Writing in the margins of empires –
The Hûsaynâbâdî family of scholars in the Ottoman-Šafawid borderlands

Introduction*

Around the middle of the 17th century Sari Osman, the son of the mufti of Amasya and a recent graduate from a madrasa in Istanbul, left the Ottoman capital and traveled "to Kurdistan in order to bring his knowledge to perfection". His journey led him to Mardin and Amid (Diyarbakır) and as far east as the mountains that formed the Ottoman-Šafawid borderland. After studying with a number of scholars he returned to Istanbul and embarked on a remarkable academic career. Sari Osman’s Ottoman metropolitan ‘ilmiye career was founded on his appropriation and representation of a corpus and practice of knowledge in which his masters in Kurdistan took a place of honor. Scholars in the Ottoman-Šafawid borderlands had a solid reputation in the Ottoman center for their transmission and explication of a corpus of philosophical-theological and philological texts that was rooted in the late pre-Mongol period and consolidated in the 15th and 16th centuries under the aegis and patronage of the Timurid and Turkmen confedera-

---

* I wish to thank Prof. Selim Kuru (Seattle) and Dr. Heidrun Eichner (Ittale) for their careful and critical readings of earlier drafts of this paper, which helped me to sharpen the focus and to mend some important flaws. The remaining mistakes are entirely mine.

1 Şeyh 1989, 1:1453, tekkâni i ’ilm ve irfân hâdediyle di’yûr-i Kürdistan’a şefer ve ye’gân yeğan faHadı ve şûrû darâlifühlerine şayer etmişdi.

2 Şeyh 1989, 1:1453. From the context his return to Istanbul can be dated to before 1654 (1063 h.), the year of death of his patron Kara Çelebihzade Mahûmid Efendi. I wish to thank Denise Klein (Munch) for pointing me to the biography of Sari Osman.
tions. The Ottoman biographer Şeyhî, writing in the first half of the 18th century, still calls Amid “a fresh spring of wisdom and knowledge.” This reputation notwithstanding the 17th-century Eastern scholars worked in an environment in which their tradition of learning had come under external and internal pressures. The integration of the Arab provinces into the Ottoman Empire since the early 16th century led to growing competition with the learned elites of cities like Cairo and Damascus over patronage in the environment of the Ottoman court. The so-called Kadızade, a Hanafi movement in the epicenter of the Ottoman establishment, targeted certain forms of communal ritual practice, non-Hanafi interpretations of the law, and Averroean metaphysics. Within the commentary tradition (if one may call it thus), for the sake of brevity, a reformist trend targeted not so much content as didactic practice. Thus Sâd Osman and his Eastern teachers represented an established and dynamic, albeit not uncontested mode of religious reading, writing and teaching.

Yet little is known about this 17th-century world of learning outside the metropolitan centers. The intellectual realm of the communities of writers and readers in the political and intellectual borderlands of Eastern Anatolia and Northwest Iran remains largely uncharted. This article attempts to reconstruct the outlines of one such community, most commonly known by the nisbas Husaynîba, Haydarî, or Hârî in combination with al-Kurî: a family of scholars and their students and readers mainly in Kurdistan and in the central Ottoman lands, but also on the Şafavid side of the border, in the period that is roughly bracketed by the Ottoman conquest of Baghdad in 1638 and the end of the Şafavid dynasty in 1722. The reception and perpetuation of a specific corpus of texts through the production of scholia that was embedded in a wider set of texts and communities of readers and writers constituted this community and tied it to the wider world of early modern Islamic intellectual culture.

Writing in the margins of texts and in the borderlands between empires, the Husaynîbâdi scholars produced a considerable number of texts that were multiplied and disseminated through students, readers and collectors. The substantial number of surviving manuscripts allows to sketch a preliminary history of the production of texts and books, the formation of libraries and madrasas, and the networks and circuits of individuals involved in this particular process of cultural production. From the Husaynîbâdi manuscripts emerges the picture of a changing geography of learning between the middle of the 17th and the middle of the 18th centuries.

The main source base for this article is the record of paratextual materials in surviving manuscript copies of texts authored by members of one family, or rather the scholarly productive members of three early generations of this family. The subject matters of their writings provide a general sense of their academic interests, but the current study does not attempt to identify intellectual trends and debates; this would be the next step and would require a considerably larger corpus of texts. But even for the narrower question addressed here, the production, reception, dissemination and circulation of written texts, this article will resist the temptation to identify general trends that would go beyond the confines of this particular group of manuscripts. The widely accepted historiographic paradigm of a broad 18th- and 19th-century Islamic reformist-revivalist movement rooted in 17th-century teacher-student networks in the Hamaymân demonstrates how persuasive such generalizations can be. Yet not only has it been shown that this “movement” is much more diverse than the genealogical concept

3 On the origins of this tradition see Endres 2006, 371-422. For the “post-classical” development see Wawro 2004, 149-191.
4 Klein 2007, 139.
5 For a prime example of this rivalry in the early 17th century see al-Khaqâni’s vitriolic Maqâmây rûmây in which the eminent Egyptian scholar expressed his frustration over his inability to secure patronage in Istanbul by blaming — among others — Kurdish scholars for corrupting scholarship in the Ottoman capital. See Elger 1984, 165-188; see, however, Elger’s remarks on the fictional aspects of al- Khaqâni’s text.
6 On the Kadızade see still the unpublished dissertation by Çavuşoğlu 1990; Zilli 1986, 251-269, and Zilli 1988. A fresh appraisal of the Kadızade based on the wide range of available mss. is an urgent desideratum.
7 Reichenthum 2004, 691-529.
9 An important model for the use of paratextual and codicological materials for the reconstruction of scholarly families are several studies by Sellheim in particular Sellheim 1976 and Sellheim 1987.
10 For one field of studies, logics, see El-Rouayheb 2006, 263-281.
11 See, for example, Levitz and Voll 1988 and Levitz and Weigert 1998, 259-277.
of an “intellectual family tree” suggests. This model tends to detach intellectual developments carried by a “cosmopolitan” elite from the political realities of Middle Eastern empires. Writing intellectual developments into a narrative of “traditional” and “reformist modes” of knowledge, it obstructs the view of simultaneous alternative discourses and their interactions. In order to gain a more complex and historically reliable picture it is necessary to engage in a much more thorough stock-taking and explore the pragmatics of text production and reception in geographic and intellectual regions that have hardly begun to be charted.

From eminent scholar to family enterprise: the Ḥusaynābādīs in the 17th and 18th centuries

Sari Osman lists among the scholars he encountered during his study tour in Kurdistan a certain Ahmad Ḥaydarānī. This is the Ottoman (or Persian) form of the name of Ahmad b. Haydar (d. 1080 H./1669-70). Residing in a village east of Arbil, Ahmad had made himself a name as an eminent scholar beyond his home region. His scholias and glosses on Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī’s 15th-century commentary on ʿAḍūd al-Dīn al-Lī’s (d. 765 H./1355) al-Aṣqīṣī al-ʿaḍūdīyya, were known in Istanbul already during his lifetime; Ahmad b. Haydar’s contemporary in Istanbul, the famous bibliophile Kātib Čelebi (1017-1067 h. / 1609-1657), listed this title in his bibliography, the Kāshf al-Zamān. Kātib Čelebi is said to have studied under one of Ahmad b. Haydar’s students who traveled to Istanbul in 1051 h. (1641-42). There is no evidence that Ahmad ibn Ḥaydar himself ever visited the Ottoman capital or traveled outside the Ottoman-Şafawīd border.

12 See the critique by Dallal 1993, 341-359.
13 Azra 2004, 8.
14 Not surprisingly this paradigm has only been used to explain the origins of 20th-century Islamic reformism, but has also been adapted to create a legitimizing genealogy for it, see for example Azra 2004 and Naft 2002, 307-355.
15 Kātib Čelebi 1853-58, 5:417, No. 13512.
16 Şeyhli 1989, 1:263.
17 al-Ḥaydarī 1962, 88 and 126.
18 In the 16th century at least the Shāfīʿī madhhab of the Ḥusaynābādīs would also speak against a Transoxonian origin, unless Muhammad b. Haydar changed his madhab. It is thinkable, however, that the Ḥusaynābādīs lived for some time in exile in Shībānī Transoxania after the establishment of ʿAṣafī rule in Iran.
19 Both forms are attested. Ḥusaynābād is the official name of the modern town 6 km north of Sanandaj, the later Ardalan capital and seat of the provincial administration of modern Kurdistan of Iran. In 1636-37 (1046 h.) the Ardalan moved their residence to the newly founded city of Sanandaj. It should be noted, however, that a village ʿAṣafī in the west of Bakhtshar in the 16th century, and a village ʿAṣafī in the Pishab in Tajikistan at least in the late 19th century. Bertel’s 1938, Index; Mukhamedjanov et al. 2001, 137 (ʿAṣafī), 143 (Ḥusaynābād).
20 On the possibility of a Kurdish origin of the ʿAṣafī family see the discussion in Grone 1993, 240. Haydar ibn Ahmad (d. ca. 1129 h./1717) appears with the nisba al-ʿAṣafī in the famous 18th-century biographical dictionary, Sīh al-durar fiʿlān al-qarn al-thālīʾ ashgar, al-Mūrādī 1966, 1:26-27. Ibrahim ibn Haydar ibn Ahmad, who was head of the family madrasa in Māvārin in the early 1700s, seems to be the last documented bearer of the nisba al-ʿAṣafī, cf. Sīleymaniyeh, Halet Eferdi 507. I hope to discuss the history of Ibrahim Faṣḥ al-Ḥaydarī and his family at another occasion.
Arbil. It seems that Ahmad (I) b. Haydar lived and worked mainly in Harrir. The nisba al-Harrir occasionally accompanies his name in manuscripts; marginal scolia signed simply al-Harrir seem generally to be his. In the oldest full biography of Ahmad (I) b. Haydar in Mustafa Fatihullah al-Hamawi's Fawaid al-irthi, he appears with the nisbas "al-Harrir al-Husaynibadi al-Kurdi." 21

