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FOREWORD

Levinus Warner died in Constantinople in 1665. In his last will he decided to bequeath his collection of Oriental manuscripts and books to the University Library of Leiden.

This precious library was brought to the Netherlands in several shipments. In 1669 the last consignment was received and less than a year later the first handwritten list of the collection was compiled—numerous printed catalogues, text-editions and articles were to follow in the centuries to come. Together with the manuscripts of Scaliger and Gellius, Warner’s legacy was the basis of the later development and flourishing of Oriental studies in the Netherlands.

This exhibition and the publishing this booklet are to commemorate this important and precious donation.

It is only fitting to take this opportunity of conveying our thanks for the work done by the various contributors: Prof. Dr. G.W.J. Drewes for his article on the history of the collection; the Curators of the Bibliotheca Thysiana for placing that library at our disposal to hold the exhibition; Mr. J. T. P. de Bruijn, Lecturer in Persian at Leiden University, for the description of the Persian manuscripts; three members of the staff of the University Library, Mrs. Inge Acker-van Eyk for her description of the Turkish manuscripts, Mr. A. J. W. Huismans for his description of the printed books and Mr. P. S. J. van Koningsveld, Keeper of Oriental Manuscripts, for his description of the Arabic and remaining manuscripts and his short survey of the collection; and Mr. F. C. Wiedel, director of E. J. Brill’s Publishing House, who was so kind as to undertake the publishing of this booklet.

J. R. de Groot,
University Librarian
THE LEGATUM WARNERIANUM OF THE LEIDEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The study of Oriental languages in Leiden commenced virtually simultaneously with the founding of the University, while a beginning with the collection of manuscripts in these languages was also made at the same time.

Then, and for many years after that, under "Oriental languages" was understood Semitic languages, and first and foremost Hebrew, which had won itself a place next to Latin and Greek in many a Western European university in the course of the sixteenth century. Both Protestant theologians and humanist scholars showed equal interest in it, so that it was only natural that this subject should be included in the Series Lectionum of the University of Leiden, founded in 1575.

Among the first professors of Hebrew there were some who occupied themselves with the study of other Semitic languages as well—at that time classified under the name "the diacritic"—especially that of Arabic; these included, among others, Plantijn's son-in-law, the scholarly printer Raphelengius, who took up the professorship of Hebrew in 1586, and his successor Fr. Junius (1597-1601). Great interest in Arabic was also shown by the famous J. J. Scaliger, who was appointed professor without specific teaching duties at the University in 1593.

Possessed of an incredible love for this language (incredibili amore huius linguae) he had drawn up an Arabic Thesaurus, and even though he made the wistful remark that "The more material I collect, the more I realize my inexperience in this language" (quo plura congero, eo me huius linguae imperitoirem esse sensio), his zeal in studying this rich language never flagged or failed to stimulate others. The Hebrew and other Oriental manuscripts (nos. 212-268 and 4728-4738) bequeathed by him to the Leiden University Library, apart from the Western ones, comprising 79 items, form the core, together with those of the estate of Colius, of the Oriental collection held by this library at present.

A separate chair of Arabic was created as early as 1599, when at Scaliger's intercession a Jewish scholar from Eastern Europe, Philippus Fernandus, who had turned Christian and had worked
in England as professor for some time, was charged with the teaching of Arabic. Unfortunately he died that same year, even before the three years’ term of his appointment, after a trial period of six months, had commenced.

After the death of Philippus Fernandus the new chair appeared to be difficult to fill. In the years 1612-1613 some instruction in Arabic was given by Jan Theunisz, a man with no knowledge of Latin and hence not regarded as a scholar in spite of the fact that he had for a short time been a student of Raphelengius. He was, moreover, a Mennonite, which at that time was probably no recommendation for a public function. Jan Theunisz also owned a number of Arabic texts in manuscript form which came from Indonesia; according to expert opinion his knowledge of Arabic left much to be desired, judging from writings of his which have been preserved. Be that as it may, the Board of Governors of the University did not appoint him professor and dismissed him, after paying him a sum of money in compensation, in 1613 when they found a better candidate in Thomas Erpenius. With Erpenius, who had acquired his knowledge of Arabic chiefly in France, the flowering of Arabic studies in the Netherlands which manifested itself in the seventeenth century began.

Erpenius was not blind to the difficulties besetting the study of Arabic and other Semitic languages. There were hardly any or no resources to draw on, and so he set out to create these. He even set up, at his own expense, an Oriental Press towards this end, partly equipped with characters he bought from one of the sons of Raphelengius, while he had the Arabic ones cast himself. He published, among other things, two grammatical texts and himself wrote an Arabic grammar, which was widely used and was even reprinted abroad several times more than two centuries later. He further wrote a Grammatica Chaldaea et Syra and drew up an Ethiopian one. In 1625, a year after his death, his famous Historia Saracenica, the first historical Arabic text to be printed in Europe, appeared and was used by many. The work contains the text, with a Latin translation, of the second part of al-Majnūn al-mubārah, a world history from the pen of the Christian Arab writer Gurgis al-Makín (d.1273). The edition is based on a manuscript from Heidelberg.

The living language also enjoyed Erpenius’ interest; understandably so, as the States General repeatedly made use of his services in the negotiations with the Barbary States, which turned out to be necessary upon termination of the Twelve Years’ Truce with Spain in order to guarantee the safety of Dutch ships in the Mediterranean. Convinced of the importance of a practical knowledge of the language he wanted to give his students the opportunity through the appointment of a “Moorish Reader” to acquire such knowledge. His premature death in 1624 prevented the execution of these plans, however.

Erpenius never visited the East and was never in a position to collect manuscripts there. He nevertheless managed to acquire numerous manuscripts, at the cost of substantial financial sacrifices, in order to increase his knowledge of Oriental literatures by means of these. At the time of his death his personal collection comprised approximately 84 items. Regrettably these MSS., which would have formed a most welcome supplement to those collected by Scaliger, passed into English hands for a sum of £ 500; all of them, with one or two exceptions, are now in Cambridge. The Oriental Press was sold for 8,000 florins to the University printer Isaac Elsevier. Looking at these sums one must admit that the offer of 5,000 florins made by the University, with special conditions as regards the press and stock, was too low and the conditions attached to it too unfavourable.

Hence the manuscripts which Erpenius had gone to so much trouble to collect were lost to Leiden. A happy consequence of this regrettable loss was, however, that now that the purchase had fallen through the authorities appeared to be prepared to allow Erpenius’ successor Golius to use the funds allocated for this for the acquisition of manuscripts during his intended journey to the East.

Golius always actively occupied himself with the acquisition of manuscripts. Even before his appointment as Erpenius’ successor he had taken great pains, on the latter’s instructions, to collect in Morocco as many objects of art and natural interest hitherto unknown in Europe as possible, to register the names of these and look for important Oriental manuscripts. That he was admirably successful in doing so is attested by, among other things, his unpublished Corneliius naturae et artis, now kept at Oxford, and, as regards Oriental manuscripts, the unique medical work al-Musta’sī fī ‘ibāb (summary of contents by Renaud in Hepsīris t.X, 1930), the historical work al-Ḥuwa‘ al-mawsitiyya fī ‘ibāb al-marrākhshīyya, later used and translated by Dozy, and the review
of Arabic poetry by Ibn Rashiq al-Qairawānī, entitled al-‘Umda bi mahasin al-shīr wa-raddābihi, cited at length by Goldziher in the first volume of his Abhandlungen zur Arabischen Philologie.

Golius had an equally good eye for collecting manuscripts during his stay in Syria, Northern Iraq and Istanbul in the years 1629-1629, whence he took home no less than 300 Arabic, Turkish and Persian manuscripts. The learned world of those days, both in Holland and outside, was delighted with this treasure brought from the East, which bore very favourable comparison with the treasures recently seized by the Dutch admiral Piet Hein from the Spanish silver fleet. Golius aedemus per festa vestis opus (Golius has brought eternal treasures across the seas) Constantijn Huygens wrote, considering the country fortunate in that praecox inimque nescit ultra pietas prosperitate best (immensely rich in both respects, it does not know with which of the two it is best off).

