Their ties can also be seen in their proximity to one another, as these six participants were seated together in the session.

Ultimately the decline of the Banū ʿAsikīr’s fortunes continued and the family was to disappear from the civilian elite of the town. In the course of the seventh/thirteenth century they lost, with one exception, all influence over posts in the civilian administration and the scholarly world.78 This waning influence is also apparent given the fact that members of the family do not only disappear from biographical dictionaries after the fourth generation, but that they also disappear to a large degree from reading certificates. While the Damascene Certificates still mention nine fourth-generation members of the Banū ʿAsikīr, the number goes down to four for the following generation. In addition, three out of these four were minor actors in the scholarly field who participated in a mere one or two sessions without assuming any role as attending authority or reader.79

This decline was not the product of structural changes within the civilian and scholarly elite in Damascus that would have excluded a family such as the Banū ʿAsikīr. Rather, the Banū ʿAsikīr were simply replaced by newly arisen families that did not substantially differ from them: they were well-established local families that belonged to the šāfī’ī school. Among these were the al-Dawālī’s, the Banū ʿAl-Rasīmī, and the šāfī’i branch of the Banū t-Maḏīnī.80

The decline of the Banū ʿAsikīr began in the early seventh/thirteenth century when the second generation started to disappear. However, the relative renaissance of the family’s position in the fourth generation shows that the persistence of established cultural practices in the third and fourth generations were underpinned by a common and viable rationale. Family members continued to have recourse to the central element of the family’s cultural capital that was at their disposal. The prominent place of the fourth generation family members in the seating order at readings shows that they still claimed an eminent position in the public performance of the work and that the other participants were still willing to grant them this position. In this sense the analysis of the certificates allows the tracing of the cultural strategies of a family that was on the brink of fading into insignificance and that had already disappeared to a large degree from the narrative sources.

78 The exception is the fifth-generation scholar al-Qūsim b. Muzaffar b. Mahmūd (d. 723/1323), al-Dhahabi, Itwād, 790-796, 207/8) who held a post in the treasury and founded his own Dār al-Ḥadīth. Cf. also Leder et al., Sīnār, 1039/7-7, fol. 73a and 1592/3-1, fol. 67a (and other certificates) where he acted as attending authority in sessions.

79 In addition to the above-named al-Qūsim b. Muzaffar b. Mahmūd, these were: ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Husayn Abī Ḥanād b. Abī Leder et al., Sīnār, 3798/10, 21-12, fol. 222b and 3798/10, 21-16, fol. 231a), Muhammad b. Abī Thābit b. Mahmūd and Muhammad b. Husayn b. Abī (both Leder et al., Sīnār, 3817/7-13, fol. 71b).

80 On the dominant šāfī’i families in Damascus during the seventh/thirteenth century cf. Pouzet, Damas, 41-46.

Teaching in 5/11th-century Baghdad:
Observations on the lectures of Abū l-Fawāris Tīrād b. Muhammad al-Zaynabī and their audience

Andreas Görke

Certificates of audition (in Arabic: samīʿāt) constitute an important source for a diverse range of issues. They proliferated especially in Damascus and Cairo from the 6th/12th to the 9th/15th centuries, with Baghdad, Mecca and Aleppo being other important centres.1 However, there are hitherto no systematic studies on the development of these certificates or on their regional particularities.2 While certificates of audition have long been used to reconstruct the transmission history of works and manuscripts, recent studies also demonstrated their value for the social history, historical topology, regional history, and the study of biographies of scholars.3 Nevertheless, the research on certificates of audition remains fragmented, and a large number of issues connected with these certificates have not yet been studied systematically. In the following it shall be demonstrated how certificates of audition can enhance our knowledge of the culture and the proceedings and practices of teaching.

To this end, a new approach to certificates was adopted. While the study of certificates has hitherto usually been confined to single copies or to a corpus of certificates of diverse sessions and by different scholars, the following study is based on the analysis of the certificates of several lecture series of the same teacher. Such lecture series became necessary when voluminous works were transmitted that could not be read in a single session, but were read in a series of consecutive sessions. As each session was documented through a certificate of audition, the reading of the whole book resulted in a series of certificates.


2 For a discussion of some regional particularities from Yemen cf. the paper of Qaimr-Zeche in this volume.

These series of certificates can provide answers to questions that cannot be attained through the study of single certificates, mainly concerning the course of teaching. Were lectures held on consecutive days or regularly over a longer period of time? Was the circle of participants stable, or was there a high degree of fluctuation? A manuscript may contain several lecture series by the same teacher. The comparison of different lecture series of the same teacher allows for the study of additional aspects such as the schedule of the lectures, the average sizes of the circle of participants and distinctions between the different series, indicating developments in the course of time.

The following observations are mainly based on the certificates of audition on an unpublished manuscript of Abu ‘Ubayd al-Qasim b. Sallam’s Kitāb al-Amwa’il. The manuscript consists of ten parts (aja’ib) of about 20 folios (40 pages) each. At the beginning and end of each part numerous certificates of audition are written, some on the respective title pages, some on the margins of the following pages, others on additional pages, probably added later to the manuscript. The second part (jaw’i) of the manuscript is missing and some pages at the beginning and the end of the first part have been added later. Apparently the original pages were lost, most probably they were damaged due to intensive use over a long period of time.

The manuscript has no colophon but it abounds with certificates of audition, many of which, though not all, are dated. The dated samad ‘at cover a time span from Muharram 402/August 1011 to Dhu l-Qa‘da 727/October 1327. Some of the undated samad ‘at are most probably even older and go back to the first half of the 4th/10th century. The manuscript itself probably dates from the 4th/10th century as well and was used for lectures over a period of some 300 to 400 years.

The bulk of the certificates of audition on the manuscript date from the period between 472/1080 and 491/1097, when the book was read with Abu ‘l-Fawaris Tiirad b. Muhammad al-Zaynabi as the attending authority (al-mustaf). Tiirad at this time was the owner of the manuscript. He must have acquired it at some point between 462/1070 and 472/1080. The manuscript was still in the possession of another scholar in 462/1070, as is documented by some notes of ownership.

The manuscript is held by the Asad library in Damascus (Ms. Zahiriya ‘amm 1096). A photographic copy of this manuscript is in the possession of the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (MS sim. or 31). I could not access the manuscript in Damascus directly, but only a microfilm copy. Some parts are illegible, in both the microfilm and the photographic copy, but in general the reproductions are of a sufficient quality that most of the certificates could be read.


See page 208, left side. The page numbers refer to MS sim. or 31 (see note 4 above). It consists of 228 photographs of double pages. As the page numbers on the manuscript conform to the numbers of the photograph but deviate from the folio numbers, page numbers are used.