Like his father, Haydar was noted outside of the Ottoman borderlands. Al-Hamawi, writing in the Hijaz and Yemen during Haydar's lifetime, refers to him in the entry for his father Ahmad: [Ahmad (I) b. Haydar] is the father of mawlana Haydar who was born in 1040 and is still [i.e. before 1129 h./1717] alive." According to al-Muradi, writing in

21 Mudarris provides no evidence for his claim that Muhammad b. Haydar settled in Mawaran and that his son Haydar established the family foothold in Harrir. It may be based on family tradition. al-Haydar 1962, 88 and 126, already mentions the marriage of Muhammad b. Haydar to a descendant of Unmar ibn al-Schaftalb from the "Bakhtiyariya", a clan possibly connected with the village Bakhtiyar a few miles southwest of Mawaran. Cf. Mudarris 1369 [1990-91], 139: min fātih Bakhtiyar.

22 al-Harrir is the nisba of Ahmad's son Haydar in a ms. copied by one of his students shortly before 1700 in Harrir (see below). The onsite electronic catalog of the Suleymaniye libraries and the Yazarlar online catalog, <http://www.suleymaniye.gov.tr/Yazarlar.htm>, last accessed 22 December 2009 generally add the nisba al-Harrir to Haydar b. Ahmad's name as well, but all ms. I have been able to check were either wrongly attributed to Haydar or had his name without the nisba al-Harrir.

23 E.g. ms. Markisa, 45 HK 927/2 (Ahmad (I) b. Haydar, text F1/C1, copied before 1109 h./1667-98), colophon: al-Bahijja al-mansuha da afdal al-muta'alibkhrin mawlanâ Harrir (sic); ms. Berlin Staatsbibliothek, HS. or. 4515 with glosses marked Ahmad-i Harrir, Harrir, Ahmad-i Haydar, Ahmad b. Haydar. His son's glosses are marked Haydar or Haydar Efendi. Cf., however, glosses attributed to "Khun Ahmad Harrir" on al-Iṣfarāni's commentary on the Adab al-ḥarb of al-Samarqandi in ms. Tehran, Sipahsalar 3170 (Shārīzī 1313-18 [1934-40], 2:410. These scolia are generally attributed to the younger Ahmad. Only an autograph of the ms. would clarify if the scribe confused the two Ahmad's, or if the younger Ahmad was also associated with Harrir.

24 al-Hamawi, 1385a. The Fawaid's complicated textual history has not yet been studied. Ms. Cairo, Dar al-kutub, Ta'riikh Ta'mīr 923 was copied in 1214 h. (1799) in Cairo from an autograph draft (mawadda) completed on 23 rajab 1129 h. (3 July 1717), probably in Yemen or Harran. Both independent manuscripts are brolouss; there are many duplicate entries, lacunae etc. which prove that the author was still in the process of compiling his information.

25 al-Hamawi, 1385a.

Damascus in the second half of the 18th century, Haydar even visited Istanbul in 1126 h. (1714), three years before his death in Mosul. 26 Given the Damascus focus of al-Muradi's Sik al-durar it is likely that Haydar traveled via Damascus. 27 Al-Muradi adds another interesting detail. Haydar's death is said to have been followed by strong winds and thunder. These typical elements of hagiographic accounts suggest that Haydar was not only a renowned scholar but also enjoyed charismatic prestige in his homeland. A biography of Haydar written by Uthman al-'Umari, a companion and student of the next generation of Husaynibades, points in the same direction: he writes that the tomb of the scholar below the citadel of Arbil was visited by pilgrims (yazār). 28

Three sons of Haydar gained reputation as scholars as well. Ahmad (II), named after his grandfather, was the oldest. 29 Al-'Umari, who as a child met Ahmad, calls him "the pole and learned of this family" (qabab al-hayt wa-'almmu) and the successor to his father Haydar after his death. 30 The younger Ahmad must therefore have been alive after 1129 h. (1717). Only one text, however, can be safely attributed to him. His work on al-Iṣfarāni's commentary on al-Samarqandi's treatise on dialectic were completed in 1103 h. (1691-92) and are preserved in a fairly large number of manuscripts. 31

26 al-Muradi 1366, 1:26-77. Al-Muradi writes that Haydar was born "around 1036 h. (1626-27)" and was about 90 years old when he died after his return from Istanbul. Writing in the late Ottoman period, the Kurdist (Bakhr) scholar Baghdati Isma'il Papa (1839-1920) deduced from al-Muradi's biograph the lifespan 1036-1129 h. (1626/7-1717) for Haydar, Baghdati Isma'il Papa 1951-55, 1342; these dates must be approximately right, but the concrete evidence allows only to say that Haydar lived from "around 1040 h." to "around 1129 h."

27 In 1127 h. a Damascus scholar, Muhammad b. Abd-al-Latif al-Ibnabi, copied Haydar b. Ahmad's glosses on al-Jami's al-Durr al-fikhr. The ms. is preserved in the Maktahat al-Asad in Damascus, ms. 9276 (see Appendix, Haydar b. Ahmad, text 4); C. Heer 1979, 10.

28 al-'Umari 1394-95/1974-75, 9. The location of Haydar's tomb in Arbil according to al-'Umari does not necessarily contradict al-Muradi's statement that Haydar passed away in Mosul, less than 60 miles from Arbil.

29 al-'Umari 1394-95/1974-75, 10.

30 al-'Umari 1394-95/1974-75, 10-11.

31 The date 1103 h. is given in the catalog description of Tehran, Milli ms. 4411/2, in Anwār 1968-2005, 19/24, and in ms. Baghdad, Awqaf 13725. Mudarris 1369 [1990-91], 53, mentions only this text for Ahmad, and adds that neither the year of his birth nor his death are known.
The greatest academic fame among Haydar’s three sons rested with ‘Abdallâh. The sequence of the biographies of Haydar’s sons in al-‘Umârî’s Rawd al-nâdir suggests that he was the second son. ‘Abdallâh was a prolific writer: He composed at least twelve texts, more than any other member of the family. This is even more remarkable if one considers that he died young, maybe as early as 1107 h. (1695–96). The peak of his activities lay in the last decade of the 17th century.

The third son, Shihâb al-Dîn Ibrâhîm, continued the teaching tradition in Mâwrân. He seems to have survived his brothers by several decades. Ibrâhîm must have been alive in 1151 h. (1738–39) when his student al-‘Umârî copied a text with his permission (see below). He was also a productive author (see appendix) and wrote “in all fields of science.” He wrote his two most important works, primary commentaries on al-Dawânî’s al-Zawrâ and Jâmi’ al-Durra al-fâdhilah, already in 1106 and 1107 h., respectively. These are his only works by which a significant, though still comparatively small number of manuscripts are in existence.

In the generation after Haydar’s sons ‘Alâmîd, ‘Abdallâh, and Ibrâhîm, the family split into two branches. It seems that from among Ibrâhîm’s five sons it was Ismâ’il who continued the tradition in Mâwrân. The mixed codex Halet Efendi 507 includes a copy of one of his works made in Mâwrân from the autograph in 1156 h. (1743–44). Another son, Shîghlatallâh, moved to Baghdad, where he established himself quickly in the scholarly establishment of the city. The fortunes of the Baghdad branch – now almost exclusively known by the nisba al-

32 al-‘Umârî 1394–95/1974–75, 13. Al-‘Umârî was a friend of ‘Abdallâh’s son Hassan. A manuscript in Baghdad, al-Maktaba al-Qâdiriya 853, seems to refer to 1107 h. as the year of ‘Abdallâh’s death.
34 Mudarris 1369 [1990–91], 18, gives the names in the following sequence: Shîghlatallâh, ‘Âsim, Fatâlallâh, Fâdallâh, Ismâ’il.
35 Mudarris 1369 [1990–91], 79, cites several titles of works attributed to Ismâ’il.
36 Süleymanîye, Halet Efendi 507/3, Ismâ’il’s superglosses on ‘Alî Qishî’s glosses on al-Samarqandî’s commentary on ‘Âdud al-Dîn al-Tijî’s Risâla wa’dîyya; another ms. is described for Mosul, Hasan Bâshî al-Khalîlî S. 281, Majmû‘a No. 25/79, text 4, copied by Ibrâhîm b. al-sayyîd Ibrâhîm al-Mawâli in 1184 h. (1770–71). On works attributed to the brothers Fathallâh and Fadallâh see Mudarris 1369 [1990–91], 310.