Of these 300 manuscripts 212 (nos. 1-211 and 1221), acquired out of the funds allocated to Golius, are to be found in the Leiden University Library. The University was unable, for lack of money, to acquire the manuscripts owned personally by Golius, which can be said to be a painful loss. In 1659, almost 30 years after Golius' death, they were eventually auctioned by his heirs and for the greater part passed into British ownership; many of these are now kept in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, including extremely valuable MSS. such as the poems of Fararazq, Ibn Hayyān's K. al-Maṣūlah bi lfitākh Andalus, Ibn Basāṣ's al-Dhakhera fi mahasin āb al-Jazīra and Ibn Ṣāḥib al-ṣalāt's K. al-Manī, a fragment of the history of the Almohads.

It was not exclusively Arabic philology in which Golius took such great interest. He also occupied himself with Turkish, Persian, Armenian and Chinese. His mathematical studies had made him realize the importance of Arabic versions of Greek writings on mathematics and had stimulated him to study Arabic, but mathematics continued to hold his interest. On his return to his homeland he gave lectures in this subject as well as Arabic at Leiden, while both the Arabic works which came to Europe through his agency and the books of his own library give conclusive proof of his interest in many other fields, such as cosmology, astronomy, geography, medicine and botany. Of the results of his studies in all these fields and of the Latin translations made by him little has appeared in print, however. What did appear was a reprint of Erpenicus' grammar, with a varied anthology added to it, and a historical text, the tendentious history of Tamerlan (d.1405) by Ibn 'Arashshāh (d.1450), which was to be re-edited with a Latin translation in 1767-1772 by S. H. Manger. The 18th century German Arabic scholar J. J. Reiske, Albert Schulten's great opponent, termed Golius' edition "ausserst fehlerhaft"; but that was when Arabic studies had advanced another 140 years.

Apart from the manuscripts which he collected, Golius owes his fame as an Arabic scholar especially to his Lexicon Arabicum, which appeared in 1654 and of which Dozy was to state in his well-known Supplement aux Dictionnaires arabes that, taking into account the time at which it was compiled, it was an admirable piece of work. Golius was not the first to make use of the products of Arab lexicography itself. Already before him Giggoles had used an Arabic work, namely Frīzābādī's (d.1455) Qānūnīs, for his Thesaurus linguae arabicae. Golius based his Lexicon on al-Jawhari's (d. approx. 1000) Tāj al-ṣuḥa, a work which is rated higher than that of Frīzābādī. It was not until the 19th century that Golius' Lexicon was superseded by G. W. Freytag's Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, completed in 1837, which is based on both the above-mentioned works.

We hear of more seventeenth century students of Oriental languages spending some time in Istanbul and taking manuscripts back with them from there. But none of these applied themselves to the acquisition of manuscripts as indefatigably as Golius' student Levius Warner, who registered as a student at Leiden in 1658 at the age of 19, and after a stay of six years in Holland began the journey to Turkey at the end of 1664.

Levius Warner, born in Lippe, was one of the numerous foreigners who, tempted by Leiden's fame in those years, studied Oriental languages in Holland. Before his departure for Istanbul four short works from his pen had already appeared, and no doubt he left an extremely good impression. For as early as 1648 the Board of Governors of the University invited him to return to Leiden so that they could recommend him for a chair at the University, namely the professorate of Hebrew. Warner thereupon asked permission to make a journey to Syria first, like his professor Golius; the Board complied with his request, granting him 300 florins for traveling expenses, but Warner chose in the end to remain in Istanbul.
Few details of his life there are known. Perhaps the private correspondence which he kept up with his friends in Holland would have been able to throw more light on his activities in Istanbul, his contacts with Turkish scholars, the origin of the manuscripts collected by him, and the conditions under which the numerous studies, translations and notes in many different fields which he found in his estate came about, if not most of these letters had become lost as it seems. The letters which are still left are those he wrote both before and after his appointment as Resident in Istanbul (1643) to official persons and bodies in the Republic of the Netherlands concerning the events of the day.

Warner did not occupy an official position in Istanbul to begin with. When the States' ambassador (orator) Cornelis Haga had repatriated in 1639, after a stay of 28 years in Istanbul, he had temporarily charged his kinsman and secretary Hendrik Cops with his function, expecting that a successor would soon be appointed. As the States failed to do so, however, Cops, whom it was actually intended to dismiss, remained in function as “Resident” until his death in 1647. This function did not enjoy the same prestige as an ambassadorship with either the Turks or the Dutch merchants and captains. “Constantinople as an ambassador’s office had in actual fact been abandoned” says Heeringa; Smyrna was beginning to grow increasingly important for trade to the Levant.

So when Warner arrived in Istanbul in 1645, after a journey via Danzig and Poland, he encountered Cops as representative of the Dutch nation there. His first year in Turkey was probably not the most pleasant. Cops was constantly pressed for money because, in Heeringa’s opinion, he had been “left to his own devices in a most irresponsible fashion” by the States, and had even been summoned before a Turkish court by his creditors. Hence Warner had little to expect from him when he was in danger of falling into just as serious financial difficulties. The physician who had been treating him for dysentery and an eye disease had cost him a great deal of money, so that he had none left for the acquisition of books and he would have to disappoint people’s expectations of him unless he was given assistance soon; this is what Warner wrote in a letter to David de Wilhem, Councillor of His Highness the Stadholder in The Hague, a man who was known as a great patron of Oriental Studies and who knew the Levant from his own experience, seeing that he had spent several years there as a merchant. He was none-theless able to report that he had perused a number of “obscuriores Persicæ linguae auctores” and had occupied himself with some Karaite writings, as well as devoting attention to the rites and religious ceremonies of the Greeks and Armenians. His broad range of interests becomes immediately apparent from this.

In a subsequent letter, dated 6th May, 1647, he expresses a similar complaint: when presently the British ambassador will have died, I shall have no one to turn to for help.

It is for this reason that he offered the Prince of Orange and the States General his services in keeping them informed of what was going on in Istanbul, so that after Cops’ passing away they should not be kept in ignorance of events there.

As it happened there was a great deal to be reported in these eventful years. Warner was rightly able to state that, “All sorts of things are happening in Constantinople at present, so that one would hold a month to be a year, judging by the variety of events” (Ingens nunc est Constantinopolis rerum omnium varietas; ut mensis aevum existimetur, si vicis rerum potestur). In 1645 the Turks had conquered by surprise part of Venetian Crete; the Turks’ fame had been sufficient to put the Christians to flight, so it was boasted in Istanbul. (Which piece of information Warner follows up with the statement that people lived in nameless horror of the Cossacks, however. The Cossacks were reputed to be such fierce fighters (ado fugnas animal esse Cossacum) that if one of them had an arm hewn off he would assault the enemy with it; if he lost both arms, he would defend himself with his legs; if he lost these as well, then he would use his teeth). When the Turks suffered numerous defeats in Dalmatia, however, Sultan Ibrahim flew into such a rage that he threatened to have all the Franks in his kingdom put to death. This could only be prevented through the intervention of the Shaikh al-Islam, the Mufti of the Turkish realm.

In 1648 Warner, without having received an answer to his request, reports the intolerable vexations caused by the Grand Vizier, who spared nothing and no one in procuring money for the orgies and debauches of the Sultan—who is said by Warner to be even more effeminate than Sardanapalus—and on the palace revolution which caused the Sultan’s downfall, after the Shaikh al-Islam had issued a fetová declaring all those who were of assistance to him in his illegal practices to be infidels.

As was said above, the Netherlands had something else in mind.
for Warner; hence Nicolò Gijsbrecht was appointed to be Cops’ successor instead of him, partly on the consideration that Gijsbrecht, as Cops’ executor, would be in the best position for keeping the official records out of the hands of the French Ambassador. For the latter had informed the States General that at the request of the Sublime Porte he had made himself responsible for the protection of Dutch merchants—showing an eagerness which was far from welcome to the States.

