

Preface

The University Library of Leipzig preserves rich holdings of Oriental manuscripts, numbering altogether around 3400 and thus surpassing even the Occidental medieval manuscripts in this collection. The majority of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts in it are accessible through the Latin catalogue by Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, which was first published in 1838¹, and the German catalogue by Karl Vollers, published in 1906². A project to catalogue and digitize 55 of the roughly 200 pieces not included in these two is presently ongoing (www.islamic-manuscripts.net). Although both catalogues have been reprinted, Fleischer's catalogue, being written in Latin, poses serious obstacles for researchers as most contemporary scholars lack the language proficiency. This aspect has become the incentive for the present abridged translation of Fleischer's catalogue.

Thanks to the late Prof. Holger Preißler's suggestion and under the auspices of Prof. Verena Klemm from the Oriental Institute Leipzig, I could undertake this project to facilitate the access to and knowledge of this 'formidable' source of 19th century scholarship. It should, therefore, be dedicated to the late Prof. Preißler and be regarded as yet another fruit of his stimulating work at the University of Leipzig. Furthermore, Prof. Klemm and her assistant Dr. Stefanie Brinkmann have kindly supported me throughout the whole project, offering me advice and assistance.

I. The author

The lifespan of Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801-1888)³ covered nearly the whole nineteenth century, expressing symbolically the centennial importance he represented for the Oriental Studies of his time. Fleischer himself was a student of famous scholars such as the classical philologist Gottfried Hermann in Leipzig and the Orientalist Sylvestre de Sacy in Paris. Later, he was to become the sought-after teacher of equally important scholars [such](#) as Ignaz Goldziher, Hartwig Derenbourg, Johann Gottfried Wetzstein or Heinrich Thorbecke to

¹ Fleischer, H.O./ Delitzsch, F.: *Codices Orientalium Linguarum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*. Grimae 1838. [reprint Osnabrück 1985]

² Karl Vollers: *Katalog der islamischen, christlich-orientalischen, jüdischen und samaritanischen Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig*. Leipzig 1906 [reprint Osnabrück 1975].

³ In the absence of a biography cf. the following works with more references: Mangold, Sabine: *Eine „weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft“ – Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart 2004, p. 91-95. Preißler, Holger: *Friedrich Rückert und Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer – Beziehungen zwischen zwei Orientalisten*. In: Friedrich Rückert. *Dichter und Sprachgelehrter in Erlangen*. Hrsg. von W. Fischer und R. Gömmel. Neustadt an der Aisch 1990, p. 23 – 34. Reuschel, Wolfgang: *Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801-1888). Der Begründer der Leipziger Schule der Arabistik*. In: *Karl-Marx-Universität 1409-1959. Beiträge zur Universitätsgeschichte*, Bd. 1, Leipzig 1959, p. 422 – 438.

name but a few out of an impressive list.⁴ The Orient-enthusiastic Europe now studied in Leipzig rather than in Paris. This often highly praised and widely recognized importance may seem somewhat hard to grasp for someone unfamiliar with the history of Oriental Studies, in general, and Fleischer's life and scholarly efforts, in particular. Fleischer remained throughout his entire professional life as the chair holder of Oriental Languages at the University of Leipzig, at this time still striving to regain its status as a leading European centre of learning and research. **The fact** that his alma mater reached this position at the end of his life was not the least thanks to Fleischer himself. Only for his studies and work in Paris did he leave his homeland, and even such honourable calls such as to chairs in St. Petersburg and Berlin were turned down by him.

As for his scientific work, it comprises of no less than three considerable volumes of "Kleinere Schriften" – a collection of his separately published articles dealing in detail with phenomena of grammatical, lexical and linguistic nature – alongside some translations of variant Arabic sources and two separate editions of Arabic texts, one of which (the Tafsīr of Bayḍāwī) is still used by scholars and students today – and finally two catalogues of Oriental manuscripts. There is no synthesis or general evaluation based on the textual knowledge accumulated in these works to be found in his bibliography: no all-embracing work on the history of the Arabic, Persian or Turkish world in any form, on the religion, the development or the present state of Islam. Moreover, no chef-d'oeuvre linking his name with a breakthrough that we would still be aware of today.

