Social and Intellectual Rivalries and Their Narrative Representations in Biographical Dictionaries: The Representation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ—A Case Study

Mohammad Gharaibeh

1 Introduction

Biographical dictionaries are important sources for the study of the social, cultural, and intellectual history of the premodern Islamicate world. And although documentary sources (including archeological artifacts, architecture, endowment deeds, numismatic evidence, manuscripts, and certificates of transmission [*samāʿ*]) have been used with increased regularity since the 1970s, the long-lasting mainstays for social and intellectual historians still remain biographical dictionaries in addition to other narrative sources.¹ Especially the rich material of the Mamluk period provides the researcher with a wide variety of information about individuals, their social contacts, and their education. Biographical dictionaries also allow conclusions about larger trends regarding society or mobility, for example, if analyzed quantitatively.²

However, as tempting as the information provided by biographical dictionaries is for the study of social and intellectual history, it has certain limits due to the selection of material that the compiler needs to make from the sources he has at his disposal. These processes of selection, (re)arrangement, and altering of the materials result in a narrative framing of the past that is shaped by the worldview of the compiler and that is often described as authorial agency. While a growing number of studies analyze narrative strategies and authorial agency in chronicles,³ there are comparatively few studies that approach biographical dictionaries in the same manner.⁴ However, scholars such as Makdisi,

1 See Hirschler, *Studying* 160–2.

2 See for example the studies of Petry, *Civilian*; Bulliet, *Quantitative*; Age; and *Conversion*; Mauder, *Gelehrte*; Romanov, *Computational*; as well as his website *al-Raḡmiyyāt. Digital Islamic history* (<https://alraqmiyyat.github.io/>). They all use mostly biographical dictionaries quantitatively to reach broader conclusions about different aspects of Islamicate societies.

3 See for examples Hirschler, *Medieval*; Franz, *Kompilation*; or the contributions in Conermann (ed.), *Innovation*.

4 Exceptions are Malti-Douglas, *Texts*; and Keshk, *How to frame*; *The historian's*, who uses both

Little, Cooperson, and Mujaddedi have already stated since the early 1960s that the information in biographical dictionaries is influenced by the author's hidden agenda. Opwis has similarly highlighted that authors of biographical dictionaries of certain schools of thought (*ṭabaqāt*) are "not merely compilers of pre-existing information. Instead, they have an important impact on shaping the identity, the doctrine, and the authority structures of groups and individuals."⁵

The purpose of this paper is to add to the growing literature on biographical dictionaries as providers of (biased) *knowledge*, as opposed to archives of neutral *information*,⁶ by presenting a case study. Moreover, the paper wishes to draw attention to the possibility that the narrative framing of certain biographies may serve a very specific purpose in the life of the author besides being part of a larger frame of shaping the identity of groups. Hence, a significant part of this paper will deal with the context and the intellectual orientation of the authors as well as certain events that might have influenced the chosen narrative strategies. Central to this paper are the three Damascene Shāfiʿī scholars al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348), with three of his biographical dictionaries, Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373), and Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370), each with their *ṭabaqāt* works. The biographical entries for Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī (d. 643/1245) in each of these dictionaries are compared with each other.

Before going into further detail, though, a methodological remark needs to be made. In this paper, the biographical entries of one individual will be compared in all used dictionaries to outline the different narrative strategies and reconstruct the hidden agendas behind them. However, one could always oppose to this very narrow sample of examples, because from the perspective of quantitative methods, it is not representative enough to draw larger conclusions regarding the author's ideological, political, or intellectual agenda(s) that supposedly influence(s) the narrative strategies. This is, of course, a valid objection. And for the example of the *Tārīkh al-islām* of al-Dhahabī, which includes over 30,000 biographies, focusing on one single biography seems very insufficient.

The idea behind this approach, though, is that not all biographies included in a biographical dictionary are equally important to the author and his political and intellectual ideology. In addition, the content of the entries also varies

chronicles and biographical dictionaries; see also Gharaibeh, Narrative.

5 Opwis, Role 32.

6 While *information* can be defined as neutral data, *knowledge* is the information that has been selected according to its relevance and semantic content in regard to a certain idea or the agenda of the author. Lahn and Meister, *Erzähltextanalyse* 157.

significantly from one to another. While some biographies only contain basic *information*, not sufficient enough to tell any story of the individual, others contain more detailed accounts forming *knowledge* that contains clear or subtle statements. From the perspective of a mere quantitative analysis, these variations in length and content might occur somehow arbitrarily. However, it is one of the main hypotheses underlying the present paper that a close analysis of the content against the backdrop of the intellectual and social setting of the author reveals the importance and significance of the biographical entry and, therefore, the *knowledge* included in it.

This also means that biographies can be significant for certain aspects of the author's intellectual and political ideologies or for situations, events, and rivalries in the life of the author. While some biographies and the *knowledge* contained in them may be crucial for the construction of a certain image of the author's school of law, or a more traditionalist or rationalist orientation of it, other biographies may have the function to justify specific actions and events or support a particular party within the struggle over resources. For a comprehensive understanding of the narrative strategies within a biographical entry, hence, a proper contextualization and an analysis of the author's social, intellectual, and political context is key.

It is for this reason that the biography of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is put at the center of the analysis and comparison, for it is considered here as crucial to all three authors that were examined. At least this is the hypothesis of the present paper, which will be proven throughout what follows, and the reason why it has been chosen among the other biographies. Certainly, there are more biographies that could have been chosen to support the argument of the paper. However, considering the significance of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, this case study demonstrates the close relation between *knowledge* included in biographical dictionaries and the political and intellectual agendas of the authors.

The article is structured as follows: section two describes the life and intellectual orientation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. A special interest lies in the network of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and that of his students and the institutions where he and his students taught to demonstrate the impact of his teachings and his role in Shāfi'ite traditionalism. The next sections (three to five) deal with the lives and works of al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr as representatives of the traditionalist movement and al-Subkī as representative of the rationalist movement. The analysis of their entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is put in the context of their intellectual orientations and social networks. The article ends with a conclusion (section six), in which the findings of the article are summarized and discussed.

2 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ: His Life, Work, and Role in the Emergence of Shāfiʿite Traditionalism in Damascus

Recent scholarship has highlighted the struggle between Shāfiʿi traditionalists and Shāfiʿi rationalists in Damascus during the 8th/14th century.⁷ Those studies usually put the network of the traditionalist Shāfiʿis in the context of the Ḥanbalī reform thinker Ibn Taymiyya and focus on individuals such as Ibn Kathīr, al-Dhahabī, al-Birzālī, and al-Mizzī. While there is no denial of the importance of the influence of Ibn Taymiyya—and probably the circle of his (Ḥanbalī) adherents, such as Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya⁸—one cannot but observe a tendency for Shāfiʿi scholars to call for stronger integration of the scripture (Quran and *ḥadīth*) into legal reasoning, as opposed to the *uṣūl al-fiqh* being based on rational science (such as logic), during the 7th century. One of the more prominent representatives of this early traditionalism is Abū Shāma al-Maqdisī. The increasing interest to integrate *ḥadīth*, in particular, within legal debates is documented in *Mukhtaṣar al-Muʿammal*, in which Abū Shāma rejects *raʾy*-based jurisprudence, blaming the *fuqahāʾ* for taking the *aḥādīth*, if ever, from books without *isnād* and not evaluating the authenticity of them. He cites a number of Shāfiʿi scholars, among them al-Shīrāzī (d. 476/1083), al-Māwardī (d. 450/1058), and Ibn al-Ṣabbāgh (d. 477/1084), and some examples where the authors used unreliable material or even contradict prophetic statements.⁹

A no less popular scholar, but usually less known for his traditionalist tendencies and whose role within the traditionalist movement of Damascus is undoubtedly underestimated, is Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. The present paper argues that an analysis of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's role in the Damascene scholarly scene, his own writings, especially his *Muqaddima*, and the network of his students, supports our understanding of the history of traditionalism in Damascus. The noticeable conflict between traditionalists and rationalists in the 8th/14th century was only the tip of the iceberg of a broader development that had already taken place in Damascus in the 7th/13th century. Moreover, the different narrative framings of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's biography by authors of the 8th/14th century can, therefore, be seen as a result of the rivalry between those two camps. Also, they are strategies to dominate in the struggle about (intellectual) dominance, resources, and (teaching) institutions in Damascus. Taking a look at Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's life, work, and students is necessary to explain all of this.

7 See, in particular, the studies of Yunus Mirza on Ibn Kathīr and of Nahyan Fancy on Ibn al-Nafīs (see bibliography).

8 See, for Ibn Taymiyya's closer circle of students, Bori, Ibn Taymiyya.

9 Abū Shāma did in his *Mukhtaṣar* 42–53.

Taqī al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. al-Muftī Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Uthmān b. Mūsā l-Kurdī l-Shahrazūrī l-Shāfi‘ī, commonly known as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, was born in 577/1181 in Sharakhān, a village in the Shahrazūr region in Kurdish northern Iraq.¹⁰ As a son of a local scholar and mufti, he received his early education from his father in Irbil, the capital of one of the minor principalities between the Khwārazmians in the East and Ayyubids in the West.¹¹

After his basic education, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ left Irbil for Mosul, where he continued his studies. He deepened his legal training there with at least three scholars. First to mention is ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Samīn (d. 588/1192), with whom Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ read the legal manual of Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī, *al-Muḥadhdhab fī l-furū’*.¹² The second scholar was ‘Imād al-Dīn Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Yūnus b. Min‘a al-Irbalī al-Mūsili (d. 608/1211), with whom he entertained close relations¹³ and with whom Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ studied the law-related works of al-Ghazālī (i.e., the *Wasīṭ fī l-madhdhab* and the *Wajīz fī fiqh al-Shāfi‘ī*).¹⁴ The third and probably most influential Shāfi‘ī scholar Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ studied with in Mosul was al-Kamāl Mūsā b. Yūnus (551–637/1156–1240), the brother of al-‘Imād. Al-Kamāl was known for his wide knowledge and expertise in many fields of the Islamic disciplines, including the so-called rational disciplines.¹⁵ According to Ibn Khallikān, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ even wanted to study logic with al-Kamāl b. Yūnus but gave up after some fruitless attempts. Al-Kamāl recommended Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ not to invest any more time in studying this discipline because of his lack of talent and the bad reputation logic had among religious scholars, who would eventually harm the reputation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.¹⁶

By the time Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ ended his study in Mosul, he had acquired extensive legal knowledge and expertise in the two *ṭarīqas* (communities of interpreta-

10 The most elaborated biography of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in the secondary literature is still the one provided by Dickinson in the introduction of his translation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's *Muqaddima*. The biographical notes provided here follow mostly his outlines in Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ma‘rifat* xiv–xxiii.

11 See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ma‘rifat* xv.

12 See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ma‘rifat* xvi.

13 Which can be seen by the fact that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ became the *mu‘īd* of al-‘Imād b. ‘Yūnus. See al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat* iv, 1430.