Heeringa, who has published the sources for the history of the Levantine trade, thinks, most justifiably so, that this post cannot have been a pleasant one for Gijsbrecht. The 1648 revolution in Istanbul put him to some expense; for the new rulers had to be presented with valuable gifts to strengthen the friendly relations. The States forbade him, however, to spend any money or to consider himself an ambassador. They only wrote to him in the interests of Dutch captives from time to time. A year before he died of the plague in 1654 he wrote to the States General: ‘It is almost for seven years that I have been bearing the heavy burden of the presentation of gifts, for which I have received but little by way of allowance…. ‘It is the old complaint which Haga had raised repeatedly before him and which Gijsbrecht had every reason for making, as in the years from 1648-1658, the period in which the Walide Sultan (Dowagers) Kösem and Turhan Hatice reigned on behalf of Sultan Mehmet IV during his minority, no less than thirteen Grand Viziers came into office. Warner, who was living with Gijsbrecht and assisted him in the performance of his duties with his knowledge of the language and customs of the Turks, knew better than anyone else, of course, how heavy this ‘burden of the presentation of gifts’ was. Hence his request upon Gijsbrecht’s death to be allowed to succeed the latter in his post is most unlikely to have been prompted by desire for gain. There can be no question, in my opinion, that Du Rien—the librarian of the Leiden University Library, the institution which more than any other reaped the benefits of Warner’s prolonged stay in Istanbul—was greatly mistaken in assuming, when editing Warner’s letters in 1883, that the desire for wealth and possessions (rei quaeerendae augendaeque cupiditas) had induced him to go over to the side of the merchants (castra mercatorum).

It seems more probable that Warner, who had preferred an uncertain future in Turkey to the security of a Leiden professorship,

desired this function so as to gain greater security. For although we know that admittedly he received an allowance for his trip to Turkey and that several years later he was given another travel grant, we know nothing of his other sources of income in the years from 1645 to 1654. He can hardly be blamed, furthermore, for aspiring to the position to which his knowledge of affairs entitled him after acting as advisor to residents less capable, or at least less well informed than he, even if this position was far from ideal from a financial point of view.

The emoluments accruing from a Residentship originally comprised 3/7 % of the incoming as well as outgoing goods and cash, not only in Istanbul but also in other Levantine ports where Dutch consuls were stationed. The fact that this 3/7 % was increased to 3/4 % in 1660, the percentage which Haga formerly enjoyed, though with abolition of the privileges which Warner had been granted privately by the consuls, shows that the original percentage was definitely too scanty, especially when we bear in mind that Haga, although he enjoyed a regular salary as well, nonetheless still complained, not least of all about the extreme delay in the payment of this. The Directors in the mother country, on the other hand, considered that Warner now no longer had any cause for complaint, because trade was flourishing more than before, and that Professor Gool, who had pleaded Warner’s case, had given an exaggerated representation of the latter’s obligations. After all, Warner was only a Resident, and Residents “do not entertain nearly as lavishly as an Ambassador, and also have a far smaller staff and retinue and are not obliged to pay as much honour or present as many gifts”. It is very much open to doubt whether the Turkish dignitaries, who had to be kept on good terms with the Resident by means of generous gifts, also looked at it this way.

Just as after Cops’ death the French envoy, so after Gijsbrecht’s death the English envoy tried to have himself recognized as ad interim representative of the Dutch nation in Istanbul. Owing to Warner’s protests to the Grand Admiral (kapudan pasha) and the Grand Vizier, the highest officials in the country, this could be prevented. Warner succeeded in obtaining from the acting Vizier a written recognition which enabled him to persuade the Kapudan Pasha to stop opposing his recognition. This high official rightly pointed out, however, that a large number of Dutch ships were fighting against the Turks together with the Venetians, which was
detrimental to the friendly relations between them. Then, when at the end of May 1655 Warner received from the Netherlands the official news of his appointment, it was not the appropriate moment for paying his respects to the Vizier, as the latter’s downfall was imminent. The official visit to the new dignitary, Murad Pasha does not take place until July, 1655.

Again Warner is told that the Dutch are supporting the Venetians and that the reverses of the Turkish fleet are attributable to this. Nevertheless he is promised that the capitulations—first obtained in 1622 and renewed once after that—would be upheld.

Dutch support of the Venetians in the war which had been dragging on ever since 1645 was casting a constant shadow over the relations with the Grand Admiral in particular, while an unequivocal case of piracy committed by a Dutch ship to the detriment of Turkish subjects was equally damaging to the friendly relations. For in 1656 the following incident took place. Captain Jan Mazier of the "Castello de Lignano" had undertaken to convey a Pasha with his goods to Algiers. When the Pasha disembarked in Tunis in order to speed up his journey by travelling to Algiers by land, Mazier sailed off to Genoa together with the Pasha’s goods and the passengers and cargo for Algiers taken aboard in Tunis, and there sold both passengers and cargo. The Grand Admiral resented this instance of bad faith in the extreme; he demanded from Warner not only measures to prevent a repetition of this incident, but also the payment of compensation to the victims. Warner of course could not comply with this, as in that case, in his own words, “delictum privatum expiaratur publice”. The incident rankled so in the Admiral’s mind that he threatened to inform the Sublime Porte about the true nature of the feigned friendship of the Dutch, and it must have cost Warner a great deal of persuasive power, and who knows what else, before he was able to make the irate admiral change his mind.

The second incident, which took place in May 1663, had especially unpleasant consequences for Warner personally. This was the capturing of the Dutch ship "Keizer Oostenaard", which, loaded with Turkish merchandise from Alexandria to Istanbul, was taken by Italian and Maltese pirates off Aboukir. The Turkish authorities demanded up to three times that Warner either deliver the ship or pay compensation for the cargo. When he refused obstinately, he was abducted from his home by four men on July 1st, 1663, and taken to Adrianople where the Sultan was in residence, and there imprisoned.

It had been pointed out to him in Istanbul that he had stood guarantee for the captain’s good faith and that his seal on the application for permission to leave port could be regarded as security. It had been easy for Warner to contradict these arguments, and in fact they were not brought up again in Adrianople. But it proved impossible to convince the Turkish judges there of the integrity of the captain. For the Pasha of Cairo had reported that the latter had banqueted with the pirates several times, that he had failed to anchor his ship in the usual place, had refused to enter the harbour of Alexandria, and had not offered any resistance. Even though Warner later succeeded in winning this Pasha over to his side through the intercession of some good friends of his, he was unable to persuade the Mufti to pronounce judgment in his favour. According to him the latter wanted him pronounced guilty as he himself owned a considerable share in the cargo.

It was useless appealing to the capitulations, too. Warner was sentenced to compensation of the damages, an amount of 78,445 rixdollars (lieuvenendaalers), to be paid within 31 months, and he had to console himself with the thought that at any rate it is better to be stripped of one’s money than to be beaten. As for the rest, the amount was charged to the account of the merchants based in the Levant. Years afterwards mention is still made in the correspondence of the settlement of the case, which prompted the imposition of the tax or Levantine duties of one per cent on imports and exports, in addition to the consular and embassy dues of 1½% (in 1667).

In this incident it became apparent once more how much the Turks counted against the Dutch the support which they gave the Venetians. The ground was cut from under Warner’s feet by saying that it was no use defending the good faith and sincerity of the Dutch too much, as in this Venetian war said Hollanders were doing a great many things at sea which were contradictory to a friendly relationship with the Ottomans.

Apart from his reports on the course of events in Turkey and the ransoming of enslaved sailors captured from Dutch ships Warner writes about countless other problems which he was given to solve and which give a clear idea of what could be termed his official activities. Such as, for instance, the imports of counterfeit Dutch money minted in Italy, which was imported by French merchants...
in order to undermine the prestige of the Dutch; or a quarrel between English and Dutch captains about mooring-places for their ships, a dispute which became so violent that they intended to have it adjudicated by the Grand Vizier and which he could only appease by drawing the gentleman’s attention to the fact that a similar dispute between the English and the French had once cost the parties concerned several tens of thousands; the chancery of the French consul in Smyrna, who had detained funds brought for Dutch merchants by a French ship—for which he had to obtain the Sultan’s judgment up to two times.

