In the course of January 1987 I visited the Egyptian National Library (Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣrīyya, more recently: Dār al-Kutub al-Qawmiyya), situated at the Corniche al-Nil in the new building of the General Egyptian Book Organisation (al-Hay'ah al-Miṣrīyyah al-Āmmah li-al-Kitāb), of which the library forms part. I had gone with the intention of gathering materials on the research facilities of the manuscript department in the Library.

Previously I had visited the Library in the winter of 1973-74 under rather unfavourable conditions. This was due to the boycott by the Arab countries of the Netherlands because of its imprudent and overzealous backing of Israel during the war of October 1973. Although my visit had no political intentions at all, Egyptian officials thought it fit to wage a war of their own against an unfortunate Dutchman, who happened to pass by. At that time it took me more than three weeks only to enter the MSS reading room, whose whereabouts were deliberately kept hidden from me. I remember that I paid a morning visit every day to the then director, Mr. Farid 'Abd al-Kāliq, in his office in the old building of the Library, at the Midān Bāb al-Kāliq. Everybody was always very kind and polite there. I was sometimes offered coffee, and most times some sweets, by the director who was either perusing leaflets on modern library equipment (which he would never be able to purchase), or entertaining his friends in his impressive room. In it I recall having seen a portrait gallery of former directors of the Library, with many a famous name among them. It was always rather dark in that building, as the electricity was cut off because of the danger of fire. But the MSS I wanted to see? Well, that was somewhat complicated just now as they were either just being transferred to a new building, or they were stored in underground shelters as a safety measure because of the war, and therefore not available to the public, or there might be some other reason, and off I had to go, determined to have more luck the next day. Sometimes I went to the new building which was situated along the Nile, and tried to find out from there what seemed to be the trouble. There the problems were of a more modern nature, just like the building, as it appeared that my clearance


with Egyptian Security was another reason for the delay of my admittance to the Library. Opposite the new building was the Casino Al-Šāgara, and I spent many an hour there looking at the Nile and contemplating my next move, for the coming day. Well, in the end, and only through the interference of an influential Egyptian friend, who had become enraged by the treatment I had to undergo, I was given access to my manuscripts, and allowed to study these in the room of the deputy director. When this proved impractical after a few days, I was shown the way, through yet unfinished parts of the building, where birds and rain had free entrance, and then through part of the stacks, to a reading room on the third or fourth floor. There, to my amazement, students and scholars were working on manuscripts and, I realized, had been doing so all the time, a fact which could not have happened without the consent and knowledge of all those kind library officials, by whom I had been offered coffee, sweets and pretexts, but, alas, no manuscripts. I had still a month or two for my research left, and was able to see most, though not all, manuscripts needed for my work.

The circumstances were quite different thirteen years later. The years of peace in Egypt seem to have dulled the sharp edges of xenophobia. This made me confident that I would fare better than had been the case in 1973-74. The manuscript department (maraqabat al-maṣāḥīth) on the fourth floor has now a spacious reading room, but right at the entrance I realized that the conditions under which the researching of manuscripts had to take place had become even less favourable than during my previous visit. At the left side of the door the following message was posted:

Notice. In view of the circumstances of the stock-taking which is taking place in the manuscript department it is definitely not allowed to study the original manuscripts. It is only permitted to study from microfilms. May God give success. The Director of Technical Affairs.

On both sides of the entrance, and repeatedly in the reading room, posters were displayed with elaborate instructions for the ordering of microfilms. These read as follows:

Instructions to be followed for the photographing of manuscripts.

1. It is necessary that whoever applies to have a manuscript photographed present an official letter which is authorized by the university or faculty to which he belongs, in one original and one copy, in which are stated the title of the manuscript of which editing is requested, together with the degree of education of the applicant, and the name of the professor doctor who is supervising the thesis.

2. Photographing outside the field of study and research is not allowed.

3. For the purpose of edition it is not allowed to have more than one original manuscript, together with two auxiliary manuscripts photographed.

4. For the purpose of study and research it is not allowed to have an entire manuscript photographed. It is, however, permitted to have six exposures' taken, which may be used during the research.

5. Manuscripts which contain ten double pages or less may not be photographed. The researcher must copy them by himself.

6. Photographing for publishers is only done in the case of exchange, and after the manuscripts which have been asked for in return have been inspected. Unique manuscripts are not photographed.

7. It must be observed that photographing rare copies, especially if the copy is good and unique, can only be done in rare cases, the importance of which is related to the degree of seriousness of the researcher in his application.

