

Titles, Labels and Names of Multiple-Text Manuscripts

A workshop at the *Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures*

Warburgstraße 26, Hamburg

30 November–1 December 2018

Outline

Paging through historical as well as contemporary library catalogues and inventory lists leaves many scholars amazed about the entries that describe or name multiple-text manuscripts (MTMs), or miscellanies and *Sammelhandschriften* in German. One finds expressions, phrases, or single terms, which are not mentioned in the books they refer to. Such entries raise questions. For instance, who assigned these terms when and for what purpose to the manuscripts, how do such names start to spread and enter common use, and what is the relationship with the evidence drawn from the manuscripts? To what extent do these names reflect the designation of an MTM in a specific manuscript culture or/and to what extent are they assigned by the cataloguer in a more arbitrary way?

We suggest distinguishing the terms ‘title’, ‘label’ and ‘name’, in order to elaborate on this. Titles, short titles or labels generally refer to the collection of texts within an MTM. Sometimes, they appear as text headings, in the introduction, in the colophon of the manuscript or even of single texts, on its cover (e.g. *The Bible*), etc. Labels can also group an MTM regarding both its material features and textual contents (e.g. cook book), while the ‘name’ of an MTM designates a specific manuscript only (e.g. *Codex Sinaiticus*).

In the workshop, we put our terminological proposal up for discussion and seek for its adjustment and refinement by the examination of phenomena from different traditions.



Titles, Labels, and Names of Multiple-Text Manuscripts

A workshop at the *Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures*
Warburgstraße 26, Hamburg (Room 2002)

30 November–1 December 2018

Programme

Friday, 30 November 2018

14:15–14:45 Welcome & Introduction

14:45–15:30 **Marco Heiles, RWTH Aachen University**

“Liederbuch, Hausbuch, Schicksalsbuch:

Names and Labels of Medieval German Multiple Text Manuscripts and their Implications”

15:30–15:45 Coffee & Tea Break

15:45–16:30 **Cornelius Berthold, CSMC Hamburg**

“Wearing Multiple-Text Manuscripts:

Pocket-Sized Islamic Manuscripts with Magico-Religious Content”

16:30–17:15 **Antonella Brita, CSMC Hamburg**

*“Titles as Fluid Entities – Some Examples from
Ethiopic Hagiographic Manuscripts”*

17:15–17:30 Coffee & Tea Break

17:30–18:15 **Rosa Maria Piccione-Hilgert, Università di Torino**

*“Collections of Greek Texts Within Multiple-Text Manuscripts:
Definitions and Morphological Evidence”*

Saturday, 1 December 2018

09:30–10:15 **Hülya Çelik, Universität Hamburg**

“The Court Librarian Sebastian Tengenagel (d. 1636) as a First Labeller of Oriental Multiple-Text Manuscripts at the Austrian National Library”

10:15–11:00 **Judith I. Haug, Orient-Institut Istanbul**

“Multiple-Text Manuscripts as Sources for Ottoman Music History: First Steps into a New Field”

11:00–11:30 Coffee & Tea Break

11:30–11:50 **HE Xiaomeng, Hamburg Universität**

“Titles of / in Early Chinese Legal Manuscripts”

11:50–12:15 **Michael Friedrich, CSMC Hamburg**

“Titles or Labels? Ruminations about a Chinese Poetic Genre”

12:15–13:00 **Heidi Buck-Albuet, CSMC Hamburg**

“Naming Japanese Esoteric Buddhist MTMs – Past and Present”

13:00–13:30 Final Discussion

Titles, Labels, and Names of Multiple-Text Manuscripts

A workshop at the *Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures*
Warburgstraße 26, Hamburg
30 November–1 December 2018

Abstracts

Marco Heiles, RWTH Aachen University

“*Liederbuch, Hausbuch, Schicksalsbuch*: Names and Labels of Medieval German Multiple Text Manuscripts and their Implications”