Writing in the margins of empires

Haydar – were not disrupted by the death of Shîghlatallâh and at least one of his sons, Haydar, in the plague of 1773–74.

Madrasa and library

We will leave the family history here and turn to the practice of scholarship and teaching in the first three generations at Mâwrân and Harîr. According to al-Hamawi the elder ‘Alâmîd b. Haydar studied with his father (among other teachers.) There is no evidence that ‘Alâmîd or even his father were running a madrasa in Harîr, or that they entertained a large community of students who copied manuscripts. On the other hand two manuscripts bearing his ownership note have been preserved in a local collection from Biyâra near al-Sulaymaniyya. A copy of his own al-Muhâkâmât in the same collection may have belonged to his personal library as well. After his death the library seems to have been divided among his heirs: ‘Alâmîd’s ownership note in one ms. is followed by a note stating that the ms. went to ‘Alâmîd b. ‘Alâmîd by way of division of estate (‘an tarîq al-taqsîm). It is likely that ‘Alâmîd b. ‘Alâmîd was ‘Alâmîd b. Haydar’s son, although no son with this name is known from other sources.

38 None of the ‘Ismâ’nâbî manuscripts listed in the appendix indicates Harîr as the place where it was written. A clean copy of three texts by ‘Alâmîd called by a certain Nâdirî between 1055 and 1057 h. (1645–48), i.e. during the author’s lifetime, is preserved in the Awaqîf libraries in Baghdad (No. 3545) and may have belonged to the family library.
39 The nisba al-‘Iṣârî makes it very likely that this is the older ‘Alâmîd b. Haydar.
40 Glosse by Khwajazade Mustafâ (d. 983 h./1578) and a certain ‘Alâmîd b. Haydar’s 16th c. commentary on al-‘Alâmîd’s Risâla al-Fâhima. Mahmûd ‘Alâmîd Muhammad 1982, 87 (S/y2), 88 and 83 (S/y2). Cf. Princeton: Yahuda-Garrett ms. 4065 and 4538 (Mack 3047), Biyâra is near the Iran-Iraq border SE of Sulaymaniyya, about 215 km SE of Harîr as the crow flies.
41 Mahmûd ‘Alâmîd Muhammad 1982, 86 (S/86) 1210m. No further details on the manuscript are provided in the catalog.
42 According to the catalog it is unclear whether this is the actual wording of the note.
A community of students is well attested for Ahmad’s son Haydar (ca. 1040-ca. 1129 h. / 1630-1717). It seems that he spent much of his life in Harrār. Shortly before 1700 one scribe describes himself in the colophons of several texts in Harrār as “one of the students of mawlānā Haydar ibn Ahmad al-Harrāri” ([min] ʾiddā tullāb [...] ] and states that he wrote those copies while he was “with” ([inda] or “in the service of” (fi khāṣma) Haydar.43 Later in his life Haydar seems to have moved his school to nearby Mawrān, the other family home. Uthmān b. ʿAbī b. Murād al-Umari (d. 1184 h. / 1770-71) attributes the establishment of a teaching community in Mawrān to him. “Haydar [...] unfolded the banner of teaching in Mawrān. From everywhere people came to study with him: from Khalkhāl and Kharāsān, from [Ira]q al-ʿAjam and Daghistān.”44 The students participated actively in the reproduction and dissemination of ḥusaynābādī scholias and glosses. Al-Umari asked him for permission to copy his -Mulhamāt and his commentary on the Bānāt Suʿūd qaṣida;45 his copy of the -Mulhamāt, written in Mawrān on 27 Jumādā 1 1151 h. (ca. 12 Oct. 1738), has been preserved in the Āḥmadiyya madrasa in Mosul.46 A certain ‘Abd al-Muḥyayn al-Kurdi47 thoroughly studied Mīr ʿAbī b. Ḥathī’s commentary on Aṣād al-Dīn al-Jīsī’s Risāla fi ʾādāb al-baḥth with Haydar ibn Ahmad and finally decided to pen his thoughts down in order to preserve them from being lost and to disseminate them.48 The only known manuscript of this text combines it with superglosses on the same glosses by the son of Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn’s teacher, ʿAbdallāh b. Haydar al-Ḥusaynābādī.49

43 Sūleymaniye, Bağdād Vehbi Efendi 2104, 68a, 8 shawwāl 1106 h. (ca. 22 May 1695), in Harrār: 86a, 12 safa r 1108 h. (ca. 10 September 1696); 114a, last day of ʿĀdī l-qāda 1105 h. (ca. 23 July 1694).
45 al-Umari 1394-95/1974-75, 216.
46 Sālim 1395/1975, 5/180. According to the catalog the copy was written ʾinda l-muṣāaraqī naḥala min mīsūr waṭalikī fi quṣūr Mawrān.
47 Thus in the colophon of ms. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Petermann I 679, 46a.
48 Ms. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Petermann I 679, 2a.
49 Apparently a third supergloss by ʿAbd al-Muḥyayn al-Kurdi, deleted from a short table of contents on the flyleaf, was originally bound with those two texts. - This Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn may be identical with the author of glosses on the Šīhār al-tifārīnī of which an undated manuscript is preserved in the Yahuda/Garrett col.

Haydar’s son Ibrāhīm continued the teaching tradition in Mawrān. A scribal colophon from 1156 h. (1743) mentions the madrasa of Ibrāhīm b. Haydar al-Ṣafawi, the grandson (nāṣir) of Ahmad, in Mawrān.41 The hand of this scribe closely resembles the handwriting of a certain Uthmān al-Mawrānī who calls himself a student of “Ibrāhīm al-Kurdi” and in 1149 h. (1736-37) signed copies of texts by Ibrāhīm and his brother ʿAbdallāh.42

The best known student of Ibrāhīm is Uthmān al-Umari, the author of al-Rawād al-naḍīr. Al-Umari writes in his biographica at Ibrāhīm that he copied two of the latter’s texts with his permission.43 One of these two copies, the Mulhamāt,44 has been preserved in a library in Mosul, the hometown of the Umari family. According to the colophon, al-Umari copied it in 1151 h. (1738-39) in the village of Mawrān in the presence of the author from his autograph.45

The fate of the madrasa and library at Mawrān after Ibrāhīm (and Īsmāʾil) is unclear. When Ibrāhīm’s son Śībghatallāḥ moved to Baghdad he seems to have taken a substantial part of the family library with him. This library, in addition to oral family traditions, was an important source for Śībghatallāḥ’s great-great-grandson Ibrāhīm Faṣḥ when he wrote up the history of the family in mid-19th-century Baghdad. Several manuscripts with ḥusaynābādī/Haydarī texts in the collection of the New York Public Library (NYPL) are believed to come

lection in Princeton: Ḥāšbūy al-ʿālā ʿādār al-tifārīnī, Yahuda/Garrett 3094 (= Mach 3438), 34 ff. Mach dates it to the 12th h./18th century.
50 Sūleymaniye, Halet Efendi 507, 179a, Friday, 11 muharram 1156 h. (8 March 1743).
51 Probably not identical with Uthmān al-Umari, who generally refers to himself as al-Mawrāwi and whose ties to Mawrān seem to have been too limited to warrant a nība.
52 Sūleymaniye, Haci Mahmud Efendi 1173 (2), signed ʿUthmān al-Mawrānī (sic); Ms. Vienna Cod. Mist. 1045 (1-3) (= Loebenstein 1970, 2272). Loebenstein reads the nība as Mardīn (see below). The Vienna ms. contains a reference to his teacher Ibrāhīm al-Kurdi.
53 al-Umari 1394-95/1974-75, 16.
54 See appendix, Ibrāhīm b. Haydar, text 6.
from this library of the Baghdad branch. Several manuscripts in the NYPL or in libraries in Baghdad are closely linked to the family, such as a NYPL ms. of a works of Ḥaydar b. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad Ḥaydar and Ahmad copied during his lifetime in 1080 h. (1675–86) by one of his sons; or — without indication of the scribe — a ms. written in the same year in Māwānān. The oldest known Ḥusaynābādī codex, copied in 1055–57 h. (1645–47), is also preserved in Baghdad and may at one time have belonged to ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Walī billahā's library.

Reading, copying and disseminating

(a) The manuscripts of ʿAbd al-Muḥammad (I)’s al-Muḥākamat

ʿAbd al-Muḥammad (I) b. Ḥaydar b. Muḥākamat, scholia on al-Dawānī’s commentary on al-Fārābī’s al-Qāṣidah al-Fārābīyya, were the foundation for ʿAbd al-Muḥammad’s reputation in Ottoman Anatolia and the capital Istanbul. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Ḥaydar b. Muḥākamat was a member of the Muḥākamat family, and his work is a fine example of the Ottoman intellectual culture of the 16th century. The manuscripts of the Muḥākamat family are known to be of high quality and are often preserved in prominent libraries and institutions.

56 See for example Ms. M&A 51906, 51907, 51873, 51959, 52028, 52029, 52030 and 52140, all described in Schmitz 1992.
57 NYPL 51907 (Schmitz 1992, VI11b1).
58 Baghdad, al-Maktaba al-Qādirīyya 571.
59 Baghdad, Awqāf 3545.
60 See Danijelmen 1961, 340–347, for a summary of the movements of the Ottoman army in the Kurdish principalities.
61 Şeyhül 1989, 1263.

