A study of manuscripts of al-Ṣafadī’s
al-Wāfī bi’l-Wafayāt in Istanbul libraries
by Jürgen Paul

The monumental biographical dictionary al-Wāfī bi’l-Wafayāt by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khālīb b. Aibāk al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) has been in the process of being edited in the Bibliotheca Islamica since 1931; even earlier, in 1912 and 1917, the scholarly world learnt about the most important manuscripts of this work (outside Istanbul) from two articles by Gabrieli, one of them with an important addition by Togan. In 1929, Helmut Ritter gave a first description of the Istanbul manuscripts; and it was Ritter, too, who began the edition.

Since then, many important scholars from Europe and the Arabic world have been working on individual volumes of the edition; the project has been an international one from the very start. By now (November 1991) vols. 1-18, 21, and 22 have been published, and the remaining vols. 19, 20, and 23 through 29 have either reached advanced stages of preparation or else have been assigned to editors by the publishers. Is it, then, of any interest to do further research into manuscripts of al-Wāfī and, furthermore, to publish the results?

A project of this size and age has and must have its own history. Habent suafata... This history is in many ways a reflection of history at large, and thus is made up of crises, obstacles and shortcomings as well as successes. And, of course, there were (and still are) difficulties in gaining access to manuscripts, in ascertaining their mere existence, their whereabouts in the first place, but also in getting hold of a permit to use them or in having microfilms made. Obstacles and difficulties of this kind are largely beyond the responsibility of anyone in the scholarly world. Nevertheless, they can have a negative influence on the quality of the edition. Moreover, there are difficulties and shortcomings in the work itself; this can hardly be avoided in a project which has been carried out over generations and in many different countries.

As a result, manuscripts of great importance have not as consistently been consulted as might have been necessary. This applies in particular to the surviving fragments of Ṣafadī’s musawwada, his draft; they are more voluminous than the edition would have us assume. These fragments are the subject of the first part of this paper. It applies as well to the series of manuscripts in the Shehid ‘Ali Pasha collection, which is a very old, although fragmentary series which has been used for the edition in only a few volumes.

Helmut Ritter lived in Istanbul from 1927 to 1949. During that period, he was in charge of the Istanbul office of the German Oriental Society (‘Aussenstelle der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft’). In this function, he acquired a very profound knowledge of the huge collections of manuscripts in Istanbul libraries, which owed a great deal to his close friendship with librarians and scholars in Istanbul. Among the many manuscripts he discovered and described, six volumes of Ṣafadī’s draft of al-Wāfī in the Nuru Osmaniye library assume a prominent place. Even earlier, Gabrieli had given a detailed description of another volume of this draft (in Gotha), and hinted at another one (in the Taimūriyya library in Cairo). All these volumes present a number of common features. Several previous authors and editors have mentioned them; thus, I will give only a very brief survey. In the draft, the alphabetical order of the entries is not yet wholly established; there are many scraps of paper that Ṣafadī later added (by gluing them into the volume); the script sometimes runs vertically, sometimes horizontally. Above all, the volumes seem to have fallen out of their binding at some moment in their long history; they later were bound again, but not always in alphabetical order, so that some volumes contain biographical entries from various parts of the alphabet. Moreover, Ṣafadī used several kinds of paper (reddish, whitish, brownish). Some pages have turned quite black, and fall apart on touch as if they had at one time been (nearly) burnt; this has led Josef van Ess to the conclusion that the books may have been rescued from a fire (those that have survived).

These pages cannot be read on microfilm and are hardly legible in the original. Thus, working with these volumes presents certain difficulties.

All the same, autograph copies of a work which is being edited are, of course, a very good basis, and Ritter, in his preface to the first volume of al-Wāfī which he himself edited, stresses that he would not have used any other manuscript beside the musawwada.
had it been complete. But as it was fragmentary, he decided (on very good grounds) to take, as a basis for the edition, a series of volumes of which are kept at the Topkapi Saray library. This is not only a very old (fair) copy of the work, but also the most complete one; of the 29 volumes it once comprised, only volumes 5, 6, 15, 16, and 29 are missing. Moreover, this series has twice been collated with the (then still complete) musawwadas.

Let us now turn to the description Ritter gave of six autograph volumes in the Nuru Osmaniye library (NO). They are rather cursory due to the state of the books, and this has maybe contributed to certain inconsistencies in their utilization.