‘Große Heidelberger Liederhandschrift’, ‘Ambrasser Heldenbuch’, ‘Rostocker Liederbuch’, ‘Hausbuch des Michael de Leone’, ‘Heidelberger Schicksalsbuch’, ‘Alsfelder Dirigierrolle’, ‘Bamberger mathematisches Manuskript’ and so forth. There are many established names of medieval German manuscripts. Their proper names consist of nominal phrases and head of these phrases are common nouns, which in turn are used as labels for groups of manuscripts. But who introduced names and labels of manuscripts? Which labels are used (by whom) and is their terminology consistent? What do the ‘Große Heidelberger Liederhandschrift’, the ‘Weingartner Liederhandschrift’, the ‘Budapester Liederhandschrift’, the ‘Jenaer Liederhandschrift’ and all the other *Liederhandschriften* (manuscripts of songs) have in common? And what are the differences to the *Liederbücher* (books of songs) like the ‘Rostocker Liederbuch’, the ‘Königsteiner Liederbuch’, ‘Schedels Liederbuch’ or ‘Fichards Liederbuch’. Is there a common understanding what a *Liederhandschrift*, *Liederbuch*, *Hausbuch* or *Schicksalsbuch* is? What do these labels implicate? And are they useful or do they prevent an unbiased analysis?

Cornelius Berthold, CSMC Hamburg

“Wearing Multiple-Text Manuscripts: Pocket-Sized Islamic Manuscripts with Magico-Religious Content”

The Serbian janissary Konstantin Mihailović (c. 1430s–1480s) witnessed the Ottoman wars on the Balkans and reported in his memoirs that many soldiers carried “small books which they treasure like sanctuaries and call *ḥamāyil*, meaning gospel. Especially in wartime they wear them under the arm and they are decorated with a depiction of Dhū l-Faqār.” In fact, the originally Arabic word *ḥamāʾil* denotes things that can be worn or carried. It was in this sense

used for cords, belts or baldrics, but mostly for various amulets, as they were worn at the body. The books which Konstantin described appear to be the predominantly Ottoman multiple-text manuscripts (MTMs) in small format (c. 10 × 7 cm) frequently found in modern libraries. If a content-related term was applied by Western scholars, they have been labelled as “prayer books”, for example. These MTMs usually contain several Koranic surahs, prayers (often in Arabic with Turkish instructions) and talismans like the seal of Solomon, magical squares and indeed depictions of Dhū l-Faqār, a legendary bifurcated sword. This suggests that they were not only used for religious devotional practices but also “passively” as talismans, which means that the emic term *ḥamāyil* refers to a mode of usage which was not necessarily reading. The present paper will briefly describe the MTMs from this group in both their contents and materiality. It will also try to explain the technical term in the context of similar Middle Eastern talismanic practices.

Antonella Brita, CSMC Hamburg

“Titles as Fluid Entities – Some Examples from Ethiopic Hagiographic Manuscripts”

Traditional labels and titles transmitted in hagiographic manuscripts not only reveal their content but also the way they were (and are) perceived in the Ethiopian manuscript culture. Recent investigations allow to preliminary assess that labels and titles are not stable elements in manuscripts, when considering the transmission of hagiographic works. In particular, it can be presumed that they change their form each time a work changes its function and needs to be embedded in a different manuscript format, i.e. from multiple-text manuscripts (MTMs) to single text manuscripts (STMs). Or, vice versa, labels and titles change when a work acquires a new function and it is transmitted in a different manuscript format, serving its new function. The aim of the paper is to show some examples of the fluidity of labels and titles transmitted in both MTMs and STMs and to analyse them from a synchronic and diachronic perspective, in order to understand how they were perceived during the time.

Rosa-Maria Piccione-Hilgert, Università di Torino

“Collections of Greek Texts Within Multiple-Text Manuscripts:
Definitions and Morphological Evidence”

From Byzantium to the Renaissance, MTMs are very common in the Greek manuscript tradition. To these “one-volume libraries”, historical as well as contemporary catalogues often assign ambiguous and misleading definitions. My contribution aims at presenting some case studies mainly from the production of handbooks that were intended for a certain kind of teaching and training practices. In addition, I will compare entries in catalogues and inventory lists with the morphological evidence from the manuscripts themselves. In order to enrich the

collection of data provided for the discussion, my contribution intends to present further evidence from books and documents related to two libraries of the 16th and 17th centuries, which I have been working on recently. Here, the key question is: What is the perception of MTMs by their patrons and/or possessors as well as by contemporary scribes drawing up indices and inventory lists?

