Establishing Ibn ʿArabī's Heritage

First findings from the MIAS Archiving Project

Jane Clark and Stephen Hirtenstein

Ibn ʿArabī has long been regarded as one of the most inventive and prolific writers within the Islamic tradition, with very large numbers of books and treatises attributed to him. For instance, in his seminal bibliography of Ibn ʿArabī's works published in the 1960s,[1] Osman Yahia listed in excess of 850 separate titles which have in some way been associated with him. Many of these are clearly misattributed, as Yahia himself pointed out, and today it is widely accepted that the actual number is much less, probably in the region of 300 to 350. This number would seem to be supported by the evidence of two lists which Ibn ʿArabī himself composed: the *Fihris al-muʾallafāt* (RG 142), of which there is a surviving certified copy,[2] and *Ijāza li al-malik al-Muẓaffar* (RG 269).[3] These list 248 and *ca.* 290 works respectively,[4] amounting to 296 distinct texts. In addition, there are 20 works mentioned in Ibn ʿArabī's other writings, making a total of 316. However, according to Yahia, only 106 have manuscripts that have survived to the present day, posing questions about the fate of the other 210 'lost' works.[5]

1. Osman Yahia, *Histoire et Classification de l'Oeuvre d'Ibn ʿArabī* (Damascus, 1964), 2 vols.
2. Yusuf Ağa 7838, fols. 188b–193b, written by Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī. The title page is missing, but a copy of the whole manuscript has also survived (Hamidiye 188, 139b–144a). However, contrary to Yahia's claim, it is unclear when it was written.
3. The manuscript base for this work is much less secure, the earliest known surviving copy being dated 973H (Ulu Cami 1600, fols. 175b–179a).
4. See *Histoire*, pp. 37–56.
5. See *Histoire*, pp. 54–6. Yahia mentions a total of 317 works cited by Ibn ʿArabī, but this seems to be a simple mathematical error.

Following the publication of Yahia's *Histoire et Classification de l'Oeuvre d'Ibn 'Arabī* in 1964, very little work was done on the bibliography as a whole until we began re-investigating the exact corpus of Ibn 'Arabī's works some ten years ago. In the intervening period, the *Histoire*, and the mode of classification Yahia adopted of giving each separate work a separate RG number (RG = *Répertoire Général*), has become the standard work of reference for Ibn 'Arabī studies. The existence of a good bibliography has without doubt been a very important factor in the enormous expansion in scholarship and translation which has taken place over the last fifty years. However, it is increasingly clear that some revision is now required: as libraries have modernised, the naming and numbering of some collections (even page numbers) have been altered, volumes have been rebound etc., so that finding the manuscripts which Yahia mentions is sometimes impossible. Another consideration is that as scholarship has developed and individual researchers have worked on particular texts, a number of significant inaccuracies in the cataloguing have come to light. Perhaps more importantly, as more libraries have catalogued their collections and modern techniques such as digitisation have opened up the contents of previously inaccessible collections, there is much new material which has come to light and needs to be included.

In determining the core Ibn 'Arabī texts, Yahia based his research upon various written sources in addition to the *Fihris* and *Ijāza*, including books mentioned by Ibn 'Arabī in his works (which do not appear in his auto-bibliographies) or by other early authors, library catalogues and general bibliographies such as those done by 'Awwād and Brockelmann.[6] In total he classified just over 2,500 manuscripts, of which he personally consulted some 1,900.[7] This article takes a rather different approach, working solely from the extant manuscript base and concentrating particularly upon the 'historic' manuscripts, i.e.

---

6. See *Histoire*, pp. 55–71; Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1943), pp. 571–82 and S1 (ibid, 1937); 'Awwād, *RAAD*, vols. 2, 3 (1955).

7. See *Histoire*, pp. 67–71.

those which carry some sort of annotation or indication which authenticates their attribution to Ibn ʿArabī. As such, it is one outcome of a larger project undertaken by the Muhyiddin Ibn ʿArabi Society, which since 2001 has examined around 2,800 manuscripts[8] with a view to creating a digital archive of 'historic' manuscripts alongside a specially designed database to catalogue the precise details of each work. The Archiving Project has the dual purpose of preserving the akbarian heritage and facilitating publication and scholarship; in particular, it aims to create a sound manuscript foundation for the production of good critical editions. This has necessitated gathering together the texts that most faithfully conform to the author's original intentions and, by extension, classifying them according to authenticity. Below we discuss the criteria that we have developed to determine the authenticity of a work and, in so doing, present some of our initial findings.

The overall result of this research is that on the basis of the current historic manuscript base (including only those which we have had access to), we estimate that there are 84 extant works which we can be certain were actually written by Ibn ʿArabī himself, with a further 11 that have a high probability of being authentic, amounting to a core corpus of 95. Of these, only 20 are currently available in a good critical edition (with a further 14 in progress), giving an indication of the scale of the task which still faces contemporary scholars.

SCOPE

When it was initiated eleven years ago, the primary focus of the Muhyiddin Ibn ʿArabi Society Archiving Project was to create a digital archive of the best surviving manuscripts. There is a large concentration of very early manuscripts preserved in the libraries of modern Turkey, a function of the importance given to the akbarian tradition by successive political, intellectual

---

8. Of these, 1664 are by Ibn ʿArabī himself; the rest are by important followers such as al-Qūnawī, or have simply been noted because they appear in the same collection as an Ibn ʿArabī text.

and religious elites since the time of the Seljuks.[9] Our first task, therefore, was to visit the very rich collections in Istanbul and Konya, using Yahia's *Histoire* as a guide to identifying the key manuscripts. Later visits were also made to libraries in Bursa, Manisa and Ankara, where a number of important manuscripts not seen by Yahia were identified and classified. More recently, as the Turkish libraries have developed their own digitisation programme in the two main centres of the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul and the Bölge Manuscript Library (Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi) in Konya, it has become possible to view digital versions of manuscripts from many smaller provincial libraries, such as Amasya and Çorum, which again have revealed important previously unknown texts. Outside Turkey, our investigations so far have systematically covered the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin and the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin. In addition, there have been some important and generous additions from private collections, such as a digital copy of an autograph volume of the *Dīwān* courtesy of the Nasser D. Khalili Collection in London, plus several significant donations of copies from colleagues and Society members from libraries around the world, including Syria, Azerbaijan, Egypt, Iran, Tunisia and France. In the Appendix we list the libraries whose collections have been systematically covered. Unlike Osman Yahia, who in some cases worked from library catalogues without viewing the manuscripts themselves, we have only catalogued texts that we have personally examined.

The project has not yet systematically covered all the major manuscript libraries, which remains the stated aim of the research. Therefore, the lists of Ibn ʿArabī's extant works presented below must be considered a work in progress; it is to be expected that as more research is completed they will be amended and extended. However, we believe that given the fact that so much important historic material has remained within the Turkish library system, the project has covered a sufficiently wide base to allow for a major re-assessment of the extant heritage.