8. Permission to photograph a manuscript will not be granted when the manuscript has already been photographed for the purpose of an edition. This is in order to save effort.

9. Photographing for individuals is done on paper; for scientific organisations and institutions microfilms are made.
10. Photographing for Egyptian students, working abroad or belonging to Arab or non-Arab universities is done upon presentation of an official letter of the faculty where they are registered for the obtaining of their scholarly degree.

11. Photographing for university professors, for the purpose of edition and publication, is done upon presentation of an official letter of the university, in which the title and subject of the manuscript is stated.

12. Photographing for colleagues in the library is only done for the purpose of scholarly editing.

13. Photographing is done free of charge in the case of exchange or when the Director-General has given his approval.

14. It is not permitted to have manuscripts photographed which the 'Centre for the Edition of the Heritage' is editing and publishing.

The Head of the Department: (signature)
The Director of Technical Affairs: (signature)
The Director-General: (signature)
The Deputy-Minister for the Section of the Libraries: (signature)
19 October 1986

These two notices are, in their mutual and combined effect, clearly an effective barrier for the scholarly study of manuscripts. The 'Notice' was given, so I was told by the Deputy-Librarian, to protect the manuscripts against wear and tear, but the 'Notice' itself gives stocktaking as the only reason for the obligatory use of microfilms. Rumour has it that thefts have occurred in the Library, and that therefore access to the manuscripts has been forbidden and the use of microfilms as the sole means of consultation made obligatory. Microfilms, however, obviously do not allow one to study the physical appearance of a manuscript, and research must necessarily remain very incomplete when it is based on microfilms only. Dating by means of the identification of watermarks and the establishing of the composition of the quires, which are both internationally well-accepted methods and techniques, has become impossible. What is worse, however, is that this measure will probably have the contrary effect from what is envisaged by it. It is obvious that only when visitors of the Library are bound to request at random from the manuscript collection, can supervision on the availability guarantee that misappropriations will not occur, or that they will be detected soon anyhow. At least when one assumes that such misappropriations, if any, were an inside job.

The fourteen rules, which make up the above-mentioned Instructions, call for some comment as well. Rules 1 and 2 are more or less acceptable. The limitations in ordering microfilms as contained in rules 3 through 8 give researchers who are working in this library a severe disadvantage: only one 'original' and two auxiliary copies will be made for the purpose of editing (rule 3), which means that the edition of texts with some complication in their textual history can no longer be undertaken, and that a methodological straight-jacket has been imposed on the readers; for research purposes only six exposures are made (rule 4), a rule which, because of its absurdity, does not need further comment: no microfilms of manuscripts of less than eleven double pages are made, as the researcher is assumed to copy these by himself (rule 5), that is: by hand, which is impossible anyway as no original manuscripts are given to the readers; no microfilms are made of 'unique' manuscripts (rule 6), which leaves the door wide open for arbitrary refusals, as the absence of a reference library of any sort in the reading room does not allow one to check the rarity of a certain manuscript; very serious applicants nevertheless may order microfilms of unique manuscripts (rule 7), but exactly how serious does one have to be?, one might ask; if one has the misfortune that a certain manuscript has already been photographed for a previous applicant, no microfilm will be made at all (rule-8): two editions of the same text must apparently be avoided, as if that were the Egyptian National Library's responsibility. The rules 9 through 13 are more positive of content and give the applicant some prospect of success, whereas
rule 14, in which the 'Centre for the Edition of the Heritage' is given the right of preference, allows the possibility of unrealistic claims by the collaborators of the Centre for future projects.

The manuscript reading room has the following facilities. Firstly there are five microfilm readers, while a few tables accommodate readers of the catalogues. The volumes of the first edition of the catalogue (published Cairo 1305-1310 AH) are not available for the public. Photocopies of the second edition (published Cairo 1924-1942) are put at the disposal of the readers, and likewise the supplement to that catalogue, which was compiled by Fu′ād Sayyid (Cairo 1961-3). Also available are the original handwritten fiche catalogues of special collections which have been incorporated in the National Library. To this category first belongs the catalogue of the Taymūriyya collection. I have seen 61 volumes, containing loose leaves, with a separate card index for each of these volumes, printed on the backs of these volumes, there must be at least 89 volumes of this type. They are arranged according to the title of the manuscript. This list also contains references to manuscripts which originate from other, smaller collections within the Library. These are the collections of Kālīl Agā, Ibrāhīm Ḥalim, al-Šīqrī, al-Sayyid Ahmad al-Husaynī, Muhammad ‘Abduh, and in addition to that al-Ḵizāna al-Zakīyya, which is the collection of Ahmad Zakī Pāšā. All these collections contain both manuscripts and printed books. Those manuscripts that have not been described in a catalogue before 1971 have been provided with an asterisk in the typewritten Handlist. According to an information leaflet, dated January 1982, the holdings of the Library contain: 57,469 Arabic manuscripts 2,554 Persian manuscripts 5,154 Turkish manuscripts 6,661 photographed manuscripts, printed on paper Total 71,838 Middle Eastern manuscripts.