The oldest known manuscript copy of the Muḥākamat bears the date 1063 h. (1652–53). The text seems to have undergone several redactions. One manuscript mentions that the work (or rather this redaction) was completed in 1070 h. (1660–61). The number of copies exceeds that of ʿAbd al-Muḥammad’s other known texts by far. Twenty-nine manuscripts are listed in appendix 2, while in the same libraries his other texts are represented by between one and five copies each.

The only known copy dating from the lifetime of the author was completed in 1063 h. (1652–53) in Erzurum in the Īḫāriyya madrasa by a certain ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Qayt. This copy as well as another early copy, completed in Trabzon only seven years after the death of ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Ḥaydar in mid-shawwal 1087 (ca. 22 December 1676), show that the interest in the Muḥākamat in mid-17th-century Istanbul was part of a wider reception of this work in the central Ottoman lands. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Ḥaydar was an influential voice in the theological debates in which Ottoman scholars were engaged between Istanbul and the Iranian-Ottoman borders. The scribe of the Trabzon manuscript, a certain ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Qayt, was originally from north central Anatolia (Amasya and Tokat) before he moved further east to Trabzon on the Black Sea coast. Where, when and how he became acquainted with ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Ḥaydar's scholia we do not know, but the Anatolian scribe underscores the reputation of the Turkish author by referring to him as “the distinguished Kurd ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. Ḥaydar who is well-known among the theologians.”

The Erzurum ms. is a stand-alone copy of the Muḥākamat. The Trabzon ms., on the other hand, is bound with ʿAbd al-Qayt. The book is printed in the same commentary by ʿAbd al-Muḥammad. The codex is...
like a mini-library of school glosses in the -lji tradition. The -Mubākāmāt is also included in other, more extensive 17th-century "libraries in one volume".68 One was compiled between 1090 and 1096 h. (1679–85) in ‘Aynāb (modern Gaziantep in Turkey) and includes text written by different scribes.69 Another codex now in the Hamidiye collection in Istanbul was completed on ‘Id al-Fitr 1088 h. (ca. 2 February 1678).60 It comprises standard school commentaries, glosses and superglosses on logic, rhetoric and jurisprudence, including a text by a (probably Imāmī) scholar from Western Iran who appears to have been a slightly older contemporary of Ahmad b. Ḥaydar.70 No place is mentioned, but I would suggest that like the other "one volume libraries"

68 The term is literally borrowed from Endres 2001, 10–58.

70 Sülümnihanı, Hamidiye 746. The codex contains the following texts besides the -Mubākāmāt glosses, all compiled by the same hand: glosses and superglosses on al-Jī’s commentary on Ibn al-Ǧāhīz’s Muhārta‘ at-Tānūḥā (on Uṣūl al-dīn GAL 64, 306) by al-Abharī (d. between 660 and 663 h./1263–65) (167a–188a, incomplete) and Afḍalāzāde Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī (d. 909 h./1503) on al-Jī’s commentary (69b–128a); Ḥusayn al-Khalqullāh (d. 1014 h./1605) glosses on al-Dawānī’s commentary on al-Ṭaṭārīzānī’s Taḥlíl at-manṣūḥ (189–222b; cf. GAL G2, 279 and 3, 270); glosses by Qādīzāde (A‘lā al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Khāliq Karāşūrī, 11th/17th c.; cf. Mach 1977, 206, No. 2040) on al-Dawānī’s Ris. Bahlāl al-ṣaḥīb (254a–233; incomplete); one incomplete text (69a–88b) described in the online catalog of the Sülümnihanı libraries as Bahlīya al-dīl-‘a‘dān.

71 Mach quotes Muḥammad Bāqir Khwānsārī, Rawdat al-jannāt šī‘ ādab al-‘alāma wa-l-sādār (Tehran? 1304–06), 99, to the effect that this scholar, Karāşūrī, was Bahlī al-Dīn al-‘Ammī’s (d. 1030 or 1031 h./1621–22) student.

this madrasa copy was also compiled by its single scribe in Anatolia or Rumelia rather than in the circle of Ahmad b. Ḥaydar in Kurdistan.

The other early copies are not part of collective codices. With the exception of the earliest extant ms., the Erzurum copy, none of these indicate where they were copied. The duxtus of the London ms. - written only three years after the author’s death in 1083 h. (1672–73) - points to Kurdistan.72 There is a remarkable peak of extant dated manuscripts of the -Mubākāmāt in the last decade of the 17th century. Five copies were written between 1102 and 1111 h. (1690–1700) to which two copies with waqf of reader notes before 1109 h. (1697–98) may be added to result in a total of more than half of all datable ms. of the -Mubākāmāt. The only ms. in this group for which a place is mentioned was produced in Jolamārg, six kilometers from Ḥarīr. It is likely that the majority of the early-12th-century copies come from the immediate environment of Māwṛān/Ḥarīr, although in the absence of a reliable stemma it cannot be ruled out that the two early ms. in the Fatḥ waqf library were copied from a manuscript in Istanbul. The production of a considerable number of copies of the most popular text of Ahmad b. Ḥaydar may be connected with the establishment of an actual madrasa in Māwṛān/Ḥarīr. It seems that the Husaynibād family enterprise experienced a veritable boost in the first decade of the 12th century. Ahmad’s son Ḥaydar II was still alive, but the new star was his son ʿAbdallāh before he died - still young - in 1107 h.

Ahmad Ḥaydarī’s scoliosis began to circulate widely as a text in its own right in the central Ottoman lands soon after they were composed. The earliest evidence for the inclusion of this text in the study course of Anatolian students dates from a few years after the death of the author. At the same time single copies of the text seem to have been produced mainly locally, at or near Māwṛān and Ḥarīr.

72 London, British Library, ms. Or. 12792, 51ff. (1083 h.). The characteristics are very similar to the hand of al-Bānī (see below), although clearer. Another early separate copy of the text, again of unknown provenience, is preserved in the ms. Princeton, Garrett-Yahuda 2954 (Mach 2298/4) (1090 h.).
The -Maḥākāmat were also copied in the form of scholia in the margins of the base text, and in this form they may have been circulating even more widely. Marginal scholia are difficult to trace, and often their authors are even more difficult to determine. Catalogers rarely make the effort to identify and record, as far as possible, the authors of marginal notes, even if these appear to form coherent bodies of text. Names are often abbreviated, and the similarity of names is not only a challenge to the modern historian, but seems to have occasionally confused the scribes. It is nevertheless important to include marginal notes if one attempts to understand processes of reproduction and dissemination.  

The main text of ms. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hs. or. 4515 is Muṣliḥ al-Dīn al-Lārī's commentary on Aṭḥīr al-Dīn al-Abharī's Ḥādiyyat al-ḥikma. It was copied in Istanbul for a certain shaykh Ṭāā in 1113 h. (1702) by a jurist (faqīḥ) named Hasan b. Ḥusayn Beg b. Yūṣuf Beg b. Murād, who worked in the Dragoman zāwyā. He also wrote one set of scholia, skillfully arranged in carefully designed and planned patterns in order to combine clarity and esthetics with the best use of the available space in the margins. Hasan b. Ḥusayn assem-

73 One cannot make the default assumption that the -Maḥākāmat or similar texts in the commentary tradition were first composed as marginal notes and then (if considered important) turned into a continuous commentary. The systematic use and re-production of marginal scholia and glosses seems to have become common only at a relatively late time. The history of marginal notes in the Islamic ms. tradition is not well researched. See Rosenthal 1947, Major 1978 and Quiring-Zoche 2008.

74 Among the few exceptions are the more recent volumes in the series of catalogs of (mostly) German ms. collections, the Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland (VÖHD).

bected scholia from more than 40 sources in the margins, including several by Ahmad b. Ḥaydar. He was, however, not the only scholar and scribe to contribute to this codex. Simultaneously with Hasan b. Ḥusayn, an anonymous scribe wrote a relatively small number of scholia and glosses in an Iranian hand in the margins and between the lines of the base text. Both scribes seem to have drawn on the same pool of texts. The writing activities of the Iranian scribe and Hasan b. Ḥusayn overlapped: the Iranian scribe occasionally disturbed Hasan b. Ḥusayn's pattern of marginal notes and forced him to write around his glosses.

A third, quite substantial set of scholia was added by an anonymous scribe at an undetermined time, but definitely after the other two sets of scholia. Writing with a thin pen in an 18th-century Anatolian hand, the scribe added several new groups of scholia, most importantly by Ḥaydar b. Ahmad. He also added a few scholia and interlinear glosses in Persian, apparently of his own invention. Judging from his handwriting and language he probably came from the Iranian-Ottoman borderlands, perhaps from Kurdistan. This unknown scholar obviously added what he considered an important new set of scholia, Ḥaydar b. Ahmad's ḥāshiyā, not too long after Hasan b. Ḥusayn and the anonymous Iranian scribe completed their compilation of text, commentaries, scholia and glosses.