**NO 3191.** Ritter: From the beginning to Muhammad b. ‘Abdallâh b. Muhammad.

This volume contains the introduction, followed by Muhammad rasûl Allâh. But apart from that, there are biographical entries from the whole Muhammad section, with particularly important groups of Muhammad b. H., M. b. ‘Abd al-, and M. b. Y.. This volume has been used for vol. 1 of the edition. According to Ritter’s description, it ought to have been used for volumes 2 and 3 (which is not the case, at least there is no mention of that in the khatima), and moreover, for volumes 4 and 5 as well. Their editor could not possibly have known from Ritter’s description that there was something in NO 3191 for these volumes.

**NO 3192.** Ritter: Ahmad b. Muh. b. ‘Ubaïd to Aýan.

This volume presents almost exclusively entries from the Ahmad section, but with widely scattered patronyms. It has been used for volumes 6 and 7, but not for vol. 8. On the other hand, the editor of vol. 9 has made use of those relatively few entries following Ahmad.²

**NO 3193.** Ritter: Ja‘far b. Ahmad to ‘Ahlay y. b. Ruzzâk.

From this description it is obvious that there must be lacunae in the volume: one volume cannot cover so much of the alphabet. Thus, its contents are not sufficiently described by the first and the last entry alone. The volume begins with entries from the letter jîm (up to p. 171)³. Then follows harf al-hâ’ with Ḥâbis Abû Ḥayyâb b. Rabî‘a al-Tâmûnî as its first entry; this letter ends on p. 249. After that there is a lacuna, the following entry (p. 250) being Sûlaimân Shâh b. Shâhûshnâsh b. ‘Umar. Sîn ends on p. 530 and is followed by another lacuna: sâd (only a few entries — Sûhaib and Sâlih). On p. 537: Tâhir (but there also are two Zâhir) and other names beginning with tâ’. The last entry cited by Ritter is the last but one, the last being ‘Ahlay b. ‘Ahlay.

This volume, which is in a particularly bad state of conservation, ought to have been used for vols. 11 (and 12) for jîm and hâ’, 15 for sûn, and 16 (the last pages: sâd and tâ’). Only these last pages have been made use of. Thus NO 3193 is one of the least utilized volumes of the musawwadas.


This is correct, but does not give a fair picture of what the volume contains. The second entry (after ‘Abd al-Wâhâb) is ‘Amr b. Ma‘âdi, and the following entries are in alphabetical order, that is, ‘Amr followed by ‘Imrân and ‘Amrân. On p. 91, ‘Ahlay; p. 160, ‘Ahlay; p. 170, ‘Umar again; p. 176, more ‘Ali. The patronyms are in such disorder that it is of no use to quote them. There is a single ‘Uthmân on p. 289, and after that ‘Abd al-Wâhâb up to p. 318, followed by ‘Atîq, ‘Ubtâ, and ‘Utaïba. From p. 385 onwards ‘Ali continues until the end of the volume. This volume, too, is in a very bad state of conservation.

The manuscript contains many biographical entries beyond the limit indicated by the last tarjuma. It can be used for vol. 19 (‘Abd al-Wâhâb and some ‘Ubtâ), vol. 20 (more ‘Ubtâ, several ‘Utaïba and ‘Atîq, as well as some ‘Ali), vols. 21 and 22 (more ‘Ali which have indeed been used), and vol. 23 (most of the first part of the volume).


Apart from the ‘Abdallâh section in this volume, which has been used for vol. 17, most of the material is important for vol. 19 of the edition.

**NO 3196.** Ritter: Fürûz Abû Lu‘lu’a to Ya‘qûb b. Muhammad.

This is correct, but there are many lacunae in the volume. One of these has been noticed by Ritter. The first entry is incomplete, the second is Quss b. Sa‘îda, followed by other names beginning with qâf up to p. 221. Then, some Laîth (thus, kaf is missing altogether), and on p. 230, Makârim b. Wâzîr (lâm is very incomplete, and mîm starts somewhere in the middle). Mîm is very incomplete as well, since there are only some names beginning with mîm-kâf and mîm-lâm. The following lacuna is the one noted by Ritter. On p. 268, Huraira and more hâ’ up to p. 361 (Harthama b. al-Hunayîd). Wâw is missing, and on p. 262: a single Ya‘qûb, followed by Yazdajird and Yazîd. From then on, the alphabetical order is roughly respected, apart from the patronyms; it is quite possible that there are Ya‘qûb entries which appear later than Ya‘qûb b. Muhammad.