9. See Jane Clark, 'Early Best-sellers in the Akbarian Tradition', *JMIAS* 33 (2003), pp. 27, 38.

CRITERIA

Our major focus has been on what we term 'historic manuscripts', by which we mean that a manuscript copy should fulfil at least one of the following basic criteria:

(1) It is written in the hand of Ibn ʿArabī himself or by one of his close associates during his lifetime, or it carries Ibn ʿArabī's signature as part of an authenticating certificate.

(2) It carries a note stating that it was copied from an original manuscript as defined above, or from a copy which was made from such an original.

(3) It was written prior to 730/1330, that is, within some ninety years of Ibn ʿArabī's death. This cut-off date has been chosen because it is the death-date of ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Kāshānī, a student of al-Qūnawī's principal disciple, Muʾayyid al-Dīn al-Jandī (d.700/1300). Thus it provides a marker for the first three generations of followers, during which period, it would appear from our research, copies were still being made within a relatively small circle with traceable connections to the original groups in Damascus and Konya. A manuscript written during this period would probably only have gone through one or two copying processes, and is therefore likely to contain fewer deviations or errors than the copies which have often been used to generate modern printed editions, many of which were written four or five centuries later.

Using these guidelines, we have so far identified 333 historic copies of Ibn ʿArabī's works spread across some 130 collections.[10] A breakdown of the different categories is given in the following

10. In practice, we have digitised far more than this number of manuscripts. This was partly because of the aim to gather enough material to enable good critical editions of the major works: in many cases, there were insufficient historic manuscripts to provide enough copies with adequate clarity. Another factor was a developing preference to digitise whole collections rather than isolating single works, as it seemed increasingly important to consider a text in context. The total number of individual manuscripts in the archive currently numbers 1182, of which 850 are by Ibn ʿArabī.

table. To give an idea of the comparative significance of these figures, we may note that in the same period only 27 historic copies of al-Qūnawī's works are extant. It should be pointed out that in certain cases a manuscript fulfils two or more of the criteria: for instance, a text written in Ibn 'Arabī's hand must also have been written before 638H. Also, in one or two cases, we have seen fit to classify a manuscript as historic even when it does not strictly adhere to the criteria. A case in point are the three works in the collection Köprülü 766, which carry no notes about date or provenance at all: however, the physical evidence of the handwriting, the paper and the style of book, as well as the contents of the text, indicate that they are very early indeed, almost certainly within Ibn 'Arabī's lifetime.

Historic manuscripts of Ibn 'Arabī's works

(1)	Written by Ibn 'Arabī or a close companion	49
(2)	Copied from an authenticated original	160
	possibly copied from an original	34
(3)	Copied within Ibn 'Arabī's lifetime	46
	within al-Qūnawī's lifetime	117
	prior to 730H	265

The figure of 49 works that fulfil the first criteria is astonishingly high, given the fact that it is now nearly eight hundred years since Ibn 'Arabī lived and all the vicissitudes of time. It constitutes a manuscript heritage which would appear to be unique not only within the Islamic tradition, but for any major world thinker of a comparable age. We should also note that in terms of volume, these manuscripts represent a very high proportion of the extant heritage, as included in this category are copies of most of the known long works. For example, there are extant copies of: *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* (RG 135)[11] and *K. al-'Abādila* (RG 2)[12] in Ibn 'Arabī's own hand; *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* (RG

11. Evkaf Müzesi 1845–81. Vol. 8 is actually a facsimile in a later hand.
12. Yusuf Ağa 4859, fols. 2a–84a.

150)[13] and *Mawāqiʿ al-nujūm* (RG 443)[14] written by al-Qūnawī; two versions of *al-Tanazzulāt al-Mawṣiliyya* (RG 762), one written by Ibn ʿArabī himself and one copied by his close disciple Ayyūb b. Badr al-Muqrī;[15] and copies of *K. ʿAnqāʾ mughrib* (RG 30) and *K. al-Isrāʾ* (RG 313), written in Ibn ʿArabī's lifetime by other disciples.[16]

The detailed ancillary information that such texts provide offers unparalleled insights into the life and times of Ibn ʿArabī and his close circle. For instance, the handwriting gives us an intimate insight into particular individuals, not only the author but also his close disciples such as Badr al-Ḥabashī and Ismāʿīl Ibn Sawdakīn. This can be seen in the copy of the *R. Rūḥ al-quds fī munāṣaḥat al-nafs* (RG 639) in the University Library in Istanbul (University A79), which is designated as al-Ḥabashī's *riwāya* (a verified copy which could be transmitted to others), and may even be in his handwriting. In Yahia's classification, many manuscripts are described as 'autograph', meaning that they were in Ibn ʿArabī's hand or carried his signature or a short statement by him. Our research has necessitated a clarification of this somewhat ambiguous term, and a way of distinguishing an 'autograph' (a manuscript containing an authenticating statement by the author) from a 'holograph' (a manuscript wholly written by the author). So far we have found at least 21 Ibn ʿArabī holographs, which provide examples of both his draft (*musawwad*) and fair (*mubayyaḍ*) hand.[17]

There are several other significant elements that are found on the manuscripts. The way that a work is titled and the author's name is styled afford clues to the source of a copy.[18] A colophon at the beginning or, more commonly, at the end of a work may give details of the author's name, date and place of composition,

---

13. Evkaf Müzesi 1933, fols. 1a–78a.

14. Yusuf Ağa 5001, fols. 1a–165b.

15. Murad Molla 162 and 1257 respectively.

16. Private 1 fols. 1a–33a and Veliyuddin 1628.

17. We intend to devote a future article to the complex issue of Ibn ʿArabī's handwriting.

18. See Stephen Hirtenstein, 'Manuscripts of Ibn ʿArabī's Works: Names and Titles of Ibn [al-]ʿArabī', *JMIAS* 41 (2007), pp. 109–29.

the scribe or copyist's name, place of transcription and so on, resembling the imprint page found in a modern book. The colophon may also include details of how the copy was collated with the original: it was common practice for collation to be done either by recitation of the newly made copy back to the author or by a physical comparison of the two texts done by the scribe himself. For example, a copy of *Maqṣid al-asmāʾ* (RG 418), entitled *al-Madkhal ilā maʿrifat al-asmāʾ al-ilāhiyya wa al-kināyāt*, was made by Ayyūb b. Badr on 12 Ramaḍān 621H (27 September 1224) in the presence of the author and then checked against Ibn ʿArabī's original in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus.[19]

In addition, most early works carry a detailed audition certificate (*samāʿ*), registering the reading of the text, where and when it was read, who was present, etc. These *samāʿ*s give unique details of Ibn ʿArabī's circle, allowing us to reconstruct a whole milieu. For example, those on different sections of the *Futūḥāt* provide some 150 names of disciples over an eighteen-year period,[20] whilst the numerous *samāʿ*s on University A79 record the reading of the *Rūḥ al-quds* between 600H and 634H in various towns, thus allowing us to reconstruct the journey Ibn ʿArabī made from Mecca to Anatolia, and include the names of all those present at the readings as well as three examples of the author's signature.

