

The Cluster of Excellence
Understanding Written Artefacts
cordially invites you to the workshop

**Identifying Models and Copies on the Basis of
Material Evidence: At the Intersection
Between Manuscript Studies and Philology**

Thursday, 10 November 2022, 9:30 am – 5:00 pm (CET)

Friday, 11 November 2022, 9:30 am – 4:00 pm (CET)

Warburgstraße 26, 20354 Hamburg

Organised by Giovanni Ciotti and José Maksimczuk

Registration:

<https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/en/register-workshop31>

This workshop aims to investigate from a cross-cultural and interdisciplinary perspective the extent to which specific material features and matters of formatting can be studied to understand the genetic relationships between manuscripts. These fall under the umbrella category of the so-called 'material evidence' originally proposed for the *eliminatio codicum descriptorum* by S. Timpanaro (1985). As defined by M. Reeve (2011 [1989], 152), material evidence is 'any peculiarity of a witness other than its readings that accounts for an innovation in another witness'. This definition thus includes cases such as damaged or missing pages, peculiarities in the visual organisation of content and paracontent, and unclear script.

Some of the questions this workshop will address are: To what extent has this methodology been so far used in the various manuscript cultures? Is it possible to allot the different manifestations of material evidence to meaningful and useful categories? What can the study of material evidence tell us about the transmission of manuscripts and works in different cultures? How can artefact profiling help scholars to evaluate the worth of certain cases of material evidence (e.g. ink analysis and recovery of erased content)? Is it possible to broaden up the scope of this approach in order to include epigraphy?

Programme

Thursday, 10 November 2022, 9:30 am – 5:00 pm

Session 1

9:30 – 10:30 Tomás Fernández (Universidad de Buenos Aires) and José Maksimczuk (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)
On the applicability of the concept of material evidence. Some examples from the Greek tradition of Aristotle's First Analytics

Session 2

Chair: Caroline Macé (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

10:30 – 11:00 Lara Sels (KU Leuven)
Identifying the translation model of the Slavonic Šestodnevnik by reconstructing the material life of codex Baroccianus graecus 228
(Discussant: G. Mitov, KU Leuven)

11:00 – 11:30 Anna Jouravel (University of Freiburg)
Same but different. The Slavic approach to the relationship between models, copies, and genetics

11:30 – 12:00 Coffee break

Session 3

Chair: Thies Staack (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

12:00 – 12:30 Costantino Moretti (École française d'extrême-orient)
Models and archetypes in Medieval China: Sundry notes with a focus on Dunhuang Buddhist manuscripts

12:30 – 1:00 Ondřej Škrabal (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)
Material evidence for models and copies in the ancient world epigraphy: From Pharaonic Egypt to Early China

1:00 – 2:30 Lunch break

Session 4

Chair: Tomás Fernández (Universidad de Buenos Aires)

2:30 – 3:00 Anna Kinder (Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach) and Sandra Richter (Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)

Material evidence of 20th century manuscripts and philological practices

3:00 – 3:30 Silpsupa Jaengsawang (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Anisong manuscripts for wedding ceremonies: Is their master version really lost?

3:30 – 4:00 Coffee break

Session 5

Chair: Giovanni Ciotti (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

4:00 – 4:30 Christina Pecchia (University of Vienna and Austrian Academy of Sciences)

The synergy between physical and textual evidence: The history of the transmission of Sanskrit texts beyond historically determined boundaries

4:30 – 5:00 Eva Wilden (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

The missing ten lines – Reconstructing the transmission of a classical Tamil text

6:30 Conference dinner

Friday, 11 November 2022, 9:30 am – 4:00 pm

Session 6

Chair: Eva Wilden (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

9:30 – 10:00 Jost Gippert (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Models shimmering through copies: case studies from Georgian manuscripts

10:00 – 10:30 Saloumeh Gholami (Goethe University of Frankfurt), Almut Hintze (University of London) and Sebastian Bosch (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Zoroastrian scribal practices on the basis of material evidence

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break

Session 7

Chair: Konrad Hirschler (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

- 11:00 – 11:30 Frédéric Bauden (University of Liège)
Advantages and pitfalls of using material evidence as a means to identify apographs in the Arabic textual tradition: The case of the Egyptian historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442)
- 11:30 – 12:00 Josef Ženka (Charles University)
The best of both worlds: Notaries and scribes as copyists or copyists as scribes and notaries in the 15th century Granada
- 12:00 – 1:30 Lunch break