14 Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt* iv, 253.

15 This includes, e.g., knowledge in *fann al-ḥikma*, logic (*al-mantiq*), *al-ṭabī‘ī*, *al-ilāhī*, also medicine, *iqūdas*, *al-ḥay‘a*, *al-makhrū‘āt*, and *al-majisī*; math with all its subdisciplines (such as *al-jabr*, *al-muqābala*, *al-arithmātiqī*), *ṭarīq al-khaṭa‘ayn*; music, grammar—he had read *Kitāb Sibawayh* and *al-‘Idāḥ* and of Abū ‘Alī l-Fārisī, *al-Faṣl* of al-Zamakhsharī—history, *ayyām al-‘arab wa-l-waqā‘i*, and poetry. See, for this and for a lengthy biography of al-Kamāl in general, Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt* v, 311–7.

16 Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt* v, 314.

tion) of the Shāfiʿī school of law, which was represented by the legal manual of Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī, *al-Muhadhdhab fī l-furūʿ* as part of the Iraqi *ṭarīqa*, on the one hand, and the works of al-Ghazālī, who was the representative of the Khurasanian *ṭarīqa* of the Shāfiʿī school of law, on the other.¹⁷ Together with the anecdote of his lack of success in the field of logic, these snippets of information were crucial for his later career in the Ayyubid territory, especially in Damascus.

From Mosul, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ performed a longer journey that seemed to be dedicated to the collection of *ḥadīth* material, to build *samāʿ* connections, and to achieve some valuable *isnāds*. His travel took him to cities such as Bagdad, Dunaysar, Hamadhān, Nishapur, Marw, Damascus, Aleppo, and Hawran.¹⁸ The interest of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in *ḥadīth* studies must be seen as rather exceptional, in his time, for scholars of jurisprudence (*fuqahāʾ*). As the works of al-Shīrāzī and al-Ghazālī indicate, jurists of this period and region did not seem to have extensive training in the evaluation of the authenticity of *ḥadīth*. Since they built their legal reasoning on the rulings of previous jurists, which were based on a well-defined corpus of prophetic traditions (and Quranic verses), there was no need for them to search for additional traditions or to evaluate other material. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, with his rather unusual engagement in the study and transmission of *ḥadīth* and his broad legal training, was probably among the first Shāfiʿī scholars who combined the study of law and *ḥadīth*.

It is somehow an enigma how, and also when, exactly Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ settled in Ayyubid territory. At some point, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ took over the teaching position in the Asadiyya school in Aleppo, then in the Ṣalāḥiyya school in Jerusalem around 615/1218, before he entered Damascus around 619/1222.¹⁹ In Damascus, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ could not easily take root in the scholarly landscape during the reign of al-Malik al-Muʿazzam ʿĪsā (r. 615–24/1218–27). This was due to the latter's promotion of the *ancient sciences* (philosophy and logic) and his suppression of traditionalism, in particular the rising influence of the Ḥanbalī community that had settled in the Ṣalāḥiyya region in 551/1156.²⁰ Eventually, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ managed to achieve the teaching position and the supervision (*tadrīs wa-naẓar*) of the Rawḥiyya school in Damascus in 622/1225.²¹ But his career in

17 See, for a description of the two *Communities of Interpretation* of the Shāfiʿī school of law, Halim, *Legal* 53–79.

18 See, for a more detailed list of individuals Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ heard from during his years of traveling, al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat* iv, 1430; *Tārīkh* xiv, 455; and *Siyar*, 2659.

19 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Maʿrifat* xvi–xvii.

20 See, for the history of migration of the Ḥanbalī al-Maqdisī family, Leder, *Charismatic* esp. 283–4.

21 Al-Nuʿaymī, *Dāris* i, 199–200.

Damascus took a peak after al-Ashraf Mūsā (r. in Damascus 626–35/1229–37) gained control over Damascus in 626/1229.²² Unlike his brother al-Mu‘azzam ‘Īsā, al-Ashraf Mūsā had no business with the *rational sciences* and aimed for their banishment from Damascus.²³ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ provided him with the legal justification for this with two *fatwās*, which he issued on the questions: “Is it permissible to read the works of Ibn Sīnā?” and “Is it permissible to engage in logic and philosophy?”²⁴ Ibn Kathīr even called Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ the Imam of the Sultan, which indicated the close relationship he must have maintained with him.²⁵ In addition, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was appointed in 628/1231, also the year of his pilgrimage to Mecca, to the teaching position of the Shāmiyya school.²⁶ Eventually, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was given the *mashyakha*, the teaching position, in the *Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya* that opened in 630/1233. Al-Ashraf Mūsā erected a similar Dār in the Ṣālihiyya region exclusively for Ḥanbalī scholars, the *Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya al-Barrāniyya*,²⁷ which shows his support of traditionalism in general and Ḥanbalism in particular. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ also held this position for about 13 years, until his death in 643/1245, and it became the institution he was associated with the most. During his teaching there, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ compiled his famous treatise on the *ḥadīth* science, known as *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, together with some other writings. He died in Damascus in 643/1245 and was buried at the Ṣūfiyya cemetery.

In contrast to his early academic career, in which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ had shown some interest in the *rational sciences*, his later career, especially in Damascus, was almost exclusively dominated by a traditionalist orientation. This is also expressed in his writings,²⁸ which show a clear focus on the two main subjects of his interest, i.e., the fields of jurisprudence (*fiqh* and *uṣūl fiqh*) and *ḥadīth*.

Especially his jurisprudence-related works demonstrate his broad legal education in the two Shāfi‘ī *ṭarīqas* on the one hand but also his interest in the

22 See Humphreys, *Saladin* 193–208.

23 See *Ibid.* 208–14.

24 See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Fatāwā* i, 208–12. See also for a description of al-Ashraf’s religious policy, his tendency to promote traditionalism, and the resulting struggle over curricula among the scholarly elite, especially between Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, the unpublished MA thesis of al-Azem, *Traditionalism*.

25 Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xvii, 112.

26 See al-Nu‘aymī, *Dāris* i, 208–9.

27 This school is also known in the sources as the Shāmiyya al-Barrāniyya and the Shāmiyya al-Ḥusāmiyya as well as the Ḥusāmiyya school. See al-Nu‘aymī, *Dāris* i, 36–42.

28 The editors of his works have invested good efforts to collect the titles of his writings from the various sources. The given list here is based on the overview provided by the editor of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Adab*, 17–9.

ḥadīth sciences and his desire to include *ḥadīth* in legal reasoning. His works, e.g., *Sharḥ mushkil al-Wasīṭ* (the original *al-Wasīṭ* was written by al-Ghazālī [d. 505/1111]), provide a reference to the sources of each *ḥadīth* used in the original and evaluate the authenticity of each *ḥadīth*.²⁹

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ also compiled a biographical dictionary, i.e., his *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya*, which is probably the first *Ṭabaqāt* work dedicated to the Shāfiʿī school written in Damascus. It is interesting to note that the Damascene authors of the other *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya* works have all taught in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, like Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, who seems to have compiled his work there. This includes the works of al-Nawawī, Ibn Kathīr, and Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī.³⁰

His *Muqaddima* and his commentary on the “introduction” of Muslim’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* work³¹ deal primarily with the categorization of many *ḥadīth* and *isnād* variations. Although it is tempting to perceive these works as entirely dedicated to the discipline of *ḥadīth* studies, one needs to keep in mind that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ called for a stronger integration of *ḥadīth* into legal reasoning. His *Muqaddima* might have been an attempted implementation of this endeavor. For a stronger integration of *ḥadīth* in legal reasoning, the authenticity of narrations was given crucial importance to distinguish valid from invalid *ḥadīth* to justify legal rulings. Providing future Shāfiʿī jurists with a manual to help them categorize narrations and to determine their authenticity, especially the *Muqaddima* was probably a crucial (teaching) tool.

2.1 *Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and His Importance for the Shāfiʿī Scholarly Elite in Damascus and the Division of the Shāfiʿī Community into Traditionalists and Rationalists*

From what has been stated above, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ can be described as one of the first Shāfiʿī (migrated) scholars of Damascus who called for a stronger integration of *ḥadīth* in legal reasoning and a refutation of the *rational sciences*, particularly logic and philosophy. This becomes particularly obvious considering the fact that during the 6th/12th and early 7th/13th centuries, Damascus was dominated by local Damascene Shāfiʿī scholarly families who were adherents of the Ashʿarī school.³² The influx of Shāfiʿī scholars from the East, especially

²⁹ See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Sharḥ* 62–3.

³⁰ See, for an overview of the teachers of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, al-Nuʿaymī, *Dāris* i, 15–36.

³¹ This work is entitled *Ṣiḥānat Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim min al-ikhlāl wa-l-ghalaṭ wa-ḥimāyatuhu min al-isqāṭ wa-s-saqāṭ*. See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ṣiḥānat*.

³² This includes the al-Khushūʿī family, the Ibn ʿAsākir family, the Ḥubūbī family, the Ibn al-Zakī family, as well as the Ibn Ṣaṣrā family. See for this the comprehensive study of Ibn

from Iraq, seemed to have challenged the standing of the local families, particularly since they found new patrons under late Ayyubid rule and replaced the locals in many teaching institutions. Since Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was one of those early Shāfi'īs who had a significant impact on later generations through his appointment at the Dār al-Ashrafiyya school, it can be assumed that authors of biographical dictionaries would have had a special interest in him. Moreover, the image an author of a biographical dictionary would draw of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ would certainly depend on his own intellectual orientation, i.e., whether or not he shared the latter's *ḥadīth*-oriented theological and legal approach.

To better understand the stance of the biographers al-Dhahabī, Ibn Kathīr, and al-Subkī toward Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, it is helpful to analyze how they relate to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ socially and intellectually and to compare the findings with the content of their dictionaries. Since all authors were born after Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's death and none of them could have met him personally, it is necessary to take a closer look into Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's impact on the Shāfi'ī scholarly community. An entire analysis of this, however, is nearly impossible and would go beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's impact will be measured by an analysis of the social network of his closer students, their control over teaching institutions, and the reception of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's writings. If we take his most significant work, the *Muqaddima*, as an example to trace back its reception, it turns out that the social network of students, the control over teaching institutions, and the reception are closely related to each other.³³

2.1.1 The Network of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's Students

Among the closest students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ are the Shāfi'ī scholars Shams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Nuḥ al-Turkmānī l-Maqdisī (d. 654/1256),³⁴ Kamāl al-Dīn Salār (d. 670/1272),³⁵ Kamāl al-Dīn Ishāq (d. 650/1252),³⁶ Taqī al-Dīn Ibn Razīn

'Azzūz, *Buyūtāt*. See, for the relation of the Ibn 'Asākir family with the Ayyūbid sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and the foundation of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya, Mourad and Lindsay, *Intensification*.

