Little is known about the life of Abū Ishāq İbrahim b. Muḥammad al-İṣṭakhri, the author of *Kitāb al-Masālik wa l-mamālik*, which was written towards the end of the first half of the 10th century CE. The work built on the earlier concept of the “atlas of Islam”, which it developed further. The climates (aṣām) it describes are no longer those of Ptolemaean geography, but, reflecting the Iranian tradition, refer to geographical entities or “countries”. Also reflecting the author’s background — whose most common nisba is al-Fārsi — Iran holds a favoured position on this work. Published in 1870, the present edition by M.J. de Goeje was the first volume in the first series of the Bibliotheca Geographorum Arablorum.
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On Sunday 25 August 1889, four Egyptian gentlemen, Abdallah Fikri Pasha and Muhammad Amin Fikri Bey, father and son, and their two compatriots, Hamza Fath Allah and Malek Said Umur el-Baghairi, visited Leiden in the Netherlands. They were on route from Egypt, through Italy, France and England, to Stockholm and Christiania (Oslo), in order to attend the 8th International Congress of Orientalists as the official Egyptian delegation. The old Pasha, who previously had held the post of Nāẓir al-Maṣūrīl al-Maṣūra (‘Supervisor of Education in Egypt’) was a dedicated educationalist and an accomplished poet and litterateur. At the congress he presented a sample of his own commentary on a Qasida by Hassan b. Thabit. His son, Muhammad Amin Fikri, presented a paper on problems connected with the use of spoken Arabic vs. standard Arabic. He also completed the travelogue, since his father, the intended author, died soon after their safe return to Egypt.


1 Held 2–13 September 1889.
2 Nāẓir al-Maṣūrīl al-Maṣūra or al-‘Ummayya, or something similar, is what is usually added to his name in the title pages of his works. On the title page of his Risāla fī Mu‘arrufat Ba‘th Mubdihih al-Hay‘a ‘alā Wārid fī al-Nuṣaj al-Shar‘īyya (Cairo, Matba‘at al-‘Ālima, 1335/1817–1818), a comparative work on modern astronomy and Islamic law, he is referred to as Nāẓir al-Maṣūrīl al-Maṣūra ‘alā Shatib, formerly Minister of Education in Egypt.
3 The event is described in his Irshād al-‘Abbā‘ī dā Mubāsin Urūdhi (Cairo (al-Maṣūfah) 1394, pp. 655–658. The full text of the commentary by Abdallah Fikri, entitled ‘Uṣūl al-Hay‘a ‘alā Shatib was published in a posthumous edition of some of his works in poetry and prose, al-‘Azhār al-Furqānīyya (Cairo 1395/1877–1878), pp. 334–396.
5 Irshād al-‘Abbā‘ī.”
They had come to Leiden, long a centre of Oriental studies, for several reasons. Its library housed, and still houses, an important and ever increasing collection of Islamic manuscripts. Its faculty had counted in the course of time many famous names in Oriental studies among its members. Moreover, Leiden was home to the publishing house of E.J. Brill, which published numerous important text editions, some of which are still in use. These facts qualified, and still qualify, Leiden as a favourite venue for scholarly tourism, and that was exactly what the four Egyptians had come for. When they had settled in their hotel, the Lion d'Or in the Breezestraat, they were told that as it was Sunday, the library was closed, as was the Faculty and 'La Maison Brill.' Seeing the disappointment on their faces, the manager of the hotel told them he would try to find a solution and send an employee on an errand. The man came back with the professor of Arabic, Michael Jan de Goeje, who told the relieved Egyptians, that in an hour's time he would organize a visit to the library and later on to Brill's as well. Thanks to their hotel manager they had met the very person who embodied the three points of interest that attracted so many learned tourists to Leiden.

De Goeje had been a professor of Arabic in Leiden since 1869; he was the honorary curator of the Oriental collections in the University Library; he was the co-author of the Catalogue of Oriental and Arabic manuscripts in Dutch collections and his scholarly editions appeared mostly with Messrs. Brill, whose house experienced an unprecedented prosperity, not least because of De Goeje's editorial projects. De Goeje was a typical exponent of the philological and editorial period in Middle Eastern studies, when the numerous sources of our knowledge of Arabic and Islamic culture in the European libraries were...