But having scores of editions and scholarly output in mind would prevent one from recognizing that Fleischer's philological self-restriction is the key to understand his importance and contemporary admiration. By giving his full attention and outstanding philological accuracy to the smallest phenomena of the language he could turn towards the Oriental languages for the sake of these languages per se, thereby giving these studies the nature and status of a "pure" philology within the university curriculum. This definition of his subject, hereby following his venerated teacher Sylvestre de Sacy in Paris, and its institutional installation at a German university can be seen as a methodological breakthrough, because it shifted the scientific focus away from Theology. The latter was often seen as the "mother" for whom the "daughter" or even "maid" Arabic Studies⁵ was often supposed to help in

⁴ A list of 322 names is preserved in Fleischer's legacy, cf. Mangold: Eine "weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft", p. 94.

⁵ Hottinger for example calls Hebrew "tanquam matrem" with respect to the other Semitic languages in the subtitle of his work: *Grammatica Quatuor Linguarum Hebraicae, Chaldaicae, Syriacae et Arabicae Harmonica*. Heidelberg 1659. The title "maid" ("Dienstmagd") is used from the perspective of 19th century scholars in a pejorative sense, e.g. in the biographical entry on Hammer-Purgstall in ADB, vol. 10, p. 486.

interpreting the Hebrew Bible if she was to have any legitimacy at all. Still in Fleischer's days Orientalists had to teach courses in Biblical studies for aspiring priests.⁶

It is in this context, that the present catalogue has to be seen and its method be appreciated. Though by coincidence, the catalogue was in fact the first major single publication by Fleischer after his official appointment to the chair of Oriental Languages in 1836. Together with a study on *Zamakhsharī* which appeared the year before, announcing in the title his designation to the new post,⁷ it can be read as a kind of programme for Fleischer's scientific work circling around one leitmotif: the sources and their correct and careful handling. In the latter, which he also called his "anti-Hammer" with polemical reference to the leading "semi-professional" Orientalist of his time, Josef von Hammer-Purgstall (1774 – 1856), he warned against incorrect text-editions and translations, using the example of Hammer's translations and edition of *Zamakhsharī*. In a way, the catalogue was Fleischer's answer in yet another field that was associated with Hammer's far-reaching interests: the bibliographical one. In terms of accuracy, which was not Hammer's strong suit, it raised the bar far above everything accomplished so far in this field. With the catalogue, Fleischer gave an excellent basis for and developed further the field of philological studies, stressing the role of its fundament, the manuscripts.

II. The catalogue

Cataloguing before Fleischer

Fleischer's work is remarkable, but he was not without predecessors in cataloguing the Oriental holdings of the Library of the Senate.⁸ In fact, the vast majority of manuscripts described by Fleischer had already been catalogued more than 100 years earlier by the Orientalist and at that time still student of Theology and Oriental Languages, Georg Jakob Kehr (1692-1740) in a manuscript titled "Catalogus Manuscriptorum Arabicorum, Persicorum atque Turcicorum Bibliothecae Senatoriae Lipsiensis",⁹ commenced in May 1723. Although

⁶ Fleischer was of course not completely without predecessors, namely Freytag in Bonn or Rückert in Erlangen nor himself totally independent from the theological curriculum. For a general picture of the Oriental Studies see Mangold, Sabine: *Eine „weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft“ – Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart 2004, especially pp. 42-63.

⁷ *Samachshari's goldene Halsbänder, nach dem berichtigen Texte der v. Hammerschen Ausgabe von neuem übersetzt und mit kritischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen begleitet von M. Heinr. Lebr. Fleischer, designirtem ordentl. Prof. d. morgenländ. Sprachen a. d. Universität Leipzig und Mitglieder der Asiatischen Gesellschaft in Paris*. Leipzig 1835.