On the title pages of parts 3 to 10, notes indicate that Tiirad acquired the manuscript and heard the work, and that he had heard the entire work before with Ibn al-Baith (d. 420/1029). There are slight variations in the wording, a sample on the title page of part 5 reads as follows (cf. Figure 1, second entry from the bottom):

This manuscript was acquired by the Sayyid, the Exalted, the Perfect, bearess of the two nobilities, Abu l-Fawaris Tiirad b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Zaynabi, may God extend his continuance, who also acquired the right of transmission of the work by audition, and he had received this right [before] for the whole book from Abu l-Hasan Ibn al-Baith, may God have mercy on him.

Apparently the same hand wrote the pages at the beginning and the end of the first part as wrote the notes, and this is in all likelihood Tiirad’s own handwriting (cf. Figure 2). The title page of the first part contains several certificates of audition, the oldest one dating from 472/1080. Tiirad thus must have acquired the manuscript before this. From this date until 491/1097 no other mustaf appears in the certificates. Thus here we have a rare example of a manuscript that remained in the possession of one teacher and was not passed around. As the manuscript was the personal copy of the sayyid, the mustaf, we may also assume that it records all the lectures of this book in this period in which he acted as the presiding authority. This gives us the opportunity to study in some detail the teaching activity of Tiirad al-Zaynabi in so far as it relates to the Kitāb al-Amwa’il.

In the time in question – the late 5th/11th century – Baghdad faced a number of significant changes, both in topography and as regards the social and political situation. In 447/1055, the Seljuk commander Tughril Beg had entered Baghdad, imprisoned the Buyid Amir al-Malik al-Rahim and thereby brought to an end the Sh’i Buyid rule. The respective period has often been referred to as the “Sunni revival”, although this term may be considered to be somewhat misleading. In any case, with the help of the Seljuks, the caliph was able to ban certain specific Sh’i phrases from the call to prayer, to dismiss people from the post as preacher for their support of Sh’i positions during the turmoil that accompanied the rebellion.

---

4 The manuscript is held by the Asad library in Damascus (Ms. Zahiriya ‘amm 1096). A photographic copy of this manuscript is in the possession of the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (MS sim. or 31). I could not access the manuscript in Damascus directly, but only a microfilm copy. Some parts are illegible, in both the microfilm and the photographic copy, but in general the reproductions are of a sufficient quality that most of the certificates could be read.


6 See page 208, left side. The page numbers refer to MS sim. or 31 (see note 4 above). It consists of 228 photographs of double pages. As the page numbers on the manuscript conform to the numbers of the photograph but deviate from the folio numbers, page numbers are used.


of the pro-Fatimid factionist al-Basâsir, and to strip the mosque where al-Basâsir had preached from its status as congregational mosque as punishment for the support al-Basâsir had received from the Shi'i inhabitants of the quarter.

Baghdad saw the establishment of its first madrasas, the first and most famous being the Nizâmiya, founded by the Seljuk vizier Nizâm al-Mulk in 459/1066. Other madrasas soon followed, and at the time when the teaching of Abû I-Fawâris Târîd is documented in the sana'ât on the manuscript, at least three or four madrasas were established, all of them either Shi'a or Hanâfi. While the caliphs al-Qâdir (r. 381/991-422/1031) and al-Qâ'îm (r. 422/1031-467/1075) apparently were inclined to the Hanâfi madhhab, the Seljuk sultans adhered to and promoted the Hanâfi madhhab. In contrast, their famous vizier Nizâm al-Mulk was a Shi'a and supported Shi'a scholars, possibly because he intended to redress the balance of power between the Shi'a and the Hanâfi which had been disturbed by the exclusive patronage of the Hanâfi by the Seljuk sultans.

The teaching of madrasas at least in the beginning did not necessarily differ very much from the traditional ways of teaching in study circles (called bâqâq or naqﬁ) in mosques or private homes, with regard to the persons involved, the methods, and the topics. But the shift from private study circles to madrasas brought forward two developments in the system of education. On the one hand, it promoted the seclusion of the different madhhab, as usually the students would attend the madrasas of their own madhhab. On the other hand, it served the association of the scholars with the state, as they were working in institutions that were funded and partly controlled by state officials. It is likely that the establishment of madrasas was partly owed to the rulers' aim to gain control of the urban elites, and that the increasing role of madrasas in the system of education signified a departure from the traditional opposition of scholars to the state. We will come back to both aspects in the analysis of the certificates. The famous scholar Abû Hamîd al-Ghazâli (450/1058-505/1111), possibly the most prominent example for a scholar teaching at a madrasa while politically legitimizing his patrons and propagating their ideological interpretations, happens to be a contemporary of the attending shaykh of our lecture series and at the time these series take place he himself teaches at the Nizâmiya.

While not reaching the fame of al-Ghazâli, the attending shaykh of our lecture series is by no means unknown, either. In his time, Abû I-Fawâris Târîd b. Muhammâd b. ‘Abî-i Zaynâbi was renowned both as a scholar and as the chief sindic (naqib al-naqā’id) of the Abbasids. In the literature he is sometimes also vocalised Târîd, but Târîd seems to be the correct reading. He was born in 398/1008 as a member of the influential Zaynabî family, which for several generations had held the post of the chief sindic, among whose functions it was to supervise the sindics of the different cities. The sindics in turn had to keep registers of nobility in order to safeguard the purity of the lineage and prevent the intrusion of strangers and the exclusion of rightful members. They also were to prevent Abbasid women from marrying below their status, to care for the respectability of the members and to secure that no one was deprived of his rightful share in pensions. As the chief sindic, Târîd's rights and duties also included the arbitration of conflicts within the Abbasid family, the imposition of legal penalties for crimes committed therein, and the allocation of stipends and pensions.

Târîd was first appointed to the office of the naqib of Basrah, and in 453/1061 became the chief sindic of the Abbasids. The chief sindic was a state official, and he seems to have been one of the more important dignitaries, as he is regularly mentioned among the first to render homage to a new caliph. Târîd once acted as deputy for the caliph, while the latter was on pilgrimage, and he was

19 Hodgson, Venture, III, 48; Safi, Politics, 1-11.
20 Safi, Politics, xxvi, xxxii, li, 90, 105-24.
23 E.g., Ibn al-Áthîr, al-Kâtîb, X, 96, 231.
often employed as envoy of the caliphs to different rulers and officials. He is seen intervening in conflicts, though his actions are not always helpful in settling them. He is said to have been of the highest standing with the caliph. Tirad adhered to the Hanafi madhab and died in 491/1098.