---

6 Brill's just launched 'Classic Arabic Texts Online' Part I (CATO-I), which offers ca. 12,000 pages of classic Brill editions of Arabic texts in a full-text searchable format. De Goeje's Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum (BGAR) is included in this first part.

7 There is an interesting and rarely seen double perspective of this encounter, first the account by father and son Fikil in their travelogue, Ibrāhīm al-Abbaṣ, pp. 523–529, and a year later by M.J. de Goeje in his review of that book, 'Ten Egyptenaar in Europa,' in De Gids 1893, pp. 566–577.

8 See also on this visit, albeit from a somewhat different angle, Arnoud Vreijik, 'Proverbial misunderstandings: The sources of Christiaan Smouck Huygens's collection of Egyptian proverbs,' in Das Islam 79 (2000), pp. 103–127, especially pp. 122–126.

9 With the arcanum title Interpretis Legati Werneriatis ('Interpreters of Wener's legacy'), an office that has been held by the present author from 1992–2010. Then this honoriific title was de facto abolished by the director of Leiden University Library.

10 Catalogus Codicum Orientalium Bibliothecae Academicae Lugduno-Batavorum. 6 vols. Leiden 1852–1877. Catalogus Codicum Arabicorum Bibliothecae Academicae Lugduno-Batavorum. Editio secunda. Vols. 1–2. Leiden 1888–1907. for the first time, disclosed to the public in detailed catalogues and made known by a large number of text editions that could stand the touch of criticism. It was also the time in which the Lachmannian method gradually became introduced in the editing of texts.

In the academic world of the first half of the nineteenth century there was an overall revival of textual criticism, following new methodologies that are mostly associated with the work of the German scholar of classical and old-Germanic studies and philologist Karl Lachmann (1793–1851). He devised what later came to be known as the Lachmannian method of textual criticism. This can be summarized as an attempt to bring about the reconstruction of a text in a version that is closest to the supposed original of the author, by removing the mistakes and interpretations of later periods that had become attached to texts. The main instrument for this method is the establishment of the stemma, by which is meant a genealogy of manuscript witnesses of a text. With the help of such a stemma those manuscripts that are without value for the establishment of the text can be distinguished from the valuable ones and then be eliminated. Ideally, the result of the application of the stemmatic method would be that the archetypal version of the author's version of a text could be re-discovered. One of the better-known instruments of textual criticism, which were perfected by Lachmann, is the rule of the more difficult reading prevailing over the simple one. This served to reconstruct original readings, which had been trivialized by generations of copyists. Lachmann never wrote a textbook on his method, but he developed and demonstrated it in his impressive production of critical editions, studies on aspects of textual criticism and commentaries on editions. He wrote on, and also edited, important texts not only in Greek and Latin literature, but also in the old-German and old-English literatures, and the New Testament. This choice of texts and fields of scholarship made his influence widely felt. Till today, students of textual criticism are (mostly unwittingly) tributary to his findings and users of his method. Some further biographical details on Michael Jan de Goeje are now in place. His father was a protestant minister in Dronrijp, a village in Frisia, a northern province of the Netherlands, where De Goeje was born on 13 August 1868. Although he was an apt and eager pupil in primary school, the follow-up of his vocational choice proved to be complicated. If everything had gone according to plan, he might have become a pharmacist, either in the Netherlands or in

the Dutch East Indies. But these and similar plans failed, and in the end it was
decided that he would study theology in Leiden, with the most probable pros-
pect of becoming, like his father, a minister. He began his study in 1854; how-
ever, he quickly became intrigued by the study of Semitic languages, the
knowledge of which was, at the time, a requirement for students of theology
and, therefore, part of their academic curriculum. It was assumed, of course,
that they were capable of reading the Scriptures in their original languages.
Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. In Leiden he also received a thorough training in
classical philology from his teachers J. Bate (1787-1864) and C. G. Cobet (1809-1889).
With them he may have been confronted with the critical methodology
towards texts, following the approach of Lachmann, whose influence was
increasingly being felt in Dutch scholarship as well. However, the professor
whom De Goeje came to value most as his teacher was the orientalist R.P.A.
Dozy (Reinhart Dozy, 1820-1882), who occupied the Leiden chair of History. Under
Dozy’s influence, De Goeje decided that a clergymen’s career was not what he
wanted out of life and he choose for a study in Semitic languages, which meant
Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic. Soon he was completely under the spell of the
latter language. He formulated his scholarly ideal as collecting Arabic texts
that were sources for the development of human civilization, then critically
assessing these sources and, subsequently, composing an attractive scholarly
synthesis of these. These sources were in the fields of literature, history and
geoigraphy. In 1879 he was put in the daily charge of the Leiden Oriental
manuscripts collection. In 1880, he defended his PhD thesis, which was a par-
tial edition of al-Yaqubi’s Kitāb al-Buldan. In 1886, he became extra-ordinary
professor, and in 1899 this appointment was changed into a full professorship
for Arabic in Leiden. In 1906 he retired, internationally acclaimed as one of
the greatest philologists of his time. He died on 17 May 1909.