The qâf section in this volume is important for vol. 24. The editor of vol. 26 will find only a few entries of interest, whereas vol. 28 is richly served. Vol. 29, in turn, will hardly contain anything from NO 3196.

**NO 3197.**

This volume is not mentioned by Ritter. Yet it is
part of the musawwada, altogether equal to the other volumes in its outward aspect and inner disorder. But, it has surprisingly enough been used for the edition, in vol. 5: the editor of that volume even mentioned it in his khātima. But this publication did not attract much notice, and to my knowledge, there is no description of the manuscript.

The volume begins with Abū Bakr b. Muhammad al-Qādirī al-Kabīr al-Zāhid al-Ahwad Qub al-Dīn b. al-Mukarram. This man is mentioned in the edition (vol. 10, no. 4751), where there is a reference to Sāfādī's musawwada, quoted not as NO 3197, but as Dār al-kutub 1219. This is something of a riddle, and a solution will be proposed after the description of the Istanbul manuscripts of the musawwada. Abū Bakr in NO 3197 runs up to p. 77 (but there is a small Sālim section between pp. 22 and 27). Up to here, the editors of vol. 10 had the corresponding entries via DK 1219. They did not have the following entries, although they fall into vol. 10: Bakrān, Bilāl, Bakr up to p. 109, from then on a few names beginning with tā’: Tūrānshāh, Tūbāl, Tawba. (Some Ahmad and Ibrāhīm are interspersed throughout: these would have been important for vol. 5, but have evidently not been used.).

There is a leap after that, and p. 337 has ‘Umar, with patronyms from the end of the alphabet: ‘Umar b. ‘Ali and ‘Umar b. Muhammad, mostly, up to p. 393. Some of the ‘Umar entries have been used in vol. 22, but most of them are of interest for the editor of vol. 23.

Then there is another leap, and p. 394 gives Muhammad b. Muḥrīz b. ‘Abdillāh al-ma‘rūf bi-Rukn al-Dīn al-Wahrānī. The rest of the volume contains entries from the Muhammad section, mostly Muhammad b. M., but also b. Naṣr, b. Gaḥlib, b. al-Ḥasan and, above all, b. Yūsuf; these begin on p. 429 and continue to the end of the manuscript (p. 462). This last section has been used for vol. 5 of the edition.

In all, the larger half of NO 3197 has been used for the edition, although there is no mention of it in Ritter’s article, either directly (vol. 5) or via DK 1219 (vols. 10, 18, and 22). The manuscript had to be discovered several times…

Ayya Sofya (AS) 4036.

This volume was found by Ritter after his article was printed; it is mentioned in GAL, S II, p. 28. (The other mentions of autographs of al-Wāfi in GAL are not correct; AS 2966, ‘8, ‘9 are fragments of autograph copies of another work by Sāfādī, A’yān al-‘asr.) The old defter catalogue of the Ayya Sofya collection shows something altogether different under this signature. Nevertheless, there is no description of AS 4036, so the editors of al-Wāfi could not possibly know for which volume the manuscript would have to be used.


Fol. 55a: ‘Uthmān b. ‘Ali and ‘Uthmān b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali, followed by more ‘Uthmān with patronyms from the second half of the alphabet. The alphabetical order is quite well respected. As far as I can tell, there is nothing in the manuscript later than ‘Ali b. Ahmad.

The last entry (fol. 146a) concerns one ‘Aṭṭāfūf, and in the very end (147b) there is one b. ‘Aṭīyā Sharaf al-Dīn Muhammad b. Abī al-Qādir. Apart from those Ahmad (relatively few of them), vol. 8, all of the material in AS 4036 falls into vol. 20: it is one of the most compact fragments of the musawwada.

Dār al-Kutub (DK) 1219.