Apart from his administrative and official capacities, Tirad b. Muhammad is also known as a mubaddith and a transmitter of numerous works. He is said to have given dictations on buddib in the Mosque of Mansur, (according to Ibn Abi l-Wafai these amounted to 23), and is praised as the musnad of the Iraq. The Mosque of Mansur, one of the five congregational mosques in Baghdad in which the Friday prayers were held, was a stronghold of the Hanbalis, and they watched carefully who was to be allowed to teach there. That Tirad was able to teach there and possibly even had an own teaching circle (balagh) in the mosque shows the respect that he must have had among the Hanbalis.

Ibn Hajir lists him as transmitter of 19 works, among them three of his own and eleven works of Ibn Abi l-Dunya. His own works include a book on the companions of the Prophet's family (fada'il al-sulabah), his dictations (Amali Tirad) and a collection by his contemporary al-Bardani called 'Anwa' Al-Tirad.

---

29 On his life see al-Dhahabi, Tarrikh al-Islam, 491-500, 95; idem, Siyar, XVIII, 38.
31 Al-Dhahabi, Siyar, XIX, 287. Transmitters of buddib who transmitted a very large number of sound buddib-sometimes were given the honorary title musnad (usually of a certain region, e.g. musnad al-Trip, musnad al-Sham etc.). Cf. Ignaz Goldzweig, Muslimische Studien, vol. 2, Halle 1800, 226f. Apparently, a musnad usually had to be of high age and was thus able to serve as a link between different generations, which made him essential for creating short-anthologies comprising only a few persons. Thus al-Dhahabi says of Tirad's brother Abu Ya'la Hamza b. Muhammad al-Zaynabi (407/1016-504/1110) who lived for almost a hundred years that he could have become the musnad al-dunya, but he only started hearing buddib in his youth. Cf. al-Dhahabi, Siyar, XIX, 352.
32 Makdisi, Rice, 15-16.
33 Makdisi, Ibn 'Aqil, 183.
35 Abu 'Ali Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Bardani (416/1025-498/1105); see al-Dhahabi, Siyar, XIX, 219-222.
36 Ibn Hajir, Mu'jam, 466, Nos. 488, 1337, 1338.
37 Ibn Abi l-Wafai, Mu'jam, 600.
38 Ibn Hajir, Mu'jam, 315.
The role of Abū l-Fawāris Tīrād

There are no samāʿūdī on the manuscript in which Abū l-Fawāris is himself listed as a listener, which is not surprising, since he only acquired the manuscript sometime between 462/1070 and 472/1080 when he was already an elderly man. He had heard the complete book in 412/1021 with Ibn al-Bāḍi (d. 420/1029), as is mentioned in a note.39 The first dated entry with his name as the attending shaykh (al-shaykh al-musumi) dates from Ramāḍān 472/March 1080, the last from Muḥarram 491/December 1097, shortly before his death. Abū l-Fawāris figures as the attending shaykh in all the certificates that include his name, but he is never mentioned as reader (qārī) or writer of the samāʿ record (kaṭib al-samāʿ) or in any other position.

In the certificates, usually several titles and offices of his are mentioned. Typically, he is addressed as

السيد الولام الوحيد لقب النظير الكل الامكاني للنورين شهيب الحسناء، أبو المؤمن طراد بن عيسى

(The Sayyid, the Exalted, the Unique, the chief syndic, the Perfect, beaor of the two nobilities, moving star of the two courts, Abū l-Fawāris Tīrād b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Zaynabī.)

Some certificates have al-sharif instead of al-sayyid, but in at least one case both titles occur together.40 The order may differ slightly from the above. The laqāb al-Kamil and the office naqib al-muqaddas occur on almost every certificate, while any other part may be left out. In some cases, his name is omitted and he is only referred to by his laqāb al-Kamil and some of his titles and offices.

The title Dhu l-Kustanjān, the bearer of the two nobilities, refers to him combining erudition and scholarship with noble ancestry.41 The title Shīhāb al-Hadraṣṭayn, moving star of the two courts, is even more noteworthy, especially as it is not mentioned in the bibliographical literature on Tīrād. It may be seen as an indication that Tīrād held official positions both at the Abbasid court and the court of the Seljuk sultans, as the use of al-Hadraṣṭayn in titles in Seljuk times usually refers to the Abbasid and the Seljuk court.42 While the biographical

literature mentions the high standing of Tīrād with the caliphs, the use of the title in the certificates may be seen as evidence that Tīrād also associated with the Seljuks and apparently was not at all at distance from the new ruling elite. However, it has to be remarked that both Tīrād’s son ʿAlī b. Tīrād and his father, Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad are said to have been given the title Nizām al-Hadraṣṭayn.43 While ʿAlī b. Tīrād, who followed his father in the office of the naqib al-muqaddas and served as vizier to the caliphs al-Mustashfis and al-Muqtāfi, is likely to have had close relations with the Seljuks, Tīrād’s father already died around 426/1035, long before the Seljuks entered Baghdad. As the title in his case apparently must be understood in a different sense, it cannot be ruled out that it does not refer to Seljuks in the case of Tīrād, either, all the more the reference to ʿAlī b. Tīrād is questionable and may be due to a mistake.44

The dates of the lectures

The certificates of audition usually record the month and the year in which the lecture took place. In about a fourth of the certificates, exact dates appear including the day of the week. In a few cases only the year of the lecture is mentioned and in some cases no date is recorded at all. The following table shows the schedule of the different lectures by month (l–al-Muḥarram, 12= Dhu l-Hijjah) and year. Capital letters refer to lecture series documented by several certificates while lowercase letters indicate single lectures. The lectures indicated by b, h, and j seem to be connected to the series B, H and J respectively, but do not fit into the schedule. They will be discussed separately. Some lectures were not included into the table, as the certificates only record a year (e.g. in the year 490/1097), but no month.

---

39 Page 207, left side.
40 Page 31, right side.
42 Ibid.
44 The only reference I found which mentions the title Nizām al-Hadraṣṭayn in connection with ʿAlī b. Tīrād is the one in Ibn Khallikān which is also added by Goldziher. However, in the reference it says that some lines of poetry were sent to "the nizam al-muqaddas ʿAlī b. Tīrād al-Zaynabī, and he was given the honorary name Nizam al-Hadraṣṭayn Abī l-Ḥasan." While ʿAlī b. Tīrād al-Zaynabī bore the knāya Abī l-Qasim, Tīrād’s father was known by the knāya Abī l-Ḥasan. So possibly the title Nizam al-Hadraṣṭayn was not given to ‘Alī b. Tīrād at all.
Of the lectures A, B, and C, most certificates record the exact date, and of lectures D and E at least one session is recorded with exact date. All these lectures took place on Saturdays. Of the following lectures (F to l), the certificates do not contain exact dates except for one lecture of h, which took place on a Tuesday. Of Lecture M three certificates record exact dates, one session was held on a Tuesday, two sessions on Saturdays. All certificates of series N record the day of the week and the sessions took place on Wednesdays, Saturdays and a Friday. Lecture o is dated to a Friday. Lectures of Series Q were held on Tuesday, Friday and Sunday.