12 The knowledge of Latin (which university students had already acquired in their gram-
nar school) had another, practical purpose as well. Latin was the language in which most
scholarly works in large parts of Europe were published, more or less the same as English
is nowadays. Several of De Goeje’s works directed to an international audience are written
in Latin, which makes them almost entirely inaccessible, now that knowledge of Latin has
become such a rare commodity.

13 See for an extensive survey of de Goeje’s life and work, C. Snouck Hurgronje, Levenverhaert
van Michael Jan de Goeje [with a list of his writings by Th. W. Joynboll]. Amsterdam 1909
(in: Jaarboek der Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen 1909).

14 Then counting not less than circa two thousand volumes of mostly Arabic, Persian,
Turkish and Hebrew texts, including the important collections of J.J. Scaliger (1540-1609),
Jacobus Golius (1596-1667) and Levinsen Werner (1649-1696).

At an early stage of his scholarly life, De Goeje realized that good editions
were a first necessity and during his many-sided career, from 1856 till his death
in 1909, editions of an impressive number of texts were his major and regular
product. It is not inappropriate to call his office a text editing factory, for not
only did he produce a considerable number of editions himself, he also had his
students work on parts of his projects and carry out the proofreading, index-
ing, etc. De Goeje’s own editions include several historical and geographical
works by al-Yaqubi (his thesis of 1850, to be repeated and augmented in 1892
as vol. 7 of the Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabiorum (BGAR)), al-Idrisi (1156,
together with Dozy), al-Baladnuri (1865-1866), several volumes of the history
of al-Tabari (1879-1901), a project that was organized by him. Furthermore,
several literary texts, notably the Divan of Abu al-Walid Muslim b. al-Wahid
al-Ansari (1875) and Ibn Qutayba’s Kitab al-Shir wal-Shuara (1904). A stream
of articles on many subjects of Oriental studies appeared both in international
scholarly journals, often with spin-offs in Dutch periodicals written for a wider
audience. Never again would the Dutch general public be so informed about
aspects of Middle-Eastern culture in such an erudite and simultaneously
entertaining way.

One of the pillars of De Goeje’s lasting fame was his single-handed editing of
what he has called the Library of Arabic Geographers’ (Bibliotheca
Geographorum Arabiorum, BGAR), a series of eight volumes containing geo-
graphical texts, which were published between 1870-1894. The texts in this
major project were the Kitab Masalik al-Mamalik by al-Istakhri (1870), the
Kitab al-Masalik wal-Mamalik by Ibn Hawqal (1873), the Kitab Ahsan al-Taqsim
fi Ma’rifat al-Aqaidh by al-Mahaddith (1877, 2nd edition 1906), the Kitab
al-Buldan by Ibn al-Faqih al-Hamahdani (1885), the Kitab al-Masalik wal-
Mamalik by Ibn Khordadbih with excerpts of the Kitab al-Kharaji by Qudama
b. Ga’far (1889), the seventh part of the Kitab al-Alaq al-Nafisa by Ibn Rusta
and the Kitab al-Buldan by al-Ya’qui (1892) and, finally, the Kitab al-Tanzih
wal-Ishraf by al-Mas’udi (1894). All these publications were first-time ‘critical’
editions of the texts concerned, and all were provided with some information
on the manuscripts used, an extensive text-critical apparatus containing the

15 See J.T.P. de Bruijn, ‘Collective studies of the Muslim world: Institutions, projects and collec-
The search for the Istanbul manuscripts as reflected in Michael Jan de Goeje’s correspon-
with his collaborators in the Tabari edition is kept in Leiden University Library, Or. 5985 e-f.