⁸ For a detailed account and all references for the following passage, see my unpublished Magister-thesis: *Arabische, Persische und Türkische Handschriften in Leipzig. Geschichte ihrer Sammlung und Erschließung*. Leipzig 2007.

⁹ Cited according to Fleischer's note on p. 464 of the catalogue.

the present whereabouts of this work are still uncertain (it is possible that it was discarded after the catalogue of Fleischer had made it superfluous), our collection still holds a specimen of Kehr's work: As part of the formal request for preparing a manuscript catalogue to his aspired patron, the Senate, Kehr described his methods of cataloguing in the Codex CLXXXI¹⁰. To support his request, he added an Arabic and Latin laudatory poem to the descriptions. This was achieved only two months before he began working on the 550 pages strong catalogue. This short time could be explained with a previous tacit agreement between Kehr and the Senate that made the specimen only a formal request submitted to the 'self-esteemed' Senators because of the prestigious nature of their library. Many loose papers in the manuscript still give testimony to Kehr's efforts and they are the only surviving textual evidence by which we can judge its qualities. And despite many mistakes and misinterpretations, Kehr did a fine job, leaving the reader with a clear impression of what was to be expected from each manuscript in terms of content as well as material value.

But the first cataloguing activities can even be traced back further beyond Kehr, though no material evidence whatsoever has survived of these works. A few years before Kehr, Gottlieb Siegfried Bayer (1694-1738) had already compiled a catalogue. Just like Kehr after him, he learned Arabic in the Orphanage in Halle, and just like Kehr he left Germany to resume his career in St. Petersburg in Russia, where both men worked together at the Academy, Bayer as a Sinologist and Kehr as lecturer of Oriental languages. In 1716 and 1717, he explored the holdings of both the Senate and the University Library. The outcome of this undertaking was a catalogue that, while nothing else can be said of its qualities, encompassed not only Arabic, Turkish, and Persian MSS, but all Oriental languages from Hebrew to Chinese. In the few years between Bayer and Kehr yet another famous name appears on the records cataloguing the Senate's Oriental holdings. As soon as 1719, Karl Rali Dadichi (1694?-1734), a somewhat mysterious scholar of Christian-Arab origin, is attested in this capacity. The loss of these two works is truly deplorable.

Although a catalogue of such dimensions as Kehr's must be commended as an important work in its own right, and although its accuracy was hardly surpassed at the time, the level of knowledge and references available made mistakes and misinterpretations unavoidable. Therefore, one can hardly wonder that one of the most outstanding but also - or therefore - most difficult scholars of his time, Johann Jacob Reiske (1716-1774), did not hesitate to use harsh words in rejecting Kehr's work. Two codices of our collection contain leaves with Reiske's Latin refutation and corrections of Kehr, dating back to 1736, when Reiske was still

¹⁰ Fleischer/ Delitzsch: Codices, p. 464.

an autodidactic beginner, but also an exceptionally bright newcomer in the field of Arabic Studies. It is, therefore, an early and important testimony of his scientifically correct, but also frank and seldom diplomatic way of critique that should become part of his reputation in the future. Furthermore, his comments are probably the first surviving documents of his scientific development altogether.