Most of the lecture series begin either in Dhū l-Hijjah or in Jumādā I-ilā or Jumādā I-akhirā. About half of all sessions take place in Jumādā I-ilā or Jumādā I-akhirā, while only single sessions take place between Rajab and Dhū l-Qa’dā, apparently in most cases because the respective lecture series took longer than intended. While there is no apparent reason why lectures were preferably held in these two months, the disproportionate distribution of the lectures over the months is striking. It seems that the lectures were not held on demand, but rather regularly in certain months.

---

Excerpt from the text:

Except for the series that took place in 490/1097 and for the series J, the sessions seem to have taken place on a regular basis. Usually the parts (ajā'īb) of the book were read in consecutive order, one part (juz') of the book was read during a session, and the sessions were held once a week. A teaching of the complete book thus took about ten weeks or two to three months. In some cases, the sessions passed for about a month and were then resumed where they had stopped. This results in slightly longer periods for the reading of the complete book. Series J, N and Q differ from the above scheme. In these series usually two parts of the book were read in one session and at least in series N and Q the single lectures took place only a few days after each other. In both cases the lectures did not strictly follow the order of the book. At least in the case of the series N and Q, the motivation seems obvious: Tiwarād was already in his 90s, and those interested in hearing the book needed to hurry lest his death prevent the completion of the same.'

**The place of the lectures**

Biographical dictionaries often tell us with whom a scholar studied, but almost never give an indication to where this took place or to which school a scholar may have been affiliated. Certificates of hearing in many cases provide answers to these questions. From the *samāʿi* from Damascus, for instance, a lot can be learned about the use of school buildings and their role in the teaching culture. In our case the certificates usually do not contain any information about the places of teaching. Of the 100 certificates analysed, only four mention a place. This is particularly striking when compared to the abundance of place names in the *samāʿi* from Damascus about a century later. The (few) certificates on the manuscript that date from 598/1202 and later, when the manuscript was transferred to Damascus by Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi who had acquired it in Baghdad, usually contain place names, but it is difficult to decide at this point whether the inclusion of the place in the *samāʿi* became custom only in the course of the 6th/12th century, whether this was practiced more consistently in Damascus than in Baghdad or whether it was left to the discretion of the writer of the *samāʿi* to record the place or not.

We have seen that Tiwarād held dictations on hadīth in the Mosque of Mansūr. However, the Kitāb al-Anwār is not a work on hadīth but a book of law, and we should not *a priori* assume that because Tiwarād gave lectures in the Mosque of Mansūr all of his lectures were held there. According to the certificates, one session was held in a private home in the Bāb al-Bayrāq Quarter of Baghdad. How-

---


ever, it is not entirely clear whether this is the home of Tirad, the musarrat, or the home of the writer of the samad. The entry reads (the names of the participants are left out):47

(…) heard this section from the beginning to the end under the supervision of the Sayyid, the Exalted, the Unique, the chief syndic, the Perfect, bearer of the two nobilities, shooting star of the two courts — may God prolong his prosperity — with Al-Mu'tammar b. Muhammad b. Al-Husayn Al-Bayyir (
(…) reciting the text, and the writer of the samad note, Al-Mād b. Abd Allāh b. Al-Husayn Al-Bāṣir Al-Shāfi'i, followed the lecture from the beginning of the thirteenth page to the end of the section, this being seven pages. This happened on Saturday, 7 Dhūl-Hijja 477 in his home in the Bāb Al-
Bāṣir quarter.)

As we can see, the name of the attending authority, Tirad, is not given in the note, but he is referred to only by his lasāb Al-Kamal (the Perfect) and by his titles and offices. The writer of the note, one of the few Shāfiʿī scholars mentioned in the certificates, missed about two thirds of the chapter in the beginning. While the place of the lecture is recorded ("his home in the Bāb Al-Bāṣir quarter"), it is not entirely clear, whose house is meant. It may refer to the writer of the note, indicating the lecture took place in his house. However, the fact that he missed a large part of the lecture calls for an explanation if it was his home. Although he may have had other obligations, it seems rather hard to imagine that the lecture would have taken place without the host. A second samad note from the same lecture series refers to a house in the Bāb Al-Bāṣir quarter, where the lecture took place:48

(…) heard this section (i.e. of the respective part) under the supervision of the Sayyid, the Exalted, the Unique, the chief syndic, bearer of the two nobilities Tirad b. Muhammad b. Al-Zaynab, with Al-Mu'tammar b. Muhammad b. Al-Husayn Al-Bayyir, who also wrote the samad note, reciting the text in Muḥarram 478 [May 1085] in his home in the Bāb Al-Bāṣir quarter.)

It is not impossible that the lectures of one and the same lecture series were conducted at different places, but it seems rather likely that it is Tirad's home that is referred to in these certificates. This view is supported by a third certificate from a different lecture series. In this certificate, dating from Saturday, 5 Rabi' Al-
Awwal 490/21 February 1997, it is stated explicitly that the lecture took place in the house of the naqib (i.e. dār al-naqib bi-Bāb Al-Bāṣir).49

The last certificate that contains information on the place is a short notice, also dated to 490/1997:

(…) heard this section from the beginning to the end under the supervision of the Sayyid, the Exalted, the Unique, the chief syndic, the Perfect, bearer of the two nobilities, shooting star of the two courts — may God prolong his prosperity — with Al-Mu'tammar b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Al-'Aziz b. Tāhir Al-Bukhari, known by his laṣab Abī Dābī Kākū, heard the complete section from his patron, the Perfect, the Exalted, the Shafi'i, the chief syndic, shooting star of the two courts, bearer of the two nobilities, on Friday, half of it in the Mosque of Al-Mansūr and half of it in … [illegible] in Rabi' Al-
Awwal 490 [March/April 1997] and with him … [illegible].)

Muḥammad b. 'Umar, known as Abī Dābī Kākū, was a Ḥanafī scholar, originally from Bukhārā who during his travels also settled in Baghdad for a while and later served as Imam of the Ḥanafīs in the Holy Mosque of Mecca.50 He was born in 450/1058 or 451/105951 and died in 525/1131.52 From the notice above we can learn that he sojourned in Baghdad in 490/1997 and that he attended lectures of Tirad, two details that cannot be found in the biographical literature. For our purpose, however, the most important fact is that at least part of a lecture of the Kitāb Al-Ama'īl by Tirad was held in the Mosque of Mansūr.