A rough estimate indicates that about 75% of the older catalogues is available in this typewritten Handlist. This implies that 25% of the older collections can be considered lost, as the library staff wishes to have no other references than to this Handlist. This Handlist also contains references to manuscripts which originate from other, smaller collections within the Library. These are the collections of Kālīl Agā, Ibrāhīm Ḥalim, al-Šīqrī, al-Sayyid Ahmad al-Husaynī, Muhammad ‘Abduh, and in addition to that al-Ḵizāna al-Zakīyya, which is the collection of Ahmad Zakī Pāšā. All these collections contain both manuscripts and printed books. Those manuscripts that have not been described in a catalogue before 1971 have been provided with an asterisk in the typewritten Handlist. According to an information leaflet, dated January 1982, the holdings of the Library contain: 57,469 Arabic manuscripts 2,554 Persian manuscripts 5,154 Turkish manuscripts 6,661 photographed manuscripts, printed on paper Total 71,838 Middle Eastern manuscripts.

Now that only microfilms are made available for the readers of the Library, a card index for the microfilms has been put at their disposal. This index is stored in the reading room, in some 120 wooden boxes, which are usually half filled with cards. Their arrangement has no concordance with the Handlist. Their first principle of order is usually (but not always) the subject matter of the text, and within each subject according to collection and then in numerical order of class-mark. Index cards of microfilms of manuscripts preserved in other libraries are arranged according to the title of the work. As the entries in the Handlist usually have no indication of subject matter, the user of this microfilm card index is left somewhat to his own wits, as he is obliged to convert the purely
alphabetical title in the Handlist to the subject classification of the card index of the microfilm collection, which is by no means applied in a consistent way, in order to find the number of the desired microfilm. From some browsing through this card index, it quickly became clear to me that the older collections are fairly well represented in the microfilm collection. When I, to name but one instance, looked for manuscripts on calligraphy and the art of writing in the Taymūriyya collection I found the following texts divided over two subject headings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ta'llım Taymūr</th>
<th>number film</th>
<th>number(s)</th>
<th>short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20367</td>
<td>K. fi-al-Aqlām al-Qaḍīna wa-Šuwarīhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>Muqaddima fi Šinā'at al-Καττ (Ibn Muqla)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2641, 40296</td>
<td>Risāla fi-al-Καττ (Ibn al-Sā'īg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30698, 20943</td>
<td>Risāla fi Šinā'at al-Καττ (Ibr. al-Quraṣī) (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20081</td>
<td>Risāla-yi Καττ (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20071</td>
<td>Manzūma fi Šinā'at al-Καττ (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20082</td>
<td>Mīzān al-Καττ (Fīruz al-Qarāḫiśārī) (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20077</td>
<td>Asāníd Asāítad al-Καττ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>no film</td>
<td>Mahfāza bihā Mağmū' ... Amṭīlat li-Ta'llım al-Καττ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>20375</td>
<td>Silsilat al-Kaṭṭātīn (Saʿīd ... [?]) Sulaymān)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>20987, 30415</td>
<td>Mağmū' Murqqa'āt wa-Luwāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Šinā'at Taymūr</th>
<th>number film</th>
<th>number(s)</th>
<th>short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17838</td>
<td>'Umdat al-Kuttāb (Ibn Bādīs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2727, 17837</td>
<td>Risāla fi Šinā'at al-Aḥbār (in 7 chapters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>21139</td>
<td>'Umdat al-Kuttāb (Ibn Bādīs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, out of a total of fourteen manuscripts only one item has not been microfilmed, probably because of its containing a number of loose specimens of calligraphy. But from a total of thirteen microfilmed manuscripts, four have been microfilmed twice. For al-Ḵīzānā al-Zakiyya, however, the score is totally different. Its total contents are 18,622 manuscripts and printed books. The card index for microfilmed manuscripts contains no more than approximately thirty films of manuscripts in that collection. The unfortunate reader who would like to consult from that collection a manuscript, of which there is (not yet) a microfilm available — and those are the most — simply has bad luck; the rule that only microfilms may be studies, and no longer original manuscripts, takes care of that.