The first part of ms. Adana il Halk Kitūphanesi 106 (now in the Millī Kütŭphane, Ankara) closely resembles Hasan b. Ḥusayn's text. About two decades before Hasan b. Ḥusayn, in 1094 h. (1683), a certain 'Abd al-Karīm b. 'Abd al-Majīd produced a calligraphic copy of the -Risāla -Hanafyya, Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī al-Ṭabarzī's commentary on al-Dawānī's Iḥbāt al-wajīb, and added carefully designed notes in the margins. It covers a similar, though smaller range of sources for commentaries and scholia. As in the previous case, Ḥaydar b. Ahmad’s scholia were added later. The difference is that they were not integrated into the existing marginal pattern, but a complete separate manuscript of Ḥaydar’s supercommentary on Mīrāzī Jān’s commentary was bound together with the -Risāla -Hanafyya. The manuscript of Ḥaydar’s text was
written by a different scribe in a less calligraphic and designed way. Although it is undated, it cannot be much younger than the first part of the codex: the characteristics of the handwriting and the paper point to the late 17th or early 18th centuries.

Both manuscripts are madrasa codices of high quality that apparently strove to produce representative compilations of commentaries on post-Mongol key texts. Haydar b. Ahmad's scholia were added to those representative compilations probably soon after they began circulating, either by integrating them into the marginal note patterns or by binding them into one codex.

(c) Glossing over borders: mss. Bağdatlı Vebbi Efendi 2104 and Tehran Milli 4411

mss. Bağdatlı Vebbi Efendi 2104

Very few ms. copies of Husaynîbâdî works have been identified in catalogues of collections in Iran. The few exceptions are mss. with marginal scholia that can be attributed to Husaynîbâdî scholars. As has been pointed out before, the catalogues give only a very incomplete picture of the distribution of marginal texts. One example of the reception of Husaynîbâdî scholia in Iran is ms. Tehran Milli 4411. Written in the early 19th century,80 it comprises three 12th-century sets of scholia on school texts on rhetoric: Muhammad al-Shirînîshî's scholia on al-Jurjânî's commentary on al-Jâlî's Risâla wa-sâfjya and two sets of scholia by the Husaynîbâdî brothers Ahmad II. and 'Abdallâh b. Haydar on al-Isfârînî's commentary on al-Samargandi's Risâlat al-istâra. It probably originates from (western) Kurdish territory; the scribe of the first text was a certain 'Abd al-Qâdir from Arbil.81 According to the catalog the first two texts in the codex have marginal scholia by various authors. The margins of al-Shirînîshî's scholia contain additional notes attributed to 'Umar b. Ahmad, Ibrahim al-Ânî, Muhammad [al-Shirînîshî himself] and 'Abdallâh b. Haydar. In the margins of Ahmad (II.)'s scholia there are, among others, additional scholia by Ahmad (II.) and by two of his sons, 'Abdallâh and 'Abd al-Âlîf.

MS. Bağdatlı Vebbi Efendi 2104 (Istanbul, Sûleymaniye libraries) is almost entirely written by one scribe, 'Abdallâh b. 'Umar al-Bâni from Bâne, a town on the Iranian side of the Ottoman-Safavid treaty border delineated in 1639.82 Between June 1694 and September 1696, al-Bâni copied ten texts, working in his hometown Bâne, in Mosul, and in Hârîr. The codex covers a typical range of topics: metaphysics, dogma, and rhetoric, and law.83 Besides popular shorter treatises by Jurjânî, Dârâshî and Qâbî al-Dîn al-Râzi and some lesser known or even anonymous short texts, two longer collections of near-contemporary scholia are included: one set of scholia on Shâfi'i law and incomplete scholia by Haydar (II.) b. Ahmad.84 Although this codex includes only one text by a member of the Husaynîbâdî/Haydarî family, it is an important document for the activities of the Husaynîbâdî/Haydarî circle in the Ottoman-Safavid borderlands. 'Abdallâh al-Bâni identifies himself as a member of that circle, describing himself as being "in the service of our master Haydar b. Ahmad al-Harîrî" (fî khidmat or 'inda mawlaâna wa-awlânâ [...] Haydar)85 or as one of master Haydar b. Ahmad's students (min 'iddâ at-talab al-mawlaî al-hâlî išâ tarîq al-îhaq [...] Haydar b. Ahmad al-Harîrî).86 Thus

80. Ca. 36 00 N 45 55 E, ca. 20 km from the modern Iran-Iraq border in the Iranian province (muqta) Kurdistan.
81. Two texts copied around the same time, but not by al-Bâni, are included at the end of the codex, bringing the total number of texts to 12.
82. Glosses by a certain Râshîl b. Yâqîb on Ibn 'Âjâr al-Haytami's commentary (completed 958/1551) on Nasawi's Minâj (completed 669/1270-71). This author may be identical with Râshîl b. Ya'qîb b. 'Umar [b. Ibrahim] who wrote a short hadîth commentary (Taḥdîf al-tâhîbî fî hadîth al-arhîn) preserved in a copy in the Sûleymaniye, Carullah 2061, and the Nasâ'i al-mulâkî preserved in a ms. copy in the Erzurum li 'ilâli Kitâbînesi, 25 HB 20694/1, copied in 1125 h./1712
84. Sûleymaniye, Bağdatlı Vebbi Efendi 2104, 68a, 86a, in the colophon for texts 6 and 7 (Harîr 1106 h. and s.l. 1106 h.).
85. Sûleymaniye, Bağdatlı Vebbi Efendi 2104, 114a, in the colophon for his copy of Haydar b. Ahmad's own text, s.d. 1105 h.
86. The catalog, Anwâr 1968-2005, 15:225, gives 1258 h. (1842-43) as the copying date of the second text, Ahmad (II.)'s scholia. The same catalog cites an ownership note by a certain safar b. 'Abdallâh b. Haydar with the date 1205 h. (1790-91). Without an autopsy of the manuscript it is not possible to decide whether this apparent discrepancy is due to a misreading of either date, or whether the first text originally belonged to a different, older volume.
87. A previous owner was Șafar b. 'Abdallâh b. Haydar.


'Abdallāh b. ʿUmar al-Bānī was at least from 1105–1106 h. Haydar’s student, probably in Ḥarrīr, where he seems to have copied texts from the madrasa library for his personal vademecum, which he had begun a little earlier, in 1103 h. (1691–1692) in Mosul.

While he was Haydar’s student he returned to his hometown Bānī at least once, where he copied at least four texts between rabīʿ al-akhar and shaʿbān 1107 h. (November 1695–May 1696) before he returned to Ḥarrīr. 86 Even though the distance between Ḥarrīr and Bānī was not very far – around 150 km as the crow flies – and both places were located within the Kurdish principalities that controlled the mountain region, the two towns were on different sides of the official border between the Ottoman and Ṣafawī empires. Al-Bānī qualifies his hometown as located “in the Persian lands” (fī bīlād al-ʿajam). Before his stay to in Bānī in 1107 h., ‘Abdallāh al-Bānī seems to have been in an involuntary exile on Ottoman territory. In one colophon, written in late 1105 h. (July 1694), he describes himself as being in deep trouble and cut off from his home.

The last text in this codex was copied in 1107 h. (1695) by a certain Maḥmūd, a contemporary of al-Bānī. Maḥmūd (a professional scribe?) produced this copy in a village near Tabrīz27 for a patron called ʿAbdallāh Efendi al-Rūmī, apparently an Ottoman subject. The text itself consists of scholia by a Kurdish judge, Yūsuf al-qādī al-Ardalānī, on -Khāyāʾī’s commentary on the -Nasafī creed. It is not clear how this text (or the undated anonymous copy of an astronomical text preceding it) found its way into this codex. A possible scenario is that soon after 1108 h. (1696) ʿAbdallāh Efendi al-Rūmī acquired al-Bānī’s vademecum and took it back to Istanbul, where it was bound together with the remaining two texts.

This codex illustrates how scholars and students on both sides of the Ottoman-Ṣafawī borders continued to form a regional network of teaching, studying, glossing and copying throughout the 17th century, and suggests that this network interacted with the Ottoman metropolis scholarly circuit (ʿAbdallāh Efendi’s “study tour” to the east, even into the Ṣafawī empire). But although cross-border scholarly contacts continued, the meager record of Ḥusaynībādī manuscripts in Iranian collections and al-Bānī’s personal notes in his ms. copies also show that the treaty border between the two empires was a reality, despite the considerably degree of autonomy that the Kurdish principalities had in the core are of this borderland during most of the 16th and 17th centuries.89

(d) The distribution of Ḥusaynībādī mss. copies

Given the still unsatisfying state of cataloguing of Arabic ms., the more than 120 mss. copies listed in the appendix will neither be anywhere near the complete number of extant mss. of Ḥusaynībādī texts, nor will they provide an entirely representative picture of the regional and chronological distribution of copies. It is also likely that important information is missing in the more cursory catalogs, and even the best catalogs contain misleading information.90 The picture is especially bleak with respect to the identification of marginal scholia. Another problem is the often deficient information about the provenience of mss. in European or American collections, which constitute more than ten percent of the total sample. One may safely assume that the Ḥusaynībādī mss. in the New York Public Library were acquired in Baghdad, and thus simply add them to the number of mss. copies in Baghdad collections. The important early copies in the Garrett-Yahuda collection in Princeton, on the other side, are much more difficult to trace to their original contexts before they were sold on the international market for antiquities around 1900. Altogether, however, these difficulties should not distort the overall picture too seriously. It is worthwhile to take a look at what we have and to attempt to identify trends in the production and dissemination of Ḥusaynībādī mss. in the period between the middle of the 17th century and 1800.