Thus, the certificates document that at least part of the lectures took place in Tirad's home, and that another part was given in the Mosque of Mansūr. Often lectures in a mosque would be held on Fridays, after the service. As there are only two cases in our certificates in which it is mentioned that a lecture took place on a Friday, while at least 21 lectures took place on other days, it seems likely that a larger part of the lectures did not take place in the mosque. However, as lectures might also be held in the mosque on different days and in some series no exact date is mentioned at all, we cannot be sure where these lectures took place. In 489/1096, Tirad made the baṣīf and taught in Mecca and Medina. As we have no certificates from this year and the subsequent lectures in 490/1997 are those that explicitly refer to Baghdad, we may conclude that Tirad did not give lectures of the Kitāb Al-Ama'īl in Mecca or at least that he did not take along his own manuscript.

47 Page 49, right side.
48 Page 97, right side.
49 Page 58, right side.
50 Page 228, right side.
51 Al-Sāfādī, Wā'if, IV, 243.
52 Al-Dāhibī, Yārib Al-islām, 520-530, 137, informs us that he lived 74 years.
53 In addition to the entries in al-Dāhibī and al-Sāfādī, see Ibn al-Jawzi, Al-Muntahā, XVII, 268.
The size of the classes

The numbers of participants in the different lecture series differ considerably and vary from single participants to numbers of about 60 and more. In most lecture series, numbers of about 10 to 25 are the rule. Certificates which only record single participants usually are single copies and are not part of a series. Possibly in these cases the completion of single lectures was only indicated by hāfiyā notes that could not be identified and only the completion of the whole book was recorded in a samāt certificate.

An increase in the size of the classes can be observed. While until 481/1088 usually less than 30 participants attend the lectures, in 482/1089 and especially in 488/1095 and 490/1097 the number hovers around 60. As we have seen, this is not due to the lectures taking place in a mosque. Instead, we must assume that it was Tikād’s growing age that led to this increase in the number of participants. The older Tikād grew, the better all the asāṣīs were becoming which he had acquired in his youth. As he had heard the Kitaḥ al-Amwal from Ibn al-Badi at the age of fourteen in 412/1021, people acquiring a transmission license from him in 490/1097 could bridge a gap of almost 80 years. This also accounts for the large number of children present in these latest lecture series (see below).

The group size may also vary in the course of the lecture. While some groups have a more or less stable size (although individual participants may change), in other groups the size varies a lot. For instance, there is a considerable increase in the number of participants over the course of series C. While in the first five or six sessions the number of participants remains constantly around fifteen (although there is some fluctuation), the number increases to around thirty in the last four sessions, reaching thirty-nine in the penultimate session. The fluctuation increases and while in the first five sessions about thirty persons take part altogether – ten of them regularly – in the last sessions this number increases to more than eighty. The increase may be related to the contents of the sections read in the different sessions. The Kitaḥ al-Amwal consists of three main parts, the kitaḥ al-fay’i, the kitaḥ al-kumās, and the kitaḥ al-sadaqah. The increase in the number of participants roughly coincides with the beginning of the kitaḥ al-sadaqah. Eleven persons miss the first part of the lecture and start listening only with the chapter on the sadaqah on cows, shortly after the beginning of the kitaḥ al-sadaqah. Possibly, the traditions and explanations on sadaqah – the legal alms tax – were considered more relevant for the majority of the participants than the rulings on booty and its distribution. However, these considerations are only conjectural, and in general the last chapters of the book do not tend to be heard by more participants than any other part.

Procedures and practices in class

A lot can be learned from the certificates about the procedures and practices in class. The lectures appear to have been partly open to the public. While there is always a number of regular participants that attend all or almost all lectures of a series, other participants only take part in single sessions of a series or only take part for a couple of sessions.

The attendance of the participants is recorded very thoroughly, and persons who did not attend the whole session are mentioned at the end of the certificate with details concerning which parts they heard and which parts they missed. An example of this meticulous recording can be seen in Figure 3. In lines six and seven, we find the name Abū l-‘Abbas Āḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Maṭāṭhār al-Dīlījānī al-Khaṭīb crossed out. In the margin next to the name, we find a remarkable note that al-Dīlījānī missed five pages at the beginning of the part. (Wu-fikā l-Dīlījānī l-Khaṭīb khamsa avariq min aanwil al-‘ājīb). And at the end of the sama‘ note, after the date, it is added that al-Dīlījānī and a Mānṣūr al-Ḥamzī (or al-Ḥumrī) were present only from page six onwards. (Wa-samāt na min aanwil al-‘ājīb li šaykh Abū l-‘Abbas Āḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Maṭāṭhār al-Dīlījānī l-Khaṭīb wa-Mānṣūr al-Ḥamzī wa-dhikābak fi l-‘ājīb.)

The thorough recording of the absences gives evidence that participants coming late were a common sight in these lectures. At least one fourth of the certificates record participants that missed part of the lecture. That a participant missed part of a lecture did not disqualify him to act as the writer of the sama‘, as we have seen above, and the certificates document a few incidents in which the writer of the sama‘ did not attend the whole session. It seems to have been common that one participant put down the certificates of several lectures of one series. However, in a couple of cases we can observe that the writer of the sama‘ changed although the “regular” writer of the sama‘ was present. Apparently the role of the Kitaḥ al-sama‘ was not formalized.

The fact that it was not uncommon that participants missed parts of a lecture resulted in another phenomenon documented through the certificates. If they later intended to be able to transmit the whole work, participants who missed a lecture needed to catch up with the material. Therefore follow-up sessions were held for participants who missed some sessions or parts thereof. We find certificates which record lectures of the same part of the book with the same qarrā taking place only a month or two apart. In the latter of these lectures, people take part who usually attend the previous lecture series, but missed the respective parts. Thus, this seems to be no regular lecture series, but rather follow-up sessions that were held in order to enable some participants to catch up on the
parts they missed. The lectures b and h mentioned above seem to be of this nature and do not constitute lecture series of their own.