Nevertheless, not every manuscript carries such precious details. For example, some of the manuscripts held as part of al-Qūnawī's private library (now in the Yusuf Ağa library in Konya) carry no ancillary information at all; in these cases an assessment has had to be made on the basis of other factors, such as handwriting or the fact that they formed part of the *waqf* (the charitable foundation) established after al-Qūnawī's death.[21]

19. Shehit Ali 2813, fols. 12a–17b.

20. See Claude Addas, *Quest for the Red Sulphur* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 264–8, for an overview of these certificates.

21. Detailed bibliographical comments, including our rationale for the classification of the manuscripts, can be viewed in the Archive Catalogue (available online through the Society).

Our cataloguing has taken all these factors into account and, as a result, in a number of cases our assessment of a manuscript differs significantly from that made by Yahia in the *Histoire*. Sometimes this is because we have been unable to find evidence for the status he grants to a text. One example is the important long collection Carullah 986, containing 34 core works by Ibn ʿArabī, which Yahia catalogues as being written in the lifetime of the author. Neither we, nor Elmore who used this text for his study of K. *'Anqā' mughrib*,[22] could find any evidence for this, and therefore, although it is a sound text and the indications of paper and handwriting would support an early date, we have not felt justified in giving it full historic manuscript status.[23] In other cases, we found that Yahia had assumed that information at the end of one manuscript extended to all the other manuscripts in the collection. Such an assumption, in our opinion, is unjustified: where a manuscript has been taken from a special copy, the scribe is almost always very careful to record the fact, even if this means adding virtually the same note to a long series of manuscripts.[24] By extension, therefore, the absence of a colophon probably indicates that there was nothing noteworthy about the original exemplar it was copied from. Consequently, we have been careful to categorise each manuscript within a collection separately, recording details about dates and copying when they are specifically present.

The resulting change of status for some manuscripts has potentially significant implications for determining the authenticity of works. For example, in the long Carullah 2080 collection, which is dated 791–3H, only two of the 34 works – K. *al-Quṭb* (RG 585) and *al-Tanazzulāt al-Mawṣiliyya* (RG 762) – carry notes indicating that they were copied from authenticated

22. See Gerald Elmore, *Islamic Sainthood in the Fullness of Time* (Leiden, 1999), p. 200.

23. In this case, all the works are verified from other sources, with the exception of a very short unique extract provisionally entitled by a later scribe as K. *al-Falak wa al-samāʿ* (RG 123).

24. For an example of this on another manuscript, see Jane Clark and Denis McAuley, 'Manuscripts of Ibn ʿArabī's Works: Some Notes on the Manuscript Veliyuddin 51', *JMIAS* 40 (2006), pp. 101–15.

originals. However, Yahia extended this status to all the works, including *al-Madkhal fī ʿilm al-ḥurūf* (RG 384) and *Risāla mutaʿalliqa bi al-qalb* (RG 631), for which this manuscript is crucial to establishing their pedigree. If one follows Yahia, therefore, one would regard these as fully verified works, but following our system, there remains a significant element of doubt.

Similar problems arise with dating. It is quite common for only some works in a collection to be dated, or for there to be a date on the *fihris* (list of contents) which may or may not apply to the whole collection. Here there is some justification for extending a date to other works: for instance, when the collection is a coherent one, clearly written in the same hand throughout, one can infer that the works were copied within a similar time frame. In other cases, however, where collections consist of a diverse set of texts in different hands, on different paper or in styles indicating different time periods, it is more problematic to do so.

Where a manuscript lacks any indication of date, various other factors have to be taken into account when deciding whether to give it the status of a historic manuscript, such as handwriting, paper, the internal evidence of the text, etc. In practice, it is rare for the status of a manuscript to be determined by date alone, but it is often a contributory factor when assessing evidence.

DETERMINING THE CORE HERITAGE

Having determined the size and extent of the historic manuscript base, we then began assessing the likelihood of a work being a *bona fide* Ibn ʿArabī composition. In determining this, the existence of a historic manuscript of the work is an important factor, but other factors have also been taken into account: for instance, internal textual evidence and whether it is referred to in Ibn ʿArabī's other works. In undertaking this task, we have been able to draw upon both published and unpublished works of many contemporary scholars, of whom Michel Chodkiewicz deserves special mention, who generously made detailed comments upon our early listings. We have developed

seven separate categories, explained below, to clarify the status of a particular work. While some texts are clearly established as either being by Ibn ʿArabī or not, there are many cases where authorship is quite uncertain: here we would expect the categorisation to change as future research and scholarship clarifies the status of a particular work, thus our database would be updated accordingly.

(1) Verified A: number of works = 71

This is the core gold-standard group, about which there is no doubt at all concerning Ibn ʿArabī's authorship and where the text is completely sound (see Table 1, pp. 20–3). It includes most of the well-known and well-established works. To qualify for this category, there must be at least one extant historic manuscript with a specified provenance which fulfils criteria 1 or 2 above (see p. 6), i.e. that it is a holograph or autograph, or can be traced back to such a copy. Our research shows that manuscripts that fulfil only the third criterion of an early date are insufficient to provide authentification of authorship, as it is clear that works were being misattributed within decades of Ibn ʿArabī's death.

Many of the core works are very well supported and have more than one authenticating manuscript, in some cases as many as seven or eight. On close examination, however, it can be seen that they often derive from a single original. *K. al-Isrāʾ*, for instance, has two excellent historic texts: one made by an Andalusian disciple named Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Qurṭubī from an original in Ibn ʿArabī's hand, carrying a *samāʿ* at the author's house in Damascus in 633H and an authenticating signature by the author;[25] and the other a copy of al-Qūnawī's copy, which the latter made from Ibn ʿArabī's own copy in 628H and then read out in front of him in 630H, also with a verifying signature.[26] It is fairly reasonable to conclude that both of these were taken from the same original

25. Veliyuddin 1628, fols. 1a–75b.
26. Ragib Paşa 1453, fols. 81a–132a.

which was in Ibn 'Arabī's possession at the time and has sub-sequently disappeared. Copies of either manuscript would in theory result in the same text, although in practice over time families of manuscripts tend to develop based upon variant readings. While this is most commonly due to scribal error, it may also reflect different readings of an often unvowelled text.

It may equally be the outcome of differences in the original text itself. In several cases we have evidence of more than one 'original'. Unlike our modern conceptions of a book, which tend to be somewhat fixed, Ibn 'Arabī's compositions are best viewed as organic artistic creations, susceptible to change according to new insights and a different audience. Whereas a new edition of a printed book today is always noted in the small print, such changes in an age of manuscripts are harder to track. There are many examples of how Ibn 'Arabī redrafted his own work, the best known of which is the second recension of the *Futūḥāt*, completed in 636H, which has significant differences from the first recension completed seven years earlier. Similarly, the much shorter *al-Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Ṣūfiyya* (RG 315) exists in three different 'editions': one copied in Damascus by Ayyūb b. Badr,[27] a second copied in Konya from a text written in Malatya in 615H,[28] and a third which is included in the *Futūḥāt*. Thus, even where the basic authenticity of a text is not in doubt, there may be multiple versions to be considered.[29]

(2) Verified B: number of works = 13

In the case of these works (see Table 2, p. 23), the manuscript base is not absolutely definitive since the copies do not mention any original from which they were made, but internal evidence is conclusive proof of Ibn 'Arabī's authorship. A good example is *al-Durra al-fākhira* (RG 105), for which the two surviving