Summing up, we cannot fail to realize that conditions of studying manuscripts in the Egyptian National Library have deteriorated considerably during the past years. Original manuscripts are no longer available, and readers are dependent on the occasional and incidental presence of microfilms. In addition to that, a number of impractical, not to say absurd, limitations has been set for the manufacture of new microfilms. Confronted with this situation in 1987 I must confess that I could not help wishing for the far from ideal circumstances of 1973-74 to return.

Chronological bibliography

For bibliographical references to the older catalogues of the Egyptian National Library the reader is referred to the entries in A.J.W. Huisman. Les manuscrits arabes dans le monde (Leiden 1967), pp. 11-12, in I.B. Mikhailova & A.B. Khalilov, Bibliografija Arabskich Rakopisej (Moscow 1982), pp. 84-87, and in Kurkis 'Awwād. Fuhūris al-Mağṭūtāt al-'Arabiyya fi-al-'Ālam (2 vols. Kuwait 1984), vol. 2, pp. 215-217. In this connection the reader may also be referred to the appropriate entries in the bibliographies in the first and in some of the subsequent volumes of F. Sezgin, Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums (Leiden 1967- ).
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Manuscripts in print: some Arabic examples

The concept that typesetter's copy could be useful for the understanding of the printed edition of a text may be self-evident, but surprisingly enough hardly any systematical research has been done on this subject. There is the pioneering study and atlas Copy and Print in the Netherlands, compiled by G.W. Hellinga and published in 1960-62. More recently, this subject has been given some attention in two books by Philip Gaskell, in which some theoretical observations and examples taken from English literature, ranging over the period between 1591-1974, are given. Hellinga's Atlas gives an overwhelming amount of material, which has far wider implications than the title suggests. Far from the present-day tiny kingdom on the shores of the North Sea, the Netherlands were, in the latter part of the 16th and in the 17th centuries, an internationally orientated merchant Republic, where, at least in the 17th century, more books were produced than in all other countries of the world together (H. de la Fontaine Verwey, in: Hellinga, op. cit., p. 29). Rather than presenting local practices from somewhere off the beaten path, Hellinga describes and illustrates features
of copy and print from the very centre of book production.

The purpose of this article is to show some typesetter's copy of printed Arabic texts, and to point out how such copy can be recognized. Some of the problems connected with copy and print will be briefly touched upon. I will limit myself to three examples, two from the Middle East (both almost certainly from Egypt) and one from Europe, all dating from the second half of the 19th or the beginning of the 20th century. Although the books by Hellinga and Gaskell provide a theoretical framework for the study of printer's copy, they cannot be applied to Arabic printed texts without at least some modification. The art of typesetting and printing in Arabic, after having been introduced in the Middle East in the early 18th century, came to flourish there only in the second half of the 19th century. Developments of printing and publishing in the Middle East in that period are at best compared with the developments Western Europe witnessed in the 15th and 16th centuries. This is an important condition for the correct understanding of the printing of Arabic in the Middle East.

How the spread of printing in early 19th-century Egypt influenced the progress of learning and science has been described several times, and need not extensively repeated here. It is well known that the first printing press which was operated on Egyptian soil had been imported in 1798 by Napoleon Bonaparte, but it was removed in 1801 with the retreat of the French from Egypt (see e.g. Ridwân, pp. 17 ff., Abū Śu‘āyṣi‘, pp. 316-7). The history of the establishment and further development of the Press in Būlāq have been described by Ridwân (op. cit., pp. 28 ff.), who also gives a survey of the typographical materials used in the Press and of the juridical conditions under which the Press could operate (op. cit., pp. 84 ff.). The subsequent flourishing of the printing industry in the second half of the 19th century, all over the Middle East and more particularly in Egypt, is testified by the huge book production of that period. The very existence of this enormous production invites to try to reconstruct its procedures and to search for documents which illustrate the coming into being of the text editions which were then produced. More often than not, however, the basis of a certain printed text, that is the employed manuscript or specially made typesetter's copy, remains unmentioned in those editions.