As has already been mentioned, part of the material from NO 3197 has not been used in the edition directly, but with reference to DK 1219. This is, however, not another autograph volume of al-Wāfi, but a set of photograph copies of the NO manuscripts. Many pages are nearly or altogether illegible, at least on a microfilm which was made from these photographs in 1948 and is now in the German Oriental Institute at Beirut (Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Beirut, OIB); it has been registered there in the inventory book with the no. 261. Thus, the original photographs must have been taken before that date. It is impossible from DK 1219 to reconstruct the NO manuscripts since somebody has tried to arrange the photographs according to alphabetical order. Thus, it is no surprise that in their references to the musawwada, those editors who have worked with DK 1219 often do not give a page or folio number.

After the entry which closes NO 3194 (‘Ali b. ‘Asākir), there is a photo of a scrap of paper which reads: qad ustunsikha mahall al-fatūghrāf Shabhal qabālat al-Bāb al-‘Āli, and, in Ottoman: Bāb-i ‘āli karshīmda Shehbal fotografkhānesinde isinsāk edilmistir. The studio is obviously “Photo Chehbal, Ruchdi Zade Frères, Vis-à-vis de la Sublime-Porte”.

To complete this section, I would like to give a brief survey of other (mostly smaller) fragments of the musawwada kept in other places than Istanbul.

Taimūriyya 976. Described by Gabrieli in Appendice, p. 1163 (no. 43): 28 fol., 90 tarājim from various parts of the work.

Taimūriyya 2410 tārīkh. First mentioned in the khātima to vol. 17. Short description by Aiman Fu‘ād Sayyid in a letter to U. Haarmann (dated Oct. 8, 1990): Autograph. 12 fol., containing four Ahmads, one Ṭashtimur, Ṭa‘ma, Ṭughān, five Ṭughrāf, seven ‘Abdallāhs: twenty entries in all.
**Taimūriyya tārīkh 125 mīn. Description by Togan cited in Gabrieli’s Appendice. The first fragment ought to be an autograph fragment, if one takes into account the outward aspect as described by Togan (glued-in scraps of paper, one folio upside down). But then, this would be the only instance known to me where biographical entries occur twice in the musawwada in a somewhat systematic fashion: The Tābal and Tawba mentioned by Togan are to be found in NO 3197, p. 120ff. as well.**

*Gotha 1733:* Detailed description by Gabrieli in *Como si possa* (with an illustration showing Ṣafādi’s handwriting). This volume has not been used at all for the edition. This is perhaps a consequence of the political situation in Germany, but in any case, the Gotha library is known to have been not very cooperative.

*Zahirīyya 9825 or 9835.* The only mention of this fragment is in the inventory booklet of the OIB, nos. 239 and 256. Both signatures are given. In this case, it is not sure at all whether this really is an autograph.

239 and 256. Both signatures are given. In this case, it would be the only instance known to me where biographical entries occur twice in the musawwada. That is a proportion of roughly 2.8%.

I have not included the fragments *Tārīkh mīn, 125* because of their uncertain status. Furthermore, I would like to stress that in some cases, one single biographical entry leads to the corresponding manuscript’s mention in the right column.

What does all this mean for the edition? It is obvious that the autograph fragments have not been fully used for the edition; to what extent they were left out will be assessed below. In the first place, the consequences for the edited text itself will be discussed. Two aspects are of some importance: the variants first, and then, biographical entries from the musawwada not included in any of the fair copies the edition is based upon.

The variants seem to be few in number and minor in contents. This shows the accuracy and competence of those scribes and collators who were responsible for the fair copies, especially of the ‘basis series’ in 29 volumes. Where variants are more than details, they sometimes offer more precise dates of a person’s death, e.g., the month is added.

Biographical entries not included in any of the fair copies are another question. These seem to be more numerous, but whether they were left out on purpose or accidentally is not to be traced; in any case, we would like to have them. The following tests have been made:

First, the editors of vol. 10 found three items (out of 53 *Abū Bakr*)s they found in the *musawwada* which were not included in any other manuscript they used (all of them are in NO 3197).

Second, out of the 78 *'Abdallāhs* that the editor of vol. 17 found in NO 3195, all were also included in some other manuscript.

Third, in the list of biographical entries from the Gotha fragment that Gabrieli made for his description, there are 192 names from already published sections. Out of these, three were apparently missing in the edition. Two more might be double entries which were dropped when the fair copies were made.