---

27. See Manisa 1183, ca. 650H.

28. See Milli 571, 668H.

29. For an example of the 'stability' of a text with variants rather than the idea of a critical edition, see Suha Taji-Farouki, *A Prayer for Spiritual Elevation and Protection* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 74–5 et passim.

manuscripts, which are dated 715H and 1006H,[30] carry no information about provenance. However, the work describes Ibn ʿArabī's Andalusian masters in a manner so similar to events related in the very well-authenticated *Rūḥ al-quds* that there can be no doubt that the two works are written by the same author. The same considerations apply to *Muḥāḍarat al-abrār*, for which again there are no historic manuscripts at present.[31]

(3) Probable: number of works = 11

For works in this category, the historic base is not definitive and, while other internal evidence may be persuasive, it is not absolutely certain (see Table 3, p. 24). Good examples are the two prayers, *K. Awrād al-usbūʿ* (RG 64) and *Dawr al-aʿlā* (known also as *Ḥizb al-wiqāya*, RG 244), for which there are no historic manuscripts at all, with nothing extant from before the 10th/16th century. However, Beneito and Hirtenstein, who have published a translation of the *Awrād*, argue for its authenticity on the grounds of content,[32] as does Taji-Farouki in the case of the *Dawr*.[33] Another notable example is *Ikhtiṣār al-sīra al-nabawiyya al-Muḥammadiyya* (RG 276), for which there are very few surviving manuscripts.[34] However, Beneito has undertaken a study and part-translation of the text[35] and makes a case for its inclusion in the corpus of accepted works. In addition, there is reported to be a manuscript dated 701H in Jerusalem, which we have not yet been able to inspect.

30. Veliyuddin 1800 and Esad Efendi 1777, respectively.

31. The earliest known copy is Esad Efendi 1897, dated 933H, although we have heard that there may be an autograph copy in a private collection. There also seems to be a much earlier copy in the Topkapı Library in Istanbul (Topkapı A2451), which according to the catalogue is dated 712H. We have not yet been able to inspect either of these manuscripts.

32. See Pablo Beneito and Stephen Hirtenstein, *The Seven Days of the Heart* (Oxford, 2000), p. 22.

33. *A Prayer for Spiritual Elevation*, pp. 1–2.

34. We have only inspected one so far: Ayasofia 765, dated 885H (RG 765).

35. 'A Summary of the Life of the Prophet by Ibn ʿArabī', *JMIAS* 30 (2001), pp. 73–103.

(4) Unverified: number of works = 62

This category is set up for works which we have inspected but for which there is not enough available evidence at present to assess the authenticity (see Table 4, pp. 24–6).

In some cases this is because there is a very small manuscript base, in which the one or two known manuscripts are either late or undated. In other cases, where there are several surviving copies, different texts may have been conflated, or neither the ancillary information nor the content provide firm proof of authorship. One example is *K. al-Ḥikam* (RG 233), for which Yahia lists 20 manuscript copies: the earliest with a definite date, Halet 821, is dated 1030H, and we were unable to verify Yahia's claim that University A3531 (dated 1322H) was copied from an original. The question of authorship, therefore, must remain open in these cases until further information becomes available.

(5) Not by Ibn ʿArabī: number of works = 73

These are works for which, in most cases, we have definite information indicating that they have been wrongly attributed (see Table 5, pp. 27–9). This is not a definitive list as there are many RG entries recording probable misattribution, but it does cover some of the more prominent examples in the field. This is an important category since works are still routinely ascribed to Ibn ʿArabī which were clearly not written by him. Examples include *Rasāʾil Ibn ʿArabī*, published in Abu Dhabi in 1998, a collection of 12 treatises which the publishers claim Ibn ʿArabī wrote in the last years of his life, but which are all apocryphal and most likely to have been composed by one of his Persian disciples, Ḥamawayh; or the 4-volume *Rasāʾil Ibn ʿArabī*, published in Beirut in 2002 to 2004, which combines verified and apocryphal works in a most confusing manner.

In some instances, information within the text makes it impossible for it to be an authentic Ibn ʿArabī work: for example, *Khalʿ al-naʿlayn fī al-uṣūl ilā ḥaḍrat al-jamʿayn* (which Yahia lists as RG 253.1) states that the author had a vision in 1001H, more

than three hundred and sixty years after Ibn ʿArabī's lifetime, while *R. al-Miʿrāj* (RG 473) is based upon a mystical experience which took place three months after Ibn ʿArabī's death. For other works the textual evidence is not so clear-cut, but the case against authorship rests upon a detailed analysis of the content: Denis Gril, for instance, has argued convincingly that one of the most celebrated akbarian works in Ottoman times, *al-Shajara al-nuʿmāniyya* (RG 665), is not by Ibn ʿArabī,[36] and we have followed his reasoning.

In other cases the work is known to be by another author. Thus works by al-Qūnawī are often found attributed to his master (e.g. *Shuʿab al-īmān*, RG 755), as have works by other followers such as Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh (RG 221, 226, 302.1), Sitt al-ʿAjam (*Kashf al-Kunūz*, RG 337), ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Jīlī (RG 266), ʿAbd Allāh al-Busnawī (RG 253.1) and Abū al-Fatḥ Muḥammad al-Wafāʾ (RG 803).

Sometimes a work is found attributed to both Ibn ʿArabī and another author, without any clear indication as to which is correct. In these cases, our tendency has been to assume that it is not by Ibn ʿArabī if it is often attributed to someone else, on the basis that Ibn ʿArabī's extraordinary fame within the Islamic mystical tradition provided a strong incentive to attribute texts to him. An example of this more complex situation is *R. al-Aḥadiyya* (RG 13), a popular and much copied work.[37] However, it is also found attributed in about half the extant manuscripts to the Persian master Awḥad al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh al-Balyānī (d.686/1287), and Michel Chodkiewicz has made a convincing case on textual grounds for this being the correct judgement.

In one or two cases, a work has been put into this category, not because there is a known alternative author, but simply because there is no attribution to any author at all on the

36. See Denis Gril, 'The Enigma of the *Shajara al-nuʿmāniyya*', *JMIAS* 43 (2008), pp. 51–74.

37. Apart from the numerous manuscripts, it has been translated into French by Michel Chodkiewicz as *Épître sur l'Unicité Absolue* (Paris, 1982), and into English by Cecilia Twinch as *Know Yourself* (Sherborne, 2011).

manuscripts we have inspected (they are nevertheless classified by libraries as a work by Ibn ʿArabī). These appear in Table 5 without a proposed alternative author.

In other cases there are copies of works known to be by other authors to which Osman Yahia has given an RG number. An example of this is *K. Faḍl shahādat al-tawḥīd*,[38] a section from the famous Sufi text *K. Qūt al-qulūb* by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 386/996), which Ibn ʿArabī himself copied out.