Even in the case where manuscripts are indeed mentioned, references to them are so global that text critical material can hardly be gained from such information. Although often a great amount of energy has been spent by the learned editors of the editing of these editions, the fact that the editing work cannot be reconstructed anymore, because the critical apparatus is practically always lacking, makes of such an editions just one more witness in the chain of transmission of a text. And often a contaminated witness at that, one in which several textual traditions converge, without being duly accounted for. An example of this is the first Middle Eastern edition of Ibn Ǧaldūn’s Mughad-dima, which was prepared by Naṣr al-Hūrīnī (Būlāq 1274/1857). We can infer from what this learned editor says in his marginal annotations that he used one manuscript from Fās and several manuscripts of Tunisian origin. In the entire printed text of 316 folio pages Naṣr al-Hūrīnī gives as few as eight marginal notes of textual criticism. Bibliographical descriptions or more detailed references to the manuscripts which he used are absent altogether. The notes that are present (op. cit., pp. 4, 64, 101, 126, 146, 165, 295) usually treat single textual variants, but no attempt is made by the editor to make an evaluation of the manuscripts. And in cases of doubt Naṣr al-Hūrīnī frequently used his own judgment as the final instance for establishing his text, as has already been observed by De Slane (see F. Rosenthal in the introduction to his translation, I, p. cit.).

The Egyptian printed text editions of the 19th century usually leave us unacquainted with an account of the text-critical work that has been done by the editor. Most often neither editor nor manuscript basis of the edition are known at all. Under such conditions it is seldom possible to trace the manuscript or manuscripts that served as exemplar, nor for that matter can much be said about the editorial method employed. More insight about methods and textual variants can only be acquired from the basic manuscript(s): the typesetter's copy could also yield valuable information. It can be safely assumed, however, that most typesetter's copy has been lost, simply thrown away, or at best stored away in some publisher's archive, upon completion of the printing of the book. This was, and still is, common practice with many printers or publishers all over the world. Some of the typesetter's copy has survived, however, and two examples of such copy from Egypt and one from Europe, which were recently acquired by the Library of the University of Leiden, will be discussed here.

The first example is a little manuscript, registered in the Library as Or. 18.696. It was acquired in 1985 from the antiquarian bookshop 'De rijzende zon' of Tilburg, the Netherlands, which had procured the book directly from Egypt. It contains two texts:

1. ff. 1a-9a. The Ḥāṣidā Rā‘īyya, a poem on Qur'ānic readings by al-Qāsim b. Finroh al-Ṣāhībī (d. 590/1194, cf. GAL G 1, 409), a qasidā rhyming in -rā, whose official name is 'Aqīlat Arâb al-Qāṣāʾ id fi Asnā al-Maqqāsid.

2. ff. 9b-12a. Asmāʾ Aḥl Bādār, an anonymous list, alphabetically arranged, of the names of the companions of the Prophet Muhammad, who had fought at his side in the battle of Badr. In all, writes the anonymous compiler, the list contains 363 names, of
whom 94 are *muhāǧirūn* and the remaining *Aṣālīr*. Of
the latter, 74 are from Aws and 195 from Ḥazraj.

The manuscript is on paper, with watermark *treble*,
and the corner-mark would seem to read *caucv*, but
this is not entirely clear. Both texts are written by
the same copyist, in Oriental handwriting, in black ink
with rubrics. The manuscript contains 12 ff. The paper
measures 160 × 105 mm, the text area c. 130 × 80 mm,
and it has 21 lines to the page. It is unbound, and it
is now kept in the cover of a modern Egyptian exercise
book. It is not dated, but could well be from the 19th
century. In connection with our subject only the first
text in the booklet, the *Qaṣīda Ra‘īyya* by al-Ṣāṭībī,
is relevant. The beginning of the *qaṣīda* (ff. 1b-2a) has
been provided with a counting in the margin of some
of the lines, together with an indication of where the
page (sāḥifa) would end in a printed edition (see figure
1). From these marks it becomes clear that we have
here a manuscript which was somehow used as typeset-
ter's copy for an edition with 16 lines of poetry to the
page. These kinds of marks are present till the indica-
tion of the end of p. 16 of the projected edition (f. 7a).
The remaining part of the *qaṣīda* lacks these marks. It
is not clear whether this manuscript was actually used
as typesetter's copy. The proof of that would be the
printed edition which I have not been able to trace.
The manuscript was at least used by someone in a
printer's establishment for the casting off of the text.

