Michael Friedrich and Cosima Schwarke have edited a collection of articles revolving around manuscripts that contain more than one text. Most of the contributions are based on the presentations given in the conference organized by the Research Group ‘Manuscript Cultures in Asia and Africa’ at the University of Hamburg on 7–9 October 2010. In addition, the volume contains two articles that were written only for this publication and one that is a reprint of an article published elsewhere in 2010.

In the introduction the editors discuss terminological development pointing out that composite manuscript and multiple-text manuscripts are more accurate and descriptive terms to what has earlier been called miscellany. They specify that a composite manuscript is a codicological unit that contains texts that have earlier been independent units but have subsequently been put together to form a single unit, whereas the term multiple-text manuscript (MTM) is used to describe a codicological unit that is a result of one production process that has taken place in a limited time and space. All the articles in the volume follow this terminological distinction. The move away from terms like miscellany to the newer terms reflects a general development from text-focused manuscript studies to a study that also pays attention to the manuscript as an artifact that has a production history.

The articles span over a large variety of manuscript cultures from Latin and Greek over Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Coptic, Ethiopian, Georgian and Nepalese to Tibetan and Chinese, all of them displaying features of composite manuscripts and MTMs. Marilena Mariaci describes the complex structures of Medieval Latin and Byzantine manuscripts and provides a case study of a Latin manuscript. Her tabular presentation of the manuscript’s codicological structure is interesting and serves as a useful model that could be applied to different manuscript cultures. Jost Gippert combines codicology and textual study in his article on the history and development of Georgian mravaltavi, a special genre of MTMs that were used in a liturgical context. Paola Buzi presents some codicological features of MTMs among Coptic manuscripts. She then discusses the origin of the MTMs and suggests that they reflect the
conscious choices made within the monastic milieu and thus form an important source in studying the Coptic culture.

Alessandro Bausi has written on Ethiopic manuscripts and presents some cases where a composite manuscript has evolved into a MTM, i.e. a composite manuscript combining different individual codicological units has subsequently become an archetype of further copies with more or less fixed content. He argues that the composite manuscript functions as a corpus organizer resulting in a MTM that eventually gains a permanent form that will not only respond to the requirements of liturgy and teaching but will also influence and develop these requirements. Alessandro Bausi’s focus is on the Christian Ethiopian manuscripts whereas Alessandro Gori’s article deals with the Islamic manuscript culture in Ethiopia. He presents preliminary findings of Ethiopian Arabic manuscripts that have only recently become a focus of study. He argues that in many cases the production of composite manuscripts was a result of European colonial presence in Ethiopia. Even though the individual codicological units forming the composite manuscript would have circulated locally, the produced composite volumes containing texts on subjects such as Sufism, theology, history and law, reflect the interests of the colonial administrators, travellers or scholars. In contrast, the MTMs produced in Ethiopia were more often produced to serve the needs of the local communities. Alessandro Gori divides the MTMs into two groups: first, manuscripts dealing with one topic or related topics, and second, manuscripts forming collections of liturgical texts. MTMs belonging to the first group would have been produced mainly for teaching purposes, whereas the liturgical MTMs would contain fairly standardized collections of devotional poems and prayers to be recited at religious festivals or congregations of Sufi brotherhoods.

Gerhard Endress connects the Arabic composite manuscripts and MTMs to the Islamic scholarly milieu that produced ‘one-volume libraries’ usually containing texts on related subjects. Endress’s argument is that these volumes do not reflect standard curriculums of the teaching institutions but, instead, illustrate the efforts of individual scholars who collected relevant texts, organized them and had them bound together for practical reasons. Some of these volumes are composite manuscripts, where the constituent codicological units had originally circulated as separate manuscripts, whereas others are MTMs where the texts were copied by the scholar himself, sometimes adding correction and collation notes in the margins. None of the composite manuscripts that Endress presents functioned as corpus organizers in the sense that Alessandro Bausi used the term in his article and, instead, emerge as individually assembled ‘one-volume libraries’ for the exclusive use of one scholar.
The individual use is also prevalent in Ottoman private scrapbooks that Jan Schmidt describes in his article. He defines the scrapbooks as a subgenre of MTMs and offers some examples of these often chaotic notebooks that seem to contain haphazardly collected text fragments. One of the scrapbooks contains a collection of brief texts that cannot be connected to any scholarly purpose, instead, it appears that the collector had focused on texts of certain rarity and Jan Schmidt compares him to ‘a philatelist collecting rare stamps’. The other example that he gives is a MTM written on a pre-bound note book and containing appointment dates, lists of various payments, samples of letters, verses of poetry, aphorisms etc., all items that must have been important and useful for the owner of the note book. It is the personal nature of the note book’s content that makes it interesting as it offers few glimpses of the owner’s life.

Florinda de Simini’s article takes us back to the idea of composite manuscripts as corpus organizers as she studies the development and organization of Śivadharma corpus in Medieval Nepal. In her article she adapts codex-based terminology to better suit the Nepalese production of palm leaf manuscripts, where a single loose leaf, and not a quire, is the basic codicological unit. By analyzing the codicological features of early composite manuscripts and MTMs of Śivadharma, she is able to show how the various texts gradually became part of Śivadharma and the MTMs developed into a fixed corpus of eight or seven standard texts. Sam van Schaik writes about a Dunhuang manuscript, a MTM containing the Tibetan Chan Compendium. In his article he combines socio-historical and codicological methods in order to explore the role that the corpus played in the Tibetan religious life. He analyses various codicological features of the MTM, such as repairs, layout and changes in calligraphic styles. The results lead him to date the production of the MTM to a period between 900 and 950. He then moves to place the MTM in the historical context of that period and is able to connect the manuscript to the social and ritual context of precept-taking ceremonies.

The two last articles in the book present examples of Chinese Dunhuang manuscripts. Donald Harper’s article is a reprint and was originally published in 2010. In the article he discusses occult MTMs dating from the fourth century BCE to the tenth century CE focusing on the arrangement and functions of the material. He argues that the organization of MTMs illustrates how the compilers and the users perceived the occult ideas and practices. He describes the MTMs as textual artifacts that can be analyzed to identify the daily life situations where occult knowledge was considered relevant. Imre Galambos provides a study of a Dunhuang scroll that consists of several texts glued together to form a composite manuscript. By studying the various parts of
the scroll he sheds light on the motivations that led to the creation of such scrolls in medieval China. He points out that manuscripts were usually not created to preserve the texts but they are mainly a result of social activity. A careful codicological study of the composite scroll allows Imre Galambos to contextualize it within a particular socio-political environment and he is able to establish the scroll’s relationship both to the Buddhist monastic community in Dunhuang and to the legitimation of the local political leadership.

The articles in the volume may reach to a wide range of manuscript cultures but, at the same time, they deal with similar issues and questions, thus giving the volume a good thematic unity. The articles show that codicology combined with socio-historical contextualization gives new insights in the processes of manuscript production. The book is an interesting and important contribution on the study of manuscripts and it underlines that it is the combination of codicological and various textual methods that provide the most interesting results.
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