33 See, for the larger argument of the replacement of local Damascene families by migrated Shāfi'īs, the change in the appointment strategies, the spread of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's students, as well as the close relation between the reception of his *Muqaddima* and the emerge of traditionalism in Damascus, Gharaibeh, *Sociology*. Most of the findings presented here were drawn from this Habilitation Thesis.

34 See, for his biography, al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* viii, 188; al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xiv, 758; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xvii, 346.

35 See, for his biography, al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* viii, 149; al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar* 1860–1; Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* ii, 807–8.

36 See, for his biography, al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xiv, 635; Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* ii, 777; see also Abū Shāma, *Tarājīm* 187, who referred to him as al-Muqri'.

(d. 680/1281),³⁷ who later was the judge of Egypt (*qāḍī l-dīyār al-miṣrīyya*), Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā‘īl Abū Shāma al-Maqdisī (d. 665/1267), and Shams al-Dīn Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282), who was appointed as judge over Syria (*qāḍī l-shām*), as well as al-Fakhr ‘Umar b. Yaḥyā l-Karjī (d. 690/1291),³⁸ al-Majd Yūsuf b. al-Miḥtār (d. 686/1287)³⁹ and his son Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. al-Miḥtār (d. 715/1315),⁴⁰ and al-Jamāl Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Sharīshī (d. 685/1286).⁴¹

These individuals played a major role in the transmission of the *Muqaddima*. Ibn Razīn, for example, is the social link to the transmission of the text to Cairo, where individuals such as al-Badr b. Jamā‘a (d. 733/1333),⁴² one of the later commentators on the *Muqaddima*, studied it with him. Also, scholars such as Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852/1448) narrated the *Muqaddima* through an *isnād* that led through Ibn Razīn to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.⁴³ Al-Faḥr al-Karjī (d. 690/1291) and al-Majd al-Miḥtār (d. 686/1287), together with his son Muḥammad al-Miḥtār (d. 715/1315), witnessed the teaching of the *Muqaddima*, either as a scribe of the *ṭibāq* (al-Fakhr al-Miḥtār) during the reading session, as a reader (al-Karjī), or as a listener (Muḥammad al-Miḥtār). Moreover, they also took over the teaching positions in several schools and *Dār al-Ḥadīth*, so it can be assumed that the *Muqaddima* was taught there as well. Among the most important ones for the scope of the present paper are the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya, and the Rawāḥiyya school. The list of individuals reveals that most of them had social ties to either Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ directly or to his students and that they had studied the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and, assumingly, had

37 See, for his biography, al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* viii, 46–8.

38 See, for his biography, Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xvii, 644; al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xv, 669–70.

39 See, for his biography, al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xv, 563.

40 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 313.

41 He is al-Jamāl Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh b. Sujmān al-Bakrī al-Wā‘ilī al-Andalusī al-Sharīshī al-Mālikī, who was born in 601/1205 in Sharīsh. He heard in Alexandria, Baghdad, Irbal, and Damascus. For some time, he taught in Cairo in the Ribāṭ al-Nāṣirī and at the Fāḍiliyya school. After that he went to Damascus where he assumed the teaching post in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya, the reading circle in the Umayyad Mosque, the *mashyakha* of the Ribāṭ and the teaching in the Umm al-Ṣāliḥ. He heard from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ the *Muqaddima*. Among his students or those who narrated from him were Ibn Taymiyya, al-Mizzī, Ibn al-‘Aṭṭār, al-Birzālī al-Ṣayrafi, Ibn al-Khabbāz, and others. Al-Dhahabī received an *ijāza* for his *marwiyyāt*, among them the *Muqaddima*, in 674/1275. See for his biography al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xv, 549–52.

The most helpful and complete list of students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is given by al-Dhahabī in his *Tārīkh*, where he differentiated between those who studied law with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and those who took *ḥadīth* from him. See al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xiv, 457.

42 See for this Ibn al-‘Imād, *Shadharāt* viii, 185; and Ibn Jamā‘a, *Mashyakha* ii, 489.

43 See for this Ibn Ḥajar, *Mujma‘* ii, 75–6; 289.

also taught it during their appointment at the Dār or the school. Interestingly, in all institutions, a shift from traditionalist to rationalist scholars that coincided with the peak of the conflict between the traditionalist and rationalist Shāfiʿī scholars was noticeable during the 8th /14th century.

2.1.1.1 *The Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya*

Among the individuals who taught in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya were al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277),⁴⁴ Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh b. Marwān al-Fāriqī (d. 703/1303),⁴⁵ Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. al-Wakīl (d. 716/1316),⁴⁶ Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Zamlakānī (d. 727/1327),⁴⁷ Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sharīshī (d. 718/1318), and Abū l-Hajjāj Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341).⁴⁸ All of them had studied the *Muqaddima*, either with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ directly or with one of his students, and can be characterized as having a notion toward traditionalism. After the death of al-Mizzī in 742/1341, however, al-Taḳī al-Subkī (d. 756/1355) was appointed in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya. Taḳī al-Dīn ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Kāfi al-Subkī was sent by the Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn from Cairo, specifically to exercise the post of Shāfiʿī chief judge in Damascus.⁴⁹ With him, a clear shift can be seen from the more traditionalist orientation of a teacher with the pos-

44 See, for his biography, for example, al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, iv, 1470–4; al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, viii, 395–400; and more extensively the three biographies on al-Nawawī by Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār, *Tuḥfat al-tālibīn*; al-Sakhāwī, *al-Manhal al-adhib*; and al-Suyūṭī, *al-Minhāj al-sawī*. Al-Nawawī studied with Shams al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Maqdisī, Kamāl al-Dīn Ishāq, and al-Imām Kamāl al-Dīn Salār. Moreover, al-Nawawī lived in the Rawāḥiyya school during his entire stay in Damascus and authored three commentaries on the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

45 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 304–5. He heard from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ directly.

46 See, for his biography, al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* ix, 253–67. His orientation is not quite clear. Although al-Subkī described Ibn al-Wakīl as being close to Ibn Taymiyya and like him (*mā huwa baʿīd ʿanhū*), he also stated that his father, al-Taḳī al-Subkī, said that Ibn al-Wakīl had a good creed and knew *kalām* in the way of the Ashʿarī school (*ḥusn al-ʿaqida wa-maʿrifat al-kalām ʿalā madhhab al-ashʿarī*). See *ibid.*, 254. Of course, there is always the possibility that the description of al-Subkī also serves his hidden agenda.

47 See, for al-Zamlakānī's biography, Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xviii, 286–8; and Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 74–6. He studied with some of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's students, such as al-Tāj ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Fazārī.

48 See, for a comprehensive biography of al-Mizzī, Mirza, *Ibn Kathīr*, 32–6. He studied with and heard from al-Tāj al-Fazārī, al-Shihāb al-Khuwayy, al-Majd b. al-Miḥtār (d. 686/1287), al-Jamāl al-Sharīshī (d. 685/1286), and from al-Fakhr al-Baʿlabakkī l-Ḥanbalī (d. 688). See, for an overview of teachers in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 59–60.

49 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 63–71; see, for al-Subkī's career in Damascus, Leder, *Damaskus*, 244–9.

sibility of having taught the *Muqaddima* in the Dār toward a more rationalist orientation.

After al-Taqī, his son, al-Tāj ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Alī (d. 771/1370), took over the teaching position of the Ashrafiyya.⁵⁰ After his death and for a short period of about three years only, Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) seemed to be the next teacher of the Dār. The individuals who followed him had only little contact with transmitters of the *Muqaddima* in particular or traditionalists in general. They are ‘Umar b. ‘Uthmān b. Hibat Allāh al-Ma‘arrī l-Ḥalabī (d. 783/1381),⁵¹ al-Bahā’ Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Subkī (d. 777/1375),⁵² Abū Dharr ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Subkī (son of the former) (d. 785/1383),⁵³ al-Burhān Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Ibn Jamā’a (d. 790/1388),⁵⁴ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-Sulamī l-Ma‘arrī (d. 799/1397),⁵⁵ and Aḥmad b. ‘Umar b. Muslim b. Sa‘īd al-Milḥī al-Dimashqī (d. 793/1391).⁵⁶

2.1.1.2 *The Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya*

Among the individuals who taught in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya were al-Tāj al-Fazārī (d. 690/1291) (student of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ), Yūsuf b. al-Ḥasan b. Badr al-Nābulṣī l-Dimashqī (d. 671/1272), al-Jamāl Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Maḥmūd b. al-Ṣābūnī (d. 680/1281), al-Majd b. al-Miḥtār (d. 686/1287) (scribe of the Ashrafiyya, transmitter of the *Muqaddima*, and student of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ), al-Fakhr al-Ba‘labakkī (d. 688/1286) (student of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ), al-Sharaf Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Nī‘ma al-Maqdisī l-Shāfi‘ī (d. 694/1295), al-‘Alā’ ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm b. Dāwūd al-‘Aṭṭār (d. 724/1324) (student of al-Nawawī), al-‘Alam al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Birzālī (d. 739/1338) (heard from al-Fazārī and Ibn al-Miḥtār), Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū l-Hajjāj Yūsuf al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341) (heard from al-Fazārī and Ibn al-Miḥtār), and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yūsuf al-Mizzī, son of Abū

50 Al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 60. And for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 245–8.

51 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 177, who did not mention any educational ties that indicate he had read the *Muqaddima*.

52 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 490–1, who mentioned relations to al-Mizzī and al-Birzālī. But given him belonging to the Subkī family, he probably was a rationalist, too, and rather opposed traditionalism, so that his ties to al-Mizzī and al-Birzālī could have been of a technical nature.

53 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 290. Abū Dharr also heard from al-Mizzī.

54 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 38–9. Among his *samā’* relations, al-Mizzī and al-Dhahabī are listed.

55 Could not be identified.

56 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 232. No indications of any contact with transmitters of the *Muqaddima* are given. For the overview of the teachers in the Ashrafiyya, see al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 60.

l-Hajjāj (749/1348).⁵⁷ Those individuals can almost exclusively be counted as Shāfiʿī traditionalists (with the exception of al-Fakhr al-Baʿlabakkī, who was a Ḥanbalī scholar) and had either direct contact with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ or with one of his students.

For the individuals after ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Mizzī, quite the opposite seems to be the case. They can either be identified as Shāfiʿī rationalists and/or as having had little or no contact with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ or his students. They were Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Khaṭīb Ibn Nubāta,⁵⁸ Muḥammad b. Rāfiʿ b. Hajras al-Shallāmī (d. 774/1372),⁵⁹ and Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. Muḥammad al-Lakhmī l-Dimashqī (aka Ibn Sanad) (d. 792/1390).⁶⁰ All three scholars migrated from Cairo to Damascus and were close associates of al-Tāj al-Subkī and, therefore, represent a rather rationalist orientation.

