one work. These texts are often clustered within one or a few manuscripts. From the 19th century, we find nineteen items, most of which are concerned with *ḥadīth* transmission. Most importantly, the Shaṭṭīs make their first appearance with a *risāla* co-authored by Muḥammad (d. 1889/90) and Aḥmad al-Shaṭṭī (d. 1898/99) and two works authored by ‘Abd al-Salām himself, *Nihāyat al-āmāl fī man yafūzu bi-l-ẓilāl* (“The highest Hopes regarding those who attain Distinction”) and, arguably, the *Sharḥ al-asmā’ al-ḥusnā* (“Commentary on God’s beautiful names”) which is in his handwriting.<sup>33</sup>

Whereas Maḥmūd ‘Azūqa created new manuscripts by way of copying, ‘Abd al-Salām did it through compilation. This is deductible from his rather regular method of annotation by which he, firstly, identified manuscripts that he acquired and, secondly, identified the texts these manuscripts contained in title statements (see figure 3.3). Studied conjointly, these can be understood as archival practices which aimed at preserving small-scale writings by compiling them into larger codices and making these contents more accessible to other readers.<sup>34</sup> As I have shown elsewhere, ‘Abd al-Salām often brought his manuscripts into their current form.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> For the latter, see Princeton, Ms. Garrett 4508Y, and Harvard, Ms. 337, fols. 1v–5v, for the former, *Risāla mukhtaṣara fī aḥkām al-ḥajj wa-l-‘umra* (in Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ms. Majāmi‘ Taymūr 155).

<sup>34</sup> Konrad Hirschler, “From Archive to Archival Practices: Rethinking the Preservation of Mamluk Administrative Documents,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 136, no. 1 (2016): 1-28.

<sup>35</sup> A detailed study of one manuscript compilation will be published shortly: Torsten Wollina, “In absence of a colophon: alternative signing practices in Arabic autograph manuscripts,” in *Scribal Practice – Global Cultures of Colophons, 1400-1700*, ed. Christopher Bahl und Stefan Hanß (London: Palgrave MacMillan, forthcoming).

Fig. 3.3: Harvard, Houghton Library, Ms. 337, fol. 1r, with a descriptions of ‘Abd al-Salām’s annotations (in blue)

In light of Muḥammad Jamīl’s intensive engagement with his family’s written legacy, it is puzzling that there is little overlap in content between ‘Abd al-Salām’s library and his grandson’s publishing activities. One possible reason is that the works ‘Abd al-Salām collected were in the majority not works or copies made by Shaṭṭī and therefore not of immediate interest to Muḥammad Jamīl. Although he published ‘Abd al-Salām’s *Dīwān*, he did not even list all of his compositions, and only one author, al-Saffārīnī, appears both in ‘Abd al-Salām’s library and Muḥammad Jamīl’s bibliography.

However, the “book drain” mentioned in the introduction opens up a different perspective: ‘Abd al-Salām’s collection most probably did not survive as a collection, and neither the part he had opted to sell as part of his inheritance nor his book endowment seems to have been accessible to his grandson around thirty years later.<sup>36</sup> In the intervening period, both endowed and private libraries in Damascus suffered from large-scale extractions of manuscripts, which were sold and transferred to other collections in and beyond the region.<sup>37</sup> A look at the current repositories of ‘Abd al-Salām’s manuscripts is telling (see fig. 3.3). Their current global distribution suggests that the manuscripts were mostly out of Muḥammad Jamīl’s reach when he wrote the history of his family.<sup>38</sup> His shift to print can thus also be seen as a conscious reaction to the book drain—as an attempt to document his family’s written production before it was dispersed even further.

Figure 3.4: Current global distribution of manuscripts once in the possession of ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī. Libraries from East to West (Mss. held): Tokyo University Library (8); King Saud University

---

<sup>36</sup> I take the publication date of ‘Abd al-Salām’s *Dīwān* in 1906 as the point in time for which it is safe to assume that he was interested in his grandfather’s oeuvre and perhaps in his library as well. For Muḥammad Jamīl’s publications, see table 4.1 below.

<sup>37</sup> Kathryn A. Schwartz, “An Eastern Scholar’s Engagement with the European Story of the East: Amin al-Madani and the Sixth Oriental Congress, Leiden, 1883,” in *The Muslim Reception of European Orientalism*, ed. Susannah Heschel and Umar Ryad (London: Routledge, 2019), 39–60; Hirschler, *A Monument to Medieval Syrian Book Culture*, 19, 163; El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics*, 31, projects this phenomenon further back to cover the entire 19th century.

<sup>38</sup> This also applies to the *Kitāb al-Barāhīn al-bayyināt fī bayān ḥaqā’iq al-ḥayawānāt* (Princeton, Firestone Library, Ms. Garrett 427Y), which was copied by Aḥmad al-Shaṭṭī but which is not mentioned in his biography in the *Mukhtaṣar*. It is accessible at <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/4945978> (last accessed 21 May 2020).

Library, Riyad (1); Maktabat al-Ḥaram, Mecca (1); private collection, Damascus (1)<sup>39</sup>; Jafet Library/American University of Beirut, Beirut (2); Dār al-Kutub, Cairo (4); Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (1); Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (1); Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA (1); Firestone Library, Princeton (10); University Library of Michigan, Ann Arbor (1).

#### 4 Muḥammad Jamīl's Publishing Activities

By Muḥammad Jamīl's time, the Shaṭṭī family was well established in Damascus, monopolizing the position of Ḥanbalī mufti periodically between the late 19th and early 20th century.<sup>40</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl served as the Ḥanbalī muftī (starting in 1929/30) and *imām*, and his brother Aḥmad Shawkat helped establish the medical faculty at Damascus University.<sup>41</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl's writing and editing activities should be seen in this context. His first work *Ḍiyā' al-mawfūr* ("The abundant Light [cast] on the Notables among the Banū Farfūr," no. 1 in table 4.1 below), which he immediately endowed to the Damascus Public Library was produced in manuscript.<sup>42</sup> All of Muḥammad Jamīl's subsequent publications were published in print. Could we understand his bequest of *Ḍiyā' al-mawfūr* as a way to ingratiate himself with the library's administration? Or rather as a way to add his own voice to the older Shaṭṭī manuscripts in the collection? As we have seen in section 1, at least one other Shaṭṭī autograph was in this library and so were, possibly, the other manuscripts he edited and published in print.

---

<sup>39</sup> I have not seen this manuscript but only reproductions in an edition. One of the reproduced images displays 'Abd al-Salām's ownership note (dated 1280/1863–64) and the title statement. Muḥammad Ibn Ṭūlūn, *Nawādir al-ijāzāt wa-l-samā'āt*, ed. Muḥammad Muṭī' al-Ḥāfīz (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1998), 10.

<sup>40</sup> Aḥmad b. Ḥasan (d. 1898/99) was the Ḥanbalī *muftī* for almost three decades until his death. His son Muṣṭafā (d. 1929/30) held the same position from the mid-1920s until his death. Muḥammad Jamīl seems to have been appointed in his place. Schatkowski-Schilcher, *Families in Politics*, 122, 179. The earliest mention of the title of *muftī*s found in Ḥasan al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar lawāmi' al-anwār al-bahiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqī, 1931), 206.

<sup>41</sup> Much later than his brother, Aḥmad Shawkat published extensively on the history of medicine with a focus on the Arabic tradition. Although redundancies in my sample are possible, the seventeen publications listed in the catalogues of Princeton and Harvard University indicate that he was a prolific writer, particularly given that all of them were published between 1958 and 1964.

<sup>42</sup> Unfortunately, I was only able to see a microfilm at the Institute of Islamic Manuscripts in Cairo and do not know the manuscript reference number in the Syrian National Library. Neither is it given in the later edition: Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Farfūrī, *Al-Durr al-manthūr 'alā al-Ḍiyā' al-mawfūr fī a'yān Bānī Farfūr* (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Taraqī, 1962). A note on fol. 1r above the title states: "waqf jāmi'ihī wa-kātibihī wa-mālikihī al-faqīr Muḥammad Jamīl Ibn al-shaykh 'Umar Afandī al-Shaṭṭī 'alā al-maktaba al-'umūmiyya fī Dimashq."