In another, also recently acquired, manuscript of the
Leiden library I was able to establish the link between
the typesetter's copy and the printed edition. This
manuscript, my second example from Egypt, is now
registered in the Library as Or. 14.526. It was acquired
in the course of 1978 from the antiquarian bookshop
McBlain's, then in Des Moines, Iowa, USA. It is now
bound in a recently manufactured green half-leather
binding, which is known in Egypt as *tagjid israng* ‘European
binding’. An owner's name is printed on the
back: Muḥammad 'Alawān, or 'Ulwa', whom I have
not identified. His name is printed in a similar way on
the back of two other Leiden manuscripts from the
same purchase: Or. 14.508 and Or. 14.527. Other
manuscripts which arrived in the same shipment
appear to originate from Egypt as well. The manu-
script contains the text of the Kitāb al-Isā'a li-Āṣrāt al-
Ṣā'a, an enumeration of portents, both historical and
future ones, of the Last Judgment, and was written by

Fig. 1. MS Leiden Or. 18.696 (1), ff. 1b-2a. The beginning of the *Qaṣīda Ra‘īyya* by al-Ṣāṭībī. On f. 1b is a beginning of the
counting of the lines, together with an indication of where the end of page 1 in the projected edition is situated. On f. 2a the
end of page 2 of the edition is indicated.
M. b. 'Abd al-Rasūl al-Barzangi al-Husaynī al-Mūsawi al-Sāfī al-Sahrazūrī al-Madanī (d. 1103/1691, cf. GAL G II, 388). As one can conclude from the rather considerable number of manuscripts of this text which Brockelmann lists in his GAL, the text must have enjoyed a certain popularity. Our manuscript was copied on paper by one copyist. It is written in Oriental handwriting, in black ink with rubrics. It contains 159 ff., measures 225 × 155 mm (text area 180 × 105 mm) and has 19 lines to the page. The manuscript is...
Fig. 3. Title-page of the printed edition of al-Bargandi's Kitāb al-Isā‘a li-Isrā‘īl al-Sā‘a, prepared by M. Badr al-Dīn al-Nāṣīr al-Halabī and published by the Matba‘at al-Sa‘āda of M. Efendi Ismā‘īl, Cairo 1325 1907 (Leiden, University Library: 830 F 19).

united, but contains a copy of the author's colophon at the end (f. 159a), which informs us that the book was completed by its author on Wednesday, between the two salāls, on 11 Dū al-Qa‘da 1076/1666, in the author's house in Medina, situated in the street known as al-Suwayqa. The present manuscript is, however, much more recent. It could well have been written at the beginning of this century. It is now kept in a modern binding, and part of the marginal space, with some of the marginal notes, was cut off when the manuscript was bound.

Upon opening the manuscript the reader is instantly struck by the untidy appearance of the book. Numerous pages show blots and stains, which were apparently caused by the handling of the manuscript with unclean fingers. The paper of many a page has been folded in the middle over the text, and a large number of pages show indications, strokes and the like, written with what at first sight appears to be pencil. Occasionally, numbers have been written in the margins in violet ink. All these phenomena indicate that the manuscript has been handled by a typesetter. The inky thumb prints must be the compositor's, as his touching the lead type usually produces stains on printer's copy. Folding the paper of the copy in the middle of the text is a common feature as well. The strokes, hooks and crosses on the paper are usually made during the typesetting as well. They indicate either the progress of the compositor's work, or can be written for the sake of the lay-out. In the present manuscript they do not seem to have been written with pencil, but with typographical material, lead type or lines. The numbering in violet ink indicates the beginning of a new quire (of 16 pages) in the printed edition.

Unlike the previously described manuscript, that of al-Ṣāḥībī's Qaṣīda Rā‘īyya, whose use as typesetter's copy could not be proven with the edition (although it is highly probable that it had been used for that purpose), the present manuscript of the Kitāb al-Isā‘a can be shown to have served as the exemplar of a typographer. The printed edition which was made on the basis of this very manuscript is available. For brevity's sake I refer here to figures 2-3 and 4-5, which show the dependence of the edition on the manuscript. A few details capture one's attention. The title of the text, as given in the manuscript and written by the copyist, contains two imperfections, which have been copied unaltered in the printed edition. Of minor importance is the fact that the tā marbūta in the words al-isā‘a and al-sā‘a lacks the two dots both in manuscript and print. More serious is the incorrect writing of the name of the father of the author: in both instances his name is given as Rasul whereas it should be 'Abd al-Rasūl. Underneath the title of the manuscript two texts have been added by a person or persons other than the copyist. One of these is written in pencil, the other in violet ink, and both serve as typesetter's copy. The text in pencil contains the names of two gentlemen from Takrit who provided the funds necessary for the printing, and the text in violet ink contains the name of the editor (musahihī), a certain M. Badr al-Dīn al-Nāṣīn al-Halabī (according to the printed text; the spelling of the first nisba in the manuscript is not very clear). Finally, the title-page of the manuscript shows an addition, written in pencil, in which lacunae in the text are located.