In other cases, participants later added a notice to a certificate in which they indicate that they had caught up on what they missed. An example of this can be seen in Figure 4. Towards the end of the main certificate it is stated that the jurist Abu 'Abdallah Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. Sâlim al-Hinâi and al-Hasan b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Hânâfi al-Astarabâdi were only present from the fourth page onwards. The certificate is dated Tuesday, 15 Jumâda I 'alâ 480/17 August 1087. The additional lines say that Abu Yâsir, who is the qâri' of the lecture series, recapitulated for Abu 'Abdallah Muhammad the four pages that he had missed. This happened in Rajab 480/October 1087, two months after the regular session. (Ar-Ra'd al-sayfi, Abu Yâsir, be-tî smâli, Abu 'Abdallah b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. Sâlim al-Hinâi mā jatâhu wa-hiyya arba'î at-târiq wa-kata'ab fi Rajab min sanâat thamâ'it.)

In a similar instance, 'Ali b. Thabit b. 'Ali al-Harbi, a regular participant in series B, in which also Abu Yâsir served as the qâri', missed the first four pages of the lecture which took place in Muḥarram 478/May 1085. In a separate note on the margin it is declared that 'Ali b. Thabit heard the whole part from Târîd with Abu Yâsir as the qâri' in 478/1085 (as is documented in the other certificate) except for four pages on which he caught up in 480/1087. Thus in this case it took two years before the missing parts could be recapitulated.

Usually, it is assumed that the certificates of auditors were written immediately after the session, and it is likely that this was indeed the prevailing routine. However, there is at least one instance, where the certificate was written a month after the session, as is indicated in the certificate itself.58

(He wrote the samâ' note in Jumâda I 'alâ 479 [August-September 1086], and the lecture had taken place in Rabi' al-aswâl [June-July] of the said year.)

There is no strict order in which the participants appear in the samâ'ât, but there are some trends that can be observed. For instance there is a tendency to name people of high rank at the beginning of the certificate, and relatives are usually mentioned together and their degree of relationship is recorded (eg. "and his brother", "and his nephew", "and his two sons").

---

55 Page 31, right side, upper certificate.
58 Page 49, left side.

---

59 Page 228, right side.
60 Al-Dhahabi, Târîkh al-Islâm, 491-500, 240.
61 Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntasir, XVII, 82.
62 Al-Dhahabi, Târîkh al-Islâm, 510-520, 377.
63 Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntasir, XVII, 144.
64 Al-Dhahabi, Târîkh al-Islâm, 501-510, 235f.
In the last years of Tirad’s activity, different qarṣa’ are employed. Four of them served as qarṣa’ for one lecture series of the entire book. Of these I could not identify Abu l-Qasim ‘Abdallah b. Muhammad b. Abiul-wal al-Walid (series N, Rabii’ al-awwal to Rabii’ al-akhir 490/February to March 1087) and Abu l-Faraj Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallah al-Labbān who together with his sons ‘Abd al-Salam and Muhammad acted as lecturer in series J (Jumādā I-lā-khārīqa 482/August-September 1098).

Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali b. ‘Ubaydallah b. Nāṣr al-Zighunā (455/1063-527/1133)²⁶ was the qarṣa’ of series M (Jumādā I-lā-lā to Shawwāl 488/May to October 1095). Al-Zighunā was one of the eminent Hānbalī scholars of his time, jurist, imām, and writer of an annalistic history. The last lecture series that could be completed in Tirad’s lifetime (series Q, Dhū l-Hijja 490/November 1097) was read by Abu ‘Abdallah al-Husayn b. Muhammad b. Khusrū al-Balkhi (d. 526/1132),⁶⁴ who was a Hānafī scholar and who is designated as mușfīl abī Ḥabīb al-Baṣri in the biographical literature. There are a few other persons who appear as qarṣa’ in the certificates, but as they are all only mentioned once, they need not be discussed here. As we can see, several of the qarṣa’ are well-known scholars, and some are known as lecturers or assistant teachers in the biographical literature.

The assistant teachers (muṣfīd)

In addition to the three assistant teachers named above who served as qarṣa’, at least one more of the participants mentioned in the certificates is designated as mușfīl or muṣfīl Baṣri in the biographical literature: ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. al-Muḥārāk al-Anmāṣ (462/1070-538/1143).⁶⁵ This al-Anmāṣ appears in several certificates. He is recorded as listener to the Kitāb al-ʿAmwāl in at least three different lecture series between 477/1085 and 481/1088 (C, E, H), the follow-up sessions b and h, and the session i, all under the direction of Tirad b. Muhammad and all with Abu Yāsir Muḥammad b. ‘Ubaydallah as the lecturer. In 490/1097, al-Anmāṣ himself is listed as qarṣa’ in a session that could not be related to one of the lecture series.⁶⁶

Another of the muṣfīd mentioned above also appears in the certificates apart from his function as qarṣa’: Ḥusayn b. Muhammad b. Khusrū al-Balkhi regularly takes part in the lecture series M (Jumādā I-lā-lā to Shawwāl 488/May to October 1095) and at least once figures as the writer of the respective samāʿ note.⁶⁷ In a

²⁸ Al-Dhahabi, Siyar, XX, 134-137; idem, Ṭārīkh al-Islām, 531-540, 4666. See also Ibn al-NAJJA, Dabāb, I, 380-381, Ibn al-Jawzi, Muntakhab, XVII, 336.
²⁹ Page 26, right side.
³⁰ Page 3, right side.
³¹ Page 3, left side, dated to Jumādā I-lā-khārīqa 484/July-August 1091.
In the lecture series of the late 470s and early 480s/late 1080s, a number of prominent members of important families take part in the lectures. Some participants come from prominent families of Hanafi legal scholars, among them the Dānaghānīs and the Zaynabīs. Abū l-Fawāris Tiirād himself belonged to the latter family. At least ten persons seem to belong to the House of the Abbasids, indicated by their titles (al-sharif), their nisab (al-Abbāsi, al-Hashimi, al-Zaynabī), and regnal titles in their nisab (like al-Muhtadi bi-lilāh, al-Wāliq bi-lilāh, or al-Mutawakkil al-llāh). Only a few of these could be found in the biographical dictionaries. Among them is Abū l-Fadl Muḥammad b. Abūdālīl h. Ahmad b. al-Muhtadi bi-lilāh (d. 537/1143), a descendant of the former caliph who had reigned from 255/869 to 256/870. Abū l-Fadl b. al-Muhtadi figures as a transmitter of three works in Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī's Muṣjam al-Muṣarās.75 Abū l-‘Izz Muḥammad b. al-Mukhtar b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wāḥīd b. al-Mu‘ayyad bi-lilāh, too, is listed as transmitter in Ibn Hajar’s Muṣjam, although not much seems to be known about him apart from this.76 Abū l-‘Abbās Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Samī b. ‘Ali al-Hashimi was a Hanafi jurist.77 The proportion of prominent scholars or participants from social elites seems to be higher in the earlier lecture series than in the later ones.