The vast majority of mss. copies, 95 out of 121 (almost 80 %) were held in the 20th century in collections in Iraq (Baghdad, Mosul and al-Sulaymānīyya). If one dismisses the mss. in Western collections, the

86 He does not indicate where he copied in rāmāḍān 1107 h. a Persian morphological treatise.
87 ŚMLH not identified.
89 The appendix to this study may, unfortunately, not be an exception.
mss. in Central and Northern Iraq and Istanbul would account for almost 90%. To this one should add a small but important group of mss. in Central and Eastern Anatolian collections.90 The remaining mss. — again apart from those in European collections — are almost all preserved in collections in Istanbul. Two urban poles, the Ottoman imperial capital Istanbul and the re-emerging political center of the Iraqi provinces, Baghdad, define the circuit on which mss. of {text} texts move between the 17th century and the formation of modern mss. collections in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries. This would not be surprising if the contrast with other regions was not so stark. The small number of mss. copies in Syria is particularly striking. Little significance should be attributed to the absence of Meccan and Medinan ms. copies: the state of cataloging allows no conclusions.91

For a more refined picture the sample has been reduced to datable mss., produced between 1050 and 1200 h. (roughly mid-17th century to 1800). There are 51 ms. copies that are either dated or can be dated with sufficient certainty to this period.92 From these 51 copies, 21 also indicate the place of copying, or other factors allow to make reasonable assumptions about the locality. The distribution of the datable mss. broadly resembles the pattern described above, but shows interesting trends. {text} were collected in Istanbul and Baghdad, but only very few copies indicate that they were written in these two cities. There are two regions of {text} mss. production: the family’s home region in Kurdistan, and East and Central Anatolia. From the 1050’s to the 1090’s h., i.e. during the lifetime of Ahmad b. I. and the first two decades after his death, the mss. display a impressive range of proveniences. Almost all of the unambiguously Eastern and Central Anatolian copies date from this early period. As has been described above, copies of {text} were written in places like Erzurum, Trabzon, and {text} Even if this sample is very small it should be noted that two of these three Anatolian mss. remained in provincial libraries; only the early Erzurum mss. was at some point acquired for a library in Istanbul. Also a significant portion of the mss. in European and American collections date from that period, possibly pointing to a diverse geographical origin of these mss.

The hometowns of the {text} provinces, appear in {text} ms. only towards the end of the 11th hijri century (1680’s). Two mss. copies were written in Mawrân in 1097 h. (1685–86). The production of dated ms. peaks in the first decade of the 12th century (1690’s) before slightly ebbing off again after 1110 h. (early 1700’s). The origin of the manuscripts in the early 1100’s is still fairly diverse. Copies were still written in Central Anatolia: apart of a ms. copied in 1117 h. (1705–06) in Çankırı, a 1106 h./1694–95 ms. without indication of a place was written by a scholar from Divriği who later worked in Sivas.93 The only two Rumelian mss. — written in 1113 h./1701–02 in Istanbul and Edirne, respectively — date to that period. Interestingly the two Rumelian ms. as well as the Çankırı ms. do not represent, as one might expect, a “second (or third) generation” of ms. of texts by Ahmad Haydarâni reproduced from older mss. Both ms. are copies of texts by Ahmad’s son Haydar, who was still alive. The Central Anatolian and Rumelian copies attest that the “academic circuit” along which Ahmad Haydarâni’s fame had initially spread was still functioning.

‘Abdallâh al-Bâni’s vademecum (see above) attests to the firm establishment of a teaching circle at Mawrân and Harîr of wider regional import in the last decade of the 17th century. It has been proposed above in the section on ms. copies of the –Muhâkkâmât that most mss. may have been produced in the context of the emerging {text} teaching center, but only one other copy, written in 1111 h./1699–1700 by a certain ‘Abdallâh b. Muhammad b. Ahmad, mentions a place of copying near Harîr, namely the qâşâba Jolamarg. This changes in a

90 Many provincial ms. collections have been transferred to the Millî Kitâbîhane, Ankara. In the appendix they are listed under the name of the library where they were kept before the move to Ankara.

91 Some of the Princeton ms. may actually come from libraries in Medina.

92 The ms. from al-Sulaymânîyya for which the date 1153 h. is given in the catalog has been excluded from the count; the date is too unreliable.
quite impressive way in the following decades. Between 1120 h./1708–09 and the second peak of dated ھویسینبادی mss. in the 1150’s h. (1737–47), not only does the majority of copies indicated the place where they were written (10 out of a total of 14 dated mss. between 1122 and 1156 h.); of these 10 mss., eight were produced at ھماران or otherwise show a strong connection with the madrasa, at that time run by ھییدار’s son یعیشیی. For example, a copy of a text by یعیشیی b. ھییدار was written in 1128 h./1715–16 by a یعیشیی who calls himself یعیشیی ھدیی b. یعیشیی یعیشیی. He copied from an autograph copy and read his copy under the author (مین ھیسکھت یکنہ ‘ذلیل ھیسکھت یکنہ موسیمی’). Since the ms. was later kept in a library in موصل it was most likely produced in the region. Another copy of a text by یعیشیی, now in the سیلیمانییye libraries in یستانبұl, was written in 1149 h./1736–37 by a certain ‘یعیشیی al-مأرینی (sic), who in the same year signed a copy of other ھویسینبادی texts explicitly in ھماران. To what extent the move of a branch of the family to یبگھداد affected the influence and prestige of the family in كردستان is impossible to tell at this point. In 1173 h./1759–60 a certain ‘یعیشیی al-قیدر b. ‘یعیشیی al-مAjید of یاربی coped a ھویسینبادی text in the madrasa سلیمانییye in یاقار al-یلی (modern گلی, east of سلیمانییye on the Iranian border).98

The distribution of ھویسینبادی mss. confirms and also refines the impression gained from biographical sources. The rise of the ھویسینبادی to a prominent family of scholars began with the recognition of the scholarship of یعیشیی ھییداری in an established network of learning between Eastern-Central Anatolia and the Anatolian-Iranian borderlands which was connected with the metropolitan learned elite in یستانبұl. These connections continued when ھییدار was the head of the family. The name of one of his students, ‘یعیشیی al-Jالیل b. یعیشیی (the Crimean) shows that he attracted students from the central Ottoman lands.99 The surname یعیشیی b. یعیشیی joined یعیشیی b. یعیشیی directly from the Crimean khanate; he could have been from a Crimean family in یستانبұl or had at least studied at one of the Istanbul madrasas before embarking on the study tour to the east. It is of course also possible that he met یعیشیی during the latter’s trip to یستانبұl, but the description of یعیشیی as a student/disciple (تیمیدیہ) of یعیشیی points to a more substantial and extended relationship.

98 The surname یعیشیی b. یعیشیی joined یعیشیی b. یعیشیی directly from the Crimean khanate; he could have been from a Crimean family in یستانبұl or had at least studied at one of the Istanbul madrasas before embarking on the study tour to the east. It is of course also possible that he met یعیشیی during the latter’s trip to یستانبұl, but the description of یعیشیی as a student/disciple (تیمیدیہ) of یعیشیی points to a more substantial and extended relationship.

99 سیلیمانییye, خمیسی یوستینیا 729 was copied by a fellow Crimean, یعیشیی al-کاتب, in 1156 h. from al-قیدر’s copy.
important study of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khādīmi.\textsuperscript{100} The intellectual and educational activity of the Ḥusaynābādī at Māwrān and Ḥarīr is rooted in an older regional tradition. A systematic study of the paratextual material in mss. would be required to understand the full extent of activities in madrasas, teaching circles and libraries in the Ottoman-Ṣa‘fiwī borderslands. Even a cursory glance through mss. collections and catalogs reveals 13th–early 18th-century madrasas in places like the village (qaryah) Māwāt\textsuperscript{101} or in Bīrān in the wilāya Ḥakkārī.\textsuperscript{102}

Tempting as it might be, it is too early to formulate conclusions – except perhaps that neither the generalization nor the likewise general dismissal of widely accepted narratives – be it the reformism/revivalism/renewal paradigm or the counterings of the “decline paradigm” with evidence for continuities or even the “flowering” of certain expression of intellectual culture – will produce satisfying results. In order to understand the strong dynamics of intellectual cultures in the early modern Middle East one must pay close attention to regional and communal differences and to processes of communication between regions and communities of learning.

Appendix: A preliminary hand list of texts and manuscripts

The following list includes works of the four most prolific members of the Ḥusaynābādī family in the first three generations after the older Haydar: Ahmad b. Ḥaydar (I.), Haydar (II.) b. Ahmad, ‘Abdallāh b. Haydar (II.) and his brother Shihāb al-Dīn Ḥibrānī b. Ḥaydar (II.), covering a time span of probably less than 75 years between the middle of the 11th/17th century and the first quarter of the 12th/18th century. Notes on ms. copies of texts by Ḥibrānī b. Haydar, who continued the family tradition in Māwrān when the center of Ḥusaynābādī activities moved to Baghdād, have also been included.

