

Some aspects of the cataloguing of Turkish manuscripts

by Günay Kut

In this article I will treat some aspects of the manuscript, and more particularly of the Turkish manuscript, that play a role in the process of identification and cataloguing. I shall only touch upon some points in respect to the publication of Turkish works which are still in manuscript form. Examples of Turkish manuscripts will be given, with the understanding that they have a relevance to Arabic and Persian manuscripts as well. I do not intend to provide a general and theoretical framework, but instead limit myself to empirical findings from the cataloguing work as it is done in the Union Catalogue of Manuscripts of Turkey (*Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu*), and in which I participate.

In the identification and producing of a useful catalogue of Turkish manuscripts two sets of considerations are taken into account.

Firstly, the identification of those manuscripts of which author or title, or both, are lacking. All who work on the cataloguing of manuscripts know that it is not difficult to identify a manuscript when its title and writer are specified in the text. The name of the writer and title are found on the first folios after *ammā ba'd* or *sebeb-i te'lif*, the author's introductory discourse. Sometimes, they are repeated in the *ḥātīme* section, the epilogue. The work's title and the author's name are often repeated in the final note added by the scribe *ketebe kaydī*, the colophon. Reading the top or bottom edge of the book block may sometimes give the requested information as well, as this is often the place where librarians write the titles on their manuscripts. In some cases, determining the title and author, and cataloguing the manuscript is accomplished after a relatively short research, provided that the author's name and the title of the text are found in the bibliographical reference works. For instance, we do not encounter any difficulty of identification and cataloguing when we already have the complete and fully documented copy of a manuscript of the *İskender-nāme* of Ahmedi, the *Ġarīb-nāme* of 'Aşiq Paşa or the *Meşā'irü's-su'arā* of 'Aşiq Çelebi. It is the manuscript that is lacking all such clear and explicit information, which is our concern.

If title and author are both lacking in the manuscript we have several options. Firstly, the text may be

anonymous and its title unknown as well. Generally speaking, if we do not find a note of its title on the title-page or in the introduction, the text is most likely anonymous. Sometimes a scribe or later owner has supplied bibliographical information which, originally, was lacking. In such cases we may come across a title, if one may call it so, like *Tasavvuftan bir risāle*, a treatise on *taşavvuf*, or *Risāle fi's-şarf*, a treatise on grammar, etc. If going through all the bibliographical reference books, such as *Keşfü'z-zunūn*, *Zeyl-i Keşfü'z-zunūn*, catalogues and catalogue-like works, gives no result, and if perusing the text in question confirms the indication given by the scribe or owner at the beginning of the manuscript, that 'title' may be accepted, provided of course that it neatly covers the contents. If it does not, an appropriate name is given to this text by the cataloguer. In such a case, the title should be printed in parentheses in order to graphically distinguish it from those manuscripts in the catalogue which have an unquestionable identification.

The second possibility is that the text consists of selections from one or more works. It can also be the second or further volume of a text. In this case, the name of the author and the title of the text may not be repeated, having been given in the first volume. In those cases where the manuscript contains selections from one text, they must all be read in order to identify them. Then, after all possibilities have been considered, a title such as *Müntehabāt-ı Meşnevī*, Selections from the *Meşnevī*, *Müntehabāt-ı qaşā'id-i Nef'ī*, Selections from the *qaşīdes* of Nef'ī, or in contemporary Turkish a title such as *Mesnevi'den seçmeler*, Anthology from the *Meşnevī*, may be given to that manuscript.

When the manuscript under consideration is one volume of a text which consists of more than one volume, the process of identifying the text may become complicated. Should no specific information or explanation about author and text appear in the manuscript, the only way is to read the text and subsequently start searching in all directions, according to its contents. There is really no methodological approach possible here. Sometimes, use is made of information supplied on the first leaf concerning the title and author (as mentioned above). Then the problem is solved, but only if this information is really accurate, otherwise it may confuse the whole issue and lead one to wrong

conclusions. There are numerous such mistakes in our old catalogues.

An example can be found in the manuscript Aya-sofya No. 3318, which is now preserved in the Süleymaniye Library. We see that the name of the author and the title of the text are not specified. On *f.* 1r of the manuscript, however, there is a note saying *Ġazavāt-ı Sulṭān Süleymān* (the word *Kitāb* was added later, as we can easily see from the different colour of the ink) and on *f.* 1v we see an almost faded note that reads *Zafer-nāme-i Husrev*. We see the same note *Zafer-nāme-i Husrev* on *ff.* 1r-v in manuscript No. 3382 in the Ayasofya collection. This note and the contents of the two manuscripts corroborate one another's identification. If we look at the inventory (*defter*) of the Ayasofya collection in order to identify the text, we see the title *Ġazavāt-ı Sulṭān Süleymān Hān* for No. 3318 and *ba'zī müverrihīn* (since three texts are mentioned in this chapter) as its author¹. The title of manuscript No. 3382 is given as *Zafer-nāme-i Husrev fī Tārīh-i Sulṭān Süleymān Hān*, with the indication of Husrev Efendi as the author². It is immediately clear that the information in the inventory is directly based on the note at the beginning of these two manuscripts, and does not, therefore, provide us with new information. Thus, it is necessary to look at other sources in order to find a more satisfactory solution. *Keşfü'z-zunūn* does not mention such a text, but the author of *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, probably after having seen these two manuscripts, based his information on the word *Husrev* which was given on *ff.* 1r-v and he gave therefore a certain Husrev Efendi as the author of the text³. On the other hand, the author of *İstanbul Kütüphaneleri Tarih ve Coğrafya Yazmaları Kataloqları*, quoting the said text, attributes the authorship of these two manuscripts, and the *Ġazavāt* of Kaz'asker Muṣṭafā Bostān (d. 973/1565), to Husrev Efendi thereby compounding the problem even more⁴. Fortunately, Agāh Sırrı Levend, in his book entitled *Ġazavānāmeler ve Mihaloğlu Ali Beyin Ġazavānāmesi*⁵, showed that the manuscript is in fact the tenth volume of the history, entitled *Tevārīh-i āl-i 'Osmān* by Kemālpaşa-zāde. This section had already been published by Pavet de Courteille with the title *Mohāç-nāme-i Kemālpaşa-zāde* in 1859 in Paris (see figures 1 and 2). This example shows that if we have too much confidence in the information given on *ff.* 1r-v of a manuscript, this may lead to disastrous mistakes.

There are many more examples of this and of a similar kind. The one which I would like to mention concerns a question in connection with the work entitled *Tercümānū'd-düstūr fī havādişi'l-izmāni'd-duhūr* by Balāṭī-zāde Kemālī (d. 953/1546), which is the translation of *Ravzatū's-şafā* written by Mirhond in Persian. A note at the beginning of a copy of this text gives the title of the work as *Cennābi-zāde Tārīhi*. Under this title this manuscript was offered for sale for a number of years in the bookseller's market,

مهاج نامه
کمال پاشا زاده
علیه الرحمت



وكان طبعه
في مدينة باريس الحميّة
بدار الطباعة السلطانيّة
سنة الحجريّة
الطائفة لستنة المسيحية

Fig. 1. Title-page of the *Mohāç-nāme-i Kemālpaşa-zāde* published by Pavet de Courteille (Paris 1859)

مهاج نامه
کمال پاشا زاده
علیه الرحمت

سیاس بی فتناس ومنت بی نهایت اول خدای بی عتابیه که نعمت
فدیمت قرای عزّیه صلاهی عامّ اندوب جمش نصرت کیش اسلام
ظفر مرجام احمون عمش مهتای مهتای امش ویاچی داغینک باغری
باعمله فراغ نالتری وریاع حالتری چراغین یاندومشدر قلب صلب
اهدای بد رأی دین میندی ویشست درشت خصوم شوم شرع متیندی
کرم ونرم اندوب جمع آرای شادی قرای جهادی اویاندومش
وکرمانی جهان افروز دار وکیرله برتاب و سوز اولان تشنلب جانلری
مدرب شمسر آبدارله شریعت شهادتیه فاندومشدر
(شعر) شهادت شریعتی نوش ایدنلر
ایچوب جام حسام جوش ایدنلر
سروریه ایدر لر عیش باقی
طهور اولور شراب و حور ساق
صیلاب صلاب بی حدّ و ورود درود بی عدّ شول ناصب لوی شریعت
کرامت احتوانه که صاحب مقام محمود در جای جایتننه کیروب

Fig. 2. Beginning of the text of the *Mohāç-nāme-i Kemālpaşa-zāde* published by Pavet de Courteille (Paris 1859)

Sahhaflar, in Istanbul and was finally purchased by the library of the newspaper *Tercüman*⁶. The difficulty in identifying the text arose from the fact that it was the second volume of the translation by Balāṭī-zāde, and that neither the title nor the name of the author appeared in the manuscript.