Session 8

Chair: Olivier Bonnerot (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

- 1:30 – 2:00 Ivan Shevchuk (CSMC, Universität Hamburg) and Kyle Huskin (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)
Accepting the limits of methodology: What MSI and image processing can and cannot answer

Final Lecture

Chair: Stefano Valente (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

- 2:00 - 2:45 Caroline Macé (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)
Corpus delicti: Material evidence of lost manuscripts
- 2:45 – 3:30 Coffee break
- 3:30 – 4:00 Roundtable and closing remarks
- 6:00 Dinner

Abstracts and Contributors in Alphabetical Order

Frédéric Bauden (University of Liège)

Advantages and pitfalls of using material evidence as a means to identify apographs in the Arabic textual tradition: the case of the Egyptian historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442)

If material evidence has been used as a means to identify models and copies in the European textual tradition for some time now, it remains largely unknown to editors of Arabic texts who, when they detail their method, still give precedence to the stemmatic approach despite its partial inadequacy for texts in Arabic script as Witkam stressed more than 30 years ago. In the Arabic textual tradition, particularly in the Mamluk period (roughly Egypt and Syria between the 13th and the 16th c.), the preservation of many manuscripts in the author's hand (holographs) is remarkable. The case of the Egyptian historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442) is quite exceptional given that 24 holograph volumes totalling 5,000 leaves are held in various libraries around the world. Al-Maqrīzī is known to have copied with own hand the various stages of each of his works (preparatory notes, drafts, fair copies), though he had recourse to a scribe in a single case at the end of his life: the production of a collection of small texts of his that also includes some of his autograph notes. The existence of such a large number of witnesses allows to dwell on the issue of the material evidence as a discriminatory argument for the identification of apographs. In this paper, I propose to review the various physical elements that can be invoked to select or exclude copies but also draw special attention to the pitfalls of exclusively relying on these elements.

Tomás Fernández (University of Buenos Aires) and José Maksimczuk (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

On the applicability of the concept of Material evidence. Some examples from the Greek tradition of Aristotle's First Analytics

It is generally accepted that apographs are manuscripts copied from extant manuscripts, and that the proof that a given manuscript is an apograph is usually indirect: as a rule, it will contain all the errors of its model, minus those which could have been eliminated by conjecture or contamination, plus at least one of its own. There is a well-known exception to this rule, the so-called "material evidence", defined by M. Reeve (2011 [1989], 152), as "any peculiarity of a witness other than its readings that accounts for an innovation in another witness". This definition thus includes cases such as damaged or missing pages, peculiarities in the visual organization of content and paracontent, and unclear script. Apographs were usually disregarded in the constitution of the text; this is the famous *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*. A more generous and more

recent critical approach concedes that apographs may contain valuable evidence (such as genuine readings gathered from other models), and that other witnesses, which are surely not apographs, are *inutiles* for the constitution of the text. The *eliminatio codicum inutilium* is more useful than the *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*. Yet, since many apographs are also *inutiles*, determining which manuscript is an apograph is still a crucial part of textual criticism.

The first part of our contribution aims to show how the concept of material evidence has been employed through the centuries and came to a turning point in the late twentieth century, especially with contributions by Timpanaro and Reeve; the latter, in an unsurpassed article on the subject, proved that material evidence is found in manuscripts more often than scholarship had previously thought. The second part of the paper will offer examples of material evidence from a huge, complex, and up-to-now barely explored manuscript tradition: Aristotle's *First Analytics*.

Jost Gippert (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Models shimmering through copies: case studies from Georgian manuscripts

On the basis of manuscripts from Mt Athos and Jerusalem, the paper examines different aspects of material evidence that allow us to determine models that were used in copying. The types of evidence to be illustrated include indirect indications of Greek models, evidence provided by sauts du même au même, evidence provided by paratexts of different kinds, and evidence based on damages.