As figures 4 and 5 show, the beginning of the third quire of the edition (figure 5) was indicated by the typesetter in the manuscript (figure 4). Strokes and crosses, which were probably made by the typesetter with lead typographical material, are still faintly visible. Stains of the typesetter's thumb prints can be seen as well. Similar marks and fingerprints can be observed on many pages of the manuscript. Indications of the beginning of a new quire, all of which correspond to the lay-out of the printed edition, are on ff. 10b, 20b, 29b, 39a, 57b, 68a, 98a, 108b, and 139b, for the beginning of quires Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 17, respectively. No marks corresponding with the
Fig. 4. MS Leiden Or. 14,526, f. 20b. Kitāb al-Islām li-Aṣrāt al-Sā' by al-Barqandi. Indication, written in violet ink, of the beginning of the third quire of the printed edition, pp. 32-33 (see next figure). Marks made with lead type, or possibly lead lines, are faintly visible between lines 8-9 and 12-13. Some thumb prints in the margin.
beginning of quires 5, 7, 10-12, 15 and 16 are found in the manuscript. As it is now, the manuscript is incomplete. There are, as is mentioned on the title-page (see figure 2), several leaves missing. The printed text is complete in such cases, however. Compare e.g. the lacuna between ff. 28-29 of the manuscript with the continuous printed text on p. 46, line 8. The explanation of this can be twofold. Either the missing text of this manuscript was supplemented from another manuscript, or, much more probably, some leaves of the manuscript were lost on the typesetter's desk and apparently not recovered. These lost leaves share the fate of the greater part of typesetter's copy, which is usually thrown away after it has served its purpose. The apparent lack of appreciation of the manuscript in this particular case could lead one to the conclusion that it was made to serve as copy for the compositor and nothing more. The poor quality of the paper points in the same direction. The typesetter, probably knowing this, assumed he could discard the used leaves after the production of the printed edition was completed.

The edition of the Kitāb al-Iṣā'a is printed on yellowish paper, measuring 165 x 135 mm. The text is set, apparently by hand, in an 18-pt. Arabic type and has 22 lines to the page. Before the actual text of the Kitāb al-Iṣā'a begins, there are eight leaves, one full quire, which contain a detailed table of contents of seven pages (numbered 1-7) and a biography of the author of five pages (numbered alif-hā'). The remaining pages of this preliminary quire remain blank. Neither addition is present in the manuscript. Then follows the text of the Kitāb al-Iṣā'a li-Āṣrāt al-Sā'a, with the title-page on p. 1 (see figure 3) and the text of the book on pp. 2-287. The beginning page of each quire has a quire mark, with a number (see figure 5). On p. 288 is a short note by the editor (musābhib), which reads like a colophon. The completion of the printing is given here somewhat more precisely than on the title-page: the end third of the month Ġumādā I of 1325 (coinciding with the beginning of July 1907). At the beginning and end of the Leiden copy of the printed edition some leaves with publisher's advertisements are bound together with al-Barғandi's text, but these do not seem to belong in any way to the Kitāb al-Iṣā'a, being printed on different paper and in no way connected with the publisher, the Matba'a al-Sā'ida.

No information is given in this editor's colophon on p. 288, however, concerning the method of edition. Nor can we expect that, since it was hardly ever done in that period. With the typesetter's copy at hand we can come to conclusions which may have some wider