The letters of Warner’s published by Du Rieu deal mainly with the foreign policy and war exploits of the Turks, however, especially those in Europe; for this was the time of the consolidation of Turkish power in Transylvania, the Danube principalities and the border area to the north of the Black Sea, as well as of the wars first with Venice and later with Austria. He also writes about internal affairs and conditions, the changing of functionaries and the coming and going of envoys. But now and then we come across information of a different nature as well, also in the letters published by Heeringa which were addressed to the authorities in the mother country and deal with internal affairs. It is clear from the papers he has left behind, moreover, that he occupied himself with countless other matters besides.

As was mentioned above, immediately upon his arrival in Istanbul he began to devote attention to the different forms of Oriental Christianity. He collected and recorded a great many data about this in note form (cod. 1160; 1167; 1759). He himself stated that it was religious interest which induced him to study Oriental languages. Like many Arabic scholars of his time he saw in the knowledge of this language a means of propagating the Christian faith in the Muslim world, among other things, and he was convinced of the usefulness of translating the Bible and Christian formulae into Oriental languages. Through his intermediary one of the most noteworthy items of the entire collection came to be written, namely the Turkish translation of the Bible by ‘Ali Bey, chief dragoman of Mehmet IV.

This ‘Ali Bey, whose real name was Albertus Bobowsky, was a Pole who had been sold as a slave in Istanbul at the age of nine in 1600. He had enjoyed an excellent education and had learnt many languages. A Turkish grammar from his pen was published in Oxford by Th. Hyde in 1691. He also translated the Church Catechism of the Anglican Church into Turkish. Warner persuaded him to translate the whole Bible (cod. 390 a-d). When Warner’s legacy arrived in Leiden publication of this Turkish translation was evidently considered; in any case a double page of a trial printing proof made by Petraiæus, containing Isaiah 29, verses 1-17, has been preserved. It was not until 1844, however, that Baron Von Diez, a former Russian ambassador in Istanbul, undertook to prepare the text for publication at the initiative of the British and Foreign Bible Society. After his death in 1877 this task was taken over by Jean-Daniel Kieffer, who had acquired a knowledge of Turkish during a period of seven years’ captivity in Turkey in the Napoleonic era. The translation came from the press in Paris in 1819. Before that only the first four chapters of Genesis had appeared in print in Leipzig (1739).

But his interest was also aroused by current conditions among the Oriental Christians. In his letters he writes about, among other things, the injustices prevailing among them and their constant quarrels, with the Turks always getting the better end of the bargain; about prefects who only managed to remain in office by means of large-scale bribery and hence did not pasture but fleeced the flock entrusted to their care, or who were so heavily in debt that they were rounded up in their churches in order to be imprisoned. It is a far from cheerful picture, which causes him to write: “At present we see in Constantinople a place in which there are only corpses to be torn to pieces and cows which do the tearing” (Videntes nunc Constantinopolin tangent locum, in quo nihil alium est nisi cadavera quae lacentur aut cervi qui lacrant).

That Warner had a sense of the topical is also apparent, in my opinion, from a treatise from his pen about a different subject altogether. In Warner’s time the dispute between Muslim jurisprudents about whether or not drinking coffee was permissible had not been settled, even though the consumption of this beverage, which was virtually unknown in Europe in those days, had already come into vogue in the Arab and Turkish world. After the first coffee-houses had been opened in Istanbul in 1554, Murad III (1574-1595) and Ahmad I (1603-1617) had tried to put a stop—though without success—to coffee drinking as well as the opening of new coffee-houses, which was displeasing to them for ulterior reasons. Murad IV (1623-1640) had the coffee-houses pulled down and took severe
measures against people drinking coffee. Under Mehmet IV (1648-1687), hence in Warner’s time, it was permissible to sell it in the streets again, although the prohibition on coffee-houses remained in force. It was doubtless this coffee dispute which induced Warner to write this treatise on the coffee-shrub (cod. 1112).

Elsewhere he writes about the routes along which Persian and Indian goods were carried to Istanbul by caravans, of which a score reached that city every year. It took 24 days to travel from Bender Abbas (Samronic) to Isphahan, and thence to Istanbul four months; or one could travel from Baza along the Euphrates to Aleppo and thence to Istanbul, each stage taking up 40 days. Goods from India were also transported to Mocha in Yemen, or, if there was too much unrest there, to Mende. The overland route took one through Kandahar and thence to Isphahan in 40 days; it was cheaper than the sea route, but could only be used if there was no war between the Persian and Indian kings. Merchandise from Europe, since the Venetian war, travelled increasingly more via Ragusa, which benefited by its position as a vassal state of Turkey.

A curious matter raised by the English ambassador in 1662 was that concerning titles. European kings are designated with kral in Turkish. The only exception to this in Warner’s time was the French monarch, on whom the title Padishah was conferred, the same title as that used for the Sultan himself. The English desired their king to be given it also, but the Turks rejected the request, saying that things had changed since the time when titles could be bought for money. In actual fact the French king owed his Padishah title to his alliance with the Turks in the war against Spain.

Further worth noting is a letter from 1659 in which Warner cites, in Latin translation, a tradition concerning the value of an oath. He tells here of the assistance given the Sultan by an Arab chief in suppressing a rebellion. As proof of this 37 rebels were beheaded and the heads sent to Istanbul notwithstanding the promise made on oath by both parties that they would spare each other’s lives. The Mufti of Aleppo had declared in writing that they could consider themselves absolved from this oath on account of the public benefit involved, on the basis of the tradition: Si quis fecerit iuramentum et postea cognoscat aliquid aliquid magis conducere, praestet illud, quod magis conductit et crimen iuramenti exspexit. This is the translation of a tradition which is found in the Sahih of Muslim, one of the most authoritative collections of traditions (Aymān No
A few years later Egidius Mesteecker—appointed consul in Aleppo by the States General, in competition with Warner’s brother Frederik, who had held the office temporarily—vented his spleen upon the settlement of the *Keyser Octavianus* affair, involving the payment of part of the sum by Aleppo as well. He writes: “... in actual fact this is definitely an unsatisfactory agreement ... We need hale merchants to occupy such posts, instead of studious ones ...”. He accuses Warner of partiality and of unlawful methods of coercion and in a subsequent letter asks “most humbly though very urgently” that “... no new measures be approved in this policy directed at our total ruin in Resident Warner’s favour”.

We definitely do not gain an impression of incompetence from all this. It is clear that in the constant bickering about the distribution of consular dues and the campaign against the incessant attempts of merchant and captains to evade these, Warner was able to take just as firm a stand as when interceding with the Turkish authorities for the “Dutch nation” in the Levant and fighting for the continuation of the capitulations. It must be said in justice to Mesteecker, however, that he was putting his finger on the sore spot when he indicated as the cause of much friction and disagreement the unwillingness of the States General to grant their representative with the Porte a fixed allowance, and so necessitating only the payment of expenses for inevitable gifts out of the dues levied.

In any case Warner did not return to his homeland a rich man like Du Mortier, and far from striving after personal gain he evidently had only one object in view, namely to acquire as many manuscripts as possible with which to add to the Leiden library. For when on 20th June, 1665, two days before his death, he made his will in the presence of the secretary of the French Resident he bequeathed all the manuscripts and books collected by him during the twenty years of his stay in Istanbul to the Leiden University.