Saloumeh Gholami (Goethe University of Frankfurt), Almut Hintze (University of London) and Sebastian Bosch (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Zoroastrian scribal practices on the basis of material evidence

Various historical evidence shows that the Iranian Zoroastrian scribes were invited to India by Parsis to copy Avestan manuscripts. From the colophon of the manuscript M 50 (Farvardin Yasht) copied in 1093 AY (1724 AD) by Jamasb Dastur Hakim Ardeshir Nushirvan Zartosht Jamasb Shapur Baxt-Afarin, resident of Yazd, we learn that the scribe of this manuscript traveled to India to present the manuscript of the Farvardin Yasht to the community. As a result of the Iranians travelling to India and transcribing manuscripts for the Parsi community there, we see that Indian Avestan manuscripts were heavily influenced by the Iranian tradition. However, it seems that later, in the 19th century, the Indian writing tradition influenced Iranian Zoroastrian writing practices.

The material identification of Iranian and Indian manuscripts and their comparison will assist us in answering the following guiding questions: Are there any local and chronological connections between any of the manuscripts? Are there any differences between the materials of Iranian and Indian manuscripts? What is the provenance of the materials used in Iranian and Indian manuscripts? Is it possible to ascertain whether the scribes from Iran brought the material for his work to India or vice versa from India to Iran?

A further key aspect of this research concerns the question whether a material analysis can help us to date a manuscript that has no colophon, and also how exact such dating can be. On the basis of laboratory work carried out by Sebastian Bosch and colleagues at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures in Hamburg on Avestan manuscripts from Iran and India, we present techniques of general ink and paper analysis to answer the aforementioned questions. Furthermore, we discuss techniques for script recovery, which serve the purpose of retrieving effaced, faded or deleted text, including individual words, lines of text, and complete colophons. Through script recovery methods, we will try to extract new information that can be used to help date a manuscript. This research will thus produce innovative outcomes in our field and can open up new possibilities for methods to gain further insights into the production and transmission of Avestan manuscripts.

Silpsupa Jaengsawang (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Anisong manuscripts for wedding ceremonies: Is their master version really lost?

Anisong is a religious textual genre of homiletic texts that are delivered by monks to a lay audience when giving sermons. The core message of *anisong* texts in general is to promote acts of gift-giving (*dāna*) and to relate them to a Buddhist (non-) canonical reference. In Laos there are only four extant *anisong* manuscripts that serve liturgy on wedding ceremonies since in Buddhism marriage as such is not considered conducive to salvation/enlightenment (*Nibbāna*). Written on palm-leaf these manuscripts date from the period 1962–1997. Except for the earliest one, all these manuscripts were sponsored by the same monk and are kept at the same monastery, Vat Maha That, in the town of Luang Prabang.

As the texts are similar, the talk aims at investigating them to figure out whether the four manuscripts were copied from one another or whether they were copied from other unknown manuscripts. Changes and differences found in the course of textual transmissions will also be discussed to distinguish antigraphs from apographs. The following questions are: were the most recent three manuscripts copied from the oldest one or were they each copied from their own original? What do the 'differences' found in these four manuscripts imply? Is it possible that one

earlier version did exist from which all manuscripts were copied? In terms of manuscript studies and philology, what is revealed through the process of transmission/copying?

Anna Jouravel (University of Freiburg)

Same but different. The Slavic approach to the relationship between models, copies, and genetics

In contrast to the long Greek and Latin traditions, in the Slavia, which only in the 9th-10th centuries entered the stage of literacy along with its Christianisation, the preserved manuscripts are only a few centuries younger than their originals. In my presentation, I shall reflect on the consequences, needs and possibilities that arise from this fundamentally different starting position for the methodology of Slavic textual criticism and the role of material evidence therein.

Anna Kinder (Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach) and Sandra Richter (Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)

Material evidence of 20th century manuscripts and philological practices

The case of “material evidence” and its use for identifying models and copies of old manuscripts seems well established and conceptualized where Latin manuscripts and the questions of genetic interrelationships are concerned. In particular, in cases in which the ‘one’ original manuscript is no longer extant, material evidence helps to establish a chronological order of witnesses and copies.

However, when dealing with manuscripts from the 20th or 21st century, the situation is somewhat different: On the one hand, we are dealing with much shorter time spans, manuscripts or typescripts are usually available, and in many cases, there are published editions. On the other hand, the question of the valid “original text” is not always clear and simple, especially if there is no last-hand edition available that has been authorized by the author. The question that arises is essentially one of edition philology: How do we arrive at a text that we can regard as valid and sanctioned for the practice of literary interpretation? In terms of edition philology, the idea of a stable text, cleansed of errors, comes to mind.