The list is divided into two parts. The first part provides basic information on the texts in relation to their base texts and other commentaries and glosses. In order to help obtain a fairly consistent reference grid, I decided to adopt the general principle of organization from Robert Wusovsky’s overview of the post-classical Arabic commentary literature, including his categorization of texts.\textsuperscript{103} Works are organized by base text (e.g. al-lijī’s ʿAqīd). As the Ḥusaynābādī texts, being glosses, usually have no fixed titles, I use Wusovsky’s C’, C’, C’ etc. to indicate the level of commentary or glosses: C’ is a commentary on the base text, C’ glosses on C’, etc.

Part two provides the documentation. It contains the most basic information on all the manuscripts on which I was able to find sufficient information or which I was able to consult directly. Occasionally manuscript catalogs or hand lists, either printed or electronic, were the only source of information on specific titles. In these cases, indicated by braces, the accuracy of the information has yet to be checked.

Ḥusaynābādī texts are printed in bold font. Wusovsky page numbers (Wn.) are given after every text included in Wusovsky’s list. The absence of a Wusovsky page number indicates that is not included in his list.

Part I: Texts in the commentary tradition

A. Commentaries on works of syllogistic and on general works of logic\textsuperscript{104}

(1) al-Abhari, Ṭahīr al-Dīn (d. 663/1264): al-Īsāḥāḥī (Wn. 161)

C’T: Muḥammad b. Hāmza al-Fanārī (d. 834/1431) (Wn. 162)

C’T: Ahmad (I.) b. Ḥaydar al-Ḥusaynābādī\textsuperscript{105}

100 Sarmaya 2005.


104 The category titles are literally adopted from Wusovsky 2004.

105 Glosses on al-Muḥtab al-Īsāḥāḥī. Without autopy of the manuscripts it cannot be decided whose commentary is intended here, or whether the author is the elder or the younger Ahmad. It has preliminarily been listed with the other Ḥusaynābādī glosses on the Isāḥāḥī. Assuming that the Mosul and Baghdād catalogs would have
(4) al-\lami, 'Adu\d al-Din 'Abd al-Rahm\n (d. 765/1355): al-Ris\a\l a
al-wad'iy\n (Wisin. 171)
C\': Ab\u l-Qasim al-Layth\n al-Samarqandi (compl. 888/1483)
(Wisin. 171)
C\': 'Ali al-Qishji (d. 879/1474)
C\': Iims\l\n b. Ibrah\m\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (Wisin. 171)
C\': 'Abd al-Din Ibrah\m\n al-Isfahani (d. 944/1537) (Wisin. 171)
C\': Haydar (II.) b. Ahmad al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (Wisin. 171)
C\': 'Abdall\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (Wisin. 171)
C\': Ibrah\m\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (Wisin. 171)

(2) Kha\t\b Dimashq al-Qaz\w\n\n (d. 724/1323): Talkhi\f al-Mift\h
C\': al-Taf\f\z\n\n, S\d al-Din 'Umar (d. 791/1389): al-Shar\h al-
mukhta\d\r
C\': Uthm\n al-Khita\dj (d. 901/1495)
C\': 'Abdall\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di

(3) al-\lami, 'Adud al-Din 'Abd al-Rahm\n (d. 765/1355): Ris\a\l a f\i \ad\b
al-ba\d\r (Wisin. 170)
C\': Mu\whammad al-Tabr\d\r al-Hanafi (d.900/1494): al-Ris\a\l a al-
Hanafiyya (Wisin. 170)
C\': Mir Ab\u I-Fat\f Mu\whammad al-Ardabili (d.950/1543)
(Wisin. 170)
C\': 'Abdall\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (Wisin.170)
C\': Ibrah\m\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di
C\': Ahmad b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di

---

C\': 'Abdall\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di
C\': Q\l\l Ahmad b. Khidr (10\d/16\d c.) (Wisin. 162)
C\': 'Abdall\n b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di

B. Commentaries on works of dialectic, semantic theory
and rhetoric

(1) al-Samarqandi, Shams al-Din Mu\whammad b. Ashraf (fl. ca.
690/1291): al-Ris\a\l a f\i \ad\b al-ba\d\r (al-Ris\a\l a al-Samarqandiy\n)
(Wisin. 169)
C\': Kam\l al-Din Mas\'\d\r b. \lhusayn al-Shir\w\n\n al-Rumi (d.
905/1499) (Wisin. 169)
C\': T\s\m al-Din al-Isfahani (d. 944/1537) (Wisin. 169)
C\': Ahmad (II.) b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di

(2) Khatib Dimashq al-Qazwini (d. 724/1323): Talkhis al-Miftah
C\': al-Tafazzul, Sadi al-Din 'Umar (d. 791/1389): al-Sharaf al-
mukhabbar
C\': Uthman al-Khitab (d. 901/1495)
C\': 'Abdallah b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di

---

D. Commentaries on longer general works of kalim and usul al-din

(1) al-Baydawi, 'Abdallah b. 'Umar: Anwar al-tanzil wa-asr\r al-ta wil
(Tafsir al-Baydawi) (Wisin. 177)
C\': Ahmad b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di
C\': 'Abdallah b. Haydar (II.) al-\lhusayn\n\b\d\i di (ayat al-nur only)

---

quoted the author's name from the manuscripts as Ahmad b. Haydar b. Ahmad if
the younger Ahmad were the author, and given the relatively early dates of most
manuscripts, it has been preliminarily listed under the elder Ahmad.
E. Commentaries on shorter general works of falsafa, kalām and usūl al-dīn, and on shorter works on particular topics in falsafa, kalām and usūl al-dīn

(1) al-Dawānī, Jālāl al-Dīn (d. 907/1501): Aḥkhāt al-Wujūd (Wns. 179)
   C: Muhammad al-Ḥanafī al-Ta브īrī al-Qarābāghī (d. 900/1494) (Wns. 179)
   C: Mīrza Jān al-Shīrāzī (d. 994/1586) (Wns. 179)
   C: Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Taṣāwī (Wns. 179)

(2) al-Dawānī, Jālāl al-Dīn: Risālā al-Zawrā (Wns. 180)
   C: Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Taṣāwī (Wns. 179)
   C: Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdallāh b. Šaydār (Wns. 179)

   C: Ibrāhīm b. Šaydār (Wns. 179)

F. Commentaries on creeds

(1) al-Bākhrūjī, ʿAbd al-Dīn: ʿAbd al-Rahmān (d. 765/1555): al-Aʿqīd al-Aʿṣādīyya (Wns. 180)
   C: Jālāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī (d. 907/1501) (Wns. 180)
   C: Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Taṣāwī (Wns. 184)
   C: Šaydār (Wns. 184)
   C: Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Taṣāwī (Wns. 184)
   C: Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdallāh b. Šaydār (Wns. 180)

(2) al-Nasafi, ʿAbū Ḥafs ʿUmar (d. 537/1142): al-Aʿqīd (Wns. 180)
   C: Saʿd al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Taḥāzīnī (d. 791/1389) (Wns. 180)
   C: Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdallāh b. Šaydār (Wns. 179)

Part 2: Manuscripts

Titles in braces: no ms. identified. Mss. in braces: not seen, information based on catalog descriptions.
(5) DJ/C: al-Baydāwī: Anwār al-tanzil.
Oldest ms.: 1055 h. (1645-46).

(6) [DJ/C: al-İşfârâ'înî C' on al-Baydāwī: Anwār al-tanzil.]
al-İşfârâ'înî 1: 385a.

(7) Fl/C: al-Dawâni C' on al-jīj al-'Aqā'îd.
Wîn., 184, al-İşfârâ'înî 1:385a.
Oldest ms.: 1063 h. (1652-53), Erzurum.
London British Library ms. or. 12792: 1083 h. With glosses by the author's son Haydar (II) and others. [Tukat] [now Ankara, Millî Kütüphane] 60 Hk 267/2: 8 shawwâl 1087 h., Trabzon, scribe: Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Abbāsi al-Tûgâdî."

According to a note in ms. St.Petersburg İVRAN B4032, the work was completed in 1070 h. (1669). Since a copy of 1063 h. exists, this may refer to a later version of the glosses, unless the scribe misread a date (e.g. 1030 or 1060 in numbers) in his master copy.

(8) Fl/C: on 'Ali al-Qâshûjî C' on unidentified text.
Oldest ms.: 1204 h. (1789-90).

(9) Ghulîs al-rîjlâyîn fî r-radd madhhab al-shî'a (varying titles).
Oldest ms.: 1055 h. (1645-46).
Mss.: [Baghdad] Awqâf ms. 3545(1) [Talas 245 Nr.3212, Jubûrî 1:609]: 1055 h., scribe: Nadhirî. Mosul Madrasat al-Hajâyât 22/3 (20)

106 JOLMARJ: Sâlim suggest a location in modern Turkey (without specifically locating it), but the identification with modern Jolmarj in Soran district of Arbil province, 6 km NE of Harîr, seems more likely.
(Sālim 3:118): 11th c.737 Baghdad al-Maktaba al-Qādiriya 1419/13
(Imād 5:377.) Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Prm.
501 (Ahlwardt: 3642).