2.1.1.3 *The Rawāḥiyya School*

The Rawāḥiyya school, together with the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, was one of the two institutions in which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ could spread his knowledge the most. After a long period in which his students were teaching there, interestingly, a change of intellectual orientation can be identified with the appointment of Abū l-Thanaʾ Maḥmūd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr b. ʿAlī b. al-Iṣfahānī (d. 749/1348), at the latest.⁶¹ After al-Iṣfahānī, ʿAbdallāh b. al-Majd or al-Shihāb Aḥmad b. al-Majd ʿAbdallāh was appointed for only one year in 733/1333.⁶² He was replaced by al-Fakhr Abū l-Faḍāʾil Muḥammad al-Miṣrī (d. 751/1350) in 734/1334.⁶³ After him, three members of

57 Al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 13–4.

58 See, for his biography, al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi* i, 208–9; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 173–4. He is the father of a famous poet, migrated from Egypt to Damascus, and had no contact with the transmitters of the *Muqaddima*. He also did not have any (educational) contact with the traditionalist Shāfiʿīs of Damascus.

59 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 439–40.

60 See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 270–1. See al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 18–9.

61 Before Ibn al-Iṣfahānī, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī l-Zamlakānī (d. 774/1327) was appointed in the Rawāḥiyya, who had also taught in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya. See, for this, *al-Nuʿaymī, Dāris* i, 204. Al-Iṣfahānī was born in Iṣfahān in 694/1295 and educated in Tabriz. He came to Damascus in 725/1325. He spent about eight years in Damascus and then moved to Cairo in 733/1333, where he died in 749/1348. In Damascus, he compiled a famous Quran exegesis but was also very famous for his treatises on logic, *kalām*, and philosophy. See, for his appointment at the Rawāḥiyya school, *al-Nuʿaymī, Dāris* i, 204–5; and for his biography al Ghouz, *Brokers*.

62 Al-Nuʿaymī, *Dāris* i, 205. Unfortunately, he could not be identified.

63 His biography in Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iv, 51–3. Ibn Ḥajar does not mention any *ḥadīth* related information in al-Fakhr al-Miṣrī's biography, so it is very unlikely he would have studied

the al-Subkī family were appointed in the Rawāḥiyya, indicating a clear change in the intellectual orientation of this school from traditionalism to the rationalist orientation. They were al-Bahā' Abū l-Baqā' al-Subkī, who also taught in the Ashrafiyya, his son Qāḍī l-Quḍāt al-Walī Abū Dharr 'Abdallāh al-Subkī, also a teacher in the Ashrafiyya, and after him, al-Badr Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad b. al-Bahā' al-Subkī.⁶⁴

The overview of the teachers in those three institutions indicates two important things. First, for a period of about 70 years, teachers dominated those institutions that had close links to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ or his students, who had studied the *Muqaddima* and probably also taught it and who can be described as having a general tendency toward traditionalism. Second, at some point at the beginning of the 8th/14th century (around the 20s or 30s) individuals who had tendencies toward rationalism or could clearly be identified as rationalist Shāfi'is were appointed. The domination of traditionalist scholars over these institutions seemed to have come to an end. The al-Subkī family, as well as other migrated scholars (mostly from Cairo), played a significant role in this change. All the authors of the biographical dictionaries that are the center of this study lived in this crucial period, and it can be assumed that they authored their dictionaries under the influence of these ongoing changes. For Ibn Kathīr and al-Subkī, one can even assume that they authored their dictionaries during their teaching time at the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya. Therefore, it is of particular interest to see how the authors of the biographical dictionaries relate to these individuals and whether or not they can be characterized as traditionalists or rationalists to see what kind of purpose might have stood behind their narrative framing of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's biography.

3 Al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr: The Traditionalists View

3.1 *Al-Dhahabī*

Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān b. Qaymāz b. 'Abdallāh al-Turkmānī al-Fāriqī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī al-Dhahabī was born in Damascus in the village Kafarbaṭnā, as a descendant of a Turkish family, in 673/1275.⁶⁵ In the same year, he was already granted child *ijāzāt* by the brokerage of another

or even taught the *Muqaddima* in the Rawāḥiyya. See, for his appointment, al-Nu'aymī, *Dāris* i, 184–8.

64 Al-Nu'aymī, *Dāris* i, 205.

65 See al-Shaykh, *al-Ḥāfiẓ* 27.

scholar. His foster brother (*akhūh min al-raḍā'a*), the Shāfi'ite scholar 'Alā' al-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm b. Dāwūd b. al-'Aṭṭār (d. 724/1324) mediated that *ijāzāt* for him.⁶⁶ Himself a well-known scholar, Ibn al-'Aṭṭār was also known as *Mukhtaṣar al-Nawawī*, a nickname he earned because of his constant company (*mulāzama*) with Muḥyī l-Dīn al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277).⁶⁷

Despite this early *ijāzāt*, al-Dhahabī only began seriously and actively hearing *ḥadīth* by himself at the age of 18. The serious engagement with *ḥadīth* studies began after he had met the historian and *ḥadīth* scholar 'Alam al-Dīn al-Qāsim al-Birzālī (d. 739/1338).⁶⁸ According to al-Dhahabī, his friend and teacher al-Birzālī had awakened his interest and passion in the field of *ḥadīth* (*huwa lladhī ḥabbaba ilayya ṭalab al-ḥadīth*) with some motivating words by telling him that his handwriting resembled that of the *ḥadīth* scholars.⁶⁹ After this, al-Dhahabī's eagerness to collect narrations must have been very strong. Al-Dhahabī's *mashyakha* counts 1043 individuals.⁷⁰

Al-Dhahabī was educated by Kamāl al-Dīn b. al-Zamlakānī (d. 742/1342) in Shāfi'ī *fiqh*, who has been mentioned above. Al-Dhahabī also studied with Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Mizzī (d. 742/1340) and held close relations with the younger historian Ibn Kathīr. They can all be described as traditionalists. Moreover, almost all of al-Dhahabī's teachers, himself included, had educational ties to students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This is true for al-Mizzī, al-Zamlakānī, and al-Birzālī, who studied with al-Tāj al-Fazārī,⁷¹ heard from al-Shihāb al-Khuwayy, from al-Majd b. al-Miḥtār (d. 686/1387),⁷² al-Jamāl al-Sharīshī (d. 685/1386),⁷³ and from al-Fakhr al-Ba'labakkī l-Ḥanbalī (d. 688/1289).⁷⁴

Hence, it is justified to reach the conclusion that al-Dhahabī not only maintained close relations to the network of students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. As a traditionalist himself, he is most likely to also have supported the intellectual orientation of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in terms of both a more *ḥadīth*-based approach to jurisprudence

66 Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 336.

67 For the biography of Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, see also Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* iii, 5–7.

68 Al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 15, 205; al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* ixv, 773. Al-Birzālī had studied with al-Tāj al-Fazārī (d. 690/1291) (one of the close students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and a teacher in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya), heard from al-Shihāb al-Khuwayy (d. 693/1294) (also a close student), and was appointed as shaykh in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nafisiyya in around 717/1317 and al-Nūriyya in around 724/1324.

69 Al-Shaykh, *al-Ḥāfiẓ* 112.

70 Al-Dhahabī, *Mu'jam*.

71 See al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xv, 660–1.

72 See *Ibid.*, 563.

73 *Ibid.* 550.

74 *Ibid.* 609.

and the rejection of logic and Greek philosophy. This conclusion is supported by at least two facts. First, al-Dhahabī informs his readers in the entry on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in his *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* about himself having studied and heard the *Muqaddima* from many of the former's students. There, al-Dhahabī states that 21 individuals⁷⁵ had heard the *Muqaddima* from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and that all of them, except for one, had also given al-Dhahabī permission to narrate it.⁷⁶ Second, al-Dhahabī addressed the question of the proper understanding of the Divine attributes himself in at least three treatises, expressing in them the traditionalist point of view of accepting the expressions without any allegorical interpretation. Those treatises are al-Dhahabī's short collection of prophetic *ḥadīth* on the *al-nuzūl* (God's descent into the undermost heaven), his collection on God's attributes (*aḥādīth aṣ-ṣifāt*), a 40-*ḥadīth* collection, also on God's attributes (*al-Arba'ūn fī ṣifāt rabb al-'ālamīn*), and his controversial and much discussed book on the "Being above of God" (*al-'Ulūw li-l-'alī al-ghaffār*), in which he gathered Quranic verses, Prophetic traditions, and sayings of the Prophet's companions as well as later scholars.⁷⁷ In those books and collections, he refuses allegorical interpretations of anthropomorphic expressions, claiming that the acceptance of the wording without questioning the how is the way of the *salaf*.

Eventually, al-Dhahabī's intellectual closeness to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and the social closeness to the latter's students' circle is also supported by the fact that al-Dhahabī authored a treatise on the *'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, his *al-Mūqīza fī 'ilm muṣṭalah al-ḥadīth*.⁷⁸ While Egyptian authors of the late Mamluk period, such as al-Suyūṭī, saw al-Dhahabī's *Mūqīza* as an abridgment of the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ,⁷⁹ there seemed to be some debate about this among present-day Arab scholars. The editor of the *Mūqīza*, 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda, believes that it is an abridgment of the treatise on the *'ulūm al-ḥadīth* of Ibn Daqīq al-ʿId entitled *al-Iqtirāḥ fī bayān al-iṣṭilāḥ*, which is supposed to be an abridgment of

75 Those are Tāj al-Dīn and his brother, al-Fakhr al-Karjī, al-Zayn al-Fāriqī, al-Majd b. al-Miḥtār, al-Majd b. al-Zahīr, Zahīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Zanjānī, Ibn 'Arabshāh, al-Fakhr al-Ba'li, al-Sharīshī, al-Jazā'irī, Muḥammad b. al-Kharqī, Muḥammad b. Abī l-Dhikr, Ibn al-Khuwayy, Aḥmad al-Shahrazūrī, al-Ṣard al-Urmawī, al-Ṣadr khaṭīb Ba'labakka, al-ʿImād Muḥammad b. al-Ṣā'igh, al-Kamāl b. al-Aṭṭār, Abū l-Yumn b. Asākīr, and 'Uthmān b. 'Umar al-Mu'addal. See al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 266o.

76 See Ibid.

77 See Ma'rūf, *al-Dhahabī*, 145–6, 148–9.

78 See the modern editions of it by 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Maktaba al-Maṭbū'āt al-Islāmiyya in Aleppo) and 'Amr 'Abd al-Mun'im Salīm (Dār Uḥud).