16 These are a bit short, however, according to present-day requirements.
DE GOEJE AND THE EDITING OF ARABIC GEOGRAPHICAL TEXTS

variant readings of the major manuscripts known and, finally, indexes and glossaries of technical terms and special vocabulary, which was not found in the usual dictionaries of classical Arabic. In one case (volume 5) a French translation was added. The German translation of all texts, which De Goeje had envisaged from the very beginning of the project, was never realized, however.

Another feature in De Goeje's work must be mentioned here, namely his sense of the importance of teamwork. Certainly for the two larger projects in which he was involved, the 701 and the Tābarī edition, but equally for the other editions which he produced, he was all too aware of the fact that teamwork and international co-operation between scholars were of prime importance for the success of such vast enterprises. On the one hand, the mere size of a project made joining forces necessary and, on the other, it was important to have good connections in the pre-photography era, in other European manuscript collections. Colleagues and friends frequently provided De Goeje with notes and quotations from manuscript sources, which they had to copy themselves. In the publication of the 701 this is illustrated by De Goeje's dedications in each volume to both his learned friends and academic colleagues.

The intricate internal relationship between the different texts of the Balkhi school of geographers is an illustration of how these texts have fared in history. Even with the overview of the manuscripts that we now enjoy, it is virtually impossible to extricate the separate texts from one another. This is already shown by the way De Goeje had to handle his manuscripts. His point of departure was the classical, predominantly static approach of texts. He looked at a text as a stable and well-defined entity, which had been composed and completed by an author and then transmitted to later periods by scribes. Such a reductionist approach may be feasible and fruitful with texts from Classical Antiquity, for a more recent and continuous textual tradition like Arabic literature, it is not always possible to maintain such a static appreciation of texts. With the early geographical texts of the Balkhi school such an approach clearly proved to be too simple. Even if De Goeje had wanted to distinguish between the works of al-İşakhrī and Ibn Hawqal, he could not escape using his findings with manuscripts of one text as a textual witness for establishing the other. So his two editions of the oldest texts of the Balkhi geographers, 703 1 (al-İşakhrī) and 703 2 (Ibn Hawqal), are so closely interrelated that each edition is used as a textual witness to the other.

For the editing of purely literary texts the editor needs a sufficient amount of textual evidence, together with a fair knowledge of the literary usage of the language of the text. The term 'fair knowledge' is a recurrent theme in discussions about textual criticism. It is sometimes referred to by Middle-Eastern scholars as al-Dhawq al-Salīm, 'good taste.' This implies that the editor who has this good taste, knows the right level and register of language and, thus, he should be able to change the text for the better, as the author might have done, or even try to do it better than the author, if the editor falls into the trap of identifying himself too much with his object of research. The extent to which this 'good taste' is exercised distinguishes a good edition from a bad one. The use of 'good taste' is the personal element in textual criticism. However, caution is necessary when the editor feels tempted to use his 'taste', as its reckless use results in erroneously applying textual criticism and devising conjectures. Yet, the editing of texts is not a mechanical procedure, as some followers of Lachmann would have it.

In the editing of scientific texts the editor's knowledge of the field of science becomes relatively more important. It is obvious that whoever edits an old mathematical text, should not only know about philology, codicology and paleography, but also about the ins and outs of the history of mathematics. Conjectures to improve corrupt texts should, then, not be made solely on the basis of philological arguments, but equally with mathematical considerations. And the same goes for other technical and scientific texts. To a certain extent,

17 See the appendix, hereafter.
18 Vol. 1 of the series (al-İşakhrī, 701), introduction p. viii.
19 Most notably to Carlo de Landberg, for his help in procuring the manuscript of Ibn Khurdābdīhī’s Kitāb al-Masūlīk wa-Mumālīk (now M 4 Vienna, ONL, Munich, 783).
20 This is not because of an intrinsic difference of classical Greek and Latin texts, but because of the long distance in time between the period in which the classical author lived and our own period. It is, in fact, our lack of knowledge about the early stages of that period, in which classical texts crystallized into a fixed shape, that creates the false impression of being static.