Reiske's occupation with cataloguing manuscripts is also attested in other places. The work with manuscripts was so important to him that once he had finished working through the holdings in Leipzig (i.e. mainly Fleischer's catalogue)¹¹ he embarked in 1783 on the long journey via Hamburg to Leiden, travelling by foot to the Mecca for Oriental texts of his day. Among his manifold activities there is also the composition of a new catalogue, replacing the last printed one from 1716.¹² Later on, he did the same work in the Royal Library in Dresden, thereby becoming Fleischer's direct predecessor for this collection. His work, however, was not printed until after his death.¹³ Additional descriptions made by Reiske for single codices can be found in the libraries of Jena, Weimar, and Hamburg. The latter collection was even about to be officially catalogued by him at the request of its librarian, but for unknown reasons this project was not completed before Reiske's untimely death.¹⁴

As can be seen by this historical outline of cataloguing activities before Fleischer, the manuscripts of the Senate Library were accessible (if one could gain access to this semi-public library at all) for the next 115 years through a voluminous, and albeit many shortcomings quite complete catalogue – a situation not unfavourable when compared to other manuscript centres of equal or bigger size. Few catalogues are worth mentioning. Only the arguably biggest collection in Northern Europe, Leiden, had a printed catalogue containing the vast Oriental funds as early as 1674 and another was compiled until 1716 – both were very brief in their descriptions at best. The Imperial Library of Vienna published a splendid catalogue in 1690 that also encompassed some engravings of precious illustrations. Uppsala in Sweden followed in 1706. And the printed catalogue of the Vatican Oriental collection, a

¹¹ Which was the case even after only two years 1736-1737, but Reiske found the available manuscripts in Leipzig "not important" anyway, cf. D. Johann Jacob Reiskens von ihm selbst aufgesetzte Lebensbeschreibung. Leipzig 1783, p. 15: „...und von geschriebenen [Büchern], hatten die hiesigen Bibliotheken wenig, und selbst das wenige war von keiner Wichtigkeit.“

¹² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 23. Dozy testifies in his preface to De Goeje, M.J./ Houtsma, M.Th.: *Catalogus Codicum Arabicorum Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno-Batavae*. Leiden 1888 (2nd edition), p. XIII that this catalogue was still in use 1851 when he wrote the preface.

¹³ Published in the magazine: *Memorabilien. Eine philosophisch-theologische Zeitschrift von Heinr. Eberh. Gottlob Paulus*. Stück 4, Leipzig 1793, pp. 1-20.

¹⁴ Cf. Brockelmann, Carl: *Katalog der orientalischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg mit Ausschluss der hebräischen. Teil 1: Die arabischen, persischen, türkischen, malaiischen, koptischen, syrischen, äthiopischen Handschriften*. Hamburg 1969. [Reprint of the edition Hamburg 1908], pp. XIV-XV.

milestone in the field prepared by the Maronite Assemani, started to appear only a few years earlier in 1719.

The method and particularity of Fleischer's Catalogue

Drawing the attention of the scientific community on the manuscript holdings in a library is an indispensable and important task. Fleischer himself understood his work as a promotion of "liberalism" when he argued against the Senate some years later to open his library for a broader public, as the publication of a library's treasures would be like an invitation to the scientific community to use them and requests could now not be turned down anymore.

But Fleischer's catalogue is more than an entry and vade-mecum to the collection. It would be useful to remember the bibliographical environment in which catalogues were published in the middle of the 19th century. Neither were bio-bibliographical works like that of Brockelmann (GAL) and Sezgin (GAS) available, nor was the Encyclopaedia of Islam. But in the meantime Fleischer's catalogue became in fact such an indispensable reference for all scholars. The carefulness of his description and the vastness of his material can thus be understood as at least partly filling a painful gap. This work had to be done in the absence of many scientific tools, the availability of which is taken for granted today to such an extent that we might hardly imagine how to work adequately without them, making it just the more admirable. The main references frequently used by Fleischer are:

1. Ḥājjī Khalīfa's "Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmī al-kutub wa-l-funūn", in the edition of his old friend Gustav Flügel¹⁵, that just started to appear in 1835 and proceeded only to the second volume (out of eight) at the time of printing. Fleischer contributed significantly to the editing and correction of this text;
2. Ignatius Mouradgea d'Ohsson's "Tableau general de l'Empire othoman" (from 1787), an extensive work on many aspects of Oriental religions, history, and society in the German translation of his former university teacher in Leipzig, the classical philologist and polyhistor Christian Daniel Beck;
3. Josef von Hammer-Purgstall's "Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf unsere Zeit" (1836-1838) and his „Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches“ (1827-1835), despite of all of Fleischer's criticism by far the most vast source of information on the Ottoman Empire and its literature;

¹⁵ Although this friendship suffered a heavy blow in the years of Fleischer's cataloguing: Flügel was expecting his own ascension to the chair in Leipzig and it seems that the rivalry of the two in this field made personal relationship impossible for some time.