The path from manuscript to text, according to the argument we will pursue in this paper, is based on philological practices of material evidence creation. To what extent these practices help to establish a trustworthy textual witness will be demonstrated by taking Kafka’s “Prometheus” as an example. In doing so, we will also ask about the limits of material evidence when it comes to questions of ambiguity and its epistemic potential for interpretive work in literary studies.

Caroline Macé (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Corpus delicti: Material evidence of lost manuscripts

The difficulty of proving a direct filiation between manuscripts on the sole basis of textual evidence has long been recognised. The problem is particularly acute if one aims at an *eliminatio codicum descriptorum* (Reeve 1989), a practice that should probably be abandoned in favour of a more pragmatic *eliminatio codicum inutilium*. Indeed, there might be very good reasons to use copies of preserved manuscripts in the *constitutio textus*: for example, they may contain important additional material (such as conjectures) or may have been copied when their model was in a better shape than today (Irigoin 1954). Conversely using one more faithful copy of exactly the same text that already exists in several exemplars, even though its exact *Vorlage* cannot be identified, may prove irrelevant for the history of the tradition and for the edition. In fact, the ‘form’ of the manuscripts must always be taken into account when searching for scribal errors and their causes (Havet 1911, ‘section 5’: ‘l’influence du contexte’). Something different, although related to this question, is the identification of ‘material accidents’ in a tradition (Irigoin 1986). These ‘material accidents’ may also help proving a filiation between extant manuscripts, but, much more importantly, they will often allow to materially reconstruct (hyp)archetypes. In this paper I will provide a few examples of material reconstruction of lost Greek manuscripts.

Constantino Moretti (École française d’extrême-orient)

Models and archetypes in Medieval China: Sundry notes with a focus on Dunhuang Buddhist manuscripts

The aim of the present talk is to analyze the mechanisms linked to the production of specific mistakes and textual alterations which provide information of codicological interest, in particular on the formal characteristics of a manuscript archetype, on its production phases, and its formal evolution. I will also draw attention to the importance of surveying the alterations in the arrangement of textual and paratextual elements by means of a structural analysis revealing manuscript filiation based on formal characteristics.

Cristina Pecchia (University of Vienna and Austrian Academy of Sciences)

The synergy between physical and textual evidence: The history of the transmission of Sanskrit texts beyond historically determined boundaries

S. Timpanaro (1985) and M. Reeve (1989) discussed the importance of physical evidence in defining relationships between textual witnesses and in identifying the witnesses that clearly serve

the purpose of constituting the text. In this paper, theoretical reflections on Timpanaro's and Reeve's views will be combined with considerations based on specific aspects of the transmission of Sanskrit texts in South Asia. We will look at examples taken from the transmission of the *Carakasamhitā*, the oldest work in Sanskrit of Ayurveda. We will see how, in the case of a highly contaminated textual tradition, families of witnesses can be configured with the help of layout and physical features, also across the divide between manuscripts and printed editions. It will be shown that, eventually, such features provide a window on what happened around models and copies, and offer unexpected information on the networks in which texts, manuscripts, and printed editions participated.

Ivan Shevchuk (CSMC, Universität Hamburg) and Kyle Ann Huskin (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)
Accepting the limits of methodology: What MSI and image processing can and cannot answer

Since the early 2000s, multispectral imaging (MSI) has produced some incredible successes in terms of text recovery, including, for example, the Archimedes Palimpsest Project and the Early Modern Electronic Library based on the manuscripts of St Catherine's Monastery in Sinai. Although MSI's primary purpose is text recovery, it has occasionally been used to answer other research questions. Signs of a manuscript's material history inevitably appear or become enhanced during image processing. MSI has, for instance, revealed evidence of parchment preparation methods, modifications to the mise-en-page, signs of later reuse, and even fingerprints haplessly left behind, presumably by the scribe or a later handler. These discoveries bring a delightfully human element to what are usually treated as rarified objects, utilitarian vessels of knowledge transmission. Researchers understandably hope that these accidental findings can be leveraged to go looking for new evidence with the hope that it might provide information about, say, a manuscript's relationship to other witnesses of the same text or its provenance. However, it is not currently feasible to go "hunting" these traces of materiality with MSI, which is one of the most time-consuming and labor-intensive methods at our disposal. This presentation will discuss precisely the kinds of research questions that MSI can and cannot reliably answer, and under what circumstances MSI might provide insight into these more complex inquiries.