79 Al-Suyūṭī, *Baḥr* i, 236–42.

the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.⁸⁰ Either way, al-Dhahabī's treatise is obviously strongly influenced by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's *Muqaddima* in terms of structure, content, and scholarly opinions.⁸¹

Another important fact needs to be mentioned here. Despite the fact that al-Dhahabī had already been appointed in the Dār al-Ḥadīth in the Turbat Umm al-Ṣāliḥ, in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ẓāhiriyya, in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nafisiyya, in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Tankiziyya, in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Fādiliyya, and in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-ʿUrwiyya,⁸² he seemed to have a strong personal wish to also teach in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya. According to Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, al-Dhahabī pursued an appointment at the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya after the death of al-Mizzī. However, due to his writings on the Divine attributes and the rejection of any allegorical interpretation, it was clear that al-Dhahabī was not an adherent of the Ashʿarī school of theology, given that its most characteristic position is the allegorical interpretation of the Quranic verses on the attributes of God. Therefore, he was denied to be al-Mizzī's successor, and al-Taḳī al-Subkī was appointed instead.⁸³

This means that al-Dhahabī had been affected by the (intellectual) change that was going on in the teaching institutions in Damascus. In fact, his teacher al-Mizzī also ran into the same kind of trouble shortly before he was appointed in 718/1318. Some local Damascenes seemed to have objections against accepting his *mashyakha* there, as Ibn Kathīr and al-Subkī inform their readers.⁸⁴ According to al-Subkī, the main concern that was brought forward against the appointment of al-Mizzī was that al-Mizzī was not an adherent of the Ashʿarī school of theology. Allegedly, it was written in the endowment deed that the teacher (*shaykh*) of this Dār is supposed to be an adherent of the Ashʿarī school. And although al-Mizzī had made a written statement that he followed this school, the Damascene scholars did not believe him and demanded his dismissal.⁸⁵ Certainly, the events in 705/1306, in which al-Mizzī was imprisoned, had a role in the negative image that Damascene scholars had about al-Mizzī. In the month Rajab of that year, al-Mizzī gave a lecture on the chapter "The creation of the servants' deeds" (*khalq afʿāl al-ʿibād*) of the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī

80 Al-Dhahabī, *Mūqīza* 5–6.

81 See, for a comparison between the three treatises of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Ibn Daqīq al-ʿId, and al-Dhahabī, Gharaibeh, *Intertextuality*.

82 See Maʿrūf, *al-Dhahabī* 106–10.

83 See Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt* iii, 74.

84 See Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xviii, 181; al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* x, 397–8. Both scholars, though, are very vague when it comes to the question of who exactly opposed the appointment of al-Mizzī. Al-Subkī refers to them as *ahl dimashq*, while Ibn Kathīr states *limā fi nufūs baʿd al-nās*.

85 Al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* x, 397–8.

in which al-Bukhārī reacted to the creed of the Jahmiyya. During this lesson, doubts about al-Mizzī's beliefs arose, and the Shāfi'ī chief judge Ibn Ṣarṣā had him arrested for several days.⁸⁶

For the purpose of this paper, it is not so important to determine what was behind those claims and what kind of creed al-Mizzī followed. Rather, it is important to note that among the list of the writings of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, the endowment deed of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya—apparently no longer extant—is mentioned.⁸⁷ Therefore, it seems very crucial to determine what kind of intellectual (or theological) orientation Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ had. Or rather, from the perspective of the scholars of this time, it is crucial to understand how Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is depicted in the biographical dictionaries.

3.2 *Ibn Kathīr*

The case of Ibn Kathīr is quite similar to that of al-Dhahabī. Ibn Kathīr, whose full name is 'Imād al-Dīn Abū l-Fidā' Ismā'īl b. Kathīr, was born in 701/1301 in the village Majlad al-Qarya in the east of Damascus. He moved to the Syrian capital around 706/1306, shortly after the death of his father.⁸⁸ In Damascus, Ibn Kathīr quickly entered the circles of the traditionalist Shāfi'īs that al-Dhahabī also belonged to. During his education at the Bādirā'iyya school where the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was assumingly taught from 660/1262 onward by students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Ibn Kathīr studied under al-Burhān Ibrāhīm al-Fazārī (d. 729/1329).⁸⁹ Al-Burhān al-Fazārī was known for his traditionalist orientation,⁹⁰ was the son of one of the closer students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, one of the transmitters of the *Muqaddima*, and led the prayer (*imām*) in the Rawāhiyya school.⁹¹ Besides the fact that al-Burhān introduced Ibn Kathīr to the traditionalist orientation,⁹² he might have also connected him to the circle of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's students. After Ibn Kathīr began studying *ḥadīth* more seriously, he became a student of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mizzī, who not only was one of his most

86 See Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xviii, 54.

87 See the introduction by the editors of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ma'rifat* 27. See also Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya* xvii, 282, who mentioned that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ authored the endowment deed (*wa-huwa lladhī ṣannaḥa kitāba waqfiyyā*).

88 Laoust, Ibn Kaṭīr, 42–3.

89 Laoust, Ibn Kaṭīr 43–4. Al-Burhān's full name is Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Farikāḥ al-Fazārī. He was born in 660/1262 and received his education from his father and others. See, for his biography, Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 34–5.

90 Mirza, *Ibn Kathīr* 66n26.

91 See Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* i, 34–5.

92 See Laoust, Ibn Kaṭīr 44; Ohlander, Ibn Kathīr 150.

influential teachers but also became his father-in-law.⁹³ Ibn Kathīr also held close ties to al-Dhahabī, who has been discussed above. Another Shāfiʿī scholar close to Ibn Kathīr was al-ʿAlam al-Qāsim al-Birzālī (d. 739/1338), a Shāfiʿī traditionalist who was known for his efforts in the fields of historiography and *ḥadīth* studies.⁹⁴

From Ibn Kathīr's social contacts, one can already see a certain (imagined) closeness to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and (actual) closeness to the latter's students. His intellectual closeness is expressed in several aspects. First, Ibn Kathīr's Quran commentary, entitled *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿAẓīm*, was a traditionalist counter-concept to the commentary of the Shāfiʿī rationalist al-Fakhr al-Rāzī, as Mirza recently pointed out convincingly.⁹⁵ It, therefore, expresses Ibn Kathīr's rejection of logic and Greek philosophy, as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did as well. Second, Ibn Kathīr compiled an abridgment of the *Muqaddima*, entitled *al-Bāʾith al-ḥathīth sharḥ ikhtisār ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*.⁹⁶ Third, his *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahāʾ al-shāfiʿiyyīn* is actually also an extension of the *Ṭabaqāt* work that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ authored, and that al-Nawawī extended, as he expressed himself.⁹⁷ Fourth, Ibn Kathīr was appointed at the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, the institution of teaching *ḥadīth* in which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ authored his *Muqaddima*, at some point between 771/1370 (the death of the former teacher al-Tāj al-Subkī) and 774/1373 (Ibn Kathīr's death).⁹⁸ Although it cannot be known with certainty, one can assume that Ibn Kathīr most likely authored his commentary on the *Muqaddima* as well during his teaching time at this institution as sort of a teaching manual. The fact that Ibn Kathīr follows Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's outline and opinions in the commentary on the *Muqaddima* supports the conclusion of an intellectual closeness to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

The analysis of the biographies of both al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr reveal a clear traditionalist orientation. While this is not new, since previous studies

93 Ohlander, Ibn Kathīr 150.

94 See, for a comprehensive biography of al-Birzālī, Mirza, *Ibn Kathīr* 37–8.

95 See Mirza, Was Ibn Kathīr; *Ibn Kathīr*. The first cited article of Mirza summarizes the findings of his PhD thesis.

96 In some sources his *mukhtaṣar* is also referred to as *Ikhtisār ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*. There are two editions of the text, one edited as *al-Bāʾith* and the other as *Ikhtisār* (see bibliography).

97 Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* ii, 783.

98 Sources are not clear about his appointment. Al-Nuʾaymī only lists the teachers in chronological order until Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, who died in 756. After that he names Ibn Kathīr and al-Tāj al-Subkī as successors with a remark that the order is not known. See al-Nuʾaymī, *Dāris* i, 15–27. Listed after are: al-Taqī al-Subkī, his son al-Tāj, then the Cairene scholar al-Sirāj al-Bulqīnī, who died in 805 and was appointed as judge over Damascus during these years, and then Ibn Kathīr. See al-Ḥāfiẓ, *Dūr al-Ḥadīth* 60.

have suggested the same,⁹⁹ the present paper adds to this at least three important aspects. Both scholars had close relations to the network of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's students, they both commented on the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, which, hence, can be described as a central text for both scholars, and third, the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya played a crucial role in the lives of both scholars. With these findings, their description of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's life in their biographical dictionaries shall be compared.

4 The Entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ

The following table shows three entries of al-Dhahabī's *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'*, *Tārīkh al-islām*, and *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz* that contain Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's biography. In the last column, the entry of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in Ibn Kathīr's *Tabbaqāt* is demonstrated. Only the parts in Arabic are crucial for the argument of the paper. The other information is only summarized. Each column roughly represents a paragraph, so that one can get an idea of what the structure and the content of the entire entry look like.

The entries of Ibn Kathīr and al-Dahabī in their writings follow a similar outline and make almost the same statement. First, they introduce Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ by citing his name and his birthdate. While Ibn Kathīr goes over the early education of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Dhahabī inserts an anecdote that should emphasize Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's extraordinary scholarly capacity that already appeared during his adolescence (see *Tārīkh al-islām*, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*). After both scholars outline Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's early and late education, both introduce descriptions about Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's intellectual orientation, which can be perceived—from the perspective of the present study—as the main message and *knowledge* of the entries. Here, both scholars support their own worldview and use Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as an authority. Ibn Kathīr states, “He was on the path of the *Salaf* with regard to the creed and hated the path of [Greek] philosophy and logic. Moreover he warned [his surroundings] against it[s danger] and prevented it from being taught while he was supported by the rulers in this. He had strong *fatwās* and righteous opinions.”¹⁰⁰

Al-Dhahabī basically gives the same impression. In his *Siyar*, he states that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ “was of solid creed on the path of the *salaf* and of right religious orientation (*niḥla*). He prevented from entering into what lets the feet slip (*mazallāt al-aqdām*),” which is a reference to the study of philosophy and logic.

99 See, for example Mirza, Ibn Kathir; Bori, Ibn Taymiyya; and Fancy, Science.

100 Ibn Kathīr, *Tabaqāt* ii, 782–3.

Al-Dhahabī adds that “he [Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ] believed in God and in His Names and Attributes.” In the *Tārīkh*, al-Dhahabī is more explicit: “He was of right creed on the path of the *salaf*. He prevented from any allegorical interpretations [of the Quran, in particular the Divine attributes] and believed in what was narrated from God and his Prophet the way it was meant.” And in his *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, al-Dhahabī adds a few details while stating that “he was a *Salafī* of good creed (*ḥusn al-i’tiqād*), who distanced himself from the allegorical interpretations of the *mutakallimūn*.”

A comparison between Ibn Kathīr and al-Dhahabī reveals a great similarity between both characterizations, which fit the intellectual orientations of both scholars. Al-Dhahabī, however, included more information and was more specific about what exactly the “Salafī creed” looked like from his perspective, i.e., the belief in the names and attributes of God without any allegorical interpretations (of the *mutakallimūn*) and the rejection of logic and Greek philosophy.