(6) Extracts: number of works = 36

This category collects together works which Yahia listed as independent works but which, on inspection, have been found to be extracts from longer ones (see Table 6, pp. 30–1). Most of these are taken from the *Futūḥāt*: for example, *R. Arḍ al-ḥaqīqa* (RG 40), which is clearly marked as Chapter 8, or the often-copied *Waṣāya al-Shaykh al-Akbar* (RG 818), which is Chapter 560. However, issues can arise about this categorisation, in that some extracts were very frequently copied as independent works and took on a life of their own. An example is *ʿAqīdat ahl al-Islām* (RG 34), which is from the first chapter of the *Futūḥāt*, for which Yahia lists 18 manuscripts. This we have regarded as an extract because it closely replicates the text in the original work.

In other cases we have left the question open, particularly where there are significant textual differences from the longer work: for instance, *K. al-Aqṭāb* (RG 35) is very similar in content to Chapters 462 to 489 in the *Futūḥāt*, but there are sufficient textual variations to indicate that it was not merely copied from it. In fact it would appear to be an earlier prototype version which was later incorporated into the *Futūḥāt* (see below). A similar situation can be found in two poetic works, *K. al-Muʿashsharāt* (RG 484) and *al-Muwashshaḥāt* (RG 517), which reproduce sets of poems also found in the *Dīwān*: both the order in which they are presented and the number of textual variations indicate that they are not mere copies and

38. Yusuf Ağa 7838, fols. 1–45.

we have therefore left in place their status as separate works. Here again, it is likely that these were originally composed as works in their own right and later incorporated into the larger collection, albeit with some modification.

(7) Duplicates: number of works = 20

Yahia often categorised a manuscript under two or even three different works, which in many cases turn out to be the same work with a variant title. We have tried to gather these manuscripts together under one title, denoting the other/s as a duplicate (see Table 7, p. 31). For example, Esad Efendi 1777 is listed under RG 105 as *al-Durra al-fākhira*, and also under RG 496 as *Mukhtaṣar al-Durra al-fākhira* along with Veliyuddin 1800. But inspection of the manuscripts indicates that there is only one work here, and so RG 496 has been classified as a duplicate.

CONCLUSIONS

Clearly, despite the seemingly solid material evidence of extant manuscripts, there remain many issues and uncertainties surrounding the classification of Ibn ʿArabī's works. There will no doubt continue to be discussion and debate about the status of certain works; as further work is done on the actual texts – a process which we hope the digital archive will facilitate – it is to be hoped that a much finer and more complete understanding of Ibn ʿArabī's written heritage will emerge.

However, the most important finding to emerge from this research is that there is a core corpus of 84 extant works which can be attributed to Ibn ʿArabī without any doubt, supported by evidence from a large historical base of manuscripts. As we have shown, the vast majority of these works are authenticated by more than one historic source and, by definition, exist in versions which are sufficiently close to the original to assure us not only of their authenticity but also their accuracy, i.e. their faithfulness to the author's intention. The fact that these 84 works include most of Ibn ʿArabī's long compositions,

including the two master works, *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, a huge *Dīwān* and a further 14 works which in manuscript form are longer than 30 pages, means that there is a truly remarkable extant body of authentic writings.

There remains the question of what might have happened to the 200 or so other works which Ibn ʿArabī lists in his *Fihris* and *Ijāza*, and for which there appears to be no surviving copy. One answer is that there are without doubt many more extant manuscripts than we have seen: some may be in libraries not yet visited or properly catalogued and some in private collections which are hidden from public scrutiny. During the course of this project, for example, we have been fortunate to come across two such manuscripts in private collections: one is the fourth volume of the holograph *Dīwān*, which carries the seal of the Ottoman sultan Selim I and is now held in the Khalili Collection;[39] the other is a set of three works, that was once part of a larger collection written by a known disciple of Ibn ʿArabī in 637H in Damascus, i.e. in the last year of the author's life.[40] There is a strong probability that more material like this will emerge in years to come, thus providing either copies of works for which there is at present no extant text but which we have good reason to think existed, such as the commentary on the Qurʾan, or further evidence which would authenticate some of the 62 works which at present are classified as 'unverified'.

A second answer may be that many works have been lost over the intervening centuries. However, this is highly unlikely to account for as many as 200 works, given that copies of works in the early period seem to have been preserved and passed on with a most meticulous attention and care. In fact, our research reveals that the early collections show considerable stability in their content, with many major works copied two or three times by different scribes in known circumstances. Although some works may not have been copied for specific reasons, such

39. Khalili 225.

40. The copy was made by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Anṣārī, who was present at readings of the *Futūḥāt* and also copied Manisa 1183, a collection of 13 works not seen by Yahia.

as the *Awrād*, which were not considered suitable for public dissemination,[41] these are likely to be exceptions to the rule and unlikely to account for a loss of works on such a large scale.

The third and perhaps most plausible explanation for the discrepancy is that many of the smaller works which are mentioned in the auto-bibliographies were absorbed into the final version of the *Futūḥāt*, and there was subsequently no reason for them to be copied separately by disciples. The first recension of the *Futūḥāt*, which was begun in 601H in Mecca, was completed in 629H in Damascus, i.e. after the composition of the *Fihris* (627H) and prior to the *Ijāza* (632H). There is some evidence to support the theory of the absorption of works: for example, *K. al-Aqṭāb*, of which only one very early copy (Köprülü 766) has survived, is undoubtedly the prototype for the section on the spiritual Poles in the *Futūḥāt* (Chapters 462 to 489),[42] and Yahia himself lists 173 other works for which he found a significant correlation with the *Futūḥāt*.[43] A similar situation almost certainly exists within the poetic works, with smaller works being absorbed into the *Dīwān al-kabīr*, which was also completed late in the author's life in Damascus.

While this research into the historic manuscript base does not give us an absolutely definitive and complete picture of Ibn ʿArabī's total written output, it does provide a very clear picture of the actual heritage that has come down to the present day. It shows that the authenticated body of works, large and well supported though it is, is considerably less than the 300-plus traditionally attributed to Ibn ʿArabī. At the same time, the relatively high number of manuscripts which can be traced directly back to a copy written by the author means that the heritage is exceptional in providing quality material which is textually accurate. Surprisingly, there are at present few critical editions of the Arabic texts or translations into western languages. Hence, the most immediate task must surely be to

41. Beneito and Hirtenstein, *Seven Days*, p.171.

42. Our initial analysis shows that *K. al-Aqṭāb* does not have any of the poems that begin each chapter in the final *Futūḥāt* version.

43. See *Histoire*, pp.75–6.

bring this carefully preserved corpus into accessible form in both Arabic and western languages, so that Ibn ʿArabī's remarkable insights may be properly appreciated by the contemporary world.

Table 1 Verified A

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Historic ms.	Earliest authenticating ms. (H)	Holograph/ Autograph/ Copy from original
2	K. al-ʿAbādila	12	7	<638	H
26	K. al-Alif/al-Aḥadiyya	24	6	621	A
28	K. al-Amr al-muḥkam	30	7	724	C
30	K. ʿAnqāʾ mughrib	22	7	597	A
33	R. al-Anwār	30	4	651	C
67	K. Ayyām al-shaʾn	21	3	603	H
68	K. al-Azal	16	5	615	H
70	K. al-ʿAẓama	15	5	617	H
71	K. al-Bāʾ	17	4	<638	H
102*	al-Dīwān al-kabīr	16	4	634	H
116	K. al-Dhakhāʾir wa al-aʿlāq	20	3	640	C
125	K. al-Fanāʾ fī al-mushāhada	24	1	<700	C
135	al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya	30	11	636	H
142	Fihris muʾallafāt al-shaykh al-akbar	9	3	<638	C
150	Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam	30	6	630	A

The two entries marked with an asterisk (*), RG 102 in Table 1 and RG 101 in Table 2, currently follow the order established by Yahia for Ibn ʿArabī's *Dīwān*. However, this classification needs revising in the light of the accompanying article by Cook and Hirtenstein in this issue.