The third possibility is that, in some cases, the author himself has omitted to give a title to his work. That is, there is no definite title in the section beginning with *ammā ba'd* or *sebeb-i te'lif*. In that case the text will either be given a name by a researcher or a suitable title will be established, according to the contents, during the process of cataloguing. In this process of naming a text, the notes on ff. 1r-v of the text are also taken into consideration. But we know from experience that when manuscripts containing the same text are carelessly catalogued and given different titles, there is the possibility that these will be forever considered as two different texts. Of course, this mistake can be avoided by actually reading the work. A few examples may illustrate this. Veysī (d. 1037/1628) wrote a book known as *H'āb-nāme* or *Vāqi'a-nāme* of which many copies exist. The author of *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, Mehmet Tahir from Bursa, not having seen all of the various copies, mistakenly mentions the manuscripts as two different texts⁷. Some copies contain the title *Hikāyet-i Iskender*, as may be seen, for instance, in the Süleymaniye Library's card-indexes under that title. In the course of cataloguing such works, it is necessary to mention the other titles of the text and to give cross-references in the index. Only when the various titles of a text are known, will it be possible to identify texts which have been registered under several different titles.

Another example may elucidate this. The influential work about religious orders entitled *Menāqib-i Hāce-i cihān ve Netice-i cān*, which was originally brought to the attention of Turkish philologists by the late Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, has been known by this title for many years. Neither Gölpınarlı nor Professor Tahsin Yazıcı, who planned to publish the text, ever mentioned the other title of this text, *Tevā'if-i 'Aşere*⁸. This title can be found at the beginning of most copies of the said work, and thus these are listed in the card-indexes and catalogues under this name, no reference to the other title being made. Knowledge of both names helped locate nineteen copies of this text⁹. Later, two more copies of the text were found in collections in Antalya and Çorum¹⁰. I believe that more copies of the text will be found as the cataloguing projects in the libraries of Anatolia progress. It is evident, however, that only when we examine the contents of the text, can we see that the two different titles refer to one and the same text (see figures 3 and 4).

In short, it cannot be over-emphasized that the cataloguer or bibliographer has to be extremely careful in such cases, and that should he identify a text with more than one name, he should provide full cross-references in his index. Only in this way can cataloguing be useful to the researcher. Bibliographical sources do not, usually, solve this kind of problems. For instance, we cannot find the title of the text mentioned above either in *Keşfü'z-zunūn* or in its appendix, not to mention *Osmanlı Müellifleri*. That

means that the only starting point will be the text itself. After the text has been examined, the bibliographical reference works are consulted and, especially, recent studies on the subject are read. Sufficient knowledge of these resources is, of course, indispensable for the cataloguer.

Another problem of identification of a text is encountered when the folios of the manuscript are bound in the wrong order or if the sheets have been scattered around during the (re)binding. If such a manuscript comprises only one text it is not difficult to put the manuscript in order again, because it can either be compared with another copy of the text or one can try to restore the order of the leaves with the help of the *reddāde*, the catchword¹¹. Displaced and missing sheets will then easily be found. If, on the other hand, we are concerned with a *mecmū'a*, a convolute of texts, more caution must be taken, since a *mecmū'a*, as we know, often includes texts on different subjects, copied, as the case may be, by various copyists; often the texts are continued in the margins. For this reason determining all texts in a *mecmū'a* and restoring the order of their leaves is a delicate affair which may be very time-consuming. A minute oversight may cause an incorrect or incomplete identification of the text.