Fourth, to enlarge the numerical basis for a statistical statement, the first 200 entries of NO 3197 were checked in the edition. These include the *Abū Bakr* entries mentioned above. Apart from the three items quoted, I have not been able to locate 7 more entries in the edition.

In all, 470 *tarājim* were checked. Of this number, thirteen are not included in any manuscript except the *musawwada*; that is a proportion of roughly 2.8%.

This number is evidently subject to the usual considerations. It is indeed remarkable that the ‘missing entries’ are very unequally distributed over the work. Moreover, a body of 470 items does not seem to be very large compared to the 14,000 entries *al-Wāfi* can be estimated at. And finally, there is of course the possibility that I have overlooked one of the 13; this

**Abbreviations:** AS: Aya Sofya, DK: Dar al-Kutub, G: Gotha; NO Nuru Osmaniye, T: Taimūriyya, Z: Zahirīyya.
cannot be excluded, however conscientiously one works.

The quoted number of 13 out of 470, or 2.8%, indicates the entries peculiar to the musawwada, not those effectively missing in the edition. After all, the musawwada fragments have been used to some extent. If we want to estimate how many biographical entries have been omitted from the edition, we must first consider how many items in all there are in the autograph fragments, and after that, we must attempt to calculate to what extent they have been utilized or could still be consulted for the volumes not yet published.

The overall volume of the musawwada fragments can be estimated at 4,000 pages (this can be calculated from the descriptions). This corresponds to a total of roughly 3,500 biographical entries; Gabrielli counted 228 entries on the 264 pages of the Gotha fragment; the first 200 entries in NO 3197 take up 216 pages. 2.8% out of 3,500 would give 100 biographical entries. This would mean that between 30 and 40 entries are made of the larger fragments G 1733 and NO 3193. Probably less than half has been used of NO 3191, probably more than half has been used of NO 3197. Complete or nearly complete use has been or still can be made of NO 3192, 3194, 3195, 3196 and AS 4036. Only in vol. 17 have the smaller fragments been hitherto used at all. All this means that nearly two-thirds of the entire musawwada has been used or can still be used for the edition.

This would mean that between 30 and 40 entries are not included in the edition and will not be even under the most favorable circumstances. This number is not the result of a count, but should be taken as a qualified guess.

There still is the possibility that further fragments of the musawwada might yet come to light, particularly in Cairo and Damascus (the Taymūriyya and Zāhiriyā libraries).

In the same article, Ritter also described some manuscripts of al-Wafi in the Shehid ‘Ali Pasha collection (SAP). According to Ritter, they belong to one of the oldest extant series of that work. Ritter presumed that Šafādī himself supervised the copyist’s work. He assumed that this was so because there are additions in the margins in Šafādī’s own hand, at least one scrap of paper (written by Šafādī) is glued into one volume, and there is a note saying that the historian Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Duqmāq read the book. Thus, the volumes in the Shehid ‘Ali Pasha collection are as important a basis for the edition as those of the ‘Topkapi’-series.


SAP 1968. Āl-’Abbās b. Ābī l-Futūḥ to Ābdullāh b. Muḥammad (…). Najm al-Dīn al-Baghdādī. Falls partly into vol. 16 (not used) and partly into vol. 17 (not used; could not be made available).

SAP 1969. Ābdallāh b. Muḥammad ‘Ain al-Dawla to Ābd al-Salām b. al-Waḥhāb. Falls partly into vol. 17 (see above) and partly into vol. 18 (not used).

SAP 1970. Ābd al-Salām b. Ālī to ‘Ubaidullāh b. Faddl Shattān al-Ṭāq. Falls partly into vol. 18 (see above) and partly into vol. 19.


The Shehid ‘Ali Pasha series has thus been used for vol. 15 only. Maybe we should say that it could be used for that volume only: obviously, there were difficulties in preparing the work. So we are lucky that SAP 1965 could be used, in that vol. 15 of the ‘Topkapi’-series is missing. For those parts it covers, SAP 1965 is a full equivalent.