In contrast to his maternal grandfather who, as we saw, came in touch with print, and his paternal grandfather Muḥammad (d. 1889/90), whose *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-mubīn fī talkhīṣ kalām al-faraḍiyyīn* (“The clear Opening into the Essence of the Talk of those knowledgeable in Inheritance Law”) was published posthumously (Damascus: Maṭba‘at Wilāyat Sūriyya, 1895), Muḥammad Jamīl embraced print full-heartedly. Overall, I have identified 24 publications (see table 4.1) published between 1903 and 1948. Sixteen of these are listed in the introduction to his *Mukhtaṣar* (marked with an asterisk).<sup>43</sup> Among his publications are his own compositions, one translation, and many editions of manuscripts. The latter cover mostly works of Ḥanbalī authors and, in particular, of his ancestors Ḥasan, Murād, Muḥammad and ‘Abd al-Salām. Muḥammad Jamīl’s output of works by Shaṭṭī’s he edited might have been even higher.<sup>44</sup> However, his involvement is not always visible in library catalogues.

Table 4.1: List of publications that can be identified as Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī’s; a “+” indicates that several works were published together in one book or booklet.<sup>45</sup>

Although Muḥammad Jamīl shifted his textual production to print, he continued certain manuscript

---

<sup>43</sup> For the list of his publications, see al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 71; al-Farfūrī, *Al-Durr al-manthūr*, 16–17.

<sup>44</sup> Muḥammad Jamīl’s involvement is only indicated in a colophon on the last page of the edition of Ḥasan’s *Aqrab al-masālik* (no. 21). This could also be the case for print publications of his paternal grandfather. See Muḥammad al-Shaṭṭī, *Risālah fī masā’il al-Imām Dāwūd al-Zāhirī* [published with Maḥmūd Efendī al-Ḥamzāwī, *Qaṣīda li-l-muftī al-mashār ilayhi fī ba‘ḍ al-masā’il al-madhkūra*] (Damascus: Maṭba‘at Rawḍat al-Shām, 1911); idem., *Fī madhhab al-Imām Dāwūd al-Zāhirī* [published with Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, “Fī masā’il Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymīyah”] (Damascus: Maṭba‘at Rawḍat al-Shām, 1911); idem., *Al-Qawā‘id al-Ḥanbaliyya fī l-taṣarruḥāt al-‘aqrīyya* (Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1929).

<sup>45</sup> This note contains additional information on unclear attributions referring to the numbers assigned in the table: (2) The subtitle states that this is a collection of *risālas* (treatises or letters?) from Fātiḥ Efendī al-Habrāwī to his uncle Murād; a work with the same title identifies Muḥammad Jamīl’s paternal grandfather as the author although he is not credited in the bibliography; al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 167. (8) The title might refer to the only printed work by Muḥammad Jamīl’s father: Muḥammad al-Shaṭṭī, *Kitāb al-Faḥ al-mubīn fī talkhīṣ kalām al-faraḍiyyīn*, Damascus: Maṭba‘at Wilāyat Sūriyya, 1895. (10) This publication is probably based on Muḥammad’s abridgment of his father Ḥasan’s work, *Baṣṭ al-rāḥa li-tanāwul al-masāḥa*: “he made an abridgement of his father’s book, he gave it a title in his name, and he added a chart to it which shows geometrical shapes and explains their area”; al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 158, 167. (13) Inheritance law is explicitly mentioned in several biographies of the Shaṭṭī family; Aḥmad is credited with teaching and writing glosses on several books on inheritance law but an original composition is only assigned to Muḥammad, in addition to “unfinished *risālas* on inheritance law”; it is his *Kitāb Ṣaḥā‘if al-rā‘id fī ‘ilm al-farā‘id* of around 70 pages and every page contains a specific study; al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 167 (quote), 176.

practices in his editions. One of these is the publication of several shorter works in one volume (no. 21), which ties his own endeavor back to his grandfather's archival practices, to a certain degree. He also retained the colophon, which is often the only place that mentions his involvement in his editions. The only visible concession to the medial change in his colophon in the *Mukhtaṣar* is an additional collation after print:<sup>46</sup>