169	K. al-Jalāla	28	8	615	H
177	K. al-Jawāb al-mustaqīm	6	3	617?	H
182	Jawāb suʾāl Ibn Sawdakīn	7	2	<638	C
205	K. al-Hū	15	3	761	C
219	K. al-Ḥaqq	29	4	621	A
237	Ḥilyat al-abdāl	30	7	602	C
247	K. al- Ḥujub	22	7	668	C
255	K. al-Khalwa	28	3	<638	C
266	K. al-Ifāda liman arāda al-istifāda	7	1	664	C
268	Ijāz al-bayān fī tarjama ʿan al-Qurʾān	2	1	622	H
271	Ijāzat-al-shaykh al-akbar	12	1	629	A
281	K. al-Iʿlām bi ishārāt ahl al-ilhām	22	3	782	C
289	K. Inshāʾ al-dawāʾir	26	3	655	C
303	Ishārat al-Qurʾān fī ʿālam al-insān	9	3	762	C
307	K. al-Isfār ʿan natāʾij al-asfār	12	3	<638	H
313	K. al-Isrāʾ	16	4	633	A
315	al-Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Ṣūfiyya	30	10	637	C
317	R. al-Ittiḥād al-kawnī	18	4	621	C
352	K. Kunh mā lā budda li al-murīd minhu	20	4	724	C
380	K. al-Mabādī wa al-ghayāt	7	2	600	A
386	K. Mafātiḥ al-ghuyūb	24	5	621	A
392	K. al-Maḥajja al-bayḍā	1	1	600	H
402	R. al-Maʿlūm min ʿaqāʾid ʿulamāʾ al-rusūm	3	1	762	C
412	K. Manzil al-manāzil	7	3	618	A
414	K. Maqām al-qurba	24	7	617	H

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Historic ms.	Earliest authenticating ms. (H)	Holograph/ Autograph/ Copy from original
418	Maqṣid al-asmāʾ	17	8	621	A
423	K. Marātib ʿulūm al-wahb	17	5	823	C
432	K. Mashāhid al-asrār al-qudsiyya	19	3	651	C
433	K. al-Masāʾil	15	5	<658	C
443	Mawāqiʿ al-nujūm	28	5	<638	A
462	K. al-Mīm wa al-wāw wa al-nūn	19	6	617	H
480	K. Mishkāt al-anwār	15	10	678	C
484	K. al-Muʿashsharāt	7	3	808	C
485	R. al-Mubashshirāt	9	4	<673	C
511	K. al-Muqniʿ fī īḍāḥ al-sahl al-mumtaniʿ	13	3	<638	C
517	al-Muwashshaḥāt al-ilāhiyya wa al-azjāl	1	1	777	C
528	Naqsh al-Fuṣūṣ	10	3	650	C
530	R. al-Khirqa	16	2	999	C
532	K. al-Naṣāʾiḥ	9	1	650	C
548	K. al-Nuqabāʾ	7	4	761	C
551	Nuskhat al-ḥaqq	20	5	621	A
565	K. al-Qasam al-ilāhī bi al-ism al-rabbānī	10	2	761	C
585	K. al-Quṭb wa al-imāmayn	11	5	825	C
639	K. Rūḥ al-quds fī munāṣaḥat al-nafs	13	3	600	A
681	Sharḥ Khalʿ al-naʿlayn	4	3	640	C
689	K. Shawāhid al-ḥaqq fī al-qalb	14	7	617	H
716	K. al-Tadbīrāt al-ilāhiyya	29	5	<638	H

736	K. Tāj al-rasāʾil	11	2	600	A
737	K. Tāj al-tarājim	13	4	617	H
738	K. al-Tajalliyāt	29	6	620	H
762	K. al-Tanazzulāt al-Mawṣiliyya	17	9	620	H
767	Tarjumān al-ashwāq	22	2	<800	C
802	ʿUqlat al-mustawfiz	25	3	<638	H
825	K. al-Waʿẓ bi al-aḥādīth al-nabawiyya	1	1	1152	C
826	R. fī al-Waʿẓ li baʿḍ aḥbābihi	3	1	1005	C
834	K. al-Yaqīn	9	3	825	C

Table 2 Verified B

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Historic ms.	Earliest ms. (H)
9	K. al-Ajwiba	5	2	<700
35	K. al-Aqṭāb	2	1	<638?
101*	Dīwān al-maʿārif	3	2	700?
105	al-Durra al-fākhira	2	1	715
168	K. al-Jalāl wa al-jamāl	14	3	637
269	Ijāza li al-malik al-Muẓaffar	8	0	<800?
294	R. al-Intiṣār	7	2	703
338	K. Kashf al-maʿnā	8	0	783
347.1	al-Kawkab al-durrī fī manāqib Dhūʾl-Nūn al-Miṣrī	1	1	712
354	R. al-Kutub	3	0	<700
493	Muḥāḍarat al-abrār	14	0	933
611	R. al-Shaykh al-ʿArabī ilā Abī ʿAlī al-Ghazzāl	5	1	667
612	R. al-Shaykh ilā al-imām al-Rāzī	22	3	690

Table 3 Probable

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Earliest ms. (H)
64	K. Awrād al-usbūʿ	30+	939
188.1	al-Juzʾ al-awwal min tafsīr kalām Allāh taʿālā	1	977
244	Ḥizb al-wiqāya	18+	994
276	Ikhtiṣār al-sīra al-nabawiyya al-Muḥammadiyya	3	885
384	Madkhal fī ʿilm al-ḥurūf	8	725
387	Majmaʿ khuṭab Ibn ʿArabī	1	<700
428	R. fī Maʿrifat laylat al-qadr	3	673?
448	al-Mawʿiẓa al-ḥasana	1	962
702	al-Ṣalāt al-fayḍiyya	12	1141
748	Takhmīs qaṣīdat Abī Madyan	2	>1000
821	Waṣiyya fī kayfiyyat ḥuṣūl al-maʿrifa al-quṣwā	7	777

Table 4 Unverified

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Earliest copy (H)	Attributed to IA
6	K. al-Adhkār	3	1011	Y
10	K. al-Ajwiba	3	980	Y
51	K. al-Asrār al-thalātha	1	1004	Y
87	Faṣl fī bayān aqsām maʿānī al-asmāʾ al-ḥusnā	2	881	N
98	Daʿwat al-asmāʾ al-ḥusnā	2	>1100	N
109	Duʿāʾ al-ism al-aʿẓam	1	>1100	N
110	Duʿāʾ	1	>1100	N
112	Duʿāʾ ʿaẓīm mubārak	1	>1100	N
113	Duʿāʾ sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ	1	>1100	N
123	K. al-Falak wa al-samāʾ	1	<700	N
152	al-Futūḥāt al-Madaniyya	5	975	Y