An illustration of what can happen in this respect may be given in connection with the story which goes by the title *Anabacı*. Manuscripts of this work are rare¹². It was written in the 16th century by an author named Ca'fer with the pseudonym Vaḥdī, who is not mentioned in any source other than 'Āşiq Çelebi, Laṭīfī and Sehī¹³. Fuad Köprülü was the first to discuss this story in his article entitled 'Meddahlar'¹⁴. He quotes 'Āşiq Çelebi, who says that he had not come across a copy of this text. But today we know that there are at least four manuscript copies of this story, and one copy has since been discovered in the Tekelioğlu collection in Antalya. Sheets of this story were extant in a *mecmū'a* of the Tekelioğlu collection, but they were bound in a disorderly way. If the *mecmū'a* had not been examined well, the presence of the story would, probably, not have been recognized. The identification made it possible to reorganise the leaves, and even to recover one more sheet that was preserved in a completely different place¹⁵.

It is indeed a disquieting phenomenon that in a great number of manuscripts the sheets have been mixed up during (re)binding. Therefore, the cataloguer should always proceed with extreme caution. The case of the story of *Anabacı* is yet compounded by the fact that it is also one of those texts that are known under more than one title, possibly due to their not having been given a definitive name by their author. One may conclude this from the fact that the *Anabacı* story is mentioned as *Hikāye-i dendāniyye* in Flügel's catalogue of the Vienna collection¹⁶. The text is also known as *Bursalı Hoca 'Abdu'r-ra'ūf hikāyesi* because the main character of the story is called 'Abdu'r-ra'ūf. Laṭīfī

هَذَا كِتَابٌ طَوَائِفِ عَشْرَةٍ
 بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 حَمْدِي خَدَّ أَوْلَى إِلَهِي نَظِيرُهُ وَشَنَائِي عَدَّ أَوْلَى بَادِ شَاهِ
 بِي وَزِيرِهِ كَهْ بُولَاكَ كَاهِ أَعْظَمَ بِرَشَشٍ دَرِ بِجَهْ وَدُرِّ خَانَقَاهِ بِي
 سُنُونُ جَارِ دِيرِ آرْ لَهْ بِأَحْرَفِ كَافِ نُونِ بِرِنَكَارِ لَهْ بِي دَلْدِي
 وَهَفَّتِ أَسْمَانِي أَكَا أَسْمَانِ ايدوب قناديل فُرُوخْتَهْ بِرِنَهْ بِرِيرِ
 نَجْمُ شَعْلَهْ دَارِي أَوْ مَخْتَهْ قَلْبُ هُوَيْدَا ايلدي وهفت طبة
 زمين چون مائله ما اوزره دوشيوب اجيني انوع نعم برله مملوا
 ايدوب جاجا جلال بركات روان ايتدي وانبياي عليهم الصلوا
 والسلام شيوخ صاحب دين قلوب البياي رحيم الله
 خلفاوا تراشيد بين ايلدي وصلحاي بر يدور آدين ايدوب
 اهل يقين قلدي وكني انسان كامل وكني كامل آذاز وكني
 بالغ حر وكني اهل تقليد وكني اهل استدلال وكني اهل كشف
 وكني مجزوب سالك وكني مجزوب غير سالك وكني مجزوب
 صرف اتدي بودكرا وكنان اهل جذباتي وساير مخلوقاتي مسافر



ايلدي

ايلدي كدر بولتي درجه لوايكي فابولو خانقاهاك برهوسندن ايمرو
 كيرود بونعمين نعمتار دن بيلر واول جلاب كهي مولردن ايجار
 برايكي كون مجاورا ولوب خوشه كچا روا وچنهي كون بينه اولوبتير
 قپوسندن طشره چقوب مسافر اوله لر نه برون كلد لر شه بينه اكا
 عزم ايله لطف منازل ايدوب اصل لر بينه واصل اوله لر مراد بولا لر
 كما قال الله تبارك وتعالى كمال شيخي يرجع الى اصله
 مشنوي در نصيحت معنوي از روي حقيقت بزي طالع باق
 الااي طالبي سلكي طريقه الااي راقب ملك حقيقت
 كل مدي بوسوز طوت كوش كوك درون دله و آريسه خيرو شك
 مسافر خانقاه بلدك جهماني برايكي كون سن انجق ميمر مانه
 او چنهي كون عملم اولور فيا فت ايله من طور سيوب اول دمه رحلت
 نه برون كلد و كيسه بيل محقق ينما اول بيوره وار برهن سن انجق
 كه بوسوز مصطفى سوز بيه اي شاه اشيدوب بنده بوسوز دن اول كاه
 كه هر نسنده اولور اصليند كر جمع بوسوزي اول كوكل سمعيله سامع
 كه بوسوز سوز لر ايمر چون شكر در كه ساكاه عالم دلن خبر دشر