In addition and in support of his explanations, al-Dhahabī included in his *Ṣīyar* and the *Tārīkh* Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s *fatwā* on the ban of philosophy. Although al-Dhahabī did not cite the entire *fatwā*, the quoted passages largely match the words of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in the latter’s collection of *fatwās*.¹⁰¹ The first passage he cited speaks about philosophy as the root of all disbelief and evil. For Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, the engagement in philosophy blinded the sight for the Divine *sharī’a*, which is supported by clear evidence. The part that al-Dhahabī left out speaks about the Prophet’s miracles, indicating that those who study philosophy do not believe in the prophethood of Muḥammad despite all the signs and miracles. In fact, in the opinion of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, the miracles of the Prophet were not restricted to his lifetime but were also visible in the miracles of the *awliyā’* (*karamāt al-awliyā’*) and even every time a believer asks God for help through the intercession of the Prophet.¹⁰² Whether or not al-Dhahabī left this passage out because he disagreed with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is not easy to answer, since he did not seem to have addressed the question of intercession with the Prophet particularly. In general, he seemed to have approved the existence of the *karamāt* of *awliyā’*, as he also condemned exaggerations and deviations from what he defined as the path of the *salaf*.¹⁰³ The next passage that al-Dhahabī cited from the *fatwā* concerned the ban of using logic, warning of its bad impact and emphasizing that the Divine *sharī’a* was not in need of logic in any way. Ibn Kathīr did not include the *fatwā* in his entry on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

101 For the entire *fatwā*, see Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Fatāwā* i, 209–12.

102 See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Fatāwā* i, 210.

103 For an overview of passages in his historical writings that approve the existence of *karamāt*, see ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Makkī, *Mawqif* 93–109.

TABLE 6.1 The entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ

<i>Ṣīyar a'lām al-nubalā'</i> ¹⁰⁴	<i>Tārīkh al-islām</i> ¹⁰⁵
Name	Name
Date of birth	Date of birth
	Anecdote of Ibn Khallikān (short version)
Early education	Early education and from whom he heard
Later education	Teaching positions
Who learned from him	Personal characteristics
Anecdote about his scholarly acumen reported by Ibn Khallikān	Anecdote about his scholarly acumen reported by Ibn Khallikān
Personal characteristics reported by 'Umar b. al-Ḥāḥib	Personal characteristics reported by Ibn al-Ḥāḥib
Personal characteristics reported by al-Dhahabī:	Personal characteristics reported by al-Dhahabī:
<p>كان ذا جلاله عجيبة ووقار وفصاحة وعلم نافع وكان متين الديانة سلفي الجملة صحيح التحلة كافا عن الخوض في مزلات الاقدام مؤمنا بالله وبما جاء عن الله من اسمائه ونعوته حسن البزة وافر الحرمة معظما عند السلطان</p>	<p>قلت: كان حسن الاعتقاد على مذهب السلف يرى الكف عن التأويل ويؤمن بما جاء عن الله ورسوله على مرادهما ولا يخوض ولا يتعمق من فتاويه أنه سئل عمن يشتغل بالمنطق والفلسفة فأجاب:</p>
[...] mentioning of his samā' contacts	<p>الفلسفة أس السفه والانحلال ومادة الحيرة والضلال ومثار الزيف والزندقة ومن تفلسف عميت بصيرته عن محاسن الشريعة المؤيدة بالبراهين ومن تلبس بها قارنه بالخدلان والحرمان واستحوذ عليه الشيطان وأظلم قلبه عن نبوة محمد</p>

104 Al-Dhahabī, *Ṣīyar* 2659–60.105 Ibid., *Tārīkh* xiv, 455–7.

<i>Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz</i> ¹⁰⁶	<i>Ibn Kathīr, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya</i> ¹⁰⁷
Name	Name
Date of birth	Early education and from whom he heard
Anecdote of Ibn Khallikān (short version)	Teaching positions
Early education and from whom he heard	scholarly characteristics
Teaching positions	على طريقة السلف في الاعتقاد يكره طرائق الفلسفة والمنطق ويعظ منها ولا يمكن من قراءتها بالبلد والمملوك تطيعه في ذلك وله فتاوى سديدة وآراء رشيدة
	Mentioning of his writings
Anecdote about his scholarly acumen reported by Ibn Khallikān	Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's teachers
Personal characteristics reported by Abū Ḥaṣṣ Ibn al-Ḥāḥib	List of who studied with him <i>fiqh</i> (<i>tafaqqaha</i> 'alayh)
Personal characteristics reported by al-Dhahabī:	Date of his death and details on his funeral
قلت: كان سلفيا حسن الاعتقاد كافا عن تأويل المتكلمين مؤمنا بما ثبت من النصوص غير خائض ولا معمق وكان وافر الجلالة حسن البزة كثير الهيبة موقرا عند السلطان والأمراء	

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., *Tadhkira* 1430–3.

¹⁰⁷ Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt* ii, 782–3.

TABLE 6.1 The entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (*cont.*)*Ṣiyar a'lām al-nubalā'**Tārīkh al-islām*

إلى أن قال:

واستعمال الاصطلاحات المنطقية في مباحث الأحكام
الشرعية من المنكرات المستبشرة والرقاعات المستحدثة وليس
بالأحكام الشرعية والله الحمد افتقار إلى المنطق أصلاً هو قعاقع
قد أغنى الله عنها كل صحيح الذهن فالواجب على السلطان
أعزه الله أن يدفع عن المسلمين شر هؤلاء المشائيم ويخرجهم
من المدارس ويبعدهم

Mentioning of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's fatwā against the
study of philosophy:

من فتاويه أنه سئل عمن يشتغل بالمنطق والفلسفة لأجاب:
الفلسفة أس السفه والانحلال ومادة الحيرة والضلال ومثار
الزيف والزندقة ومن تفلسف عميت بصيرته عن محاسن الشريعة
المؤيدة بالبراهين ومن تلبس بها قارنه الخذلان والحرمان
واستحوذ عليه الشيطان وأظلم قلبه عن نبوة محمد
إلى أن قال:

Mentioning of his popularity among the people
and the Sultan

واستعمال الاصطلاحات المنطقية في مباحث الأحكام
الشرعية من المنكرات المستبشرة والرقاعات المستحدثة وليس
بالأحكام الشرعية والله الحمد افتقار إلى المنطق أصلاً هو قعاقع
قد أغنى الله عنها كل صحيح الذهن فالواجب على السلطان
أعزه الله أن يدفع عن المسلمين شر هؤلاء المشائيم ويخرجهم
من المدارس ويبعدهم

Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz

Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya*

TABLE 6.1 The entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (*cont.*)

<i>Ṣiyar a'lam al-nubalā'</i>	<i>Tārīkh al-islām</i>
Date of his death and details on his funeral	List of who studied with him <i>fiqh</i> (<i>tafaqqaha 'alayh</i>)
A list of who heard the <i>'Ulūm al-ḥadīth</i> from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ with a reference that all of them have given al-Dhahabī an <i>ijāza</i> , except for one individual	List of who narrated from him
	Date of his death and details on his funeral

*Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz**Ibn Kathīr, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyya*

List of who studied with him *fiqh* (*tafaqqaha*
'*alayh*)

List of who narrated from him

Date of his death and details on his funeral

List of individuals who died in the same year

Mention of a *ḥadīth* that al-Dhahabī narrates
from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ through one of his students:

أخبرنا أبو العباس أحمد بن إبراهيم الفزاري المقرئ الخطيب
المحدث النحوي

ثنا أبو عمرو عثمان بن عبد الرحمن الحافظ

أخبرت أم المؤيد زينب بنت أبي القاسم الشعرية وسمعت من
زينب الكندية وابن أبي عصرون عنه

أن إسماعيل ابن أبي القاسم أخبرها

أنا عبد الغافر بن محمد

ثنا بشر بن أحمد

ثنا داود بن الحسين

ثنا يحيى بن يحيى

TABLE 6.1 The entries on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (*cont.*)

Ṣiyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ

Tārīkh al-islām

--

*Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz**Ibn Kathīr, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'īyya*

أنا عبد الله بن محمد بن أبي فروة

يزيد بن خصيفة

عن بسر بن سعيد

عن أبي هريرة قال

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم أيما امرأة أصابت بخورا
فلا تشهد معنا العشاء الآخرة

وقد أخرجه مسلم بإسناد آخر عن بكير بن الأشج عن بسر فقال
عن زينب الثقفية بدل أبي هريرة

Remark that this *ḥadīth* indicates the prohibition for women even old ones to enter the mosques wearing perfume, citing two other *ḥadīth* on this topic

Another difference between Ibn Kathīr and al-Dhahabī is that the latter also includes in his *Sīyar* a list of individuals who had narrated the *Muqaddima* from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. Besides the demonstration of the accuracy with which al-Dhahabī seemed to have put together this list, he also used this occasion to inform his reader that he received from all of those individuals—except one—permission to narrate the *Muqaddima* as well, thus highlighting the connection he had with Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This connection is also supported by the fact that al-Dhahabī cited in the *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ* a *ḥadīth* that he narrated with a full chain of transmission (*isnād*), in which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is also mentioned (with one intermediary between al-Dhahabī and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ).

Despite these differences between Ibn Kathīr and al-Dhahabī, the picture that both scholars drew of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is the same. For them, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was a traditionalist scholar, as is proven by the remarks on his creed and the condemnation of philosophy and logic. In addition, both scholars sort of feel loyal to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ due to their own intellectual orientation and their social closeness to the circle of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's students. Against the backdrop of the struggle between traditionalists and rationalists about teaching institutions in general and those that were dominated by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and his students (i.e., the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriyya, and the Rawāḥiyya school), it can also be argued that the outline of biographies is meant to support the claims of traditionalists over these institutions. The argument that both scholars put forward seems to have run as follows: If the scholar who dominated these institutions in the first place was a traditionalist, traditionalists rather than rationalists should continue to teach there. Al-Dhahabī was obviously also trying to justify the appointment of his teacher al-Mizzī in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, in addition to his own ambitions to take over its *mashyakha*. Ibn Kathīr, who was appointed in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya after two rationalists had already been appointed there in between—al-Taḳī and al-Tāj al-Subkī—apparently attempted to reinstate the traditionalist image the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya used to have before.

5 Al-Tāj al-Subkī

In comparison to al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr, al-Tāj al-Subkī shows a significant difference, not only with regard to the entry of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ that he included in his *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyya* but also with regard to his own biography and intellectual orientation.

Tāj al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. 'Alī al-Subkī was born in Cairo in 727/1327 or 728/1328 into a family of scholars. His father, Taḳī al-Dīn 'Alī, who was born in

Subk, was a great Shāfiʿī *ḥadīth* scholar and jurist himself, and took over the early education of Tāj al-Dīn.¹⁰⁸ In 739/1339, at the age of eleven, al-Tāj moved with his father to Damascus, where he continued his education, mostly with the local scholars.¹⁰⁹ Although, as Berkey suggests, his education seems “typical of those of the leading ulama of the Mamluk period,”¹¹⁰ the information provided by Ibn Ḥajar about al-Tāj’s teachers, the works he read, the disciplines he specialized in, and the works he authored suggest that al-Tāj had a rather rational orientation compared to his traditionalist Shāfiʿī colleagues in Damascus. It is true that he studied with al-Mizzī and held close relations to al-Dhahabī;¹¹¹ however, al-Subkī also criticized his teacher al-Dhahabī for his bias against Ashʿarī-Shāfiʿī scholars as well as Sufis.¹¹² Makdisi even goes as far as to describe the *Ṭabaqāt* of Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī as work that, through the use of narrative strategies, shapes the historical image of the Shāfiʿī school as rationalist oriented with tendencies toward Ashʿarīsm. Following his predecessor Ibn ʿAsākir, al-Subkī defended Ashʿarī rationalism against the anthropomorphist Ḥanbalīs and traditionalist Shāfiʿīs of his time.¹¹³ Those also include, as was described above, his teacher al-Dhahabī and his colleague Ibn Kathīr.¹¹⁴ This impression goes together with the works Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī read and wrote. Among those that Ibn Ḥajar lists are the *Minhāj* of al-Bayḍāwī and the *Mukhtaṣar* of Ibn al-Ḥājib, both works on jurisprudence and legal theory. In addition, al-Tāj al-Subkī decided to write a larger work on legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*) instead of, as his colleagues did, a work on the principles of *ḥadīth* studies (*ʿulūm al-ḥadīth*).¹¹⁵

This is crucial information—and not only to identify the intellectual orientation of al-Subkī in comparison to Ibn Kathīr and al-Dhahabī. Since al-Subkī also took over the teaching in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya after the death of his father in 756/1355, it is important to notice that he did not compile a commentary on the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as Ibn Kathīr did. Moreover, there is

108 See, for a short biography of both Taqī l-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, Berkey, al-Subkī 7–8. See also for slightly more information about the al-Subkī family, Schacht, al-Subkī ix, 743–5.

109 See Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 426.

110 Berkey, al-Subkī 8.

111 See Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 425–8.

112 Al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* ii, 22–3; see also Irwin, Mamluk 161.

113 See Makdisi, Ashʿarī esp. 57–79.

114 For the description of Ibn Kathīr as a traditionalist and his *Ṭabaqāt* as a means of shaping a traditionalist image of the Shāfiʿī school, see Mirza, *Ibn Kathīr* 10–22, 95–112, with examples from the *Ṭabaqāt* and the *Bidāya* of Ibn Kathīr.

115 See Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar* ii, 426.

little indication that he had any contact with students of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ at all.¹¹⁶ The only ones were al-Mizzī, Ibn Kathīr, and al-Dhahabī. Al-Subkī, however, criticized them for their traditionalist orientation, which is the characteristic feature that connects them to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. Moreover, Leder already stated that al-Taḳī al-Subkī, the father of Tāj al-Dīn, did not attach much value to the public reading sessions of *ḥadīth* in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, so he did not continue this practice during his employment, which might also indicate that he no longer continued the tradition of teaching the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.¹¹⁷ In continuation, al-Tāj al-Subkī might have followed his father's lead and done something different from his colleagues, so that the lack of any reference to any reading, studying, and teaching of and commenting on the *Muqaddima* can be interpreted as a strong indication that al-Subkī did not feel a deeper connection to the text in particular or the intellectual legacy of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in general.

Accordingly, the entry that al-Subkī included in his *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'yya al-kubrā* about Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ differs significantly from the entries of al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr.

Al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'yya al-kubrā*¹¹⁸

Name

List of places he achieved *samā'* relations

Personal characteristics:

وتفقه عليه خلائق وكان إماما كبيرا فقيها محدثا زاهدا ورعا مفيدا معلما
استوطن دمشق يعيد زمان السالفين ورعا ويزيد بهجتها بروضة علم جنى كل طالب جناها
ورعا ويفيد أهلها فها منهم إلا من اغترف من بحره واعترف بدوره وحفظ جانب مثله ورعا

List of his teaching positions

Anecdote of Ibn Khallikān

Date of his death and details on his funeral

Al-Subkī, in total, shares much less information about Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ with his reader than his two traditionalist colleagues did. After he gives the full name and date of birth, he mentions that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ had heard *ḥadīth* in Mosul, Bagdad, Naysabur, Marw, and Damascus. In the next paragraph, al-Subkī lists

¹¹⁶ Ibn Ḥajar did not list any of the teachers of al-Subkī. See Ibn Hajar, *Durar* ii, 425–8.

¹¹⁷ Leder, *Damaskus* 248.

¹¹⁸ Al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt* viii, 326–36.

three individuals who narrated *ḥadīth* from him.¹¹⁹ This is much less than the extensive list al-Dhahabī provided, for example, in the *Tārīkh*. There, he counted 18 individuals by name and added that others had heard from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as well (*wa-ghayruhum*).¹²⁰ In al-Subkī's entry, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's influence and role in *ḥadīth* do not appear that strong to the reader.

When al-Subkī speaks about Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ settling in Damascus, he uses the description *salaf*, as his colleagues did. However, instead of referring to a specific intellectual orientation or certain opinions regarding the creed and God's attributes, he uses it in a more general meaning of piety. He states that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ "brought back the piety of the time of the Salaf [or those who were before us] (*yu'īdu zaman al-sālifina war'an*)." Al-Subkī, therefore, is aiming for a characterization of a general piety that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seemed to have been famous for. He, however, did not connect this piety with a certain intellectual orientation or any theological school. In fact, the use of the word *sālifin* instead of the word *salaf*, as al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr did and which was more common among the traditionalists, could even have been meant in the sense of "those who were before us," as if al-Subkī meant that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ attempted to remind society of the piety that it had lost and that previous people had.

The information al-Subkī further gives concerns the travels of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as well as his teaching positions. He also quotes Ibn Khallikān, stating that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was among the greatest in the disciplines of Quran exegesis, *ḥadīth*, and jurisprudence. In addition, al-Subkī supports the image of the pious Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ by quoting an anecdote that was narrated anonymously (*wa-dhakar ghayruhu*). It was said that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ once had said that he never did even a small sin (*ṣaghīra*) in his life. Al-Subkī closes this part of the entry with information on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's death date and his funeral.

The following part takes most of the space of the entry and contains Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's legal opinions. On about eight pages from the total ten of the entry (in the modern edition), al-Subkī gives examples of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's *fatwās*. He touches upon topics such as the sale of a slave girl, the question of a man intending an optional prayer while he is sitting (not standing up during the prayer) (*nadhara an yuṣallī qā'idan*), inheritance matters, and some other topics, none of which has any connection with theology or creed.

As was expected, the entry in al-Subkī's *Tabaqāt* on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ differs significantly. No references are found to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's creed. Instead, al-Subkī refers to the general piety of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ that he connects to the *Sālifin*. Other than

119 Those are al-Fakhr 'Umar b. Yahyā l-Karjī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Farikāh, and Aḥmad b. Hibat Allāh b. 'Asākir. See al-Subkī, *Tabaqāt* viii, 326.

120 Al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh* xiv, 457.

this, nothing gives the reader the impression that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was a traditionalist. By contrast, the long passage on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's *fatwās*, as well as the reduced list of individuals that heard *ḥadīth* from him, give the impression of a jurist with little engagement in *ḥadīth*. Against the backdrop of the struggle between rationalist and traditionalist Shāfi'īs in Damascus in general and the competition about the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, it is reasonable to conclude that al-Subkī aimed for a justification of his father's and his own appointment in the Dār. If the "founding father" Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was rather a good jurist, as al-Taqī and al-Tāj al-Subkī appear, then the claims of traditionalists on predominance over the Dār is invalid.

6 Conclusion

The differences between the three scholars and their accounts on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ are obvious and support the hypotheses of a bias-driven shape of historiography in general that Makdisi, Mirza, and Irwin note for the historical writings of al-Dhahabī, al-Subkī, Ibn Kathīr, and others as an expression of the opposite intellectual orientation to shape the image of a certain *madhhab*.¹²¹ As the analysis of the social networks of all three scholars demonstrates, the intellectual closeness to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, and hence the orientation toward traditionalism, as well as its distance from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, and the resulting orientation toward rationalism, go together with a social closeness to and distance from Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and his students, respectively.

This appears to be a crucial finding against the backdrop of the ongoing struggle between rationalists and traditionalists in Damascus over teaching institutions during the 8th/14th century. This concerns especially those institutions in which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and his students were teaching the *Muqaddima* and that were for about 70 years dominated by them. In the 8th/14th century, these were given to rationalist Shāfi'ī scholars, who mostly migrated from Egypt to Damascus. To put the analysis of the biographical entries of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in this context highlights the personal interest each of the authors had while framing the biography of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This is especially the case if one takes into consideration that these changes happened with the appointment of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī at the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya after the traditionalist Shāfi'ī al-Mizzī in 742. Since Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was one of the first scholars who shaped the traditional image of these institutions and influenced their future through the

121 Makdisi, Ash'arī 59; Mirza, *Ibn Kathīr* 95–103; Irwin, Mamluk 161.

network of his students, and since Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ also had written the endowment deed of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyya, it becomes self-evident that the depiction of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is crucial to all involved in the struggle over these institutions (i.e., al-Dhahabī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, and Ibn Kathīr). The different narrative strategies, the *knowledge*, and the overall framing of the entries can be seen as additional means by scholars of both camps to dominate in the struggle between traditionalism and rationalism and in the struggle over institutions. While al-Dhahabī and Ibn Kathīr wanted to defend al-Mizzī's appointment, as well as justify their own and reintroduce the traditional image of the school, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī was, obviously, justifying his father's appointment after al-Mizzī over al-Dhahabī.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Makkī, *Mawqif a’immat al-ḥaraka al-salafiyya min al-taṣawwuf wa-l-ṣūfiyya*, n.e., Cairo Dār as-Salām 32001.
- Abū Shāma al-Maqdisī, *Mukhtaṣar al-Mu’ammal fī l-radd ilā l-amr al-awwal*, ed. Ṣ. Aḥmad, Kuwait n.d.
- Abū Shāma al-Maqdisī, *Tarājim rijāl al-qarnayn al-sādis wa-l-sābi’ al-ma’rūf bi-l-Dhayl ‘alā l-Rawḍatayn*, ed. M. al-Kawtharī, Beirut 21974.
- al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 4 vols., Beirut n.d.
- al-Dhahabī, *al-Mūqizah fī ‘Ilm Muṣṭalah al-Ḥadīth*, ed. ‘A. Abū Ghuddah, Aleppo 1984–5.
- al-Dhahabī, *Mu’jam shuyūkh al-Dhahabī*, ed. R.‘A. al-Suyūfī, Beirut 1990.
- al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh al-islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a’lām*, ed. B.‘A. Ma’rūf, 17 vols., Beirut 2003.
- al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a’lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Ḥ. ‘Abd al-Mannān, Beirut 2004.
- al-Ḥāfiz, *Dūr al-ḥadīth al-sharīfa bi-Dimashq*, Damascus 2010.
- Ibn al-‘Aṭṭār, *Tuhfat al-ṭālibīn fī tarjamat al-imām Muḥyī l-Dīn*, in *al-Nawawī*, ed. A.‘U.M. b. Ḥasan Āl Salmān, Amman 2007.
- Ibn ‘Azzūz, *Buyūtāt al-ḥadīth bi-Dimashq*, Damascus 2004.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *al-Mujma’ al-mu’assis li-l-mu’jam al-mufahris*, ed. Y.‘A al-Mar’ashlī, 4 vols., Beirut 1992.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *al-Durar al-kāmina fī a’yān al-mī’a al-thāmina*, 4 vols., Beirut 1993.
- Ibn al-‘Imād, *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab*, ed. ‘A. al-Arnā’ūt and M. al-Arnā’ūt, 10 vols., Damascus and Beirut 1986.
- Ibn Jamā’a, *Mashyakhat qāḍi l-quḍāt*, ed. M. ‘Abd al-Qādir, 2 vols., Beirut 1988.

- Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bā'ith al-hathith sharh ikhtisār 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. A.M. Shākir, Beirut n.d.
- Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, ed. 'A. al-Turkī, 21 vols., Cairo 1997.
- Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'īyya*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥafīẓ Maṣṣūr, 2 vols., Beirut 2004.
- Ibn Kathīr, *Ikhtisār 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. M.Y. al-Faḥl, Dār al-Maymān 1431/2010.
- Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān*, ed. I. 'Abbās, 8 vols., Beirut 1978.
- Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'īyya*, ed. 'A. Khān, 5 vols., Hyderabad 1978.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ṣiyanat Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim min al-ikhlāl wa-l-ghalaṭ wa-ḥimāyatuhu min al-isqāṭ wa-l-saqāṭ*, ed. M. 'Abd al-Qādir, Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī 1984.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Adab al-muftī wa-l-mustaftī*, ed. M. 'Abd al-Qādir, 'Ālam al-Kutub 1986.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Fatāwā wa-masā'il Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī l-tafsīr wa-l-ḥadīth wa-l-uṣūl wa-l-fiqh, wa-ma'ahū Adab al-muftī wa-l-mustaftī*, ed. 'A.A. Qal'ajī, 2 vols., Beirut 1986.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Ma'rifat anwā' 'ilm al-ḥadīth*, ed. 'A. al-Hamīm and M.Y. al-Faḥl, Beirut 2002.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *An Introduction to the Science of the Ḥadīth [Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā' 'ilm al-ḥadīth]*, trans. E. Dickinson, Garnet Publishing 2006.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Sharḥ mushkil al-Wasīṭ*, ed. 'A.K.A. Bilāl, 4 vols., Riyadh 1432/2011.
- al-Nawawī, Y., *al-Ījāz fī sharḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī*, ed. A.'U.M. b. Ḥasan Āl Sal-mān, Amman 2007.
- al-Nu'aymī, 'A., *al-Dāris fī tārikh al-madāris*, ed. I. Shams al-Dīn, 2 vols., Beirut 1990.
- al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, ed. A. al-Arnā'ūṭ and T. Muṣṭafā, 29 vols., Beirut 2000.
- al-Sakhāwī, M., *al-Manhal al-'adhib al-rawī fī tarjamat quṭb al-awlyā' al-Nawawī*, ed. A.F. al-Mazīdī, Beirut 1971.
- al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'īya al-kubrā*, ed. M.M. al-Ṭanāḥī and 'A.M. al-Ḥulūw, 10 vols., Cairo 1964.
- al-Suyūṭī, *al-Minhāj al-sawī fī tarjamat al-imām al-Nawawī*, ed. A.S. Damaj, Beirut 1988.
- al-Suyūṭī, *al-Baḥr alladhī zakhar fī sharḥ Alfīyyat al-athar*, ed. A.A. al-Andūnūsī, 4 vols., Medina 1999.

Secondary Sources

- al-Azem, T., Traditionalism against scholasticism. The debate over "curriculum" in Damascus between 1150–1350, MA thesis, University of Oxford 2007.
- Berkey, J., al-Subkī and his women, in *MSR* 14 (2010), 1–17.
- Bori, C., Ibn Taymiyya wa-Jamā'atu-hu. Authority, conflict and consensus in Ibn Taymiyya's circle, in Y. Rappoport and S. Ahmed (eds.), *Ibn Taymiyya and his times*, Oxford 2010, 23–52.
- Bulliet, R., Quantitative approach to medieval Muslim biographical dictionaries, in *JESHO* 13/2 (1970), 195–211.
- Bulliet, R., *Conversion to Islam in the medieval period. An essay in quantitative history*, Cambridge 1979.

- Bullett, R., Age structure of medieval Islamic education, in *SI* 57 (1983), 105–17.
- Conermann, S. (ed.), *Innovation oder Plagiat? Kompilationstechniken in der Vormoderne*, Berlin 2015.
- Fancy, N., *Science and religion in Mamluk Egypt: Ibn al-Nafīs, pulmonary transit and bodily resurrection*, London and New York 2013.
- Franz, K., *Kompilation in arabischen Chroniken: Die Überlieferung vom Aufstand der Zang zwischen Geschichtlichkeit und Intertextualität vom 9. bis ins 15. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2004.
- Gharaibeh, M., Intertextuality between history and ḥadīṭ studies. The Mūqīza fī ‘ilm muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīṭ in the center of ad-Dahabī’s (d. 748/1348) work, in T. Miura and S. Conermann (eds.), *Studies on the History and Culture of the Mamluk Sultanate (1250–1517)*, Göttingen 2021, 255–289.
- Gharaibeh, M., Narrative strategies in biographical dictionaries. The ad-Durar al-Kāmina of Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī—A case study, in S. Conermann (ed.), *Mamluk historiography revisited. Narratological perspectives*, Göttingen 2018, 51–75.
- Gharaibeh, M., The sociology of commentarial literature—An analysis of the commentary tradition of the Muqaddimat Ibn aṣ-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, Habilitation thesis, University of Bonn 2019.
- al-Ghouz, A., Brokers of Islamic philosophy in Mamlūk Egypt: Shams al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Iṣfahānī (d. 1348) as a case study in the transmission of philosophical knowledge through commentary writing, in S. Conermann (ed.) *History and society during the Mamluk period (1250–1517)* (Studies of the Annemarie Schimmel Institute for Advanced Study 11), Göttingen 2016, 149–72.
- Halim, F.A., *Legal authority in premodern Islam: Yaḥyā b. Sharaf al-Nawawī in the Shāfi‘ī school of law*, London 2015.
- Hirschler, K., *Medieval Arabic historiography, authors as actors*, London 2006.
- Hirschler, K., Studying Mamluk historiography: From source-criticism to the cultural turn, in S. Conermann (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? Quo vademus? Mamluk studies—State of the art*, Göttingen 2013, 159–86.
- Humphreys, S.R., *From Saladin to the Mongols: The Ayyubids of Damascus, 1193–1260*, Albany 1977.
- Irwin, R., Mamluk history and historians, in R. Allen and D.S. Richard (eds.), *Arabic literature in the post-classical period*, Cambridge 2006, 159–70.
- Keshk, K., *The historian’s Mu‘āwiya: The depiction of Mu‘āwiya in the early Islamic sources*, Saarbrücken 2008.
- Keshk, K., How to frame history, in *Arabica* 56 (2009), 381–99.
- Lahn, S., and J. Christoph Meister, *Einführung in die Erzähltextanalyse*, Stuttgart 2008.
- Laoust, H., Ibn Kaṭīr Historien, in *Arabica* 2/1 (1955), 42–88.
- Leder, S., Charismatic scripturalism: The Ḥanbalī Maqdisīs of Damascus, in *Der Islam* 74 (1997), 279–304.

- Leder, S., Damaskus: Entwicklung einer islamischen Metropole (12.–14. Jh.) und ihre Grundlagen, in T. Bauer and U. Stehli-Werbeck (eds.), *Alltagsleben und materielle Kultur in der arabischen Sprache und Literatur. Festschrift für Heinz Grotzfeld zum 70. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 2005, 233–50.
- Makdisi, G., Ash‘arī and the Ash‘arites in Islamic religious history 1, in *SI* 17 (1962), 37–80.
- Malti-Douglas, F., Texts and tortures: The reign of al-Mu‘taḍid and the construction of historical meaning, in *Arabica* 46/3 (1999), 313–36.
- Ma‘rūf, B.‘A., *al-Dhahabī wa-manhajuhū fī kitābih Tārīkh al-islām*, Cairo 1976.
- Mauder, C., *Gelehrte Krieger: Die Mamluken als Träger arabischsprachiger Bildung nach al-Safadi, al-Maqrizi und weiteren Quellen*, Hildesheim 2012.
- Mirza, Y., Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373): His intellectual circle, major works and Qur’ānic exegesis, PhD diss., Georgetown University 2012.
- Mirza, Y., Was Ibn Kathīr the “spokesperson” for Ibn Taymiyya? Jonah as a prophet of obedience, in *JQS* 16/1 (2014), 1–19.
- Mourad, S.A., and J.E. Lindsay, *The intensification and reorientation of Sunni jihad ideology in the Crusader period: Ibn ‘Asākir of Damascus (1105–1176) and his age, with an edition and translation of Ibn ‘Asākir’s The forty hadiths for inciting jihad*, Leiden 2012.
- Ohlander, E., Ibn Kathīr (ca. 1301–1373), in J.E. Lowry, D.J. Stewart and R. Allen (eds.), *Essays in Arabic literary biography 1350–1850*, Wiesbaden 2009, 147–59.
- Opwis, F.M., The role of the biographer in constructing identity and doctrine: Al-‘Abbādī and his *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘iyya*, in *JAIS* 11 (2011), 1–35.
- Petry, C.F., *The civilian elite of Cairo in the later middle ages*, Princeton 1981.
- Romanov, M., *al-Raqmīyyāt. Digital Islamic history* (<https://alraqmiyyat.github.io/>).
- Romanov, M., Computational reading of Arabic biographical collections with special reference to preaching in the Sunnī world (661–1300 CE), PhD diss., University of Michigan 2013.
- Schacht, J., Al-Subkī, in *ET*², ix, 743–5.
- al-Shaykh, *al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī: Mu‘arrikh al-islām, nāqid al-muḥaddithīn*, Damascus 1994.