D. Krawulsky, who edited vol. 17, gives a tentative diagram listing which manuscripts depend on which earlier ones. She believes that the basis series was copied from another fair copy which was written under Šafādī’s supervision. This is indicated by collation entries in the basis series. The London and Oxford manuscripts have both been copied from a series which apparently has not survived (perhaps London was also copied from Oxford). Apart from these three manuscripts, Krawulsky made use of a Paris manuscript (BN Arabe 2066). Although this is a rather recent copy, Krawulsky thinks that this Paris manuscript may have been copied from a manuscript written when Šafādī was still alive. She is not explicit about whether the Shehid ‘Ali Pasha series may be this very early copy, but the question arises by itself.

There are some hints that this is exactly what happened, but we cannot be altogether sure.

As has already been mentioned, the Shehid ‘Ali Pasha series contains several notes written by Šafādī in the margins and even a glued-in scrap of paper. The biography of Abdallāh al-Manūšī al-Mālikī (vol. 17, no. 593) which, of the manuscripts used by Krawulsky, is to be found only in the London and Paris manuscripts, is included in SAP 1968 on a scrap of paper written by Šafādī, glued in between fols. 35 and 36. This is where the Abdallāh section ends. Šafādī may have waited until the last moment to add this biography to the fair copy because he could not ascertain this man’s patronym.

This Manūšī died on Ramadān 7, 749 (November 30, 1348). Šafādī tells two stories about him, both on the authority of Taqi al-Dīn al-Subkī. When he
learnt that Manûf had died, did Șafadî ask al-Subkî what he knew about the deceased? If he did, he may have written down what al-Subkî had told him and glued the paper into the fair copy he happened to have at hand. This is of course only an idea, but we know for certain that Șafadî was always asking people in his circle about people and dates.

There are a small number of notes written by Șafadî in the margins. Apart from these, the margins are practically clean, no notes having been written on them. Thus, the marginal notes are very easily detected.

The variant about ‘Abdallâh b. Ahmad b. al-Husain ‘b. Naqqâr’ (vol. 17, p. 50 line 3ff — no. 44), which Krawulsky found only in the Paris manuscript, is such a marginal note, written most probably by Șafadî (SAP 1968, fol. 32).

The variant in the biography of ‘Abdallâh b. Muhammad b. İbrahim ‘al-Wâﬁ’ (no. 505), where we learn (contrary to what the basis series says) that this man did not die in Jumâdá I, but in Rajab of 749 in Damascus, and the additional information that he vomited blood and died after two days (of the plague), is included in SAP 1969 in a marginal note probably written by Șafadî on fol. 4b.

So far, the hints seem to be quite clear. The Paris manuscript ought to have been copied from Shehid ‘Ali Pasha, and we may even assume that this copy was already made before 749. It is known that Șafadî continued working on al-Wâﬁ in a relatively systematic fashion up to 753, but this does not exclude the possibility that fair copies were made before that date.

But, as has been mentioned before, there are doubts about all that. I should have liked to find the biography of ‘Abdallâh b. Ahmad al-Wâﬁ ‘Alam al-Dîn b. al-Qâdî Tâj al-Dîn b. Zanbûr (only in Paris, vol. 17 no. 54) in its place (or any place) on a glued-in paper or a marginal note in SAP. But disappointingly, I did not find it at all.

The verses mentioned with the biography of al-Shaikh Taqî al-Dîn b. Tamâm (vol. 17 no. 48, verses only in Paris manuscript) are likewise missing in SAP.

Thus, we cannot tell from which manuscript these Paris particularities were taken. But we still may assume that the writers of that manuscript had (among others) the Shehid ʿAli Pasha manuscripts at their disposal.

To propose an explanation, I wonder whether it is possible that Șafadî (who, as we know, never wrote a fair copy of al-Wâﬁ himself)21 dictated it instead, and that on this occasion, several fair copies were made simultaneously. This would resemble a public collation, a procedure known to have taken place for A’yan al-ʿAṣr.22

**Notes**

* University of Hamburg.

**Author’s note.** This paper is based on research I did in Istanbul in 1990 and 1991. On this occasion, I would like to thank Prof. Erika Glassen, director of the Orient Institut; Prof. Ulrich Haarmann, co-publisher of Bibliotheca Islamica, for his encouragement and support. Information about Cairo manuscripts is due to Prof. Aiman Fu‘ād Sayyid, whose help I gratefully acknowledge. Above all, I am greatly indebted to the director of the Süleymaniye library, Muammer Ülker, and the head librarian, Mine Özen, as well as the library’s staff who kindly and generously helped me in my work. — An earlier version of this paper was presented to the XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag at Munich, April 1991.