Fig. 3. MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Antalya, Tekelioğlu No. 385, ff. 1v-2r. Beginning of *Kitāb Tevā'if-i 'Aşere*



Fig. 4. MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Halet Efendi No. 242, f 1r.
Beginning of *Menāqib-i Hâce-i cihân ve Netîce-i cân*

mentions three names of the story in his *tezkiire*: *Bursalı 'Abdu'r-ra'ûf hikâyeti*, *Anabacı* and *Dendân laîfesi*¹⁷. The author obviously never gave a definitive name to his story.

Another complication met with during the identification stage is when the front sheet of the manuscript has been torn off or when the preface of the text is not extant in the manuscript which is being studied. If we have a manuscript of a *divân* or a well-known *mesnevi* or historical text, a missing introduction poses few problems. But if it is not a familiar text, it is always better to admit that the text could not be identified because of certain deficiencies than to assign to it an incorrect name or record it as an anonymously written work. Note should be taken of such texts, and whenever similar texts appear, they should be compared.

The case of Ahmed Da'i may serve as an example. This 15th-century poet compiled an Arabic-Persian dictionary for Sultan Murad II, who was his pupil. In a Persian preface Da'i mentions that he named his dictionary *'Uqudü'l-cevâhir* (see figure 5). But in some copies of this text, this preface is lacking. In such an instance, the text begins directly with the dictionary (see figure 6) and it becomes difficult to determine the name of the text and its author. In this particular case, the first thing the cataloguer does is to compare the manuscripts which do not provide him with a sufficient amount of information with other dictionaries in the library. This may not always yield the expected result. In that case, and after having determined the beginning and end of the text and after having given the necessary information, the cataloguer should simply admit

بِاسْمِ عَقُودِ الْجَوَاهِرِ مَوْسُومِ كَشْتِهِ بِرَبِّهِمْ خِرَانَةُ مَعْرُوفَةٌ
 سُلْطَانِ رَادَةِ جِهَانِ بِرَحْمَةِ زَيْدِ بْنِ وَرَمَانَ نَوَّارِ حَقِيقَةٍ
 أَهْلِ إِيمَانٍ وَنُورِ حَقِيقَةٍ عَدْلٍ وَأَمَانٍ شَعْرَةٍ
 خُرَشِيدِ سَعَادَتِي أَمَانِي مَقْصُودِ مِرَادِ رِنْدِ كَانِ
 الْأَمِيرِ الْكَبِيرِ الْأَمْعَدِ وَالنَّسَبِ النَّسَبِ الْمُجَمَّدِ وَارْتِ
 الْمَلِكِ عِزِّ الْأَبِّ وَاللَّجْدِ مَسْتَحْمَلِ الْكَلَامَاتِ فِي لَوْحِ أَمْعَدِ
 عَالِي جِهَتِ أَنْ جَلَالِ تَكْلِينِ يَعْنِي كَلَامِ جَلَالِ دَوْلَتِ دِينِ
 خَلَاصَةِ الْمَاءِ وَالطَّيْرِ سَلَالَةِ الْمُلُوكِ وَالسَّلَامِينِ
 مِرَادِ جَلِي كَامِرَانَ السُّلْطَانَ الْأَعْظَمِ وَالْمَلِيقَانَ الْمَنْعِ
 مَالِكِ أَرْمَةِ الْأُمَّةِ مَلِكِ الْعَرَبِ وَالْحَجْمِ غِيَاثِ الدُّنْيَا
 وَالدِّينِ سُلْطَانَ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ بَايُنُودِ بْنِ مِرَادِ بْنِ أَوْخَانَ بْنِ عُمَانَ

مَنْعَ اللَّهِ الْمَلِكِ وَالذِّينِ بَطُولِ بَقَائِهِمَا وَأَقْدَمِيهِمَا بِمَشَاهِدَةٍ
 لِقَائِهِمَا تَأْمُونِ كِهْ بِنَطْرِ عِنَايَتِ مَلْحُوظِ كَرْدَانِيهِ بِشَرَفِ
 مَطَالَعَةِ قَبُولِ مَحْضُوطِ دَارِ دَنْظِ