---

Fig. 5. Al-Barғandi’s Kitāb al-Iṣā'a li-Āṣrāt al-Sā'a, edition Cairo 1325/1907, pp. 32-33, showing the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd quire, which correspond with the mark in the MS (see previous figure).
Fig. 6. MS Leiden Or. 20.192, p.3. Beginning of the *Kitab Akhbar Makka* by al-Azraqi. Typesetter's copy made by the editor, Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, Gottingen 1858 (see next figure).
Fig. 7. Opening page of al-Azraqī’s *Kitāb Akhār Makka*, in the edition of Wüstenfeld, Leipzig 1858, p.3. The text in red ink of the exemplar has been set in a larger font; the lay-out of the heading in the exemplar has been followed by the compositor. (Leiden, University Library: OLG 64:9331).
bearing than on the Kitāb al-Isā’a only. We may assume that the manuscript of the text was made in order to serve as typesetter’s copy. In any case, to judge from its appearance, it is not much older than the edition of 1325/1907. In Egypt, and probably elsewhere in the Middle East as well, manuscripts have been continued to be made till the early years of this century and our manuscript could be one of these. The low quality of the paper employed could point to its having been made solely as printer’s copy. It is not, however, an entirely finished typesetter’s copy with a detailed typographical instruction. Much of the interpretation of the manuscript was probably left to the typesetter and his work cannot anymore be distinguished from the editor’s. A few typographical instructions are extant in the manuscript, though. The rubricated text (e.g. on ff. 1b, 2b, 3a) was put between brackets by the compositor. Red overlining (on ff. 148b-149a) had the same result. Towards the end of the manuscript there are some marginal notes of a text critical nature, written in red ink, in a hand different from the copyist’s (ff. 121a, 122a, 124b, 126b, 148a, 151a (?), 153a). They contain suggestions for emendations and conjectures, and have usually been accepted in the printed edition. Compare for this e.g. manuscript f. 148a with edition p. 270, line 2, and manuscript f. 153a with edition p. 278, line 11. On numerous occasions there are interpretations in the edition of defective manuscript readings. Thus, to give but one example out of many, one sees in the manuscript on f. 57a, line 8 li-yuhillu (ليعيّل), which has become in the printed edition. The question whose work the inclusion of these emendations and interpretations was, the editor’s or the compositor’s, remains unanswered. Direct information on the working practice in the Matba‘at al-Sā‘āda in Cairo and, more particularly, on the printing history of the Kitāb al-Isā’a is lacking. To what extent a corrector has modified the text in between the editor’s and typesetter’s activity is equally unknown. Summing up we must concede that not much more can be said than that there is a number of arguments in favour of the conclusion that the Leiden manuscript Or. 14.526 was the printer’s copy for the edition published in Cairo in 1907. More precise information on the different activities which eventually lead to the production of the edition cannot, however, be gained from the material we have at hand.

My third, and last, example of copy and print is of European origin. It is the edition by Ferdinand Wüstenfeld of M. b. ‘Abdallāh al-Azraqi’s archaeological history of Mecca, which was published by Wüstenfeld as the first volume of his Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka (Leipzig 1858). The manuscript, Wüstenfeld’s autograph, was acquired by Leiden University Library in the course of 1986 from Brill’s antiquarian bookshop in Leiden (catalogue 555, No. 38), and originates from the private library of the German Islamologist H. Gottschalk. It is now registered in the Library as Or. 20.192. It consists of 410 + 18 pp., measuring 215 × 170 mm. The pages are provided with a lineation, as in an exercise book. It is inscribed on the front flyleaf: ‘F. Wüstenfeld. Göttingen 1858’. On the inside of the flyleaf at the end of the volume (where the Arabic text begins) is written by Wüstenfeld ‘Abschrift für den Setzer’, that is, ‘copy for the typesetter’. That the manuscript is entirely copied by Wüstenfeld can be proven by comparison with Wüstenfeld’s handwriting in two other Leiden manuscripts (Or. 2339 (1), cf. Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 412; and Or. 3055 D, cf. ibid., p. 15).

The problems connected with copy and print in this European manuscript are entirely different from those in the two preceding examples. The main difference is the fact that the typesetter in this case was, one must assume, ignorant of Arabic. This is still usually the case with European and American typesetters of Oriental languages. They perform their task without the slightest inkling of the meaning of the text they are setting up in type and look at the characters they handle as graphic symbols. This is both an advantage and a disadvantage. These typesetters are never tempted to read the text and make typesetting mistakes because of that. If a typesetter can understand a text the number of errors in his work usually increases. The disadvantage is that they are usually unaware of typographical conventions of the languages in which they work and are, therefore, bound to make mistakes in the choice of ligatures, interpunction and the like. From the present example it becomes clear that Wüstenfeld had anticipated this. The typesetter’s copy is very clearly written, with all necessary ligatures carefully indicated. It is at once obvious that Wüstenfeld has done his best to write all Arabic characters, including the ligatures available in the compositor’s case, as distinctly from one another as possible, and in a style of writing that resembles the design of Arabic type as it was in use in 19th-century Europe. The occasional strokes, coinciding with the beginning of pages in the printed edition, are present in this manuscript as well. What is really amazing in this manuscript is that it has remained so clean: the usual thumb prints are absent altogether. That it was, nevertheless, used as typesetter’s copy is proven by Wüstenfeld’s own indication as such on one of the fly-leaves.

I have shown by what kind of characteristics one may identify a manuscript as the typesetter’s copy. Once these features are known it may well be that quite a considerable amount of typesetter’s copy appears to have been preserved after all. Once it has been recognized it can play its vital, but till now almost neglected, role in the research on the textual history of a certain text.
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