The short sentence containing this testamentary disposition reads: “Pour ses papiers tant manuscrit que Livres et autres demeurent a son ordre secretaire Pour les Envoyer a LaCademie e Leyden en Ollande.” The size of this generous gift cannot be deduced from it. For the manuscripts, both Arabic, Hebrew, Turkish and Persian, together with the papers which he left, comprise no less than a thousand items, nos. 269-1199 and 4739-4814 of the catalogue. Apart from that there are a few hundred printed, chiefly Hebrew, including a few very rare, sometimes unique incunabula. It was the largest acquisition, both in number and content, since the founding of the University of Leiden, and the Board of Governors was able several years later to state with justification: “… our shelves are abundantly supplied with the most excellent Oriental manuscripts” (*praecellars Orientalium librorum autographis scrinia nostra...abundant*). Only it is regrettable that they made this observation so as to refuse Golius’ successor designate financial assistance for further purchases.

The question has been asked repeatedly how Warner formed this considerable collection. Part of it, according to an indication found in the items concerned, was originally owned by someone whose name was read by Houtsma, in imitation of Th. W. J. Juyboll, as J. van Hill, whom they wanted to identify conjecturally with Joh. Chr. von Hulin from Lübeck, registered as a student of Oriental languages at Leiden in 1642.

On second reading this signature turned out to be J. van Hell. This name occurs in about sixty manuscripts and in an occasional book. Frequently its position is surprising, sometimes being written upside down, while at other times it occurs on the final page of the text. This gives rise to the assumption that the owner did not know how to use an Oriental book, was not acquainted with the script and had no command of the language.

Now, who is this J. van Hell?

The name (Hill), van (de) Hill or ab Hello was borne by different persons registered as students at the universities of Leiden, Franeker and Harderwijk in the seventeenth century. On 5th May, 1604, a certain Johannes Hell, 15 years of age, was registered as a student in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Leiden; where he came from is not on record. Two students by the name of Van Hell, who came from Harderwijk, were registered at Leiden in 1644, and Harderwijk in 1648 respectively, but for lack of data it cannot be decided whether one of these was the J. van Hell who was the original owner of the manuscripts.

It has further been brought to light with the aid of a quite-lamp that at least one of Warner’s manuscripts, an illuminated copy of Ibn Lājin al-Tarabulusī’s *Baghyat al-qāsidin bi‘l-‘ilm fī‘l-mayyādin*, an extremely rare writing on cavalry tactics, of which only one other copy is known, once belonged to Gerbrand Aneloo—a Hebrew scholar and, like Dionysius Vossius, a pupil of Manasse ben Israel.
of Amsterdam—whose manuscripts were sold after his death in 1642. A few were bought by Ravius and donated by him to the University of Utrecht, while a few others reached Leiden via the Royal Library in the Hague last century. Hence Warner apparently began to collect manuscripts when he was still in Holland.

More information on the manner in which Warner acquired manuscripts is supplied by the short letters published by Houtsmuller. It is apparent from these that he availed himself of the services of an Arab intermediary who had connections with brokers and auctioneers and, as a man of letters, probably also sometimes with learned manuscript owners and copyists. Via this intermediary, Majnun Ahmad b. 'Umar al-'Urđ al-Ḫalabi, he bought, for example, a fine copy of a commentary on the Maʿʾalīyyāt (cod. or. no. 628) and two works by al-Zamakhshary (nos. 307 and 379); and further also a number of works from the estate of the famous scholar Ḥajji Khalifa (Katib Celebi) who died in Istanbul in 1657 (nos. 470, 526, 695, 733, 873 and possibly others as well). Furthermore, owing to his prolonged presence there he probably also had the necessary contacts in the local world of learning, by which the acquisition of manuscripts and copies (see cod. or. 1123(1), glosses to Ibn Sina’s al-Qanān fi l-Qīḥ) may have been expedited.

The first consignment of items from the legacy did not reach Leiden, via Smyrna and Livorno, until three and a half years after Warner’s death; in 1669 and 1674 further batches which were sent later arrived. There was no delay in carrying out the instructions to catalogue the collection. Th. Petreus, a scholar from Flensburg who studied Coptic and Armenian besides Arabic, made a tentative inventory with the assistance of the Armenian Shahin Kandy. This was printed, with supplementary information by Boots, in the catalogue of the University Library published in 1674. The books and manuscripts of the legacy were put in a separate cupboard on which Warner’s liberality was mentioned to his honour and glory.

At the time when Warner’s gift arrived in Leiden, Golius had died and his successor not yet been appointed. This vacancy would turn out to be a difficult one to fill, just as difficult as it would be to find someone who could match Golius’ zeal in collecting manuscripts. H. Harderns, appointed extraordinary professor in 1671, left for Istanbul two years later and chose to stay there. Thereupon the Board of Governors appointed Carolus Schaaf Reader of Hebrew and other Oriental languages in 1680. Schaaf was mainly active in the field of Syriac. In 1710 the former clergyman Johannes Heyman from Smyrna was appointed professor of Oriental languages next to him, especially with a view to the scientific edition and translation of Oriental manuscripts.

Meanwhile the University library had been reorganized, and not only had a better and safer method of keeping valuable manuscripts been evolved, but also the whole inventory had been thoroughly checked. That Schaaf was not very concerned with the manuscripts is evident from the fact that this checking was done by T. Hemsterhuys, who was still a student at Groningen at the time and was later to become well known as a Greek scholar. Hemsterhuys would have been willing to stay in Leiden, but the Board of Governors did not respond to his application.

The Board’s expectations with respect to Heyman were disappointed, however. In 1719 they summoned him to show forthwith how much progress he had made with his work. For the only evidence of his concern with the manuscripts was a six volume catalogue compiled by him and Schaaf, which was contained in the general catalogue of the University Library which appeared in 1716. The letters left by Heymans show that he worked on a number of projects, however, such as the well known encyclopaedia of Nuwairi, the adages attributed to ‘Ali, and the preparation of a Turkish-Latin dictionary.

Although it is open to doubt whether the Board of Governors had an accurate idea of the immensity of the task they had assigned to the professor of Oriental languages with respect to the manuscripts, in any case they had the collection so much at heart that they proceeded in 1729 to make a special provision. In that year the entire collection of manuscripts was created a separate section of the University Library and its supervision entrusted to a special keeper, who was given the title Interpres Legati Warnerianum.

The first man to hold this office was Albert Schultens, previously professor of Hebrew at Franeker from 1713-1729. He combined it with that of Principal of the States’ Theological Seminar. When still a student at Groningen he had been taught not only Hebrew but also Arabic by Professor Braun. He was already acquainted with the Leiden collection from the years 1706-1711, when he had continued his studies mainly at Leiden and had occupied himself
seriously with Arabic with the aid of the manuscripts kept there. At the age of 20, in 1706, he had already written a treatise on the use of the "dialects", especially Arabic, for studying the Old Testament; this tenet always remained the point of departure for his Arabic studies. The activity shown by him in this field undoubtedly did much to promote the study of Arabic. One can, however, only agree with his opponent Reiske when the latter says that "die Art des Herrn Schultens das Arabische zu treiben und zu befördern, die rechte Art nicht sey". Arabic had a right to be studied for its own sake instead of serving as a mere handmaid to "sacred philology".

Schultens' first publication as Interpres was an edition (1731) of the first three _maqāmus_ of Ḥarīrī (d. 1122), with translation and annotation. Golius had included a specimen of this poetry in his re-edition of Erpenius' grammar before this. The credit for introducing in Europe the work of Ḥarīrī, which won renown in the 17th century as a result of De Sacy's excellent edition (1822) and Rückert's famous translation (1826), is due to Golius and Schultens, who edited another three _maqāmus_ in 1740.