دَرْخَفَةُ مَخْتَصَرِ دَامِ حَدِيثِ نَبِيِّ وَهُوَ الدَّعَاءُ الَّذِي أَدْرَجْتُهُ فِيهَا
 مَا رَأَيْتُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ مَا جَاءَ حَوْلَ دَنْظِ مِنْ

القطعة الأولى

إِبْتِدَاءُ وَافْتِتَاحُ وَقَاتِحَاتِ أَعْيَانِ	إِسْتِمَالَتِ دِلْحَسْتِي دَارِ دَنْ مَوَافِقِ
إِحْتِمَامُ وَخَمُّ وَغَايَاتِهَا وَعَاقِبَتِ	كُنْهٌ وَقُصُورٌ وَقُصَارٌ خَائِمَتِ بَيَانِ
جَهْدُ وَإِعْلَانُ شَرْحِ وَتَفْصِيحِ أَشْكَارِ	جُودِ مَرَاخِطِ أَشْكَارِي وَصَرِيحِ
إِحْتِبَابُ وَإِحْتِمَابُ وَإِسْطِفَاءُ وَاجْتِبَابُ	بِرْكَزِ بَدَنِ مِثْلِ أَوْ بَأَشَدِّ خِيَارِ
مُجْتَبِ جَوْنِ مُجْتَبِ مَخَارِجِ مَعْطِي	مُجْتَبِ أَشَدِّ بِرْكَزِ بَدَنِ مِثْلِ أَوْ بَأَشَدِّ خِيَارِ

Fig. 5. MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Baghdatlı Vehbi No. 1949. Beginning of 'Uqūdū'l-cevāhir by Ahmed Da'i, an Arabic-Persian dictionary compiled for Sultan Murad II, who was the author's pupil. Here the title is mentioned in the Persian preface (right page, first line).

that he has been unable to determine the title of the text and the author's name.

Another example in this respect is the *Mülk (Tebā-reke) süresi tefsiri*, the author of which was unknown for a great number of years. The text was classified as an anonymous work. As a result, no information related to other copies of the work could be obtained. However, when Professor M. Esat Coşan compared manuscript No. 3779 of the collection of the Library of the Seminary for Turkish Language and Literature of the Literary Faculty of the University of Istanbul, whose front sheet had been torn off, with other manuscript copies, he found that the name of the author was in fact Muştafā b. Muḥammad, also known by his pen-name Muşliḥi'd-dīn¹⁸. Again, it cannot be overstressed that seemingly unidentifiable texts must be compared with other manuscript copies. It is so self-evident, but hardly ever done in a proper way.

Now I will touch upon my second topic, namely how a manuscript catalogue can be made in such a way that it is useful for the researcher in general and the editor of a text in particular. Once the author and the text are identified correctly, the subject that most concerns the researcher is the status of that manuscript in the textual tradition of the text. It is as important to describe the details of the physical appearance of a manuscript as it is to identify the text. It goes without saying that this takes a great amount of time and effort from all those who are working on the publication of texts by critical editions. Therefore, the cataloguer should give in great detail all relevant particulars of the manuscript, even down to the point of scribal errors. First he must indicate all details of the outward appearance of that manuscript copy, such as the date of copying, the type of paper, its writing style, and the number of its sheets and lines. Suppose that the cataloguer has a *divān* before him on his table. If he does not give the number of *qaşides*, *ğazels*, *tercī-i bends*, *rübā'ī* and chronograms contained in that copy, his cataloguing effort will be futile. To this I want to add the following point, just as a reminder. Only an accurate method of numbering the leaves of the manuscript is a guarantee for correct references in the future. This would seem to be a truism, and only too self-evident. Numbering the leaves, however, is in most libraries done by non-experts, and the confusion arising from the incorrect counting of the leaves of manuscripts is enormous. Sometimes sheets were missed while the manuscript was being numbered or this numbering procedure was not done according to the order of the sheets. Such mistakes should be recognized and corrected during the cataloguing.

