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The paper shows, on the example of manuscripts from Ethiopia containing the *Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ* which were surveyed by the IslHornAfr project, how a relational database can manage data on complex (composite and multiple-text) manuscripts.

One of the main aspects observed in manuscripts retrieved within the framework of the project *Islam in the Horn of Africa*—and possibly the most challenging to deal with during the conception of the descriptive database of the project—is the codicological and textual complexity of this manuscript heritage. Most of the codices were non-homogeneous, and their complex textual and codicological stratigraphy had to be duly reflected in the relational database.

Needless to say, such complexity is a feature not limited to the manuscripts in Arabic script produced or circulated in the Horn of Africa, nor to the manuscripts in Arabic script in general. In fact, fruitful reflections on multiple-text manuscripts and composite manuscripts have developed in the last years, and important contributions on the subject have been published extending concepts and terminology previously used for western manuscripts also to different cultural contexts.²

As in other spheres, manuscripts in Arabic script from the Horn of Africa can be complex from the point of view of their material history (composite manuscripts) and from that of their content (multiple-text manuscripts). In his 2016 contribution,³ Alessandro Gori showed that in the Islamic context of the Horn of Africa, composite manuscripts (with one codex made up of several codicological units which were formerly independent) are mostly represented by manuscripts assembled by Europeans travellers and scholars. Even if compiled locally, they were often bound or otherwise put together once they had to be stored in European collections. As for multiple-text manuscripts (single codicological/production units with two or more texts), we can distinguish between (a) closed, or canonized, collection of texts, such as, for example, ‘liturgical’ collections of devotional poems and litanies, always copied together, and (b) instable, or open, collections that group various texts usually
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on the same or related topic (sometimes also on different topics), most typi-
cally collections of texts related to the various fields of the traditional Islamic
knowledge for teaching and learning.

In this paper, I would like to illustrate how these complexities of the
material and textual structure of this manuscript heritage have been dealt with
in the IslHornAfr database. A preliminary remark has to be done regarding the
aim of the project, which has mainly a literary perspective. This is reflected
in the description of the book heritage and in the structure of the database: in
fact, the priority has been given to text entities which have been selected as
the central reference element to be described.

**The identification of texts in the Kitāb al-farā`iḍ**

As a case study, I have chosen one of the most representative works of the Is-
lamic literary tradition of the Horn of Africa, the *Kitāb al-farā`iḍ*, an extensive
work in Old Harari, written in Arabic characters. Its title can be translated as
if we want to maintain a closer correspondence to the meaning of these words
in the Arabic tradition, which specifically refers to the law of inheritance. The
numerical portions are indeed a constant motive in the explanations of moral
and religious duties introduced in the work. For example:

> God said ‘With three things you should persuade me, for three things you should fear
> me, for three things you should worship me.’

> God said ‘With three things you should persuade me’: God said: ‘You should per-
> suade me with your prayer, your fasting and your alms’.4

The case of the *Kitāb al-farā`iḍ* was particularly challenging when trying to
describe it in a database that has to account for textual and material evidence,
as the work as we know it is actually a combination of different (three, in fact)
textual entities not easily identifiable in manuscripts, as we shall see below.

The first to describe the *Kitāb al-farā`iḍ*, using just one witness avail-
able at the time (now Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cer. et.
3255) was Enrico Cerulli.6 He offered an Arabic vocalized transcription, a
transliteration, and an Italian translation.7 According to this edition, the text
is divided into two sections which are reflected in a shift of content. The first
section falls into the genre of wisdom literature and contains sayings and max-
ims with moral and religious subject or pertaining to ritual obligations. The
second section falls into the genre of religious teaching, containing a cate-
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chism-like text, structured in a question and answer alternation, in which the articles of faith are first given in Arabic and then explained in Harari. In his introduction to the edition, Cerulli noticed that the colophon ‘oddly’ appears mid-text on f. 7 (the text covering ff. 1v–17v) and mentions a certain Ṭayyib al-Wanāġī al-Ṣadrī, to whom he ascribed the entire work.8

After more manuscripts containing the Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ came to light, it became obvious that the label is conventionally applied to several distinct works, written by different authors, which are usually copied together.

Thus, Ewald Wagner9 could show that the two sections of Cerulli’s edition correspond to two different works, which explains the difference in content. The first work is a Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ ascribed to āw ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-ʿArāšī (hereafter KF1), and the second is a Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ ascribed to faqīh Ṭayyib al-Wanāġī al-Ṣadrī (hereafter KF2). Wagner also noted that ‘the IES owns a third Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ written by a certain ʿAbd Allāh ‘Umar b. Gibrīl al-Aswām al-Sāḥītī’ (hereafter KF3).10 A closer analysis, drawing also on the manuscripts which clearly show all the text boundaries and ascriptions, has revealed, however, that Cerulli’s edition actually contained all the three texts (with the ‘oddly’ placed colophon appearing at the end of KF2).

Wagner explained Cerulli’s failure to identify the two sections as KF1 and KF2 with ‘a lacuna [...] at the passage of the first to the second work’. But in fact there is no textual lacuna, and the passage from KF1 to KF2 is evident in the edition11 thanks to the presence of a typical explicit formula (Tammat Kitāb al-farāʾiḍ bi-kalām al-Ḥabaš aḫraǧahu faqīh Ṭayyib al-Wanāġī al-Ṣadrī, naṣaʿanā Allāh bihum amīn,12 with a verb, aḫrağa, normally used in Arabic for the compilations of collections of hadīts on special themes). The explicit is then followed by a basmala. Yet, while the passage from KF1 to KF2 is quite evident in the edition, the shift from KF2 to KF3 is in fact oblique: there is no explicit or colophon, nor any other kind of textual boundary.