The compiler and abridger of the book, Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī, the current Ḥanbalī Qāḍī and *imām* in Damascus, says: here ends what we compiled and abridged of the *Ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila* of our ancestors and scholars; I compiled and abridged it in 1325 [1907–8]; then in 1335 [1916–17] I made its clean copy; then I looked at it again when it was printed, and this was completed on 12.06.1339 / 20.02.1921 [both dates are given in the original].<sup>47</sup>

Recently, Islam Dayeh has examined Aḥmad Zakī's (1867–1934) innovative approach to editing as “investigation” (*taḥqīq*).<sup>48</sup> In contrast, Muḥammad Jamīl consistently denotes his editions as *taṣḥīḥ*, which indicates a limited reach of Zakī's innovations which, admittedly, “were sometimes difficult to implement [...] depending on material, social and cultural conditions.”<sup>49</sup> Perhaps the distinction between editorial approaches should be understood as being more gradual. Muḥammad Jamīl included tables of contents, editorial introductions, and punctuation, but retained the colophon, emphasizing the continuity with the manuscript tradition of his ancestors. This continuity is reflected further in overlaps between Muḥammad Jamīl's publishing activities and Maḥmūd al-ʿAzūqī's book list. Although few, the overlaps are significant. Al-Karamī's *Taḥqīq al-burhān fī sha'n al-dukhān* (“The Affirmation of the Proof in the Matter of Smoking,” 1922), al-Najdī's *Najāt al-khalaf fī i'tiqād al-salaf* (“The Salvation of the Later Muslims regarding the Faith of the Early Muslims”) and al-Saffārīnī's *Aqīda* (both in the same book, 1932) also appear in Maḥmūd's book

---

<sup>46</sup> This was common practice, see El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics*, 79.

<sup>47</sup> Al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 186.

<sup>48</sup> “In Zakī's use, *taḥqīq* is a comprehensive investigation into a text's history, sources, transmission, and reception.” Islam Dayeh, “From *Taṣḥīḥ* to *Taḥqīq*: Toward a History of the Arabic Critical Edition,” *Philological Encounters* 4 (2019): 245–99, here 291.

<sup>49</sup> Dayeh, “From *Taṣḥīḥ* to *Taḥqīq*,” 292–93.

list.<sup>50</sup> However, as ‘Abd al-Salām’s collection, several of Maḥmūd’s manuscripts were later dispersed to collections outside of Damascus, taking them out of Muḥammad Jamīl’s reach. As Maḥmūd’s collecting activities have not received similar attention, they are more difficult to locate than ‘Abd al-Salām’s manuscripts.

Another indirect connection exists between Ms. Garrett 784Y and Muḥammad Jamīl’s edition of Ḥasan’s work, both of which relied on the same autograph. Muḥammad Jamīl indicates the same first two dates for the copy as Maḥmūd, adding that he was Ḥasan’s great-grandson and had “collated and corrected it with an autograph rough draft” (*qābalnā wa-ṣaḥaḥnāhu ‘alā musawwadat al-mukhtaṣar allatī hiya bi-khaṭṭihi l-sharīf*). As the handwriting was difficult to decipher in places, he consulted other “manuscripts and prints” of al-Saffārīnī’s source text, but not Maḥmūd’s copy which had already been taken away from Damascus.<sup>51</sup>

Muḥammad Jamīl’s focus on editing the 19<sup>th</sup>-century compositions, compilations, and copies of other Shaṭṭīs makes sense within a continuous textual tradition and from his own temporal vantage point. As his ancestors had continued and actualized this tradition in manuscript, so did he actualize their contributions in print, adding his date of copy in the colophon. Chains of textual transmission were thus continued in print. At the end stood Muḥammad Jamīl’s own compositions, especially his three biographical works *Rawḍ al-bashar* (no. 23), *Tarājim a’yān Dimashq* (no. 24), and the *Mukhtaṣar* (no. 16). His editing and biographical endeavors were connected. Were the editions secondary products of his research for the biographical works? Or was the *Mukhtaṣar* a collateral of his engagements with manuscripts and the literary heritage? Were the two consecutive steps in the evolution of Muḥammad Jamīl the author or Muḥammad Jamīl the editor? Were his compositions and editions connected by further professional or intellectual concerns? The confluence of both aspects suggests that Muḥammad Jamīl’s status rested on his family connections, which, in turn, rested on the family’s long term connections to the scholarly elite of Damascus. These connections could take many shapes: face-to-face teaching, poetic competition, marriage and kinship ties, collection of manuscripts, written as well as oral transmission, a continuation of an authority’s

---

<sup>50</sup> Their small size in print suggests that Maḥmūd’s respective manuscripts consisted only of single quires and might have been unbound.

