

between the Latin translation and one Coptic fragment. Massimo Villa presented his discoveries of previously unknown Ethiopic manuscripts containing the *Physiologus*, and demonstrated the existence of several recensions of the Ethiopic translation, that need to be taken into account in the new critical edition he is preparing. Sami Aydin showed the weaknesses of the extant editions of the Syriac *Physiologus*, and highlighted the necessity of a new critical edition. Sibylle Wentker, who edited the Arabic *Physiologus* in 2002, offered some insights into interesting aspects of the translation. Anissava Miltenova and Ana Stoykova presented the manuscript tradition of the south Slavonic translation of the *Physiologus*, based on the second Greek recension. Anna Dorofeeva and Emmanuelle Kuhry offered complementary analyses, codicological and philological, of the early Latin tradition. In the last paper of the conference, Caroline Macé showed how much can be gained in the research about the history of the Greek text, by looking at the ancient translations. A round-table led by Valentine A. Pakis closed the meeting.

The complete programme and summaries are available at <https://colloquephysiologus2017.wordpress.com/>. The results of the conference will be published in the form of a book, edited by Jost Gippert and Caroline Macé, entitled *The Physiologus: multilingual history of an early Christian text*. Another conference, focusing on traditions parallel to the *Physiologus* in oriental manuscripts, will be held in the Hamburg Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures on 28 and 29 June 2018.

Caroline Macé
Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen

Hagiographico-homiletic Collections in Greek and Oriental Manuscripts: Histories of Books and Text Transmission in a Comparative Perspective

Hamburg, 23 June 2017

On 23 June 2017, Jost Gippert and Caroline Macé organized a workshop dedicated to Hagiographico-homiletic Collections in Greek and Oriental Manuscripts at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures at Hamburg University.

The vast majority of manuscripts in the Christian world, both west and east, consists of Bibles and liturgical books, florilegia, and hagiographic-patristic collections (homiliaries). The same kind of manuscripts exists in dif-

ferent linguistic traditions; sometimes containing the same texts that were translated and circulated. Even within one language, those manuscripts were rarely taken in consideration for themselves; editors of a specific text will generally use them, but extracting the text to be edited from its context. The gigantic work Albert Ehrhard did on Greek manuscripts of what he calls the ‘hagiographic-homiletic’ tradition (*Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, published between 1937 and 1952), trying to classify those manuscripts according to their contents, is unparalleled in other languages. Although probably necessary for the purpose of an edition, the de-contextualisation of texts from the gatherings in which they were transmitted obscures to some extent our understanding of their transmission history, for which a more global approach, combining stemmatological analysis and palaeographical-codicological studies, is necessary. The problem is made even more acute in the case of texts translated and transmitted throughout the ancient Christian world: were the collections translated as such or were translated texts rearranged in other collections? Whereas it would probably not make sense to edit each collection for itself, it is important to study them, across the languages, as textual witnesses and as material objects. Yet the task is daunting, requires a comparative approach and a clear methodology, which has not yet been developed. Ehrhard’s work, however admirable, is only a first step, but his efforts were unfortunately never continued (except for an index compiled by Lidia Perria).

The focus of this workshop was therefore in a comparative perspective, on the origin and development of ‘hagiographico-homiletic collections’, with a special attention to methodological issues and *instrumenta studiorum* (electronic or not). Some of the questions that were raised were: Is it possible to identify common clusters of homilies in the different traditions under consideration? If yes, what does it tell us about the history of those collections? Which texts / authors are preserved only through those collections (and in which languages)? Can we compare the history of transmission of homilies preserved both in those collections and in ‘authorial’ collections? What can we learn about the circulation of early Christian homiletics, based on the examination of hagiographico-homiletic collections? How could we go beyond the state of the art which is constituted by Ehrhard’s monumental work?

The first panel focused on the Greek tradition. Sever Voicu spoke on ‘The Earliest Greek Homiliaries’ and Matthieu Cassin presented in particular on ‘Gregory of Nyssa’s hagiographic homilies: authorial tradition and hagiographico-homiletic collections, a comparison’.

The following sessions discussed the shapes taken by the patristic and homiletic texts in various traditions: Coptic (Alin Suci, ‘Greek Patristics in

Coptic: Early Translations and Later Systematisations within Homiliaries'), Ethiopic (Antonella Brita and Alessandro Bausi, 'A few remarks on the hagiographico-homiletic collections in Ethiopic manuscripts'), Arabic (Michael Muthreich, 'Dionysius Areopagita in the Arabic and Ethiopic Homiletic Tradition'), Armenian (Bernard Outtier, 'The Armenian hagiographic-homiletic tradition'), Georgian (Jost Gippert, 'Codex Vindobonensis georg. 4: an untypical mravaltavi'), Slavic (Christian Hannick, 'Formation and transmission of hagiographic-homiletic collections in the medieval Slavic tradition'). A view on a particular corpus across the many oriental traditions was offered by André Binggeli ('The transmission of Cyril of Scythopolis' corpus in Greek and Oriental hagiographico-homiletic collections').

In addition, a few *instrumenta studiorum* were presented. Daniel Stoekl Ben Ezra (via Skype) showed the progress of the database *THALES: Thesaurus Antiquorum Lectionariorum Ecclesiae Synagogaque*, which currently contains 34 lectionaries with at least one witness of most Jewish and Christian liturgical families (i.e. Roman, Gallican, Mozarabic, Bohairic, Jerusalem (Armenian), Ashkenazi, Sephardic, Yemenite, Saadia Gaon, Mishnah, etc.); 4015 liturgical events; and 13075 readings (visit < <http://www.lectionary.eu/>>). André Binggeli and Matthieu Cassin presented the project of digitalization of the hand-written card catalogues of the hagiographic manuscripts produced by the Bollandists: the project BHGms (<<http://www.labex-resmed.fr/les-manuscrits-hagiographiques?lang=fr>>) is processing 8750 cards. Sergey Kim illustrated his work towards a digital liturgical index of Ehrhard's *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*. The recent project *Pseudo-Chrysostomica: An Online Database on the Texts Wrongly Attributed to John Chrysostom*, to be hosted on the platform Trismegistos, < <http://www.trismegistos.org/>>, was introduced by Sever Voicu.

The proceedings shall be published in a special issue of Manuscript Cultures journal of the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures.

Eugenia Sokolinski
Universität Hamburg

Medical Traditions in and around Byzantium

Munich, 14–15 July 2017

This workshop on Medical traditions in and around Byzantium, convened by Albrecht Berger, Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann and Alain Touwaide, was jointly