Further acquitting himself of the task assigned him, Schultens edited in 1732, with the assistance of the Board of Governors, a detailed history of Saladin, who reconquered Jerusalem from the Crusaders (1187); this was based directly on the historical works of Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Shaddādī (d. 1234), Abī ʿl-Fidaʾī (d. 1333) and ʿImād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Isfahānī (d. 1201) which were present in manuscript form. But for obvious reasons he preferred to concentrate on the poetry and history of pre-Islamic Arabia. The fourteen Old Arabic poems added to the Ḥarīrī edition of 1740, and the posthumously published compilation of fragments from Arab authors on the history of the descendants of Yōkṭan (1786) testify to this predilection. It is apparent from the papers he left that he also occupied himself with the _Mawlaʿūqūt_ and the poems of the Ḥudhāli tribe; he as well collected a great deal of lexicographical material, both Hebrew and Arabic. He further included fragments taken from Zamakhshari's collection of proverbs, _Kalīm al-nawābigh_, and Abī Tammām's _Ḥamāsā_ in his re-edition of Erpenius' _Budimenta_ (1733) and grammar (1748).

Schultens was appointed professor as early as 1732, however, and in 1740 he was further given Hebrew antiquities to lecture on. The pressure of work which this brought with it evidently left him no time for publications such as his work on Saladin. It is therefore regrettable that the University omitted, for no matter what reason, to secure the good offices of Reiske, who lived in Leiden from 1738-1746, finally to leave this town as a doctor of medicine. No one acquainting himself with the impressive list of copies, comprising 25 items, made by this highly gifted and zealous Arabic scholar during his stay in Leiden—copies of poems, collections of proverbs and adages, historical and geographical writings—and with his later publications, as well as other activities in the field of Arabic, will be able to suppress a feeling of regret that no use was made of the accomplishments and energy of this man, undoubtedly Schultens' best student. He ranks among the most prominent eighteenth century Arabic scholars in Germany; perhaps he furnishes the most eloquent example of the international significance which the Legatum Warnerianum had already won for itself at an early date.

After 1732, when Albert Schultens was appointed professor, the function of Interpres continued to be connected with the ordinary or extraordinary chair of Oriental languages of the University of Leiden until 1861. J. J. Schultens, who succeeded his father as professor in 1749, was granted the title Interpres after the latter's death a year later. His son H. A. Schultens, who was called to the chair at Leiden from Amsterdam, was Interpres until his death in 1793, which marked the end of the Schultens era. The following three years there was a rapid succession of holders of this office. H. A. Schultens' successor, the Semitics scholar E. Scheidus from Harderwijk, died in 1794. His successor S. F. J. Rau was deposed for political reasons in 1795 and replaced by J. H. van der Palm, a man of unquestionably anti-Orange convictions. He enjoys greater fame as a pupil orator and bible translator, as well as the man who introduced the Siegenbeek spelling of the Dutch language, than as an Orientalist, however. When he became Commissioner of National Education in 1799, Rau returned to Leiden. His successor was again Van der Palm, who was Interpres for the second time from 1808-1817.

This is not the place to discuss at length the value of the Legatum for the continuation in the eighteenth century of the study of Oriental languages, particularly Arabic, which was begun so handsomely under Erpenius and Golius. Upon a merely superficial examination of the achievements of eighteenth century Arabists we are
struck by two things, however. In the first place, its importance can only be assessed in part from the number and length of the text editions, translations and studies made by them. For anyone going by this alone is apt to overlook the circumstance that the technical facilities for editing such texts were restricted, while further the limited market which these could be expected to have made them a far from attractive article for printers. These factors are not likely to have stimulated the interest in publishing. In fact, eighteenth century scholars devoted their attention to many more matters than one would infer from their publications. The work left by many of them is present in the libraries in one form or another, namely copies of manuscripts, translations and annotations, often in the field of lexicography.

A second point worth mentioning is that not only were they active in what were on the whole the same fields, namely older and more recent poetry, collections of proverbs and adages, and historical works, but that also the same writings recur again and again. The reason for this is probably partly that they had access to only an extremely limited number of text editions, and in order to begin on anything new they first had to apply themselves to copying the necessary manuscripts—for which not everyone alike had an opportunity. Hence the same texts were always studied to begin with, at which scholars could try their hand.

Evidence of interest in theological texts after Erpenius (who had plans for publishing a translation as well as a confutation of the Koran, to which would be added among other things a translation of three Muslim creeds, including a Malay one) is found chiefly with Reland, whose book De Religione Mohammedica, which was based on a study of the sources and first appeared in 1705, has been translated into various languages. This interest is later on also evinced by H. A. Schultens, who, for the rest, also directed his attention to new subjects. Interest in the geographical and historical literature is found only sporadically after Scaliger and Golius. Such interest was shown by Warner, however, who left a detailed description of Asia of over 1200 pages in manuscript form and collected a great deal of material for this from Arabic and Persian sources. Nicolaus Witsen made use of this description for his book on North and East Taurary (1694). The large-scale edition of geographical works by Arab authors was to be a special concern of the 19th century.

Eighteenth century scholars showed considerable interest, on the other hand, in what is sometimes called the first chapter of Arabic literature, namely the seven famous Old Arabic odes known as the Ma‘allaqât. The commentaries on these present in the Legatum, especially those of al-Tibrizi, “perhaps the greatest of all commentators on Old Arabic poetry” (Arberry), served them as aids. Of these seven odes they edited and translated three: that of Imr‘ al-Qais (by Warner, prepared for printing by Lette, 1747); that of Ṭarafa by Reiske (1740) at the instance of A. Schultens, and in conclusion, that of Antara by Merill (1816).

We mentioned above the interest shown in Abu Tammam’s (d. ca. 845) Ta‘mā‘a, an anthology of fragments mostly taken from early poems which is highly thought of in the entire Arab world. These fragments successfully illustrate different literary genres, the first being that of which bravery in battle (ha‘mā‘a) is the subject. The attention to the poems of the Hudhail tribe, which can pride itself on having produced a number of prominent poets, both in the pre-Islamic period and after, also belongs to this category. Apart from A. Schultens and Lette, N. W. Schroeder occupied himself with these in particular, as is evident from the papers left by him. The poetry of Ibn Duraid (d. 953) was also much in vogue. It was studied by many; A. Haitsma (1773) and E. Scheidius (1786) prepared poems of his for the press, and the Dutch poet Willem Bilderdijk translated “Ibn Duraid’s elegy” into Dutch (1795). Mutanabbi (d. 965) enjoyed less fame.

It was mentioned above that Ḥarīrī’s (d. 1122) Mağānas stood in high repute at an early date. After Golius and A. Schultens other scholars, such as J. J. and H. A. Schultens, E. Scheidius and Willmet appear to have paid attention to this poet. The Lāmiyyat al-‘Ajam of another poet of that time, al-Ṭughrā‘ī (d. 1221), was similarly very popular. Thanks to Golius’ edition of it in his anthology of 1629 and the posthumous edition with Latin translation (1707), this poem is probably the first example of Arabic poetry to have become known in wider circles in Europe. There were several reprints as well as translations into European languages; in Holland two re-editions appeared, one by Van der Sloot (1729), the other by L. G. Bureau (1824). Only towards the end of the 19th century are there any signs of interest in an altogether different poetic genre, namely the short poems written in vernacular Arabic by the mystic al-Shustarī (d. 1269), whose diwān was copied by H. A. Schultens,
and the work of Abū 'l-'Alā' al-Ma'ārī (d. 1507), from which Golius had previously taken a few excerpts for his re-edition of Erpenius' grammar, and whose Saḥṣ al-Zanād was studied by Willmet, as is apparent from Cod. Or. 3040.

Apart from Old Arabic poetry the collections of adages and proverbs also exercised a strong attraction in the 17th and 18th centuries. The so-called Adages of 'All b. Abī Taḥābī, to whom numerous dicta, prose works and poems are attributed, already contributed to the anthology of Golius which has been mentioned above several times. Even as late as 1806 C. van Waamen published the Sententiae Alii b. Abī Taḥābī, Arabice et Latine, at Oxford, while in 1879 Van der Palm devoted a lecture to him. The Majma‘ al-amthāl, a collection of adages by the Arab philologist al-Maidānī (d. 1124), which was already known to Scaliger and Erpenius, had been edited in part by Scheidius (1779) and H. A. Schultens (posthumous edition of 1795 by Schroeder), before the classical edition with Latin translation by G. W. Freytag (1838-1843). Equally popular was al-Zamakhshāri’s al-‘Aṣāl al-mawābīgh, eventually published in 1772 by H. A. Schultens. To this classical triad H. A. Schultens added al-Taḥābī’s (d. 1038) Kifāh Lata‘if al-Ṣaḥāba wa ‘l-Tābī‘īn, which he did not edit, however. Some excerpts have been taken from this text in the anthology in Roorda’s Arabic grammar (1835).