Written upon request of his friend Muḥammad, preacher (khāṭib)
at the mosque (jāmi‘) of Aqrā.

(10) Tafṣīr āyat al-kurṣ.  
Oldest ms.: 1057 h. (1647–48).  
Mss.: [Baghdad] Aqwāf ms. 3545(3) (Jubūrī 1:63 Nr.168): 1057 h.,  
scribe: Nadhirī.)

Mss.: [Baghdad] Aqwāf ms. 13782(9) (Jubūrī 2:514 Nr.4202.)

Haydar (II.) b. Ḥāmid (1036 or ca. 1040–1129 h. / 1626 or ca.1630–1717)

(1) B4/C: on al-Isfanārīnī C’ on al-Ṣālī: al-Ris. al-waḍ‘iyyya (completed  
before 1106 h.).
(2) C1/C: on al-Ṣālī C on al-Maybūdī C on al-Abhārī: Ḥiḍayat al-  
hikma.
(3) C2/C: on Mūzā Jān C’ on Mūrak al-Ṣālīhī C’ on al-Kātibīb: Ḥikmat al-  
ayn.  
(Wisn. 175.)
(4) E1/C: on Mūzā Jān C’ on al-Ḥanafi C’ on al-Dawānī: Ithbāt  
wājīb al-wajīd.
(5) F1/C: on al-Dawānī C’ on al-Ṣālī al-’Aqīd C’ (completed not  
than 1097 h.).
(6) F1/C: on al-Khayālī C’ on al-Dawānī C’ on al-Ṣālī al-’Aqīd C’ (  
completed not than 1097 h.).

Oldest ms.: last day of ḍhū l-hijja 1105 h. (ca. 21 Aug. 1694).  
Mss.: Iṣṭanbul Bağdatlı Vehbi Efendi 2104(10): last day of ḍhū l-hijja  
1105 h., scribe: ’Abdallāh b. Umar al-Bānī, a student (ṭālib) of  
the author. Čankuri [now Ankarca, Milli Kütüphane] 18 Hk 94/4: 15 ḍhū

193 Bound in a codex with texts copied between 1011 h. (by al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad  
al-Būrīnī in Damascus) and 1090 h.

1–qa’dā 1117 h., Kāngīrī (= Čankuri), scribe: al-ḥājj Sha’bān efendi b.  
al-ḥājj Mustaḥfā. [Baghdad] al-Maktaba al-Qādiriya Nr. 881/4 (İmād  
3:218): 5 shawwāl 1185 h., scribe: Ībrāhīm al-Barzanjī. al-  
Sulaymāniyya Maktabat al-Ṣābābīyin 155 (Muhāmid  Āḥmad  
al-mansūb ilā Bakhshī āghā. al-Sulaymāniyya Aqwāf (no number) (  
Muhāmid  Āḥmad Muḥammad 4:292f. Nr. 15/38.).

(2) C1/C: on al-Ṣālī C’ on al-Maybūdī C’ on al-Abhārī: Ḥiḍayat al-  
hikma.  
Oldest ms.: after 1113 h. (1701–02), Iṣṭanbul?  
Mss.: Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hs. or. 4515:  
Marginal glosses; scribe of the base text: Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn Beg b.  
Yūsuf Beg b. Murād faqīh, 1113 h., Ḥusaynīyya, zāwiyya  
Drāğhmān, for shaykh Ḥisā‘, glosses by three hands: the scribe of  
the base text and a different but contemporary hand, and a later  
(but how much?) Iranian hand which wrote all glosses by Ḥaydar.

(3) C2/C: on Mūzā Jān C’ on Mūrak al-Ṣālīhī C’ on al-Kātibīb: Ḥikmat  
al-ayn.  
Wisn. 175.  
Oldest ms.: sha’bān 1142 h. (Feb.–March 1730).  
Mss.: Princeton Garrett–Yahuda 2866 (Mach 3079): 1142 h. Baghdād  
Aqwāf ms. 5227 (Jubūrī 2:262 Nr. 3298): 1171 h., from a copy  
from the autograph. Baghdād al-Maktaba al-Qādiriya Nr. 832 (İmād  
3:163): on a Friday, the last day of rajab 1178 h., scribe:  
Almād al-Charīb for ṭāfī Efendi.

(4) E1/C: Mūzā Jān C’ on al-Ḥanafi C’ on al-Dawānī: Ithbāt wājīb  
al-wajīd.  
al-Mūrādī 1966, 1:76–77 (one level less: “glosses on sharḥ ithbāt  
al-wajīb.”).  
Oldest ms.: end of sha’bān 1156 h. (ca. 18 Oct. 1743).  
Mss.: Iṣṭanbul Hāmидiyē 729: end of sha’bān 1156 h., scribe:  
Muḥammad al-Kafawī, from a copy written by ’Abd al-Jalīl al-
Qirimî, a student of the scholiast (ilmîdî al-mubâshirîn), from an autograph copy he read with the author. (Kayserî Raşid Efendî 461/2 (Karabulut Nr. 916): 18 rajab 1186 (ca. 15 Oct. 1772), scribe: hâljî Maḥmûd b. Muṣṭâfâ. Adaana Îl Halk Kütüphanesi 106/2: undated, but probably not much later than part 1 of the codex (al-Ḥanâfî C on al-Dawâni: ībâd al-wujûb, 8 sha'ban 1094 h.).

(9) 'F1/C2: al-Dawâni C on al-lji: al-Āqâ'id.
Oldest ms.: râbi' 1 1097 h. (Jan.-Feb. 1686), Mâwîrân.

Oldest ms.: 1097 h. (1685–86).

Ahmâd (Ili) b. Ḥaydâr (II) b. Ḥaymâd

(1) B1/C2: on al-īsârârînî C on al-Samarqândî: al-Ris. fi ūdâb al-balîth (compl. 1103 h.).

(1) B1/C2: on al-īsârârînî C on al-Samarqândî: al-Ris. fi ūdâb al-balîth. Oldest ms.: 7 râbi' 1 1156 h. / ca. 1 May 1743, Mâwîrân, from the autograph.
Mss.: Istanbul Halet Efendi 507(4): 7 râbi' 1 [1156 h.], Mâwîrân, madrasa of İbrâhîm b. Ḥaydâr aṣ-Ṣafawî. İstanbul Ayasofya 4427(2):

(9) E1/C: on al-Dawānī: Ris. ṭḥbhāt al-wājīb.

(10) E2/C: on al-Dawānī: Ris. al-zawrā'.


(12) Ris. fi suʿ al-mantiq.


(3) B1/C: on Isfārāʾīnī C on Samarqandī: Ris. fi ṣaddī al-ḥabīb?

111 Abbarī 2001, 174
112 al-Sulaymānīyya was founded in 1199 h.
An autopy of the ms. seemed to confirm Loebenstein's reading of the niha as al-Māwārānī (which appears in only one colophon, the other ones simply signed "Ithnān"). The two middle consonants are, however, not written clearly enough to completely rule out the reading Māwārānī. On the other hand, "Ithnān" adds several times the epithet al-sharīṭ, which could mean "the stranger", but also simply "the poor".

114 Apparently collections of responses of varying length, not necessarily containing the same texts but listed here under one number for the sake of convenience.
al-ʿUmari 1394–95/1974–75, 16.\(^{116}\)
Mss.: [Mosul Madrasat al-Khayyāt 16/10 (2) (Sālim 5:29).]

(6) al-Mulhamūt al-Rabbānīyya fī asrār dhawâqiyya wijdānīyya.
al-ʿUmari 16.
Oldest ms.: 1151 h. (1738–39).

Mss.: [Baghdad Awqāf ms. 6287 (Jubūrī 4:128 Nr. 2396).]

İsmāʾīl b. İbrahim b. Ḥaydar (II.) al-Ḥusaynībādī

(1) ?C(?): on al-Qarābāḡī on logic.

(2) F1/C: on ʿAlī al-Qāṣībī C: on al-Samarqandī C: on al-Ījī al-Ris. al-waqīyya (not later than 1156 h./1743–44).

(3) C: al-Qurʿān (partial).

(1) ?C(?): on al-Qarābāḡī on logic.
Mss.: al-Sulaymānīyya Maktabat al-Bābānīyin 173–177 (Mahmūd Ahmad Muhammad 1:46 Nr. 16/8): 1240 h., describe: ʿAbd all-Qādir al-Shirālī (?)-al-Sinkawī (?).

(2) F1/C: on ʿAlī al-Qāṣībī C: on al-Samarqandī C: on al-Ījī al-Ris. al-waqīyya.
Oldest ms.: ca. 1156 h. (1743–44).

\(^{116}\) al-ʿUmari 1394–95/1974–75, 16, writes that he copied this commentary with the author's permission. See also the following text.

\(^{117}\) Autopsie of the colophon's facsimile only.

---

Writing in the margins of empires


(3) C': fragment of Qurʿān commentary.
Mss.: Baghdad al-Maktaba al-Qādiriyah Nr. 1443/2 (Imād 5:156).

---
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