Religious affiliation

Most participants that could be identified were either affiliated to the Hanbali or to the Hanafi madhḥah. Only two Shafi‘i scholars could be identified, and so far no Mālikī or Zāhirī. As no complete examination of all the participants recorded in the certificates was made, and the religious affiliation of a large part of the participants remains unknown, the results can only be provisional and should not lead to general conclusions. Nevertheless, the distribution of affiliations observed so far deserves closer attention. Abū ‘Ubayd’s work must have been relevant for all madhāhib, his juridical position was considered to be somewhere between Mālik’s and al-Shafi‘ī’s, and several authors rank him among the Shafi‘īs.79 Mālikīs and Zāhirīs only constituted a minority in Baghdad in the 5th/11th century, so their apparent absence from the certificates is hardly surprising, but the Shafi‘is constituted an important faction. As we have seen, Tiirād, although himself Hanafi, must have held close ties to the ruling Seljuks. Although themselves adhering to the Hanafi madhābah, their vizier Niẓām al-Mulk strongly promoted the Shi‘i cause, inter alia through the establishment of colleges. The relative absence of Shafi‘ī scholars from Tiirād’s lectures therefore may possibly indicate that they rather followed lectures by other Shafi‘ī scholars, possibly in the emerging madrasa, which were primarily schools of law. The fact that Hanafis and Hanbalis scholars take part in the same sessions may also indicate that there were no irreconcilable differences between these two groups, while the differences to the Shi‘is may have been more important. This is in sharp contrast to the results of Ephrat’s research about the Sunni ‘ulamā‘ of 5th/11th-century Baghdad. According to her, it was the Hanbali scholars who usually acquired their entire education within their own madhābah, while scholars of other madhāhib were more inclined to engage in common scholarly pursuits.80 In addition, while in Nishapur violent struggles between Hanafis and Shi‘is occurred,81 the lines of conflict in Baghdad were rather between Hanbalis on the one side and Shafi‘īs and Hanafis on the other side,82 or between different Shi‘ī and Sunni groups.83 Leaving political considerations aside, Tiirād’s good reputation as regards scholarship and ancestry may well have attracted scholars from other affiliations to his lectures, all the more as his great age made him the last surviving transmitter of a number of famous teachers.

Age

For most of the participants in the lectures, the date of birth cannot be established. Those whose birth dates are known took part in the session at different stages of their lives. Some participants, as well as some of the lecturers, were already in their fifties, others in their twenties or thirties.

According to the same records, in most sessions a few persons are accompanied by their children or by their slaves (fāsiq). However, the age of the children is not recorded, and it is possible that the accompanying children themselves were adults already. Quite often they already bear a kānyā, which may (but does not necessarily) indicate that they already had children themselves. It seems already

---

74 Ephrat, Society, 161.
75 In this case, the title al-sharif evidently encompasses members of the Abbasid family and is not confined to descendants of ‘Ali, as some of the persons so called in the same record can be identified and are direct descendants of ‘Ali’s. Cf. C. van Andelrod, art. “Sharī‘”, in: The Encyclopaedia of Islam, new ed., Leiden, vol. 9.
76 Ibn Hajar, Muṣjam, 531.
77 Ibn Hajar, Muṣjam, 544.
78 Al-Shafi‘ī, Ważf, VII, 62.
79 The nisab of one participant may be read as al-Maghribi, in which case it is not unlikely that he was a Mālikī (page 3, left side).
80 Ephrat, Society, 46-48; George Makdisi, Ibn ‘Aqīl, 278f.
82 Ephrat, Society, 91-93.
84 Ephrat, Society, 92; Keyhan, Formation, 144f.; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, IX, 614, X, 104f.
to have been common practice to give a kunyā to newborn children. The children of Abū ʿI-Fawāris himself were 24 years old when they attended a lecture series taking place in Jumāda al-ʾakhirah 468/July 1093. Possibly they already attended a lecture in 472/1080, then being 10 years old.

While usually only a few children are recorded in the sameit prior to 488/1095, in the lecture series M, N, and Q which take place in 488/1095 and 490/1097, the number of accompanying children is considerably higher. In series Q, at least ten children take part, among them the famous Shuddūt bt. Abī Naṣr al-Bābān (d. 568/1173), who became the most important transmitter from Abū ʿI-Fawāris Ṭirād of the Kitāb al-Anwaʾl. Not all the children take part in all sessions of this series. The relatively high number of children most probably is due to Ṭirād’s advanced age – being already in his nineties – at that time, which presumably made him the last surviving transmitter from Ibn al-Bāḥi (d. 420/1029).

**Conclusion**

From at least the 470s/1080s, Abū ʿI-Fawāris Ṭirād was highly sought after as a teacher. He combined learning, a high reputation, nobility and great age. Taking together all the sameit notes from the Kitāb al-Anwaʾl, several hundred people heard at least parts of the Kitāb al-Anwaʾl under his direction. Ṭirād b. Muḥammad, the shaykh muṣūmī, is already 74 (lunar) years old when the first lecture series recorded on the manuscript takes place. In the last lecture series, he has reached the age of 92. This is of major importance for the participants, because this way they have a short chain of transmitters. As the Ḥanfī scholar al-Zarnūjī at the turn of the 7th/13th stated in his instructions for the student, one should always choose the oldest teacher one can find. Other scholars held similar positions.

In the literature, the informal, flexible and open character of teaching in the Islamic world has often been emphasised. This view may need some modification or at least some clarification. The lecture series studied here were indeed open, insofar as participants could join or leave the circle at any time and take part in single sessions only if they so wished. Apparently, they were also open to scholars of different religious affiliation, but possibly only to a certain extent. In any case, the under-representation of Shāfiʿī scholars calls for an explanation.

The lectures were flexible insofar as they did not necessarily all take place at the same place, and at least one session was partly held in a mosque and partly in a different place. But most of the lectures seem to have had a fixed schedule on a weekly basis with a fixed workload, and it is very likely that they were also held at a fixed time. On the other hand, it was possible to later follow up with parts one might have missed, and the lectures could be suspended – sometimes for a week, sometimes for about a month – possibly due to holidays or external circumstances.

The lectures don’t appear to be very informal, but rather seem regulated. The attendance of the participants is meticulously recorded. The qaṭīr who actually performed the lectures apparently was not chosen from among the participants but was a professional reader. The most intensive and long-lasting cooperation took place with Abū Yāsir al-ʿUkbari, who worked together with Ṭirād in at least five lecture series, two follow-up series and some single sessions over a period of ten years. Teaching assistants (muṣāfīd or muṭāḥīd) regularly took part in the sessions, sometimes taking on the duties of the qaṭīr. Thus, the teaching culture seems to have been highly specialized and professionalized.