As important as the date of copying is the information which can be gained from the front sheets and fly-leaves of a manuscript. These notes, *fevā'id*, may indicate property (*temellük*) or *vaqıf* records or other sorts of information in connection with the (former) status

of the manuscript. If they are available, they should be taken into account. Sometimes it is possible, if only approximately, to determine the date of copying from this information, or it is possible to discover that the manuscript under consideration is an important one. For example, the presence of the seal of a Sultan or a note, saying *odadan çıkan Türkī* (a Turkish work coming from the palace library) on a manuscript, will help in dating the text and making clear the importance of that copy.

In Turkey there is a centre and a bureau which are now working under the name *Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu* (TÜYATOK), i.e. 'The Union Catalogue of Manuscripts in Turkey'. The centre tries to carry out its activities in accordance with the above-mentioned principles. According to the statistical data which were gathered in 1984, there exist in Turkey, besides libraries belonging to universities, museums, newspapers, banks, *vaqıfs* and persons, some ninety libraries with manuscripts in their holdings which operate under the supervision of the General Directorate of Libraries and Publications. In all, 166,593 Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts have been counted in those ninety libraries and no less than 28,106 of these are listed as Turkish. If we add to these the number of manuscripts extant in the other, above-mentioned, libraries, we can easily understand that the said number will multiply several times. Here we are counting only the number of texts in one or more volumes, but if we also add the texts which are contained in several volumes and the texts included in *mecmū'as*, we must understand that we are facing a cataloguing project which will need a great number of years to be completed. As Professor E. Birnbaum put it in one of his essays: 'Turkey is the warehouse of manuscripts'¹⁹. Serious efforts are being made to bring to light the contents of this 'warehouse'.

In conclusion I would like to briefly touch upon a few problems in connection with the publication of Turkish texts which have not yet been printed and which are still available only in manuscript. Roughly speaking, these manuscripts can be divided into three categories. Texts preserved in one manuscript copy only, texts preserved in several manuscript copies, and, thirdly, texts which are available in huge amounts of manuscript copies.

In my opinion the most advantageous way of publishing texts which are preserved in only one copy is to give a facsimile edition, together with a transcription. An example of such an edition is that of Barbara Flemming entitled *Fahrīs Husrev u Şirīn. Eine türkische Dichtung von 1367*, which was published in Wiesbaden in 1974.

The ideal way of publishing works that are available in several manuscript copies is to establish the status of these copies in the textual tradition and their relation to other copies of the work in order to prepare a critical edition of the text. To this a facsimile edition of

the best manuscript copy should be added. An example of such a publication is Andreas Tietze's edition of *Mustafa Ali's Description of Cairo of 1599*, published in Vienna in 1975.

The most complicated task is the publication of texts that are preserved in a huge amount of manuscripts. The question arises, for instance, which criteria will be used for the publication of Fuzuli's *Ḥadīqatü's-su'adā* of which about two hundred manuscript copies were located, or for the publication of Laṭīfī's *Tezkire* of which now more than fifty copies are known to exist? We know that even just to try to study all copies of such a text or to determine the mutual relationship of the manuscripts may take years. A practical solution for the publication of such texts would be to select either the oldest or the most complete copy of such texts as the basis for a critical edition. However, even with this procedure, it is still necessary to identify all the copies of a text. Next to this, the publication of a facsimile edition of an old and reliable copy is also necessary. That all this effort of publishing and editing can only have lasting value when explanatory notes, indexes, table of contents and the like are added goes without saying.

NOTES

¹ *Defter-i Kütüphane-i Ayasofya* (Dersaadet: Mahmud Bey Matbaası, 1304/1886-87), p. 199.

² *Ibid.*, p. 203.

³ Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, III (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Amire, 1342/1923-24), p. 50.

⁴ *İstanbul kütüphaneleri tarih ve coğrafya yazmaları katalogları* (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), p. 77. It should be noted that the MS number given as 3217 on this page must be changed to 3317. The beginning line of this text is different from the opening lines in the two other manuscripts.

⁵ Ağâh Sırrı Levend, *Ğazavât-nâmeler ve Mihaloğlu Ali Bey'in Ğazavât-nâmesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1956), pp. 44-45.

⁶ The catalogue of the Turkish manuscripts of this library has been compiled by the present author and is now in the press.