Gabrieli, G.: Appendice. Altri manoscritti di Șafadî Wâﬁ. In: Rendiconti, vol. 25 (Roma 1917), p. 1165 ff. The Cairo autographic fragment has the no. 43. This article includes a description of the Cairo manuscript Tâmâriyya târîkh mîm 125 by Z.V. Togan (in French).

The first volume of the edition includes a general description of the principles underlying the project. Gabrieli’s article as well as the first volume of the edition include photographs of Șafadî’s handwriting as well as proof for the authenticity of the autographs.

2 Cf. Little, Donald: al-Șafadî as Biographer of his Contemporaries. In: Essays on Islamic Civilization presented to Nyazi Berkes. Leiden 1976. Little quite rightly states that vol. 2 of the edition was published nearly twenty years after vol. 1. His remark that the edition advanced so slowly after the Second World War that it would get no further than the Muhammad section seems to be belied, however, by the fact that the remaining (9 out of 29) volumes have all been assigned to editors and are now in various stages of preparation.


4 Cf. note 1.

5 Cf. note 1.


8 Ritter in vol. 1.

9 Cf. the corresponding list in the khâtoma van Ess wrote to this volume which he edited.

10 All the volumes in NO have several paginations. Cf. Krawulsky’s khâtoma to vol. 17. She has also discovered which is the original one, which I could not use, however, since the numbers are not to be found on every sheet; even if they were, they would not permit one’s locating a quota-
tion in the given volume. Thus, the page numbers in this article refer to a simple chronological pagination, which is in small oriental (not European) Arabic numbers. Every page, including the pages glued in and those with no text on them, has its own number. It is thus the only pagination fit for quoting.

I believe that Ritter (who mentions in his article that he did the descriptions rather in a hurry) was led astray by the fact that NO 3196 takes us nearly up to the end of the alphabet. It is not evident that there is another volume that begins with ُبَاء again.

The pagination mentioned for the NO manuscripts (cf. note 10) is missing in AS 4036. This manuscript was at some point paginated in the same fashion as the NO volumes, but it counts folios instead of pages.

The inventory booklet kept at the OIB lists all the microfilms available there. Although the Orient-Institut is officially not in Beirut (but in Istanbul) at the present date, the library and with it the microfilms have not been moved.

I owe the reference to “Photo Chehbal” to Dr. W.D. Lemke of the Orient Institut.

The 3 entries from the ُأبَا بَكْر section are mentioned by J. Sublet and A. Amara in their khātima to vol. 10. — The 3 entries from the Gotha list are: Muhammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Ahmād b. 'Alī b. Muzaffār b. 'Abdallāh Fakhr al-Dīn; Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Mun'im Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Mu'tān al-Manfūlah and Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān Sharaf al-Dīn “b. hānī Ṣa'd”. The two doubles are: Tayhughā al-

16 The names are: ِIbrāhīm Abū Rāfī’ mawlā Rasūl Allāh and ِIbrāhīm Abū Isāq al-Bazāwī al-Qairawānī; both NO 3197, p. 7. Further: Ḥamād b. Ḥawās mutawallī Dimashq, p. 143; Ḥaṃza b. Asad b. Ṣa'd b. al-Qalānī, p. 175; Ḥumād b. Fadl b. Ṣūd, p. 171; and Ḥumād b. Ḥawās al-Uqailī, p. 191. The seventh person is Ḥamād b. Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Khāṭābī, p. 112. This entry has been crossed out in the ms, but it is quite legible (several other entries have been deleted in such a way that everything but the person’s ism is illegible). We have to include this Ḥamād in the missing biographies even if Ṣafādī did not want to have him in the final version.

Both the volumes and the registers have been checked. There are instances where a tarjuma is missing in the register, but is present in the book.

Ritter. article quoted in note 1.

Other instances of persons whose patronyms were unknown to Ṣafādī are quoted by van Ess, Ṣafādī-Splitter I (note 7), p. 252. These are also placed at the end of the corresponding section.

For Subkī as a source for Ṣafādī, cf. Little’s article quoted in note 2, p. 205.

Cf. van Ess, Ṣafādī-Splitter, p. 249.

This is suggested by van Ess in his article, i.e.

Little, l.c., p. 209.