Lara Sels (KU Leuven)

Identifying the translation model of the Slavonic Šestodnevnik by reconstructing the material life of codex Baroccianus graecus 228

When studying a mediaeval Slavonic translation from Greek, the scholar will try to picture the Greek translation model, viz. to identify its text version or, if possible, to identify the manuscript

copy that served as a model for the translation. This paper illustrates the crucial role of material evidence in the identification of the Greek translation model of the late 13th/14th-century Slavonic *Šestodnevnik*, viz. a translation of Basil of Caesarea's *Homiliae in Hexaemeron* (CPG 2835) followed by Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio* (CPG 3154). A text critical assessment of the textual variation in the Greek and Slavonic manuscript copies – together with a comparison of the scholia – already pointed to the 10th/11th-century Greek Oxford codex *Baroccianus graecus* 228 (E6) as an interesting witness. However, it was the material examination of the Greek codex that finally settled the question, by shedding light on the manuscript's state preceding its fourteenth century repair.

Ondřej Škrabal (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

Material evidence for models and copies in the ancient world epigraphy: From Pharaonic Egypt to early China

While inscriptions are usually left out from the discussion on theoretical matters of copying, they, too, can offer interesting insights into manuscript practices and copying processes in general. Single inscriptions were sometimes copied from a manuscript model, while inscriptions produced in multiple copies could be based on a common (manuscript) ancestor or reproduce one another. Shape, size, and style of their carriers can serve as material evidence for distinguishing the sequence in which the inscriptions were produced (including authentication), but oftentimes a more nuanced analysis is necessary. Here, the consideration of material features of the model manuscript can prove helpful, especially in cases where the unusual features in an inscription hint at distortions in the hypothetical manuscript model. In this talk, I will first briefly survey how this kind of 'material evidence' was noticed and explored in the study of inscriptions from ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, India, and China, and discuss the current challenges and future potential of this line of inquiry. In the next step, I will offer a case study of the recently unearthed inscribed bronze bell chime from the seventh century BCE China, known as the Lord of Zeng bells. Based on textual garbling in the inscription on one subset of these bells, I will provide a reconstruction of material features of the model manuscript used by craftsmen to inscribe these bells. Finally, I will argue that this knowledge allows us not only to reconstruct the sequence in which individual subsets of bells were inscribed (i.e., copied), but also to gain a glimpse into how the inscription process was organised in the workshop, assess the degree of literacy among the workshop craftsmen, and, in connection to further evidence, also understand how these copying practices evolved in Early China during the first half of the first millennium BCE.

Eva Wilden (CSMC, Universität Hamburg)

The missing ten lines – Reconstructing the transmission of a classical Tamil text

The *Akanāṭṭu*, one of the classical Eight Anthologies in Tamil, comes with a verse that stipulates its thematic arrangement. In the majority of sources this arrangement works well up to verse 107, but does not for most of the rest of the text. Luckily a second (minority) strand survives which allows to find out what went wrong: the first ten lines of poem 108 have been omitted and the remaining lines have been added to poem 107, thus making the whole one poem short. Since in this particular case several subsequent generations of manuscripts are still extant, the current paper proposes to reconstruct how copyists on palmleaf, then on paper and finally the editors dealt with the material evidence at their disposal.

Josef Ženka (Charles University)

The best of both worlds: Notaries and scribes as copyists or copyists as scribes and notaries in the 15th century Granada

In this workshop, I would like to discuss the perception of the materiality of manuscript books and documents by a particular group of people of my manuscript corpus from Muslim Granada. These individuals copied books, professionally or for themselves, while working as notaries or chancery scribes. The presence of specific features or certain habits of these professions points toward a much broader contemporary context of transmission of manuscript books and documents. The use of a particular type of handwriting is one of the most discernible characteristics; others, namely the format of the quire/document, the layout and its visual organization, or the preservation of the information regarding the original manuscript, are also attested, among other things.