Of the historiographers it was al-Makīn (d. 1272), Ibn ‘Arabshah (d. 1450), and, to a lesser degree Ibn Khallīkān (d. 1282), as well as the historiographer and geographer Abū 'l-Fida‘ (d. 1351), and of the geographers al-Idrīsī (d. 1166), who were read in the 17th and 18th centuries; most widely read of these were al-Makīn (Erpenius, Schroeder, Albert en J. J. Schultens, Willmet) and Abū 'l-Fida‘ (Erpenius, Golius, A. and H. A. Schultens).

E. Scheidius' interest in the compendium made by 'Abd al-Šāmād of the Sirāj al-muḥād of Ibn Abī Randaq (d. 1126), a kind of mirror for kings in anecdotal form, occupies a place apart; as does H. A. Schultens' interest in the originally Indian book of animal fables Kitāb wa-Dīnma of Ibn al-Muqaffā‘ (d. 799), and that of Willmet in the stories of Arabian Nights, as well as that of Roland and S. F. J. Rau in books on stones. Rau's manuscript of an intended edition of al-Tifashi’s (d. 1253) Azhār al-aflāh fi khawāṣṣ jawāhīr al-bijār with translation was lost in the 1807 explosion in Leiden.

After this brief discussion of Arabic studies in the 17th and 18th centuries we shall now continue our outline of the administration of the Legatum. Approximately a century after Albert Schultens was appointed first Interpres the Board of Governors of the University made renewed efforts to give the collection, which had meanwhile been augmented with eighty manuscripts from J. J. Schultens' legacy and a few purchases, wider publicity. In 1817 they appointed a special Interpres again, next to Van der Palm, who remained in function as professor of Oriental languages, poetry and clerical elocution until 1833.

H. A. Hamaker was this new Interpres. He was also appointed extraordinary professor of Oriental languages, though on the condition that he was not allowed to give more than one lecture on Arabic or Syriac and apart from that devote himself entirely to cataloguing the manuscripts and studying modern or contemporary Oriental languages and dialects. The first fruits of Hamaker's labours in respect of the Legatum was a specimen of a manuscript catalogue (1820), in which he had described 21 MSS., with the addition of biographical notes on the authors. But Hamaker was soon appointed ordinary professor, in 1822, next to Van der Palm. Although he has edited two historical texts (a fragment of Maqrizi’s (d. 1442) Khiyāf and a text of pseudo-Wāqidi) he soon directed his attention to other subjects, such as Phoenician inscriptions (the Cippi Puni, at present kept in the Leiden Archaeological Museum), Samaritan and Sanskrit.

Hamaker was succeeded by his student H. E. Weyers (1835-1844). Weyers had already tried his hand at describing the Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts in Upsala. He wrote a few articles as an improvement on the Leiden catalogue in the short-lived periodical Orientalia (1840-1846) of which he was co-editor, and he made a beginning with cataloguing the Oriental manuscripts of the Royal Academy, completed in 1862 by P. de Jong. His plan for editing a work on the Spanish Arab poet Ibn Zaidūn (d. 1070)—whose Risāla had been translated by Warner and later edited, with Latin translation, by Reiske—was never realized because of his premature death. His dissertation concerning the lost Ibn Khacanis de Ibn Zeidoun (1834), the material for which he had drawn from the manuscripts of the Legatum, dealt with the same poet.

The last professor of "Oriental languages" to have also fulfilled the function of Interpres Legati Warnerianus was T. W. J. Juyndbøll.
formerly professor at Groningen and before that at Franeker. Apart from his publications on the Samaritans, including the edition of the Arabic version of “The Book of Joshua” (1848), he started together with Mathes on the edition of Abu ʿIn-Shāsin Ibn Taghrībdīr’s history of Egypt in the Muslim period (al-Nujām al-ṣīrah), of which the American Arabist W. Popper has published further parts in the present century, as well as translating the part on the Circassian Sultans. The Lexicon Geographicum, being the Marāṣīl al-Ḫilāl, a geographical compendium extracted from Yaḥyā’s (d. 1229) lengthy compilation Muḥamm al-baladān, was already in the process of being published at the time; edited by him and Gaal, it was never completed.

After Juynboll’s death (1861) the chair remained vacant for five years, partly as a result of the plan—only realized in 1865—for creating a chair of Sanskrit, which was given priority. During these years the Reader of Persian and Turkish, P. de Jong, was Acting Interpreps; he had succeeded Abraham Kuenen, who was later to become famous as an expert on the Old Testament, as adiutor interpretis in 1855.

We first hear of adiutores under Weyers, who was assisted by M. Hoogvliet and A. Meursinge in the preparation of a new catalogue. This task was taken over by R. P. A. Dozy, who was adiutor from 1846-1851. In 1859 M. J. de Goeje, who had not yet taken his doctoral degree, was appointed second adiutor next to P. de Jong. His dissertation, devoted to Yaʿqūb’s description of the Maghrib, in which the future editor of the Bibliotheca Geographorum Araborum already announced himself, appeared the following year.

Definitive measures were taken in 1866. By the same Royal Decree by which De Goeje was assigned the extraordinary professorship of Syriac, Chaldean and Arabic, De Jong was granted the professor’s title and the appointment as Interpreps. This satisfied the rule which had been in force since Albert Schultens’ appointment as professor and according to which the Interpreps had to be a professor. De Jong worked for the Legatum until the beginning of 1869, when he accepted a professorate at Utrecht.

The credit for the complete description of the Oriental manuscripts kept at the time, with the exception of the Hebrew ones, which were catalogued by Steinachneider in 1889, is due to the trio Dozy, De Jong and De Goeje. Dozy is the author of the first two volumes of the Catalogue Codicum orientalium Bibliothecae

Lagd-Hatanae, which appeared in 1851. The two subsequent volumes were compiled by De Jong and De Goeje (1863-66) jointly, and the fifth and last volume by De Goeje (1873). An Index (1877) prepared by adiutor Houtsma is added to these as sixth volume.

De Jong was succeeded as Interpreps by De Goeje, whose extraordinary professorship was turned into an ordinary professorate in the Faculty of Arts at the same time. In 1877 his function was described, at his own suggestion, as “professor of Arabic”. Hence the separate chair in this subject, as well as its combination with the function of Interpreps, dates back to that year.

In the forty years in which he was in office De Goeje was assisted by a number of different scholars as adiutor: M. Th. Houtsma (1866-1890), later professor at Utrecht; G. van Vitoten (1890-1907), and Th. W. Juynboll (1903-1917), Houtsma’s successor at Utrecht.

De Goeje and Houtsma first started with the compilation of a separate catalogue of Arabic manuscripts. The first volume of this appeared in 1888; the first part of the second volume, prepared by De Goeje and Th. W. Juynboll was published in 1907, but was never followed by a second.

In the 19th century the change in the interest which was first to be perceived in the second half of the 18th century, and of which H. A. Schultens was clearly an exponent, completed itself. Arabic was no longer studied mainly with a view to gaining a better understanding of the Old Testament and Hebrew antiquities, but for its own sake. All kinds of fields of science in which Arab authors were active, particularly history and geography, came to attract increasing attention.

Contrary to the opinion held by many, Dozy was not professor of Arabic, but was charged with the teaching of Mediaeval and Modern History. Yet he had already occupied himself with this language before he became a student. Professor Weyers introduced him to the Arabic literature of Spain, and he remained faithful to this field of study all his life. Strangely enough both his first and last books are dictionaries; the first the Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes (1849), the second the Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes (1881). These works, which are extremely important in their own right, can be regarded as by-products of his study of the history of the Muslims in Spain, on which he has shed a great deal of light through the publication of sources and most of all through his major, recapitulative studies on
the basis of personal examination of these sources. Of his brilliant Histoire des Musulmans d’Espagne, which appeared in 1861, E. Lövy-Provençal edited a reprint as late as 1932.