⁷ Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, II (İstanbul: Matbaa-i amire, 1333/1914-15), pp. 477-78.

⁸ Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, 'Menakıb-ı Hâce-i cihan', in: *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, III (1935), pp. 129-132; Tahsin Yazıcı, 'Kalenderlere dair yeni bir eser', in: *Necati Lugal armağanı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1968), p. 787.

⁹ Günay Kut, 'British Museum'daki bazı önemli Türkçe yazmalar ve Teva'if-i aşereden taife-i Bektaşiyân', in: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı*. Belleten 1971, pp. 220-222.

¹⁰ For Antalya see: *Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu*

07/IV (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1984), p. 278, nr. 3280.

¹¹ Apart from *reddāde* one encounters also the following terms: *rabıta*, *muraqıb*, *müş'ir*, *müş'ire*, *reddadiye*, *müşahide*, *ta'qıbe*, *raqabe*, *payende*, *ayaq*, *çoban* and *garib*. See Orhan Şaik Gökyay, 'Eski, yeni ve ötesi', in: *Kaynaklar*, I (September, October, November, 1983), p.60.

¹² *Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu*, 07/V (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1984), pp. 247-48, No. 3960 (Tekelioğlu, 869/5). See for the other copies: Gustav Flügel, *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlich-königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, I (Wien, 1865), p. 423, No. 428; Hanna Sohrweide, *Türkische Handschriften*, 5 (Wiesbaden, 1981), p. 265, No. 284.

¹³ *Heşt Bihışt. The Tezkire by Sehî Beg*, ed. Günay Kut (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 277; Laṭīfī, *Asar-ı eslafdan Tezkire-i Latîfî*, ed. Ahmed Cevdet (İstanbul: İkdâm matbaası, 1314/1896-97), p. 357; 'Aşık Çelebi, *Meşar'ir üş-su'arû Tezkere of 'Aşık Çelebi*, ed. G.M. Meredith-Owens (London: Luzac and Company Ltd., 1971), 77a.

¹⁴ Fuad Köprülü, 'Meddahlar', in: *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, I (1925), pp. 16-17.

¹⁵ The *reddāde* on f. 51v does not fit f. 52r, thus there is a lacuna. A close examination of the manuscript reveals that the lacuna can be filled by folios 15r-v. Unfortunately, this is not indicated in the printed version of the catalogue (*Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu*, 07/V, pp. 247-247), whereas it is written in the draft of the catalogue, which is preserved in the Süleymaniye Library.

¹⁶ G. Flügel, *op. cit.*, p. 423.

¹⁷ Laṭīfī, *Tezkire*, p. 357. The subject of this story was published by Şükrü Elçin (in: *Erciyes*, 4 37, Kayseri, May, 1981). We learn from this article that there is still another manuscript copy of this story, which was purchased from the late Raif Yelkenci by the Faculty of Language and History and Geography in Ankara. Unfortunately, this copy is missing today.

¹⁸ M. Esat Coşan, 'XV. Asır Türk yazarlarından Muslihu'd-din, Hamid-oğulları ve Hızır Bey', in: *Vakıflar Dergisi* 13 (1981), pp. 101-102. The present author mistakenly referred to this text and its copy as No. 329 (olim No. 5/21) Ankara, Adnan Ötüken İl Halk Library. See for this *Başlangıcından günümüze kadar büyük Türk klâsikleri*, I, edd. A. Bican Ercilâsun, Fahir İz, Günay Kut, Nevzat Kösoğlu (İstanbul, 1985), pp. 378-80. Similarly, Fehmi Ethem Karatay was used as a source and MS Revan 630 was referred to as *Anonim İlm-i Hal*. See Fehmi Ethem Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu*, I (İstanbul, 1961), p. 93, No. 275, *Başlangıcından günümüze kadar büyük Türk klâsikleri*, I, p. 381, whereas this manuscript is in fact another copy of the *Muqaddime* by Kutbeddin İzniki of which the front page was lost. The two mistakes are herewith corrected, we hope.

¹⁹ E. Birnbaum, 'Turkish manuscripts: Cataloguing since 1960 and manuscripts still uncatalogued. Part 5: Turkey and Cyprus' in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 No. 3 (1984), p. 466.