21 See the appendix to this article, which gives a survey of the manuscripts used by De Goeje for his editions. Gerald R. Tabbets has drawn a stream of the texts of the Balkhi school of geography, demonstrating the complications of transmission of the material ('The Balkhi school of geographers', in J.R. Harley & David Woodward, Cartography in the traditional Islamic and South Asian societies [II] (Chicago 1992), 908-136, 02 p. 31). See now also Franz Bork, Geschichte des arabischen Schriftbuchs, vol. 10 and 12, both published in Frankfurt in 2000.
22 The work by Paul Maas, Textual criticism, which has been used widely by generations of classical scholars, is confusing in this respect. It is at all applicable in practical textual criticism of Greek and Latin, in all its extreme consequences it is hardly useful for textual criticism of the Islamic literatures. I have expressed my doubts about the applicability of Maas’ book in 'Establishing the stigma. Fact or fiction?' of 1988, and the 'Philologist's Stone' of 1995.
one can consider geographical texts as literary texts, as travelogues, as descriptions of far-away countries and the manners and customs of their inhabitants. But geography is not just a topographical description of a region. It often contains a wealth of information on economic and other matters as well. Ibn Hawqal is a case in point, and the idea that he was economically active during his travels makes sense. The other story, that he probably also acted as a Fatimid missionary, only corroborates this, since activism for a cause and commercial activities have, in the history of Islam, always gone hand in hand.

Geographical texts are not just literary travelogues, nor just collections of commercial information, nor simply descriptions of bizarre habits of far-away peoples, nor cosmological fantasies. They contain, in fact, aspects of all of these. Geographical texts sometimes have the extra dimension of maps, and these put an extra burden on the shoulders of the editor. The earlier editions of geographical texts hardly ever had maps added to the text. On the one hand, this had to do with the limited technical possibilities of the reproduction of images at that time; on the other hand, this can be attributed to the nineteenth-century philologist’s preoccupation with texts, to the exclusion of graphic images. It seems to me that De Goeje was less interested in this extra pictorial dimension as a help to the interpretation of the geographical texts he was editing. His orientation toward his subject was mostly of a literary nature. As a text he wanted it to be as correct as possible, and to consider it as a collection of maps with explanatory texts was much less his approach.

Textual criticism works by the assumption that each copy of a manuscript contains the scribal errors already contained in the exemplar, plus a set of new ones. By analyzing the genealogy of errors it is possible to establish a genealogy of the manuscripts. These rules of textual criticism cannot simply be transposed to the critical analysis of a hierarchy in the tradition of maps, and their relationship with their captions, legends or accompanying texts in the manuscripts. The maps compound the matter, because their analysis is on the basis of more than just the text or legends. Art historical considerations, especially with regard to the techniques of painting and the conventions of representation, give extra information and, thereby, complicate matters. There is, of course, always the correlation with the geographical reality. In other words, the question to what extent does the map represent the reality both on the ground and in the text, is a constantly relevant one.

One example I will give here. It concerns the dilemma of the editor for the map of the Caspian Sea. In the al-Istakhri maps two islands are drawn. If one compares the map in the Leiden manuscript with the one in the Persian translation as contained in the Oxford manuscript, one can see that the names, or relative positions of the two islands, have been interchanged. This is not only a problem for textual criticism, but equally for the study of cartographical representation.

De Goeje never wrote a survey of his editorial methods (as Lachmann never did, for that matter). Their philological methods are implicitly available from their editions and other works. The obvious source for the method used is the critical apparatus. When one peruses De Goeje’s critical apparatus, one sees that he sometimes does use the maps, but just as additional evidence, where the text has failed him or shows a lacuna. Furthermore, De Goeje made no distinction between a critical apparatus, which serves to elucidate the selection of readings of the text, and the commentary which he needed for understanding the meaning of the text. For the editing of geographical texts this is not always feasible. Often the textual difficulties are about the spelling of names, and the correct spelling cannot always be reconstructed by textual criticism. The editor of a text must then have recourse to other works with a better reading, even though they are textually unrelated to the primary text that the editor is establishing. The numerous references in De Goeje’s apparatus are eloquent witnesses to this procedure. It proves the peculiar situation with the editing of non-fictional texts, and the impossibility of complying with the requirements of editorial theory under all circumstances.