4. Barthélemy d'Herbelot's "Bibliothèque Orientale" (1777-1779), already used by Kehr in the first edition of 1679, and still an indispensable source over a century later!

5. Fleischer's own catalogue of the Oriental manuscripts in Dresden, "Catalogus codicum manuseriptorum orientalium Bibliothecae Regiae Dresdensis" (1831).

Further manuscript catalogues of a comparable richness were yet to be released, especially in Germany. The greater collections of Gotha or Vienna would follow up in the next decades, the latter one with Fleischer's help for his friend Gustav Flügel.¹⁶ Catalogued data was rare. Fleischer's publication of descriptions for 351 Oriental codices and 25 single sheets was, therefore, not a small service for the scholarly community of his period. It is in fact a major work in the field of cataloguing and furthermore, due to its quite unique richness in historical, bibliographical and philological material, it set a new standard for later works.

III. The collection

The history of the collection presented in Fleischer's catalogue would deserve a more detailed study since it could be representative for many other early Northern-European collections concerning the origins, the ways of purchasing, and donating Oriental manuscripts. Nonetheless, some preliminary observations on its character and history will be given here.

The question how and when the manuscripts found their way to the city of Leipzig and its library, so far away from any Arabic or Islamic influence, is connected firstly with four names: Fleischer's catalogue preserves the old class-marks with their abbreviations Pf., Ac., W. and K. The first stands for August Pfeiffer (1640-1698), who held the chair for Oriental Languages in Leipzig between 1681 and 1689. The second signifies his protégé Andreas Acoluthus (1654-1704), who also taught Oriental languages in this town but without appointment to a chair at the university, which was the reason for his departure from Leipzig in 1680. The W. signifies Professor Johann Christoph Wagenseil (1633-1705) of the University of Altdorf/Nürnberg. And lastly the K. refers to no one else than Georg Jacob Kehr (1692-1740) himself. Altogether these class-marks make up for 344 of the 376 manuscripts or fragments described by Fleischer. We can, therefore, ascribe the acquisition of the vast majority of them to a period between the 1680s and 1727. More detailed, the share of Pfeiffer amounts to 67 manuscripts, while Acoluthus contributed 186 and Wagenseil 11. Therefore 264 codices had definitely been acquired in the last decade of the 17th century up to the year 1710, when manuscripts and books from the estate of August Pfeiffer were bought in Lübeck.

¹⁶ Digitized under: <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/gaeste/onb/onb.htm>.

Furthermore the class-mark K. does not necessarily imply a later date of acquisition as the case of codex XXXVII shows. This splendid *ḡuz*' of a Koran made for the Mongol Khān Ūljāytū, the uncontested masterpiece of our collection, bears a K.-signature. Nonetheless, a recent examination of the codex revealed a Latin inscription in which one of Leipzig's most important booksellers, Gleditsch, dedicates it to the library of the Senate as early as 1694. The class-mark K. has as a result to be regarded as meaning all titles described by Kehr that did not belong to a collection of the former ones and were not necessarily from his possession.

The above mentioned date point, in view of the political landscape of these years, to the ongoing conflict with the Ottoman Empire, on its way to lose many of its European possessions in a long retreat following the humiliating defeat before the gates of Vienna in 1683. Saxonian troops played a certain role in the campaigns following this battle and leading to the conquest of the important Hungarian towns Buda /Ofen and Fünfkirchen inter alia.