De Jong produced four editions of texts in different fields between 1864 and 1869, all of them based on manuscripts in the Warner collection, namely the Mushahhah, an alphabetically arranged dictionary of easily interchangeable names occurring in the works on traditions, by the theologian and historian al-Dhahabi (d. 1343); the Athsab al-mutafaqia fi ‘l-lhaff (domoinya inter nomina relativa) of Ibn al-‘Qasirah (d. 717), al-Tha‘alibi’s Laqtif al-mad‘irif, a book classified as recreative literature, recently (1968) translated into English by C. E. Bosworth; and, together with De Goeje, the Kita‘ al-wuyon wa ‘l-had‘a‘iq fi abkhār al-haqa‘iq, a historical work of an eleventh or twelfth century anonymous author.

Where Dozy’s main concern was to make recapitulative descriptions on the basis of material drawn from Arabic authors, De Goeje had the publication of source material foremost in his mind. His Bibliotheca Geographorum Araborum in the eight bulky volumes of which the works of the most important Arab geographers are edited, as well as the thirteen volumes of the 9500 page edition of the historical writings of Tabari (d. 923), which was produced under his supervision in a project of international cooperation, bear witness to this. It is these standard works which have won De Goeje perennial fame in East and West.

De Goeje’s successor as professor and, two years later, also as Interpres was his student C. Snouck Hurgronje (1869-1936). The latter had been the very beginning struck a different course from that of his teacher by choosing as his field of study the province of the sacred sciences of the Muslims, a field hitherto virtually neglected in Europe. His pioneering studies of Islamic law and the meaning of Islam in the lives of its followers have made him one of the founders of modern Islamology. During the seventeen years he spent in the then Dutch East Indies he put together a large collection of Arabic and Indonesian manuscripts of religious content, which he first gave in loan and then, at his death in 1936, bequeathed to the University Library.

Th. W. Juyoiball was in charge of the day-to-day administration in Snouck Hurgronje’s time, until 1927, and after him C. van Arendonk (1927-1946). Th. W. Juyoiball is the author of the work Handleiding tot de kennis van de Mohammedaansche Wet volgens de leer der Sja'f'I‘tische school (Guide to Islamic Law according to the teachings of the Shafi‘i school) which first appeared in 1903, and has been reprinted several times and translated into German and Italian. The German edition is widely circulated and is often cited, but the Dutch editions have the advantage of containing a wealth of supplementary information in the notes concerning the religious and legal practice in Indonesia. The author has dedicated this book to Snouck Hurgronje, without whose fundamental studies it would certainly not have been able to appear at the time it did.

As regards the recent past, we shall restrict ourselves here to mentioning Snouck Hurgronje’s successor A. J. Wensink (1936-1939) and the latter’s successor J. H. Kramers (1940-1951), and Van Arendonk’s successor as adiutor P. Voorhoeve (1950-1965).

As was mentioned above, the collection was augmented in 1981 with a bequest made by J. J. Schultens which comprised eighty manuscripts. The most important acquisitions in the years following were: Hamaker’s collection; that of De Testa of Aleppo, from whom eighty manuscripts were purchased in 1835-1839; that of the Royal Academy of Sciences, including a number of manuscripts and papers originally owned by Willmet, which has been given in loan; and that of Amin al-Madani, an Arab visitor to the International Congress of Orientalists held in 1883 in Leiden, comprising no less than 750 items, which was acquired through the intermediary of Messrs. Brill, the well known Leiden publishing house.

After 1930 the library received another two substantial legacies, namely in 1936 the Snouck Hurgronje collection already mentioned above, which contains an extensive collection of Indonesian manuscripts in addition to the Arabic ones, and in 1947 the Van Arendonk bequest. Also the so-called Batun collection, originally given in loan by Snouck Hurgronje, passed into the ownership of the library. It numbers about fifty Arabic manuscripts. In 1932 another fifty manuscripts were purchased in Yemen through the agency of the then Netherlands Chargé d’Affaires in Jeddah, Mr. C. Adriaanse. The purchase of manuscripts has not stopped in recent years either; both large and small lots of Arabic and other manuscripts have been added repeatedly to the library’s collection.

A large number of manuscripts is therefore still awaiting description. Meanwhile the Handlist of Arabic Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden and other Collections in the Netherlands’s
completed by Voorhoeve in 1957 is meeting the most immediate needs. This Handlist, in which the manuscripts are arranged in alphabetical order according to their titles, is an indispensable reference work. The first step that will have to be taken in the immediate future is to reprint it in a supplemented form. But it is high time that a new catalogue altogether were compiled, not only because the existing one has been unprocurable since time immemorial and hence a supplement will be inadequate, but also because the fact that it is written in Latin constitutes a well-nigh insurmountable obstacle for many.

In the above incidental mention was made of the expansion of the library’s manuscript collection through the acquisition of manuscripts of a different origin from that of the Near and Middle East. The entire Oriental department of the University Library is popularly referred to as “Warner,” however, so that a brief remark about this will not be out of place. We should first mention, though, that in 1906 J. Rendell Harris presented a collection of 57 Armenian manuscripts; a description of these was made by F. Macler in 1924.

A small number of Sanskrit manuscripts was presented by H. Kern (d. 1917). More numerous than the Arabic, Hebrew, Persian and Turkish manuscripts put together, however, are those which come from Indonesia. These are for the greater part the property of the Library or passed into its ownership in the course of the years after first being given in loan, while others are still held on loan, such as the important collection of the Netherlands Bible Society in Amsterdam. In this field the Leiden University Library is better stocked than any other library in Europe or the United States. Only the Library of the former Koninklijk Bataviaas Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Royal Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences) in Djakarta can compare with it in this respect.

Collections of various sizes of manuscripts or notes in no less than 37 languages of the Indonesian Archipelago are present. The most important of these are: the languages of North Sumatra; of Bali, Lombok and the Lesser Sunda Islands; of the Batak countries; of South Celebes; of Java, including West Java and Madura; and of the Malay countries and Minangkabau. Of different groups of these printed catalogues are present, while the cataloguing of others is in progress. The catalogues in this field which are to be found in Leiden are listed in an article by P. Voorhoeve in the Bijdragen of the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology), Vol. 108 (1952). To this should be added the three volume Catalogue of Javanese manuscripts compiled by Th. Pigeaud (1967-1970).

With the mention of this monumental work we conclude our survey of the history of the Legatum Warnerianum, though not without pointing out the lesson to be drawn especially from the completion of this work, and adding an earnest plea to this.

The foundations for the study of Oriental languages at Leiden were laid about four hundred years ago; three hundred years ago Warner, through his generous and magnificent gift, greatly encouraged the progress and further expansion of this study. The fame of Warner’s collection—at present the core of richer treasures still—has remained undiminished, and the Library of Leiden is still attracting many learned visitors, both from the Netherlands and abroad, for the sake of its precious and rare manuscripts. This brings out most clearly the importance of the collections now referred to as Legatum Warnerianum.

If this importance is to be a lasting one, however, the access to the wealth of material still awaiting examination will have to be widened by means of a complete description. The Leiden University Library enjoys a good reputation on account of the liberality with which it opens its doors to all scholars; herein indeed lies the justification for collecting cultural treasures from the past. Science would be better served still, however, if they could be given access to completely up-to-date catalogues written in a modern European language. The recently completed Javanese Catalogue is proof that we can only look forward to the completion of such voluminous works if there are people prepared to devote themselves exclusively to this work for a number of years. For the highest tribute Leiden can pay Warner and all those before and after him who have had a share in putting together the manuscript collections is to carry on not only with the work of preserving and administering these treasures, but also of giving them the publicity they so fully deserve.
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