<sup>51</sup> Ḥasan al-Shaṭṭī, *Mukhtaṣar lawāmi’ al-anwār al-bahiyya*, 205–6. In this case, he acknowledges the help of other people in the revisions (*murāja’a*), including unnamed family members (*banī al-‘amm*).

work,<sup>52</sup> and calligraphic reproduction or adornment. Through all these relations, Muḥammad Jamīl’s ancestors connected him to an older tradition.

By uncovering his family’s past contributions to the manuscript tradition, Muḥammad Jamīl also secured his status in the present. His publishing activities affirmed the high status his family had held since the later 19<sup>th</sup> century as well as their presence in Damascus since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and his affirmation of his family’s position within Damascene Ḥanbalī society and history also reflected on himself.

## Conclusions

This contribution is not the first to make a case for studying textual production across the seeming gap between manuscript and print cultures.<sup>53</sup> It has illustrated that, in order to find meaningful explanations for the shift, we have to take other contemporaneous developments into account. From the perspective of Muḥammad Jamīl and others, print did not precipitate the end the manuscript but rather created a complementary mode of reproducing texts. It allowed for continuity in transmission, a continuity which relied on continuous efforts of actualizing canonical works through means of copying, commenting, abridging, and elaborating.<sup>54</sup> Contrary to Ahmed El Shamsy’s recent claim that the contingencies of print and a rediscovery of Arabic classical works pushed aside the “post-classical tradition” (roughly 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> centuries), Muḥammad Jamīl continued to adhere, as we have seen, to that tradition as well as to a similar understanding of textual transmission.<sup>55</sup> He also followed a rather traditional approach to editing (*taṣḥīḥ wa-muqābala* instead of *taḥqīq*) until the 1930s, in conversation and, perhaps, competition with innovations in editing by intellectuals

---

<sup>52</sup> See Christopher D. Bahl, “Preservation Through Elaboration: The Historicisation of the Abyssinians in Al-Suyūfī’s *Raf’ Sha’n al-Ḥubshān*,” in *Al-Suyūfī, a Polymath of the Mamluk Period: Proceedings of the Themed Day of the First Conference of the School of Mamluk Studies: (Ca’Foscari University, Venice, June 23, 2014)*, ed. Antonella Ghersetti (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 118–42.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ahmad Khan, “Islamic Tradition in an Age of Print: Editing, Printing and Publishing the Classical Heritage,” in *Reclaiming Islamic Tradition: Modern Interpretations of the Classical Heritage*, ed. Ahmad Khan and Elisabeth Kendall (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2016), 52–99.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Matthew Ingalls, “*Šarḥ, Iḥtiṣār, and Late-Medieval Legal Change: A Working Paper*,” *ASK Working Paper 17* (2014).

<sup>55</sup> El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics*, e.g., 4–6. Muḥammad Jamīl was also involved in the edition of al-Qāsimī’s exegesis based on Ibn Taymiyya; Pieter Coppens, “Breaking with the Traditional Ottoman *Tafsīr* Curriculum? Al-Qāsimī’s *Tamhīd Khaṭīr fī Qawā’id al-Tafsīr* in the Context of Late-Ottoman Arabism,” in *Osmanli’da ilm-i Tefsir*, ed. M. Taha Boyalik and Harun Abaci (Istanbul: ISAR Yayinlari, 2019), 13–34, here: 27.

like Aḥmad Zakī.<sup>56</sup>

Rather than viewing the shift from manuscript to print as the result of a technological determinism, I have tried to show that it was affected by the emergence of a global manuscript market and by the creation of institutional manuscript repositories in the region. Muḥammad Jamīl used both his access to the Zāhiriyya Library as the Ḥanbalī *muftī* and his paleographic skills to extract works from this institutional repository and to make them legible for new generations. Most readers only ever gained access to this part of their textual tradition through his publishing activities, not only because prints were available in greater numbers and at lower prices. In this context, print reacted—rationally—to the extraction of large numbers of manuscripts from Damascus and other places; it offered Muḥammad Jamīl a way to preserve the past and to disseminate knowledge of that past. Without acknowledging the effects of the book drain, these developments cannot be fully understood.