So, when father and son Fikri, together with their two compatriots, on that quiet Sunday afternoon in August 1889 informally sat together with De Goeje in his house, smoking and talking, was it at all surprising that they posed him a question with a geographical implication, a relevant conversation piece? Where in the world, so they asked the learned editor of so many geographical texts, would he situate the legendary island of Wāq Wāq? De Goeje did not disappoint and, of course, came up with the correct answer: Wāq Wāq was Japan. He gave his visitors a full account of the numerous literary sources about Wāq Wāq and the etymology of its name, and then he produced the decisive arguments for his opinion.

24 See the bibliographical references in the appendix, below, under BGL, vol. 3.
25 Irshād al-Allāhī, p. 527.

23 De Goeje never travelled in the Orient.
Appendix

A survey of the manuscripts used by M.J. de Goeje in his Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum (864)

In the following De Goeje's sigla have been explained, according to De Goeje's own, often scanty, notes. This information has occasionally been augmented with details of the descriptions of the manuscripts, drawn from the catalogues.26

Before De Goeje had arrived at the idea to publish an entire library of Arab geographers, he had already edited, together with Dozy, the part on Africa and Andalusia of the Kitāb Naṣrät al-Muḥāsin fī Iskābīri al-Afṣiq by al-Sharīf al-Idrīsī.27 De Goeje visited Oxford in order to collate the two manuscripts there. The following manuscripts form the basis of this edition:

D = MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Grav. 3837–3842. The second best manuscript of the edition. An old manuscript in Maghribi hand, with maps.

BGA vol. 2. Kitāb Masālik al-Mamālik by al-Īstakhri (1879).28

Dedicated to Theodor Nübel (1836–1930).

A = MS Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, Cod. 352 (Cat. Rosen, p.44, No. 421).
C = Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, Arab. 1521 (Cat. Pertsch, vol. 3, pp. 142–144). An extract, or shortened version of, the text.
D = the Kitāb al-Masālik wa-Mamālik by Ibn Hawqal, edited by De Goeje as BGA vol. 2 (see hereafter).

I refrain from giving the full bibliographical details of the relevant catalogues as these can all be found in Geoffrey Roper, World Survey of Islamic Manuscripts. London (al-Furqan Islamic Heritage Foundation) 1992–1994 (4 volumes). Libraries are referred to by their present-day names.


Dedicated to William Wright (1850–1889).

A = MS Leiden, University Library, Or. 301 (Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 200). An Arabic compendium, copied in 916 (1510), purchased in 1876 by Alfred von Kremer (1828–1879) in Egypt, and not yet available when BGA 4 was published.

De Goeje also addsuce textual evidence from many later historical sources. In his critical apparatus and commentary one finds references to the works of Yaqūt, Abū al-Fadl, al-Qazwīnī, al-Yaquiṣūrī, al-Dimashqī, al-Idrīsī and others.


Dedicated to William Wright (1850–1889).

A = MS Leiden, University Library, Or. 301 (Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 347). Without maps, copied in Istanbul in 916 (1510).
C = MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arabe 2214 (Cat. de Slane, pp. 390–391). A shortened version of the text. The photograph of this manuscript, which was used by J.H. Kramers for his second edition, is kept in Leiden University Library as Or. 8525 (Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 348).
D = Kitāb Masālik al-Mamālik by al-Īstakhri, edited by De Goeje as BGA vol. 1.

A new edition of Ibn Hawqal’s work was edited in 1938–1939 under the title Kitāb Ṣurāt al-Ard (as the Istanbul manuscript has it) by that other Leiden editor of geographical texts, J.H. Kramers (1891–1957). The difference between De Goeje’s and Kramers’ edition is, of course, the use by Kramers of the Istanbul manuscript as the basis (referred to as al-Aṣfī in his apparatus), which had been unavailable to De Goeje.

Kramers used the following textual sources:
- MS Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi, No. 3546. Kramers’s photographic copy of the manuscript is kept in Leiden University Library as Or. 8244 (Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 347).
- MS Leiden, University Library, Or. 314, containing version II, the manuscript that was denoted by De Goeje as L.
- MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hunt. 538, containing version II, the manuscript that was denoted by De Goeje as B.
- MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, arabe 2234, containing version III, the manuscript that was denoted by De Goeje as P.

BGA vol. 3, Kitāb Aṣya’ an al-Taqāsīm fi Ma’rifat al-Aqṣām by al-Muqaddasi (1877), and the second edition (1906).

Dedicated to Aloys Sprenger (1883–1893).