Textual boundaries in the manuscript witnesses

As Giorgio Banti noted, ‘in most mss. one or even the two junctures between the three different texts have been skipped over, and only one or two of the three ascriptions remains’.13

8 Ibid. 282–283.
11 Cerulli 1936, 290–291.
12 ‘It is concluded the Book of Obligations in the language of the Abyssinians which Ṭayyib al-Wanāġī al-Ṣadrī extracted...’, ibid. 290.
The quite old (early nineteenth century?) manuscript Addis Ababa, IES 256, is an excellent witness as it clearly shows all the boundaries and is one of the more concluding for the textual identification. The first section (KF₁, ff. 1v–4r) has an explicit with attribution to al-ʿArāšī; the second section (KF₂, ff. 4r–7r) begins with an attribution to al-Wanāǧī al-Ṣadrī, and has only tammat as the explicit; in the third section (KF₃, ff. 7r–10v), an incipit with attribution to al-Sāḫīṭī was added and partially written on the margin; the explicit confirms the attribution to al-Sāḫīṭī with the common formula (see fig. 1a, 1b).

In a manuscript from ʿAbd Allāh Šarīf collection in Harar (MS Harar, ʿAbd Allāh Šarīf, 191), the text boundary between KF₁ (which is acephalous) and KF₂ is marked by the word tamma and a circle with a dot inside (fig. 2), which was traditionally used as a collation mark and iǧāza (that is approval...
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for transmission) but also as a separation of individual textual units (expecially between ḥadīṯ). There is instead no text boundary between KF₂ and KF₃, while the latter is correctly attributed in the colophon to al-Sāḥīṭī.

In manuscript Addis Ababa, IES 306,₁⁵ KF₁ is copied on ff. 1r–6r and is acephalous; there is no text boundary within the scribal frame, but on the margin there is a note stating that ‘in a copy, after the eulogy on the Prophet, there is a basmala’ which is in fact a very common mark of textual boundary and a testimony to the manuscript having been collated with another witness of the text (fig. 3). In IES 306, the boundary between KF₂ and KF₃ is not marked at all, but, meaningfully, after the explicit of the last textual section the work is attributed to all three mentioned authors.₁⁶

While the codicological evidence of textual boundaries is confusing (with the lack of textual boundaries being more common between KF₂ and KF₃), the threefold textual identification can be confirmed by the clear thematic division between KF₂ and KF₃. At a first glance, both fit into the general class of catechism-like texts, but the KF₂, ascribed to al-Wanāǧī al-Ṣadrī, deals primarily with ‘aqīda (creed) and general Islamic dogmas and beliefs (for example the

₁⁵ Ibid. 16.
₁⁶ One could infer that the attribution to the three authors is based on the witness used for the collation, rather than coming from the antigraph.
eschatological ones), and the KF, ascribed to al-Sāḥitī, focuses on *fiqh* (law) issues, following the order and subjects of the Šāfīʿite manuals.

**Data organization**

In the *IslHornAfr* database, the *Kitāb al-farāʾīd* is encoded as a set of entities. There is a general record for the entire work as it is traditionally transmitted and known, with its three sections (fig. 4).
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Fig. 4. Database record for the *Kitāb al-farāʾīd*, detail (August 2018).

At the same time, each section is encoded as a textual entity in its own right, as they are attributed (sometimes also explicitly in the manuscripts) to
different authors.\textsuperscript{17} Such encoding is also necessary as the single sections may have circulated separately. This is illustrated by MS Addis Ababa, IES 265, where KF\textsubscript{1} is copied on its own in an independent monomorous (homogeneous, containing a single codicological unit and text unit) manuscript (fig. 5).

This method of structuring data gives project researchers the opportunity to account both for the codicological and textual complexity of this manuscript heritage. The codicological homogeneity can be a connecting element among the different textual entities, as well as the textual homogeneity and continuity can link different codicological units.

There are many other cases of textual constellations similar to the Kitāb al-farāʾīd. One of them, also related to the city of Harar, is the work known as the Mawlid šaraf al-ʿālamīn, a constellation of texts including the ‘Unwān al-šarīf, the Taḫmīs al-Fayyūmī ʿalā al-Burda, and a connective group of duʿāʾ and doxologies.\textsuperscript{18} Other cases include various collections of duʿāʾ, for

\textsuperscript{17} Cp. also the contributions by Massimo Villa and Tito Orlandi in this issue.

\textsuperscript{18} Gori 2010.
example the rather unstable one compiled by Kabīr Ḥamza b. Kabīr Maḥmūd b. Kabīr ‘Alī al-Ḥarallī al-Awsī al-Ḥanafī (1211–1279H/1796–1862AD) and commonly known under the title Fawātiq al-falāḥ wa-bawāriq al-ṣalāḥ fī ḏikr mawlid al-nāṭiq bi-l-naḡāḥ—which will hopefully be object of further enquiries within the framework of the project Islam in the Horn of Africa.
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