The character of the lectures changes over the course of time. While the lecture series of the 470s and early 480s apparently take place very regularly on a weekly basis and are characterised by small study groups of some 10 to 25, usually adult, participants, the lecture series in the last years of Ṭirād’s teaching activity are carried out in a much shorter period of time and are characterised by large groups, including many children. The aim of these series clearly is to enable children to later transmit the book with the best irisā possible. Ṭirād himself has benefited from this practice, as apparently he, too, was taken to lectures when he was still a child. Apart from Ibn al-Bāḥi, from whom Ṭirād heard the Kitāb al-Anwaʾl in 412/1021, as we have seen above, all of the teachers of Ṭirād’s who appear in the record of transmissions by Ibn Hajar died between 411/1020 and 415/1024.

The religious affiliation of the participants deserves further study. Apparently the composition of the study groups does not reflect the structure of the scholarly society (Shāfiʿīs are underrepresented), but is not focused on the affiliation of Ṭirād, either. In any case, Ḥanbalis apparently did not constitute a self-contained group.

**Catalogue of the lectures**

In the following, the presumable lecture series (capital letters) and single lectures (lower case letters) in which Ṭirād al-Zaynabi acted as the shaykh muṣūmī are documented with details about the qaṭīr (Q), the date (D), and the page numbers:

---


89 Samei note on page 24, left side.

90 Samei note on page 3 left side.

91 Samei note on page 50, right side.

92 Bahrān al-Dīn al-Zarnūjī, Tafsīr al-Maʿṣūmī - Tafsīr al-Taʾwīlī, trans. Gustave Edmound von Grunebaum, Theodora M. Abel, Instruction of the Student: The Method of Learning, New York 1947, 28: "Regarding the choice of a teacher, it is important to select the most learned, the most pious and the most advanced in years."

93 Berkeley, Transmission, 226.

94 Berkeley, Transmission, 18; Tibawi, "Origin", 230; Ephrat, Society, 8, 71, 80, 102.
of the manuscript on which the respective certificates can be found. The copy from the Staatsbibliothek Berlin consists of 228 photographs of double pages. As the page numbers on the manuscript conform to the numbers of the photograph but deviate from the folio numbers, page numbers are used.

The lecture series:

A) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Ramadān - Shawwal 478/March - April 1080
   2 certificates: 3 l, 52 l

B) Q: al-Mu'āmmar b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayyī (424/1033-515/1120)
   D: 7 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 477 - Muḥarram 478/April - May 1085
   3 certificates: 49 l, 97 l, 125 l

C) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: 28 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 477 - 2 Rabī’ al-awwal 478/26 April - 28 June 1085
   9 certificates: 24 l, 49 l, 72 l, 97 l, 125 l, 151 l, 155 l, 204 l, 228 l

C) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Rabī’ al-awwal 478/June - July 1085
   2 certificates: 180 l, 204 l

D) Q: Abū Sa’d al-Ḥasan b. 'Abī b. Abī al-Wahhāb
   D: Jumādā l-ūlā - Ramadān 478/September 1085 - January 1086
   8 certificates: 3 l, 72 l, 75 l, 125 l, 151 l, 177 l, 180 l, 207 l

E) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: 22 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 478 - Rabī’ al-awwal 479/November - December 1086
   5 certificates: 60 l, 75 l, 124 l, 150 l, 177 l

F) Q: Abū l-Barakāt Hībat Allāh b. al-Mubārak b. Mūsā al-Saqqāfī (d. 509/1115)
   D: 8 Rabī’ al-akhir - Jumādā l-akhirah 479/23 July - September 1086
   8 certificates: 25 l, 49 l, 97 l, 100 l, 152 l, 177 l, 204 l, 228 l

G) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Jumādā l-ūlā - Jumādā l-akhirah 479/August - September 1086
   4 certificates: 25 l, 49 l, 97 l, 125 l

H) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Jumādā l-ūlā - Jumādā l-akhirah 480/August - September 1087
   7 certificates: 25 l, 94 l, 113 l, 150 l, 176 l, 180 l, 207 l

H) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah - Sha’bān 480/September - November 1087
   3 certificates: 25 l, 31 l, 227 l

i) Q: Abū Yāsir Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Kādīsh al-'Ukbārī (d. 496/1103)
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah 481/August - September 1088
   1 certificate: 151 l

j) Q: Abū l-Faraj Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh al-Labbān and his sons 'Abd al-
   Salām and Muḥammad
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah 478/August - September 1089
   7 certificates: 3 l, 30 l, 79 l, 149 l, 155 l, 203 l, 228 l

k) Q: Abū l-Faraj Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh al-Labbān and his sons 'Abd al-
   Salām and Muḥammad
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah 482/August - September 1089
   2 certificates: 3 l, 227 l

l) Q: Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Maymūn
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah 484/July - August 1091
   1 certificate: 3 l

m) Q: Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭūrāzī
   D: Jumādā l-akhirah 486/July - October 1093
   1 Certificate: 25 l

   D: 29 Jumādā l-ūlā - 17 Shawwal 488/6 May - 20 October 1095
   7 certificates: 3 l, 31 l, 75 l, 126 l, 155 l, 200 l, 223 l

N) Q: Abū l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ruwaydāshī
   D: 2 Rabī’ al-awwal - 2 Rabī’ al-akhir 490/18 February - 20 March 1097
   8 certificates: 23 l, 44 l, 58 l, 116 r, 150 r, 158 r, 196 r, 212 r

o) Q: not mentioned
   D: Rabī’ al-akhir 490/March - April 1097
   1 certificate: 228 l

p) Q: Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. al-Mubārak al-Anṣāfī (462/1070-
   538/1143)
   D: 490/1097
   1 certificate: 26 r

Q) Q: Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. Khūrūs al-Balkhī (d.
   526/1132)
   D: 5 Dhū l-Ḥijjah - Dhū l-Ḥijjah 490/13 November - November or December
   1097.
   8 certificates: 26 r, 50 r, 74 l, 125 l, 129 r, 155 l, 180 r, 207 r
Part 2
Widening the horizon:
Assessing other types of manuscript notes
Figure 1: Title page of the fifth part (juz') of the Kitab al-Anwal of Abu 'Ubayd with the note of acquisition of Abu l-Fawâris Tîrîzî (Staatbibliothek Berlin, MS sm. or. 31)
Figure 3: Names crossed out and recorded absences from a hearing session (upper note) (Staatsbibliothek Berlin, M5 sim. or. 31)

Figure 4: Space left free for a same' note for later addition of names and note of repetition (upper note) (Staatsbibliothek Berlin, M5 sim. or. 31)