B = MS Berlin, Staatliche Bibliothek zu Berlin, Sprenger 6 (Cat. Ahlwardt vol. 5, pp. 362–363, No. 6033). Sprenger had brought this manuscript from India, where he apparently had commissioned it. It is a copy (‘copied for the press’) of Sprenger’s own manuscript, which is now MS Berlin, Staatliche Bibliothek zu Berlin, Sprenger 5 (Cat. Ahlwardt, vol. 5, p. 362, No. 6034).

C = MS Istanbul, Stüleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Aya Sofya 2971 bis (Deferter, p. 179). From this manuscript a copy was made at De Goeje’s request and provided to him by the Dutch ambassador in Istanbul. This copy is now kept in Leiden University Library as Or. 20635 (Voorhoeve, Handlist, p. 7).

For the and, improved, edition of 1906, De Goeje did not use more manuscripts, but he gave a wider review to the existing sources, and he used the opportunity to add a considerable number of textual emendations, which he had received from a number of colleagues in the meantime.

BGA vol. 4 does not contain an edition, but comprises the indexes, glossary, and the additions and corrections to the texts in vols. 1–3. There is no dedication. The volume does mention, newly discovered materials, notably MS Leiden Or. 301, a shortened version of al-Isakhīrī, dated 589 (1193), with maps (pp. iv–vi). In the section for additions and corrections De Goeje selected material from this and other manuscripts (from p. 381 onwards).

BGA vol. 5, Kitāb al-Buldān by Ibn al-Faqīḥ al-Hamadhānī (1885).

Dedicated to the memory of Otto Lot (1844–1888).


BGA vol. 6 contains two texts: Kitāb al-Masālik wa-l-Mamālik by Ibn Khurdābdīshīb and excerpts of the Kitāb al-Khurāj by Qudāmah b. ‘Abšar (1889).

Dedicated to C. Barbier de Meynard (1826–1908) and Carlo de Landberg (1848–1924).

- Ibn Khurdābdīshīb:

A = MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Mixt. 783 (Cat. Loebenstein, p. 197, No. 248). The manuscript was originally purchased by Carlo de Landberg in the Orient and donated by him to the Vienna library, with the condition that it would be used first by De Goeje. The basis manuscript of the edition.


1233), incomplete and lacunous. A copy of this manuscript is MS Berlin, Staatsbibliothek
- Qulama b. Ṣafar, the geographical and statistical parts only (al-Manzila al-Sabā‘i, which is all that is preserved of the text).

Cod. = Storning for the edition was a copy of MS Istanbul, Köprülı Küttāphanest, which was in the possession of Charles Schefer (1820–1895) in Paris. Subsequently, De Goeje's own copy of the Schefer copy was collated at De Goeje's request by the Orientalist Dr. Hermann Gies, first dragoman of the German embassy in Constantinople, with the Köprüli original. Köprüli Defter, p. 70, Cat. Şev. vol. 1, p. 548, No. 1076. Şev. was unaware of the manuscript having been edited in this way, De Goeje's own collated copy is now in Leiden University Library. Or. 5289 (Foxhoven, Handlist, p. 115).

86 A vol. 7 contains two texts: the 7th part of Kitāb al-Âlāq al-Nafsā by Ibn Rusta and the Kitāb al-Âbdān by al-Ya'qūbi (892). Already in 1860 De Goeje had published part of al-Ya'qūbi's text, as his PhD thesis.40
- Dedicated to Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (1808–1899).
- Ibn Rusta:
Cod. = MS London, British Library. Add. 23378. Supplement Catalogue (1871),
pp. 564–567.
- al-Ya'qūbi:
Cod. = MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. According to De Goeje's preface (p. viii) at first part of the Muchinski collection, and later purchased by the Munich library.

86 A vol. 8. Kitāb al-Tanjib wa l-Ishraf by al-Mas'ūdī (894).41

40 Specimen literarum inuarae, exhibens descriptiornem Al-Maqrisî, suntium e libro regionum Al-Jaźībî, versione et annotationibus illustratum [...] Michael Janus de Goeje. Lugduni-Batavorum (apud E.J. Brill) 1890.
41 Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum. Edidit M.J. de Goeje. Pars Octava. Kitāb al-
Tanjib wa l-Ishraf auctore al-Mas'ūdī. Accedunt indices et glossariwm ad tomos VII et VIII. Lugduni-Batavorum (apud E.J. Brill) 1894.