And indeed, many manuscripts indicate their origin as spoils of war with inscription. They also show the relations between the two Orientalists Pfeiffer and Acoluthus and high-ranking figures in the Saxonian army in South-East Europe. The codices CXCI and CXCIV of the Fleischer catalogue, for instance, are donations by militaries involved in the conquest of Buda to August Pfeiffer. Leipzig seems to have profited even more from the fall of Buda on 2. September 1686. Ten codices are marked as endowments for this town, not less than six of them donated by the preacher of the main mosque, Sulaymān Efendī.¹⁷ Another codex originates from Buda. This is to show how tight the dates and ways of acquisition can be pinpointed.

Further proofs for a Turkish background in general - and therefore most probably also a robbing - are: the integration of Turkish works into collective manuscripts; Turkish marginal glosses, interlinear translations or introductions; a copyist or place of copy or note of endowment from Turkey or one from the European lands of the Ottoman Empire. According to these criteria and judging only from the information given in the catalogue, 122 out of the 235 Arabic manuscripts (and therefore excluding the self-evident Turkish and also the Persian codices that might as well stem from Ottoman possessors) can be linked with some certainty to the wars against the Ottomans.

Age is a further parameter reflecting the relatively young history of the collection. 117 codices or parts of them are dated. 61 belong to the 17th century (the last date being

¹⁷ Two more endowments of this man are preserved in Leipzig in the collection of the University Library, three found their way to Dresden and another two to Jena. More could certainly be found in other collections.

interestingly enough 1682/83) and 36 to the 16th, while the 15th century has 15 specimens¹⁸ and the 14th only five¹⁹. So only few can be considered very old. The oldest item and also the most beautiful is the splendid Koran of Ūljāytū, datable at 706 (1306/07).

Autographs are equally rare among our manuscripts. Sometimes the manuscript contains a statement referring to the existence of one, but it can be easily refuted and explained as a remark in the original handed down through copying. Only CCXCVI, an encyclopaedic collection of some pious and frivolous texts surely is written by the author of some of its content, Yūsuf Ibn Ni'ma al-Ḥamawī, the composer of the whole codex. Very close to the original, though, is a manuscript connected with the Mongol Sultan Ūljāytū, the very old Shiite propaganda text by al-'Allāma al-Ḥillī CXCIV dedicated to this Khān, which has been copied, at least within 40 years from the original, in 1343.

What characterizes the present collection in Leipzig in general are manuscripts written by Orientalists at least partly in Arabic. There are works by Flügel, Hammer-Purgstall, Hottinger, Golius, and Fleischer himself, to name but a few. Also the present catalogue features some of them, namely the specimen of Kehr that has already been mentioned and some notes by Pfeiffer and Reiske. Andreas Acoluthus copied two amulets and a complete Koran (LXXX), the last presumably during his work on a critical edition of it.

IV. My work on the catalogue and the applied methods

The present text should not be mistaken as an exact translation of Fleischer's work, but rather as a paraphrase. The objective was to present the researcher who is interested in the collection of Oriental manuscripts held by the Leipzig University Library with a practicable and quick reference to this excellent treasury. Only in the second place may it serve also to facilitate the access to the Latin catalogue as prepared by one of the most outstanding Orientalists of his time. I have omitted or re-edited parts of the vast material, provided by Fleischer, in order to give a condensed description of the material in question. The following criteria for abridgments were used:

1. Schematic enumerations, e.g. when Fleischer gives all the abbreviations found in the margins of a codex together with the authors or works they represent as well as the headlines or the transmitters of certain works. These mere lists do not need a translation and can easily be looked up in the digitized Latin version accompanying the internet presentation of this text.