**Acknowledgements:** My gratitude goes to Kathryn Schwartz, Benedikt Reier, Laurenz Kern, the editors, and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. This article was prepared during a Marie Curie Cofund Fellowship with financial support from the European Commission and institutional support from the Trinity Longroom Hub, Dublin.

## **Bibliography**

Auji, Hala. *Printing Arab Modernity: Book Culture and the American Press in Nineteenth-Century Beirut*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

al-Bagdadi, Nadia. “Print, Script and the Limits of Freethinking in Arabic Letters of the 19th Century: The Case of al-Shidyāq.” *Al-Abhath* 48-49 (2000 – 2001): 99 -122.

Bahl, Christopher D. “Preservation Through Elaboration. The Historicisation of the Abyssinians in Al-Suyūṭī’s *Raf‘ Sha’n Al-Ḥubshān*.” In *Al-Suyūṭī, a Polymath of the Mamluk Period: Proceedings of the Themed Day of the First Conference of the School of Mamluk Studies: (Ca’Foscari University, Venice, June 23, 2014)*. Edited by Antonella Gheretti (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 118-142.

---

<sup>56</sup> Dayeh, “From *Taṣhīḥ* to *Taḥqīq*,” 291.

al-Bayṭār, ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *Ḥilyat al-bashar fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar*. Damascus: Maṭbū‘āt Majma‘ al-lugha al-‘arabiyya, 1961.

Coppens, Pieter, “Breaking with the Traditional Ottoman *Tafsīr* Curriculum? Al-Qāsimī’s *Tamhīd Khaṭīr fī Qawā‘id al-Tafsīr* in the Context of Late-Ottoman Arabism.” In *Osmanli’da ilm-i Tefsir*. Edited by M. Taha Boyalik and Harun Abaci (Istanbul: ISAR Yayinlari, 2019), 13-34.

Dayeh, Islam. “From *Taṣhīh* to *Tahqīq*: Toward a History of the Arabic Critical Edition.” *Philological Encounters* 4 (2019): 245-299.

El Shamsy, Ahmed. *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics. How Editors and Print Culture Transformed An Intellectual Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020.

Al-Farfūrī, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ. *al-Durr al-manthūr ‘alā al-Ḍiyā’ al-mawfūr fī a’yān Bānī Farfūr*. Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1962.

Gianni, Celeste. “Poetics of the Catalogue: Library Catalogues in the Arab Provinces During the Late Ottoman Period” (SOAS, University of London, doctoral thesis, 2017).

Hirschler, Konrad. *A Monument to Medieval Syrian Book Culture: The Library of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

Hirschler, Konrad. “From Archive to Archival Practices: Rethinking the Preservation of Mamluk Administrative Documents.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 136, no. 1 (2016): 1-28.

Ibn Najjār, Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad. “al-Kawkab al-munīr sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Taḥrīr.” Princeton, Firestone Library, MS Garrett 2538Yq.

Ibn Ṭulūn, Muḥammad. *Nawādir al-ijāzāt wa-l-samā‘āt*. Edited by Muḥammad Muṭī‘ al-Ḥāfiẓ. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1998.

Ingalls, Matthew. “Šarḥ, Iḥtiṣār, and Late-Medieval Legal Change: A Working Paper.” *ASK Working Paper* 17 (2014).

al-Iskandarānī, Muḥammad. “Kitāb al-Barāhīn al-bayyināt fī bayān ḥaqā’iq al-ḥayawānāt.” Princeton, Firestone Library, MS Garrett 427Y.

Khan, Ahmad. “Islamic Tradition in an Age of Print: Editing, Printing and Publishing the Classical Heritage.” In *Reclaiming Islamic Tradition: Modern Interpretations of the Classical Heritage*. Edited by Ahmad Khan and Elisabeth Kendall, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2016, 52–99.