178	Jawāb 'an mas'alat al-durra al-bayḍa	1	>950	N
179	Jawāb 'an mas'alat al-sabḥa al-sawdā'	1	1202	N
180	Jawāb 'an mas'alat al-zumurruda al-khaḍrā'	1	1202	N
195	K. al-Ghāyāt	2	1004	Y
204	K. Hayākil al-nūr	1	n.d.	Y
233	K. al-Ḥikam	11	1030	Y
238	Ḥizb al-aḥadiyya	8	1010	Y
249	Māhiyyat al-qalb (K. al-Ḥulal)	4	837	Y
282	K. al-I'lām fī mā buniya 'alayhi al-Islām	2	1004	Y
293	K. al-Insān al-kullī	3	1057	Y
323	R. al-Kalām 'alā ḥurūf al-mu'jam wa ma'ānīhā	1	789	Y
325	Kalimāt fī faḍā'il al-futuwwa	1	1084	Y
328	Kanz al-jawāhir fī maẓāhir al-awākhir	1	>950	Y
333	Kashf al-ḍamīr min aḥruf al-taksīr	1	>950	Y
349	Kīmiyā' al-sa'āda li ahl al-irāda	10	953	Y
391	R. fī al-Maḥabba	3	705	N
410	Manqabat mawlid al-Nabī	1	1100	Y
421	K. Marātib al-taqwā	2	789	Y
427	R. fī Ma'rifat al-nafs wa al-rūḥ	1?	722?	Y
447	Maw'iẓat al-albāb	1	977	Y
470	Min khuṭab al-shaykh al-akbar	2	724	Y
481	Mishkāt al-ma'qūl	1	1098	Y
489	al-Muḍāda fī al-'ilm al-ẓāhir wa al-bāṭin	3	1117	Y
494	Muhayminiyyāt Ibn 'Arabī	1	1021	Y
510	R. al-Mūqiẓa	2	777	Y
518	K. al-Muwāzanāt	3	1043	Y
533	R. al-Nash'atayn	1	896	Y

RG No.	Title	Copies seen	Earliest copy (H)	Attributed to IA
536	K. Natāʾij al-adhkār	3	704	Y
543	Sayr al-hilāl	1	>900?	Y
550	Nuskhat al-akwān	1	1004	Y
554	K. Nuzhat al-naẓar fī al-mawāʿiẓ wa al-ʿibar	1	>900?	Y
564.1	Qaṣāʾid	1	n.d.	Y
566	al-Qaṣīda al-tāʾiyya	4	915	Y
622	R. Ibn ʿArabī	1	>950	Y
623	R. Ibn ʿArabī	2	724	Y
628	R. li al-shaykh al-akbar	1	1000?	Y
631	Risāla mutaʿalliqa bi al-qalb	1	791	Y
638	R. Rūḥ al-quds al-wārida min sidrat al-muntahā	1	n.d.	Y
644	Safīr al-ilhām	1	1099	Y
675	Sharḥ al-asmāʾ al-ḥusnā wa taḥqīqātihā	2	>950	Y
692	K. Shujūn al-masjūn wa futūn al-maftūn	6	959	Y
704	al-Ṣalāt ʿalā al-Nabī	4	>1100	Y
707	Ṣalawāt sharīfa	6	994	Y
731	Tafsīr al-Fātiḥa	1	886	Y
746	Taḥdhīr dhawī al-tashhīr	1	n.d.	Y
757	al-Tāʾiyya	4	876	Y
763	Tanbīhāt	1	826	Y
766	Taqsīm al-nuʿūt al-ilāhiyya	1	875	Y
768	Tartīb al-sulūk ilā malik al-mulūk	1	1238	Y
773	Tawajjuh waqt al-saḥar	2	1164	Y
900	R. fī qawlihi (SA) al-nās yanāmu	1	1002	Y

Table 5 Not by Ibn ʿArabī

RG No.	Title	Probable author
13	R. al-Aḥadiyya	Awḥad al-Dīn Balyānī
18	ʿAyn al-aʿyān	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
19	ʿAyn al-ḥayāt	Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Makkī
24	K. Alf maqām	ʿAbd Allāh al-Anṣārī
25	K. al-Alfiyya	ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī
32	al-Anwār al-qudsiyya fī bayān qawāʾid al-Ṣūfiyya	ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Shaʿrānī
38	K. al-Arbaʿīn ḥadīthan	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī
46	R. fī Asrār al-ḥaḍra al-ilāhiyya	ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī
77	Baḥr al-shukr fī nahr al-fikr	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
80	Baqiyyāt risālat al-radd ʿalā al-Yahūd	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
90	K. al-Bughya fī ikhtiṣār al-Ḥilya	Abū Nuʿaym Iṣfahānī+
91	Bulghat al-ghawwāṣ	Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī
99	al-Dawḥā al-rabbāniyya	?
104.1	al-Durra al-bāḍiʿa fī kashf ʿulūm al-jafr al-jāmiʿa	?
116.2	R. al-Dhikr	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
120	K. Faḍl shahādat al-tawḥīd	Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī
131	Faṣl fī bayān al-ashkāl al-sabʿa	Ibn Muqla?
194	R. al-Ghawthiyya	ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī
203	K. Hatk al-astār fī ʿilm kashf al-asrār	ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Nābulsī?
214	Ḥall al-rumūz wa mafātiḥ al-kunūz	ʿAbd al-Salām al-Maqdisī
217	Ḥaqīqat al-ḥaqāʾiq	?
221	Ḥaqq al-waqt	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh
226	Ḥarf al-miʿrāj	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
230	K. Ḥawd al-ḥayāt	Samarqandī?
253.1	Khalʿ al-naʿlayn fī al-uṣūl ilā ḥaḍrat al-jamʿayn	ʿAbd Allāh al-Busnawī
256	Khātimat risālat al-radd ʿalā al-Yahūd	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh
262	Khurūj al-shukhūṣ min burūj al-khuṣūṣ	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh

RG No.	Title	Probable author
275	Ikhtiṣār al-Muḥallā	Ibn Ḥazm+
288	Inkhirāq al-junūd ilā al-julūd	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh
302.1	Irshād al-ṭālibīn wa tanbīb al-murīdīn	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh
332	Kashf al-asrār wa hatk al-astār	Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī
337	Kashf al-kunūz	Sitt al-ʿAjam
339	K. Kashf al-rān ʿan wajh al-bayān	?
340	Kashf al-sitr li-ahl al-sirr	?
342	Kashf sirr al-waʿd wa bayān ʿalāmat al-wajd	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh
366	R. Lawāmiʿ al-anwār	?
372	al-Lumʿa al-mawsūma bi kashf al-ghitāʾ	Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī?
378	K. al-Maʿārij	Qirīmī
442	Mawāqiʿ al-ilhām min nafaḥāt al-ʿaql wa al-anʿām	al-Fāḍil al-Makkī?
463	Minhāj al-ʿārif al-muttaqī	ʿAlwān al-Hamawī
473	R. al-Miʿrāj	Saʿd al-Dīn Ḥamawayh?
475	Mirʾāt al-ʿārifīn	Muḥammad al-Shīrīn?
477.1	Miṣbāḥ al-iṣbāḥ	?
519	Nafāʾis al-ʿirfān	Muḥammad al-Wafā
552	al-Nuṣūṣ	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī
571	al-Qawl al-nafīs fī taflīs Iblīs	ʿAbd al-Salām al-Maqdisī
588	K. Radd maʿānī al-āyāt	Abū al-Ḥasan al-Shādhilī?
615	R. fī ayy dhikr afḍal	?
642.2	K. Sāʿat al-khabar	?
661	K. al-Sulūk fī ṭarīq al-qawm	ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Ibn Sabʿīn
663	K. al-Shaʿāʾir	Muḥammad al-Wafā
665	al-Shajara al-nuʿmāniyya	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Basṭāmī?
666	Shajarat al-kawn	ʿAbd al-Salām al-Maqdisī
671	K. Shaqq al-jayb	?

676	Sharḥ al-Jaljalūtiyya	Ibn Muqla
701	R. fī al-Ṣalāt	?
710	al-Ṣuḥuf al-nāmūsiyya	Abū al-Mawāhib al-Shinnāwī
718	K. Tadhkirat al-khawāṣṣ	ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Qādirī
730	Tafsīr baʿd ayāt al-Qurʾān	ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī
732	Tafsīr al-Qurʾān	ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī?
745	Tahdhīb al-akhlāq	Yaḥyā b. Adī
749	Takhmīs al-abyāt	Muḥammad al-Wafā?
755	Taḥrīr al-bayān	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī
758	K. Tanqīḥ al-adhhān wa miftāḥ maʿrifat al-insān	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī?
760	Tamhīd al-tawḥīd	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī
772	R. al-Tawajjuh al-atamm	Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī
775	R. al-Tawḥīd	Mulla Fanārī
782	Tuḥfat al-safara ilā ḥaḍrat al-barara	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Basṭāmī?
803	K. al-ʿUrūsh	Muḥammad al-Wafā?
808	Uṣūl al-ʿuqūl	Abū Zakariyya al-Khayyāṭ
815	K. al-Fatq wa al-ratq	Muḥammad al-Wafā
835	Zād al-muqillīn	Ḥaydar ʿĀmulī?
836	K. al-Zahr al-fāʾiḥ fī sitr al-ʿuyūb wa al-qabāʾiḥ	Muḥammad al-Ghazarī

Table 6 Extracts

RG No.	Title	Source
16	Aḥwāl al-anbiyā'	Futūḥāt
34	'Aqīdat ahl al-Islām	Futūḥāt
40	R. Arḍ al-ḥaqīqa	Futūḥāt
43.1	R. al-Asmā' al-ilāhiyya	Futūḥāt
56	Asrār al-Qur'ān	Futūḥāt
58	Fī ma'rifat asrār takbīrāt al-ṣalāt	Tanazzulāt
62	R. fī Awjūh al-qalb	Mashāhid
72	Bāb fī al-tawḥīd	I'lam
78	al-Bay'a al-ilāhiyya	Futūḥāt
81	R. fī al-Barzakh	Futūḥāt
103	Dīwān ishrāq al-bahā'	al-Dīwān al-kabīr
131.1	Faṣl min kalām al-shaykh al-akbar	Futūḥāt?
132	Faṣl mufīd fī tafsīr Fātiḥa al-Kitāb	Futūḥāt?
149	Fuṣūl min kitāb al-Masā'il	Masā'il
156	Jadwal al-ḥaḍra al-ilāhiyya	Inshā'
209	Ḥaḍrat al-ḥaḍarāt	Futūḥāt
242	Ḥizb al-shaykh al-akbar	Awrād
305	al-Ishārāt ilā sharḥ al-asmā' wa al-ṣifāt	Tāj al-rasa'il
348	R. fī kayfiyyat aḥwāl rijāl Allāh	Futūḥāt
382	K. al-Mabāḥith al-muta'alliqa bi al-asmā' al-ḥusnā	Futūḥāt
390	R. al-Maḥabba	Futūḥāt
405	K. Manāhij al-irtiqā'	Futūḥāt
411	Manzil al-'ārif al-Jibrā'īlī	Futūḥāt
412.1	al-Manẓūmāt	Futūḥāt
413	K. Maqām al-ma'rifa	Futūḥāt
425	R. fī ma'rifat al-asmā' al-ḥusnā	Futūḥāt
430	R. fī ma'rifat sayr rijāl al-ghayb	Futūḥāt
542	Naẓm al-futūḥ al-Makkī	Futūḥāt

565.1	Qaṣīda	Tarjumān
567.1	Qaṣīda fī ḥaqq al-Mahdī	Dīwān
602	Rijāl al-ghayb	Futūḥāt
626	R. ilā aṣḥāb al-Shaykh al-Mahdawī	Mashāhid
677	Sharḥ alfāẓ al-Ṣūfiyya	Futūḥāt
816	K. al-Waṣā'il	Futūḥāt
818	Waṣāya al-shaykh al-akbar	Futūḥāt
844	(extracts)	Futūḥāt

Table 7 Duplicates

RG No.	Title	Other RG No.
5.1	Ad'iyat al-shaykh al-akbar	64
45	K. al-Asrār	313
47	K. Asrār al-ḥurūf	380
150.1	al-Fuṣūl wa al-fawā'id	182
297	K. al-'Iqd al-manẓūm	384
451	Mawlid al-Nabī	276
496	K. Mukhtaṣar al-Durra al-fākhira	105
621.1	R. fī al-taṣawwuf	various
669	K. al-Shamā'il al-Nabī	276
749	Takhmīs qaṣīdat al-ḥajj al-akbar	566
761	al-Tanazzulāt al-layliyya fī al-aḥkām al-ilāhiyya	433
785	Thalātha masā'il	433
817	K. al-Waṣāya	821
820	K. al-Waṣiyya	821
827	Wird al-aḥadiyya	64
828	Wird al-i'tiṣām	64
829	Wird al-ma'rifa	64
830	Wird al-nūr	64
831	Wird al-qurba	64
832	Wird al-saṭwa	64

Appendix

Libraries personally visited

Beyazıt Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Bodleian Library, Oxford
Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Konya
Chester Beatty Library, Dublin
Inebey Kütüphanesi, Bursa
Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Köprülü Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Koyunoğlu Müzesi ve Kütüphanesi, Konya
Manisa İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Manisa
Milli Kütüphanesi, Ankara
Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Selim Ağa Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Staatsbibliothek, Berlin
Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul
Enderûn (Ahmed III) Kütüphanesi, Topkapı Palace, Istanbul
Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, Istanbul
Yusuf Ağa Kütüphanesi, Konya

Libraries from which digital copies viewed

Amasya Beyazıt İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Amasya
Çorum İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Çorum
Diyarbakır İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Diyarbakır
Kastamonu İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Kastamonu
Kayseri İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Kayseri
Vahid Paşa İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Kütahya