¹⁸ I; II; XXIV; CVI, 1); CIX, 15); CXVIII, 5); CLXXXII; CLXXXIII; CLXXXVIII; XXXIII, 1)+5)+6)

¹⁹ CLXXX; CXCIV; CXCVI; CCLXI, 1)+2); CCCVII

2. Reflections of bibliographical and biographical nature that have generally found their way to the great reference works of Brockelmann (GAL) and Sezgin (GAS) and are of no use for the contemporary scholar.
3. Fleischer's references to the scholarly literature and editions of his time. Such topics can be neglected in so far as the paraphrase of Fleischer's catalogue serves mainly as a source of information about the manuscript holdings in Leipzig. Whenever Fleischer's academic world and its place in history are studied, it is unavoidable to read the original Latin catalogue.
4. Text passages are omitted or summarised when the catalogued texts led Fleischer to historical or linguistic elaborations on the topic that do not reflect the text itself but a scholarly critical or, in some cases, even a polemical comment.
5. In many instances the detailed account of the manuscript's content could be abridged without losing the essential statements and the change would merely be in style.

On the other hand, I have not omitted any works, regardless of their extent, if Fleischer describes them separately (e.g. a collection of letters under the simple header "letters"). I sometimes felt compelled to undertake more extended translations of Fleischer's comments, while at other times merely paraphrasing their main contents was sufficient. But no crucial information about the content and outer appearance of a codex has fallen prey to my personal interest. Some seemingly unbalanced descriptions of different titles are caused by Fleischer's own shifting interests. We can find descriptions of more than 30 pages as well as such of only a few lines that do not even contain a transliteration of the Arabic title but rather a Latin translation of it. In these cases I had to add necessary information to satisfy modern needs of cataloguing. My additions are distinguished from the original information by square brackets [].

I also supplied bibliographical references, but only of the most basic kind. The works and editions I used are:

EI = The Encyclopedia of Islam. New edition. Vol. I – XI, Leiden 1960-2002.

Enc.Ir. = Enciclopædia Iranica. Edited by Ehsan Yarshater. Vol. I-XII, New York/London 1990-2004.

GAL = Brockelmann, Carl: Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur. Vol. I-II and Supplement I-III, Weimar/Leiden 1898-1942.

GAS = Sezgin, Fuat: Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums. Vol. I-XII, Leiden/ Frankfurt a. M. 1967-2000.

Hitti = Hitti, Philip K. (ed.): Descriptive catalogue of the Garrett Collection of Arabic manuscripts. Princeton 1938.

Rypka = Rypka, Jan: Iranische Literaturgeschichte. Leipzig 1959.

Leiden = Schmidt, Jan: Catalogue of Turkish manuscripts in the Library of Leiden University and other collections in the Netherlands. Vol. I-III, Leiden 2000 – 2006.

TürkDili = Türk dili ve edebiyatı ansiklopedisi. Vol. I-VIII, Istanbul, n.d.

In rare cases, when I found these reference works unsatisfying, I gave additional literature in footnotes.

Some words on layout and script may be useful. I adopted a pattern to present the information of a codex in fields under the headings Title, Author, Date, Content and so on, as can be seen in any sample in the catalogue, and regrouped Fleischer's information accordingly. Therefore, everything concerning the content of a text or the comments on its significant features like the history of the codex was assembled under the respective header even if Fleischer treated it in different and sometimes remote places of his text.

The description of a codex as Turkish following Fleischer's terminology is of course to be taken *cum grano salis* as it may include the literary Ottoman language with its Arabic and Persian influences as well as more vernacular forms of pure Turkish.

Furthermore, in representing Turkish or Persian words in Latin script, I preferred a transliteration of the Arabic script rather than a phonological transcription. I therefore also adhered to the Arabic three vowel system and did not try to transcribe the spoken particularities of each of the two languages, except in the case of the Persian *izāfa* with -e to distinguish it from the indefinite form of the word with -i.²⁰

²⁰ For questions relating to the difficulties in transcription and transliteration of Ottoman in its variant historical stages see Anhegger, Robert: On transcribing Ottoman texts. In: Manuscripts of the Middle East 3(1988), pp. 12-15.