Hülya Çelik, Universität Hamburg

“The Court Librarian Sebastian Tegnagel (d. 1636) as a First Labeller of Oriental Multiple-Text Manuscripts at the Austrian National Library”

Sebastian Tegnagel was the court librarian of the Imperial Library in Vienna from 1608 to his death in 1636. At the same time, he was an active member of the international community of scholars – the Republic of Letters. His writings that have survived until today document his work with manuscripts in Arabic, Persian, Ottoman Turkish, and a few other languages. Tegnagel’s index “Libri Arabici, Persici, et Turcici” in particular sheds light on his labelling activities as librarian and scholar. Drawing a wider picture on Oriental MTMs at the Austrian National Library, I will also review the catalogues by Gustav Flügel and Smail Balić. Flügel authored the catalogue of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts acquired before 1864, and Balić the Ottoman-Turkish manuscripts from 1864 to 1994.

Judith I. Haug, Orient-Institut Istanbul

“Multiple-Text Manuscripts as Sources for Ottoman Music History: First Steps into a New Field”

In the Ottoman culture of writing, reading and knowledge transmission, the importance of multiple-text manuscripts is considerable. Under the broader term *mecmū‘a* (“collection”, “miscellany”), different types can be discerned. For instance, the so-called *güfte mecmū‘ası* („song text collection“) is a particular source type that helps us understand and to a certain amount trace the history of vocal repertoire in a music culture dominated by oral repertoire transmission. Different subtypes exist according to the different repertoires and stylistic spheres which are prevalent in a given *mecmū‘a*. For example, a *şarkı mecmū‘ası* is supposed to contain only or predominantly texts for the genre *şarkı*. The term *cönk* – actually referring to the external shape of the book – is commonly used today for collections of “folk” song texts often of heterodox content.

In my contribution to the workshop I will ask which designations the scribes themselves employed (if the manuscripts have titles at all), how researchers have dealt with this, and, lastly and importantly, how those manuscripts have been catalogued in later times. The outcome of this labeling and definition process determines (and sometimes distorts) the di-

rection of research to the present day. Recently embarked on a project relying on *güfte mecmūʻas* from the Ottoman Empire and surrounding areas during the 16th and 17th centuries, I am confronted with the problem that many sources relevant for my study are insufficiently or erroneously described in the catalogues of the (mostly) European libraries that hold them.

Heidi Buck-Albuet, CSMC Hamburg

“Naming Japanese Esoteric Buddhist MTMs – Past and Present”

Among the teachings of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan, many were initially transmitted orally, but also recorded on single leaves (*kirigami*). From an early period onwards, these single leaves were collected into MTMs. A special subgroup of such MTMs contains legends and symbolic explanations on Mount Kōya and about Kūkai, founder of Shingon Buddhism in Japan.

The titles of these manuscripts, ‘Kōyasan hiki’ (‘Secret records on Mount Kōya’), ‘Kōyasan shinpi’ (‘Deep secrets on Mount Kōya’), etc., hint at the content as well as the ways and means of transmission: teachings on Mount Kōya that were (initially) meant to be secret, transmitted orally from teacher to disciple. Among the extant manuscripts (copies dating from the 13th /14th to the 18th /19th century), there are many variants that can roughly be grouped according to the following criteria: a) same title, same content/ancestry, b) same title, similar content, c) different title, similar content, d) different title, different type of text/manuscript, e) same content, different titles. I will pick up three concrete examples.

The titles also show transtextual references, indicating the affiliation of the scriptures to specific categories. I would like to shed some light on what kind of categories these are and also what naming practices they reflect. In a very brief excursus I will add two more aspects, namely what catalogues might reveal about categorization and how labelling and naming practices are continued until this day.