Kropf, Evyn. “The Yemeni manuscripts of the Yahuda Collection at the University of Michigan. Provenance and acquisition.” *Chroniques du manuscrit au Yémen* 13 (2012) [<https://journals.openedition.org/cmy/1974>].

Mardam, Khalīl (ed.). *Kitāb waqf al-wazīr Lālā Muṣṭafá Bāshā*. Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1925.

al-Nābulṣī, ‘Abd al-Ghanī. *Kifāyat al-ghulām fī jumlat arkān al-Islām ‘alā madhhab al-imām al-a‘zam Abī Ḥanīfah al-akram*.” Damascus: al-Maṭba‘a al-Dūmāniyya, 1866.

al-Nābulṣī, ‘Abd al-Ghanī. *Awrād al-Ustādh ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulṣī*. Edited by ‘Abd al-Salām al-Shaṭṭī, Damascus: al-Maṭba‘a al-Dūmāniyya, 1864.

Roded, Ruth. *Women in Islamic Biographical Collections. From Ibn Sa‘d to Who’s Who*. Boulder: L. Rienner, 1994.

Schatkowsky-Schilcher, Linda. *Families in Politics: Damascene Factions and Estates of the 18th and 19th Centuries*. Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden, 1985.

Schwartz, Kathryn A. “An eastern scholar’s engagement with the European story of the east: Amin al-Madani and the Sixth Oriental Congress, Leiden, 1883.” in *The Muslim Reception of European Orientalism*, ed. Susannah Heschel and Umar Ryad (London: Routledge, 2019), 39-60.

Schwartz, Kathryn A. “Did Ottoman Sultans Ban Print?” *Book History* 20 (2017): 1-39.

Schwartz, Kathryn A. “The Political Economy of Private Printing in Cairo, As Told from a Com-

missioning Deal Turned Sour, 1871.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 49, no. 1 (2017): 25-45.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Ḥasan. *Mukhtaṣar lawāmi‘ al-anwār al-bahiyya*. Edited by Muḥammad Jamīl al-Shaṭṭī. Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1931.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Ḥasan. “*Mukhtaṣar lawāmi‘ al-anwār al-bahiyya li-sharh al-manzūma fī ‘aqd al-firqa al-marḍiyya*,” Princeton, Firestone Library, MS Garrett 784Y.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad Jamīl. *Tarājim a‘yān Dimashq fī niṣf al-qarn al-rābi‘ ‘ashar al-ḥijrī*, Damascus: Maṭba‘at Dār al-Yaqza al-‘Arabiyya, 1948.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad Jamīl. *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a‘yān Dimashq fī al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar*, Damascus: Maṭba‘at Dār al-Yaqzah al-‘Arabiyyah, 1946.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad. *al-Qawā‘id al-Ḥanbalīyah fī al-taṣarrufāt al-‘aqārīyah*, Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1929.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad Jamīl. *Mukhtaṣar ṭabaqāt al-ḥanābila*, Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Taraqqī, 1921.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad. *Risālah fī masā’il al-Imām Dāwūd al-Zāhirī*. Damascus: Maṭba‘at Rawḍat al-Shām, 1911.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad. *Fī madhhab al-Imām Dāwūd al-Zāhirī*. Damascus: Maṭba‘at Rawḍat al-Shām, 1911.

Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad. *Kitāb al-Faṭḥ al-mubīn fī talkhīṣ kalām al-faraḍīyīn*. Damascus: Maṭba‘at Wilāyat Sūriyya, 1895.

Wollina, Torsten. “Tracing Ibn Ṭūlūn’s Autograph Corpus, with Emphasis on the 19th-20th Centuries.” *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 9 (2018): 308-340.

Wollina, Torsten. “The Banu Qadi ‘Ajlun: Family or Dynasty?”, *DYNTRAN Working Papers*, no. 19, online edition (2016), <http://dyntran.hypotheses.org/1623> (last accessed 20 June 2020).

Wollina, Torsten. “In absence of a colophon: alternative signing practices in Arabic autograph manuscripts.” In *Scribal Practice – Global Cultures of Colophons, 1400-1700*. Edited by Christopher Bahl und Stefan Hanß (London: Palgrave MacMillan, forthcoming).