

ical Diagrams in Chapter 371 of Ibn al-‘Arabī’s (d. 638/1240) *Meccan Openings*’ and Ali Karjoo-Ravary (University of Pennsylvania) on ‘Illustrating the Forms: Ibn al-‘Arabī’s (d. 638/1240) Images in *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya*’.

Orkhan Mir-Kasimov (The Institute of Ismaili Studies) spoke of the ‘Use of Digrams in the Ḥurūfī and Nuḡṭavi Manuscripts, and Possible Links between the Ḥurūfī ‘Verbal’ and the Bektashi Visual Iconographies’. Eliza Tasbihi (McGill University) focused on the ‘Esoteric Deliberations on Visionary Unveiling: Mystical Knowledge from Ḥaydar Āmulī’s (d. after 787/1385) *Naṣṣ al-nuṣūṣ fī sharḥ Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*’.

Giovanni Maria Martini (University of Bonn) presented on ‘Shīrīn Maghribī’s (d. 810/1407) Visual Sufism: Diagrams, Intellectual Networks and the Transmission of the Spiritual Knowledge in 14<sup>th</sup>-Century Tabriz and Beyond’. Eryn Kropf (University of Michigan) talked on ‘Sensible Metaphors’: Pictograms in the Transmission of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha’rānī’s (d. 973/1565) *al-Mīzān al-kubrā*’. Side Emre (Texas A&M University) presented a ‘Comparative Study in 16<sup>th</sup>-Century Sufi Images and Diagrams: Bāyezīd Ḥalīfe’s (d. after 921/1516) Sīrri-i-canān and Muḥyīyi Gülşenī’s (d. c. 1014/1606) *Devā’iru’l-ma’arīf*’.

The discussion addressed a number of questions concerning the emergence, use, and evolution of diagrams in Sufi literature.

A collective volume is expected as an outcome of the workshop.

*Red.*

## **Manuscript Cataloguing in a Comparative Perspective: State of the Art, Common Challenges, Future Directions**

**Hamburg, 7–10 May 2018**

In the recent years, several paradigmatic changes in manuscript studies have strongly influenced the cataloguing method. First and foremost, it is the onset and expansion of electronic cataloguing, which brings its advantages but also its constraints. Second, there is the increasing attention to the material aspects of the manuscript. And finally, connected to that, the new understanding of the historical complexity of the structure of the manuscript, its multi-layered nature, that has far too often been neglected in catalogues.

From 7 to 10 May 2018, a conference took place at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures at Universität Hamburg, to address the old and new trends and challenges in scientific manuscript description. The organizers—Patrick Andrist (Munich), Alessandro Bausi (Hamburg), Michael Friedrich (Hamburg), and Marilena Maniaci (Cassino)—wanted on the one hand to compare the approaches and strategies currently applied to manuscript cat-

aloguing in various traditions and on the other to try and discuss the best practice that might be adopted across the many cultures.

After a conceptual introduction by Patrick Andrist and Marilena Maniaci, the first session united three papers offering a historical overview of cataloguing practices in Hebrew (Javier del Barco), Ethiopic (Alessandro Bausi and Denis Nosnitsin), and Arabic (Tilman Seidensticker, with some glimpses also into the other traditions covered by the *Katalogisierung der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland* project). In all these cases the shift of attention to the physical aspects of the book has been made evident, whether in print or in online catalogues.

The challenges of proper accounting for the physical aspects of the manuscript book were in the focus of the following two sessions, with the first centring on the codex and the second on non-codex manuscripts. Patrick Andrist and Marilena Maniaci spoke of the wide range of physical features that should deserve the cataloguers' attention and the possibilities of their codification. Timothy Stinson and Yasmin Faghihi addressed the ways the physical (and other) features have been and can be encoded in electronic catalogues. In particular, Faghihi illustrated the TEI XML guidelines for the codicological description. A series of case studies in cataloguing completed the sessions, with the one on Coptic Sahidic biblical manuscripts (Ulrich Schmid), and on Hebrew Torah scrolls (Élodie Attia-Kay) falling into the COMSt scope. In his insightful presentation, Christoph Flüeler illustrated the challenges of (electronically) describing physical features of manuscript fragments faced within the framework of the *Fragmentarium* project.

A session was also dedicated to the particular aspects of describing the contents of manuscripts, including main or added texts (e.g. in the talks by Christian Brockmann, with examples from the Greek tradition, or by Ronny Vollandt, describing the composition of biblical manuscripts in Arabic) or paratextual information (e.g. Steve Delamarter, with examples from Ethiopic psalter manuscripts, and Julia Craig Mc-Feely, talking of music notation).

The final two sessions primarily dealt with the challenges of electronic cataloguing. In the session *New and Open Issues*, the ways thinking digitally may modify our approach to manuscript description were highlighted by Marina Bernasconi on the example of the experience made by the *e-codices* project. Matthieu Cassin proposed a universal and unequivocal way of referring to manuscripts: an ISMI, International Standard Manuscript Identifier, could resolve the situation when the same manuscript is known under various shelfmarks and catalogue numbers. Columba Stewart illustrated the choices made in describing and visualizing manuscripts in the new *vHMML* reading room. Among the software solutions offered in the *Missing Tools* session, there was

the VisColl (<<https://github.com/leoba/VisColl>>), designed for building models of the physical collation of manuscripts, and then visualizing them in various ways (the project is led by Dot Porter at the Schoenberg Institute for Manuscript Studies and was presented at the workshop by Alberto Campagnolo). Saskia Dirkse and Pietro Liuzzo both addressed the issue of digitally representing the complex syntax of manuscripts. Dirkse introduced the work on the tool StruViMan (Structural Visualization of Manuscripts, <<https://www.struviman.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>>), and Liuzzo showed how TEI schema and RDF ontologies (<<https://github.com/BetaMasaheft/SyntaxeDuCodex>>) can be used to encode and visualize the various ‘layers’ in a manuscript as described in the *Syntaxe du Codex* by P. Andrist, P. Canart, and M. Maniaci (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

The discussions after each session as well as the final discussion showed that while full standardization can probably never be achieved, more exchange and discussion of the best practice can eventually lead to more shared approaches in manuscript cataloguing in the future. A publication of conference papers is planned.

For the general description and a full programme visit <[https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/register\\_cataloguing2018.html](https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/register_cataloguing2018.html)>.

*Eugenia Sokolinski*  
*Universität Hamburg*

## **80 years since Nordenfalk:**

### **The Canon Tables in a comparative perspective**

**Hamburg, 16–18 May 2018**

The cross-referencing system of ten tables devised by Eusebius of Caesarea to emphasize the harmony of the Four Gospels was one of the most widely copied works during late antiquity and the middle ages. The Canon Tables, often prefaced by an explanatory epistle by Eusebius to Carpianus, circulated in manuscripts of the Four Gospels throughout the broader Mediterranean world and have been transmitted in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Gə'əz, and other languages. Since it features a unique combination of texts, numbers, and images, the Eusebian apparatus has attracted the interest of scholars working on the text of the Gospels, on exegesis, and on art history. Although this evidence requires a multidisciplinary approach, the lack of team-based approaches, combined with the vastness and complexity of the material, has meant that most research on the Eusebian apparatus has generally focused on a single tradition or on one of the strands of evidence. It is no wonder, then, that the organization of a conference to mark the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication