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Announcement
1. Introduction

The Ethiopian manuscript culture is no exception amongst the Christian oriental ones. Like the others, the Ethiopic or Gǝʿǝz literary tradition is rich in hagiographical-homiletic material. At the latest since the adoption of the Christian faith by the king of Aksum in the mid-fourth century, the diffusion and transmission of a literary corpus translated from Greek was in all likelihood committed to manuscripts, presumably codices. This corpus, albeit limited, was instrumental to Christian practice, and, besides biblical and para-biblical (apocryphal) texts, it certainly included patristic writings concerning theology, liturgy and monasticism, as well as hagiographical and homiletic literature. If this early Aksumite corpus consisted to a large extent of translations going back to Greek originals and in this way included authentic and spurious materials, a small and still little explored portion might have consisted of pieces of local production, for which, however, we do not yet have definitive evidence.

Most of this corpus was probably translated between the fourth and the sixth century and survived through complex processes of manuscript transmission. Some texts were simply copied, while other texts have come down to us only in a much reshaped form due to partial re-translations from Arabic into Ethiopic, with Arabic translations documented starting from the thirteenth century at the latest, which is also the date of the most ancient precisely dated Ethiopic manuscripts. Attested are even double versions, based on different models from different languages, of what was originally the same text. If for texts translated in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries Arabic was the ultimate language of provenance, the origin of this additional corpus could be very different and displays a variety of possible channels of transmissions and adoptions, both linguistic – Greek-Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic, Coptic-Arabic-Ethiopic, Greek-Syriac-Ethiopic, Syriac-Arabic-Ethiopic – and regional, with translations possibly carried out in different places. The systematic analysis of this corpus has just started with a few sporadic attempts, and every evaluation of its importance and extent is still premature.

The presence of historical texts reshaped in the form of hagiography or homiletics is a recently ascertained fact. A case study from this genre provides precise clues to the strategies and practices employed to re-use an earlier legacy. In particular, for at least the last four decades, a specific form of archaic hagiographical-homiletic collection, with similar contents, has attracted researchers’ attention. It was first documented in three archaic homiliaries, manuscripts Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library (henceforth EMML), nos 1763 and 8509, and London, British Library (henceforth BL), Or. 8192, but it now appears to have been present in other collections where ancient materials were preserved, as well. This seems to be the earliest form of homiliaries of which we have any precise evidence in the Ethiopic domain.

Soon after or even at the same time, fully fledged hagiographical collections appear, in the form of the archaic collections known as Gadla samā’āt (‘Acts of martyrs’) and Gadla qaddusān (‘Acts of saints’), transmitting hagiographies about martyrs of the Western as well as of the Eastern...
Churches, mostly Egyptian. In rare cases, they also include a few texts on Ethiopian saints.

The manuscripts transmitting these hagiographic collections were widespread mostly between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, but they are also attested, to a lesser extent, earlier in the thirteenth, as well as later, after the sixteenth century. This peculiarity, along with the presence of specific codicological features, allows us to draw some conclusions about the circulation of these texts and their use. Gadla samāʾ tāt – and to a lesser extent Gadla qǝddusān – is a label identifying specific multiple-text manuscripts containing a well-defined corpus of texts. The corpus known includes at least 143 different hagiographies transmitted in c.70 manuscripts recorded so far. Although they are never all present in one and the same manuscript, groups of them can be attested in a given manuscript and can be associated in different ways in the collection.

The number of still extant manuscripts preserved in monasteries and churches in Ethiopia indicates that these manuscripts were essentially canonised collections largely used for the liturgical service. Their nature as liturgical books influenced the internal structure and the arrangement of the texts transmitted in them. Each manuscript is organised according to the liturgical calendar, but a single manuscript contains readings for only a few days per month. The layout of these multiple-text manuscripts is specifically designed to enable the reader to identify the texts at a glance and to use them easily. Furthermore, there are two precise features that seem to characterise short hagiographical texts in multiple-text manuscripts that belong to the more ancient and archaic layer of the Ethiopian literary heritage: (a) a Greek-Coptic form of the name in the commemoration date, which is usually placed at the beginning of the text; and (b) a sort of double title, placed both at the beginning and at the end of the text. This element might definitely be a point to be carefully examined having in mind what happens in the Coptic tradition. The selection criteria of the texts to be included in each manuscript are still to be investigated. This is also a very crucial point since it is related, on the one hand, to the local venerations of foreign saints and, on the other hand, to the material function that the multiple-text manuscripts containing these collections attained in the course of time, thus facilitating the emergence of a local hagiography.

2. The scope of the Hamburg SFB Ethiopian manuscripts project

The Hamburg SFB 950 ‘Manuskriptkulturen in Asien, Afrika und Europa’ has hosted since its first phase (2011–2015) the sub-project (Teilprojekt C05) ‘Cross-Section Views of Evolving Knowledge: Canonico-Liturgical and Hagiographic Ethiopic Christian Manuscripts as Corpus-Organizers’, where the hagiographical and canonical-liturgical collections have been the centre of research. Within the second phase of the SFB (2015–2019), the sub-project has focussed on ‘“Parchment Saints” – The Making of Ethiopian Hagiographic Manuscripts: Matter and Devotion in Manuscript Practices of Medieval and Pre-Modern Ethiopia’, also with consideration of the role of hagiographical collections.

As for their contents, there is a deep dynamic relationship between the canonical-liturgical and the hagiographical-homiletic collections, as the case of a revealing text, the Acts of Peter of Alexandria, in the form of a homily, will demonstrate. With a more general approach, and against the trend to deal episodically and sporadically either with a single item of the corpus or with a single manuscript randomly selected among many without any understanding of its precise role and interconnections, the aim of the SFB projects was to set up the framework for a broader understanding of the context.

3 The canonical-liturgical collections are not the focus of this paper, but it is a fact that, for example, several homilies of pseudo-Chrysostomian attribution are transmitted within the standard collection of canon law of the Ethiopian Church, known as the Sinodos (dating from the thirteenth/fourteenth centuries). For an overview, see ‘Senodos’, E Ae, IV (2010), 625a–625a (Bausi).

4 Still within the SFB and its project area C ‘Manuscript Collections and Manuscripts as Collections’, the case study of the Ethiopic canonical-liturgical and hagiographical collections also offered the opportunity to propose and discuss the term of ‘corpus-organizer’ (‘CO’), which was first defined in a research note (Bausi 2010) and appeared to have some usefulness for heuristic purposes. The SFB group ‘Theory and Terminology’ also keeps the ‘CO’ on its agenda, and there is the hope that an extended definition might be proposed in the near future.

5 For more details on this point, see Bausi 2017a, 223–224.

6 This means that at this moment we have at our disposal twice as many manuscripts of hagiographical collections of Gadla samāʾ tāt (Acts of martyrs) as we had a few years ago. The additional manuscripts were made available through Antonella Brita’s field research within the SFB 950 and thanks to the European Research Council, European Union Seventh Framework Programme IDEAS (FP7/2007–2013) / ERC grant agreement no. 240720 (Ethio-SPARe), directed by Denis Nosnitsin. See Bausi 2017b, with a new edition of the Gadla ʾAzqir based upon 25 manuscripts and further references; see also Bausi 2015a.
3. Definition of ‘homily’

Aside from the liturgical definition of ‘homily’ in the Christian ritual, the Ethiopic term normally taken as indicating a ‘homily’ in the Ethiopian tradition is dārṣān, which actually means ‘the exegetical or homiletic activity developed by an ecclesiastical interpreter, or dārṣāti.7 In keeping with this, the Ethiopic tradition is rich in dārṣān collections that are thematically organised and actually contain one or more pieces of truly homiletic genre, as well as, narrowly defined, non-homiletic materials. The Encyclopaedia Aethiopica (EAe), for example, has entries for no fewer than ten major works in the form of dārṣānāt: Dārṣānā ‘abrāhām wasārā bagbhs (‘Homily on Abraham and Sara in Egypt’), Dārṣānā gabrō el (‘Homil(i)ar) on Gabriel’), Dārṣānā māḥayaw (‘Homil(i)ar) on the Saviour’), Dārṣānā mārýam (‘Homil(i)ar) on Mary’), Dārṣānā mīkā el (‘Homil(i)ar) on Michael’), Dārṣānā rāgu el (‘Homil(i)ar) on Raguel’), Dārṣānā rufā el (‘Homil(i)ar) on Rufael’), Dārṣānā sanbat (‘Homil(i)ar) on the Sabbath’), Dārṣānā sallāsē (‘Homil(i)ar) on the Trinity’), Dārṣānā urā el (‘Homil(i)ar) on Urael’).8

However, if we just look at the index of the same Encyclopaedia Aethiopica, we find no fewer than 43 works or textual units titled dārṣān and mention of no fewer than 32 authors of homilies, among whom there are very few Ethiopians (‘Elyās, Gyorgis of Saglā, Mārqos, Minās, Ṣat’u Haymānōt, Salāmā, Yoḥanni, Zar’a Yā’qob), but mostly fathers of the Western or Eastern Churches: Aphrahat, the disputed author of the monastic treatise The Spiritual Elder (‘Aragāwī manfasāwī), Athanasius, Basil, Cyriacus of Antioch, Cyriacus of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephrem, Epiphanius of Salamis, Eusebius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Hippolytus of Rome, Isaac of Nineveh, Jacob of Sarug, John Chrysostom, Michael the Syrian, Priscus of Cyzicus, Severus of Antioch, Severus of Ašmunayn, Theodosius of Alexandria, Theodotus of Ancyra, Theophilus of Alexandria and Timothy of Alexandria.9 Conversely, under ‘homily’, no fewer than 74 individual homilies are explicitly mentioned.10 Still, there are complex works containing homilies but with no dārṣān appearing in their titles, typically the Gabra ḫomāmāt, the ‘Homiliary for the Passion Week’,11 or even the archaic patristic collection known as Qerāllos, i.e. Cyril of Alexandria, which is probably the best known of all Ethiopic collections, thanks to the editorial effort by Bernd Weischer for the series of Äthiopistische Forschungen.12

4. The state of the art

What is the state of the art? We can distinguish several phases in the development of research on Ethiopic hagiographical-homiletic corpora. It is obviously impossible to provide all details here,13 but some high points can be defined with some accuracy.

4.1. The beginnings: from Petraeus to Dillmann

The very first printed homily in Ethiopic brings us back to the origins of oriental studies, and to the personality of Theodorus Petraeus (c.1630–1672), active in Ethiopic and Coptic studies: in 1660 he published in Leyden a homily on the Nativity, Dārṣān baʾṣantu latatu la ʾagziʾa ṣan ʾiyasus krasatos (‘Homily about the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ’).14 The manuscript from which the homily was taken is known: it is the famous manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Ms. or. fol. 117.15

7 See ‘Dorsan’, EAe, II (2005), 136b–137a (Steven Kaplan).
8 See ‘Dorsanā Abraham wāsara bagbhs’, EAe, II (2005), 137b (Kaplan); ‘Dorsanā Gabra el’, EAe, II (2005), 137b–138a (Samuel Yelew); ‘Dorsanā maḥayaw’, EAe, II (2005), 138a–b (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā Maryam’, EAe, II (2005), 138b–139a (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā Mikā el’, EAe, II (2005), 139a–140a (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā Ragu el’, EAe, II (2005), 140a–141a (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā Rufa el’, EAe, II (2005), 141a (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā sānbāt’, EAe, II (2005), 141a–142b (Nosnitsin); ‘Dorsanā sallasē’, EAe, II (2005), 143a (Lusini); ‘Dorsanā Urā el’, EAe, II (2005), 143b–b (Lusini). A comprehensive Clavis is being developed by the Project Beta masāḥeh in cooperation with the aforementioned TraCES project and the SFB 950 sub-project (cf. notes * and 6 above).

9 See EAe, V (2014), 811a–812a.
10 See EAe, V (2014), 934a–935a.
11 See ‘Gobra ḫomāmat’, EAe, II (2005), 725b–728b (Ugo Zanetti).
12 See ‘Qerāllos’, EAe, IV (2010), 287a–290a (Bausi).
13 A more substantial bibliographic contribution can be found in Bausi 2016, where I presented a report on the relationship between Coptic (Egyptian) and Ethiopian traditions, with a large part concerning literary borrowing; see in particular the sections on homiletics (pp. 546–547) and Aksumite literature (pp. 542–543).
14 See Petraeus 1660; Lockot 1982, no. 6459.
15 See Dillmann 1878, 56–57, no. 66 (‘12. Homilie des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus über die Geburt unseres Herrn Jesu Christi, am 28. Thahs’), Ms. or. fol. 117, pp. 272–285, with marginal notes by Petraeus. The manuscript used by Petraeus as a draft for publication is also known and is found in the same library, Ms. or. quart. 12 (Dillmann 1878, no. 67); ‘Vorn auf dem Titelblatt steht: Homilia Aethiopica de Nativitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, in Latinum ad verbum conversa et notis necessarisis ac Aethiopum proverbibus illustrata, addito textu Graecco S. Johannis Chrysostomi itidemque Latinitate donato; nunc primum in lucem edita a
The homily was reprinted without the Ethiopic *incipit* in 1668 in Amsterdam and once again by Christoph Schlichting (d. post 1729), this time in Hamburg.

The father of Ethiopian studies Hiob Ludolf seems not to have been very conversant or interested in patristics in Ethiopic versions. Only with the edition of a small selection of homilies by August Dillmann, included in his *Chrestomathia Aethiopica edita et glossario explanata*, did it become manifest how much Ethiopic could contribute to patristics and to homiletics in particular. In this work, Dillmann provided text editions both in section ‘7. Epistolae’ (a: *Epistola Joannis Antiocheni ad Cyrillum missa* and b: *Epistola Cyrilli ad Joannem*, pp. 70–76) and, particularly, in section ‘8. Sermones vel homiliae’ (a: *Homilia Severiani Gabalorum*, b: *Cyrilli de Melchisedec homilia prior*, c: *Cyrilli de Melchisedec altera*, d: *Homilia Severi, episcopi Synnadorum*, e: *Homilia Juvenalis Hierosolymitani*, f: *Homilia Eusebii, episcopi Heracleae*, g: *Homilia Theodoti episcopi Ancyracae*, h: *Homilia Firmi episcopi Caesareae*, pp. 77–107).

4.2. Pereira and Peeters

At the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, interest in patristic and homiletic Ethiopian literature was again only episodic: this was the time when the local sources started to be researched and the interest of historians who saw in them a new source to explore the past, whereas those interested in literature found much more important major works to work on like the *Book of Enoch* or even the Bible. Patristic and homiletic works were confined to a small group of passionate scholars: for homiletics, one should mention at least Francisco Maria Esteves Pereira, who published between 1906 and 1915 several homilies attributed to John Chrysostom, along with a comprehensive study of them; whereas for hagiography translated into Ethiopic, one should mention the pioneering work carried out, not only in this field, by Paul Peeters, the Bollandist Father who put together for the first time all hagiographical traditions from the Eastern Churches in the form of a *clavis* (*Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis*, 1910).

4.3. Weischer and the Qerollos

What we could call the medial period of research on Ethiopian patristic collections is marked by a major editorial enterprise, that is the almost complete edition by Bernd Manuel Weischer of the extensive collection known as the *Qerollos*. The *Qerollos* is a patristic collection, for the major part translated from Greek into Ga’az in the Aksumite period – as a whole, one of the most important works of Ga’az literature. Named after Cyril of Alexandria, it contains writings originating in the context of the councils of Ephesus (431) and its immediate aftermath, with the later addition of a few patristic writings. The *Qerollos* results from the conflation of two different main collections, both of Alexandrian origin, with the addition of later materials. The first collection, besides major treatises, contained homilies by Theodotus of Ancyra, Cyril of Alexandria, Severus of Synnada, Acacius of Melitene, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Reginus of Constantia, Eusebius of Heraclea and Firmus of Caesarea, as well as some letters. The second section consists of seven writings (homilies and symbols) on christological and trinitarian questions and includes one homily each by Epiphanius of Cyprus, Proclus of Cyzicus, Severianus of Gabala and Cyril of Alexandria on Melchizedek.

Some of the texts were referenced in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (*CPG*), but definitely not all of them. Still in the times of the *Clavis*, the exploration of Ethiopic patristic versions was of little importance to mainstream research in the field. Among the few systematic contributions to be mentioned here is a short one comprising the first approach see now Pacheco Pinto 2019 and in the same volume the republication of a homily, Pereira 2019.

---

16 See Pereaes 1668; Lockot 1982, no. 6458.
17 See Schlichting 1691; Lockot 1982, no. 6462, but Lockot writes some words incorrectly; the same in *Schlichting, Christoph*, *EAc*, IV (2010), 575a–b (Sophia Dege and Uhlig) and also Six 1999, 258–263 on manuscript Kiel, Universitätsbibliothek, Cb 5152 (the description of the work on p. 259); the *Homilia Aethiopica* is found on fols 85–91; with an interlinear translation in Latin and handwritten corrections.
18 See Dillmann 1866, 70–107.
19 See Pereira 1906, 1907, 1910a, 1910b, 1911a, 1911b, 1915. On Pereira
to the corpus of Gregorius of Nazianzus, published in 1983 by Emery van Donzel – an excellent scholar in Islamic studies and an Ethiopianist as well, within the framework of a comprehensive enterprise carried out in Louvain-la-Neuve on the homiletic corpus of Gregorius of Nazianzus.23

4.4. The impact of the EMML enterprise
At the end of the 1980s, the increasing and progressing microfilming and cataloguing effort carried out by the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library (EMML) project brought about substantial consequences.24 Particularly important was the partial access to and microfilming of the libraries of Dabra Hayq Ḳistifanos and Ṭanā Qirqos: the first one revealed manuscript EMML no. 1763 – early studied by Getatchew Haile, who dedicated to this manuscript fourteen pages of thorough and detailed description in his catalogue, while the latter, with manuscript EMML no. 8509, eventually studied by Sergew Hable Sellasie, showed that the typology of an archaic homiliary attested by manuscript EMML no. 1763 was not a unicum. This was also confirmed by the existence of a third manuscript earlier catalogued by Stefan Strelcyn from the new acquisitions of the British Library in London, Or. 8192, with provenance from the historical church of Gʷǝnagʷǝnā in Eritrea,25 the contents of which matched to a large extent those of the others, also with a similar arrangement.26 As early revealed by Getatchew Haile’s publications, it was apparent that these archaic homiletic collections contained materials of different age and provenance, and a few texts with an apparent Greek Vorlage were published. Getatchew Haile’s opening contributions were those of a series of texts from manuscript EMML no. 1763 (starting with the Acts of Peter of Alexandria in 1980 and the Acts of Mark in 1981),27 whereas Sergew Hable Sellasie provided a detailed description of manuscript EMML no. 8509, also focusing on palaeographical aspects.28

4.5. The first systematic attempts: Lusini and Proverbio
In these years and in the climate of expectation of new discoveries, an article by Gianfrancesco Lusini with the promising title ‘Appunti sulla patristica greca di tradizione etiopica’ appeared in 1988. Probably inspired by the interests of Gianfranco Fiaccadori, Lusini clearly posed several questions that had been highlighted in the most recent contributions and attempted a first, albeit limited and later revised and emended, recensio of Greek patristic writings in Ethiopic translation, with particular attention to homiletics traced both in collections of exclusively homiletic character and in other kinds of multiple-text manuscripts.29 There was nothing in his article that had not already been stated in current publications – the importance of the Qerǝllos, the double process of penetration of Greek patristics into Ethiopic first from Greek models and later from Arabic ones – and he also maintained a relatively late date for the earlier translations of the Aksumite age in the sixth century, to which one would not subscribe now. Yet, it was the first time that the topic was defined in a systematic way.

The specific question of the archaic homiliaries was taken up again in a little-known postdoc research project undertaken at the University of Florence by Delio Vania Proverbio, now scriptor orientalis at the Vatican Library, formally directed by Paolo Marrassini, but in fact unofficially tutored by Gianfranco Fiaccadori. Unfortunately, the project ended before it could produce what it promised. It is therefore really surprising that, although stressing the importance of liturgical homilies in a 2001 overview paper on Greek translations from Coptic and Ethiopic, Marrassini did not even mention Proverbio’s work.30 This latter paper also provides a comprehensive list of texts, with reference to the Clavis Patrum Graecorum.

Proverbio, however, used his preliminary work for other contributions and introduced the concept of codices trigemini (‘trigeminal manuscripts’) to define the kind of archaic homiletic collection attested by manuscripts EMML nos 1763 and 8509, and BL Or. 8192.31 In addition to several

23 See Van Donzel 1983.
25 See ‘Gʷǝnagʷǝnā’, EAc, II (2005), 943b–944a (Bausi).
27 See an updated bibliography in the Appendix at the end of this paper.
29 See Lusini 1988a.
30 See Marrassini 2001, 1003, ‘dall’altro, quella etiopica, conformemente alla minore capacità innovativa di quest’area, sembra poter riservare non poche sorprese, soprattutto se si vorrà procedere a uno spoglio sistematico della enorme massa di materiale a disposizione, in special modo di quello contenuto negli omelii liturgici’.
31 See Proverbio 2001, 518–519, n. 3.
other publications of patristic texts of which he could demonstrate the existence of a Greek Vorlage. Proverbio’s main contribution was the deep and thorough study, with edition and large philological and linguistic commentary, of the pseudo-Chrysostomian homily De ficu exarata (CPG 4588), with consideration of the whole oriental background. The study was published as volume 50 of Aethiopistische Forschungen in 1998.

Although extremely complex and sometimes not immediately accessible, pages 59–90 of this remarkable work provided the first detailed and reliable survey of the pseudo-Chrysostomian homiletic tradition, as well as an overview of the translation literature in Ethiopic and a detailed presentation of the manuscript tradition of the edited homily. After twenty years, this book still remains the most important contribution on pseudo-Chrysostomian homilies in Ethiopic versions.

5. New perspectives
What are the new frontiers of research on Ethiopic homiletic collections? Several authors have valuably contributed in the last few years, searching for further texts from the older layer of Ethiopic literature. Among these, Sever Voicu deserves to be mentioned, who early maintained the importance of an ‘earlier layer’ of Ethiopic literary heritage, along with Osvaldo Raineri, Tedros Abreha, Robert Beylot and others, who have actually contributed to the discovery and publication of new texts that can all be attributed to the homiletic genre. Others have resumed research on texts already published, like Gianfrancesco Lusini, who has re-edited the Acts of St Mark with the addition of new manuscripts. Also the publication of the Encyclopaedia Aethiopica has greatly contributed, with many comprehensive articles, chiefly by Gianfranco Fiaccadori, Gianfrancesco Lusini, Witold Wita-kowski and some by the present author, whereas for individual authors an overview of the relevant textual tradition was provided, sometimes but not always with references to the CPG. All in all, however, the references to an essential work like the CPG were by far below expectations, and not at variance with the references to the BHG.

5.1. New findings
It is a true merit of the Ethio-SPaRe project to have documented and, with the competent contribution of the project fellows, started to catalogue additional, at times fragmentary, archaic homiliaries, which increase the dossier of the codices trigemini and also better suggest the kind of distribution and dissemination of these collections. These collections now appear to have been present in several most important libraries of the Christian kingdom of Ethiopia, although their copying ended at a relatively early time and their transmission probably ceased before the fifteenth century. The reasons why this happened should be further investigated and can only be surmised at this moment. These additional liturgical homiliaries are known from the most important library of ‘Urā Masqal/’Urā Qirqos, representing the registration (or even circulation) units catalogued under the shelf marks UM-037, UM-045, UM-046 and UM-050. These shelf marks contain portions from at least seven, five, four, and ten manuscripts respectively, but it should be verified whether more hands and more craftsmen originally worked on the production of individual manuscripts, as is frequently the case. Getatchew Haile used small excerpts from these bundles of leaves for the editions included in his The Ethiopian Orthodox Church’s Tradition on the Holy Cross.

5.2. The earliest translations
The crucial question of when the first translations from Arabic into Ethiopic started is still disputed: the term was confidently fixed at the fourteenth century, but we are sure now that it must be anticipated in the thirteenth at the latest. Conversely,
aside from the question of their models and of the time of the translations from Arabic, there is now fresh evidence of the early translation of pseudo-Chrysostomian homilies, as it was surmised also in the past. I will briefly mention a few interesting case studies from the more recent past:

a. Manuscript ʾAbbā Garimā III (carbon-14 dated to the fifth to sixth centuries) contains an ‘Ethiopic Preface: On the Agreement of the Words of the Four Gospels’, which is actually a homily of John Chrysostom, Homilies on Matthew, 1, 5–10 (= PG 57, 13–18; see CPG 4424 In Mattheum homiliae 1–90).40

b. one more case is the endleaves of one of the oldest biblical Octateuchs – Orit in the Ethiopian tradition – known

---

40 See McKenzie et al. 2016, 217–220.
so far, manuscript UM-040,\textsuperscript{41} fols 1–4 are endleaves in J. Peter Gumbert’s terminology; they are written in two different hands, probably earlier than that of the Octateuch. One hand, on fols 1–2 (2 cols, 29–31 ll.), exhibits a very archaic writing with noteworthy palaeographical peculiarities (Fig. 1).\textsuperscript{42} Fols 1–2 contain approximately half of the homily attributed to John Chrysostom, on Jesus’ words in Mt 26:39 (‘Father, if it is possible, let this chalice pass away from me’: the words are not interpeted as an expression of fear but as having a hidden theological meaning. The homily (\textit{CPG} 4654; cf. Proverbsio 1998, 71–72 and 104) was included in the \textit{Gabra ḥamāmāt \ or Homiliary for the Passion Week}, among the readings for Good Friday.\textsuperscript{43} The Octateuch is probably the oldest known manuscript containing the homily, which is also attested (among others) in manuscript EMML no. 1763, fols 204\textsuperscript{b}–209\textsuperscript{b} (no. 41), dating to 1336/1337 or 1339/1340. c. In a recent article, Fr. Maximous el-Antony, Jesper Blid and Aaron Michael Butts have provided carbon-14 datings of an Ethiopic manuscript leaf found in situ in the original archaeological context during excavations at the monastery of St Antony at the Red Sea: 1185–1255 (68.2%) and 1160–1265 (95.4%).\textsuperscript{44} Besides the two ʾAbbā Garimā manuscripts,\textsuperscript{45} this is the third Ethiopic manuscript ever to have been carbon-14 dated. The manuscript leaf certainly contains a homily \textit{On silence} attributed to John Chrysostom and also known from later monastic collections.\textsuperscript{46} The name of a ‘John metropolitan (pāpās)’, can be also read in the fragmentary leaf, which is of paper. As the editors state, The fragment from the Monastery of St Antony, and especially its witness to ‘On Silence’ by (Pseudo-) John Chrysostom, prompts us to augment this picture. If ‘On Silence’ was translated directly from Greek, then it adds another text to the very small corpus of Ethiopic literature from the Aksumite period. If ‘On Silence’ was translated from Arabic, then it pushes the translations from Arabic into Ethiopic to before the Solomonic period. It is of course also possible that ‘On Silence’ is an Ethiopic composition, pseudonymously associated with John Chrysostom, which would make it the first such piece that could be dated to before the Solomonic period.\textsuperscript{47} d. A new promising field of investigation in the research on homiletic works appears to be Ethiopic palimpsest manuscripts. Ethiopic palimpsests were noticed a long time ago, for example manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopien d’Abbodiey 191, but no systematic research was carried out so far. The manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Peterm. II Nachtr. 24\textsuperscript{48} was investigated in 2016 within the framework of the DFG project ‘Textkritische Ausgabe und Übersetzung des 1 Henoch’, directed by Loren Stuckenbruck. Multi-spectral imaging has revealed ‘fragments from at least nine earlier codices’ containing Old Testament Apocrypha and a lectionary, a homiliary and multiple hagiographical codices from the fourteenth century and before, with texts containing archaic linguistic features attested in only the earliest layers of Ethiopic material evidence, thus confirming the archaic character of Ethiopic homiletic collections.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{41} Also documented and microfilmed by Jacques Mercier in 1999, described by the author, later digitised by Antonella Brita and later digitised again and re-catalogued by the Ethio-SPaRe project.

\textsuperscript{42} The sixth order of s is the same as in the \textit{Ort}; the fourth order is marked by a vertical stroke along the right leg of the letter, which however does not descend under the writing baseline; there is no vowel shift from -a to -ā in syllables ending in a laryngal consonant; there are archaic -e endings instead of -ə endings; the writing is very similar to that of manuscript EMML no. 8509, from Ṭānā Qirqos.

\textsuperscript{43} See ‘Gabra ḥamamät’, \textit{EAE}, II (2005), 725b–726b (Zanetti); full text of the homily in Ethiopian Orthodox Church 1989–1990, 257a–262a; the passage in fols 1–2 of the Octateuch, on pp. 259b.13–262a.12: beginning and end are missing.

\textsuperscript{44} See Maximous el-Antony et al. 2016.

\textsuperscript{45} See McKenzie et al. et al. 2016.

\textsuperscript{46} See Maximous el-Antony et al. 2016, 33, n. 12, with reference to Arras 1963a, 174 (text), and Arras 1963b, 127–128 (Latin translation, no. 29).

\textsuperscript{47} See Maximous el-Antony et al. 2016, 46. The conventional term ‘Solomonic period’ refers to the period starting with the purported ‘restoration’ of the dynasty founded by King Yakunno Amlāk (1270–1285), who allegedly claimed origin from King Solomon of Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{48} Described by Dillmann 1878, iii and 52–53 (no. 63), who detected a lower script dating to the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries for fols 8–107, also recorded as a palimpsest by Uhlig 1988, 233, see Bausi 2008, 542–543.

\textsuperscript{49} Ted Erho has provided a few details of current work on Ethiopic palimpsests in the paper ‘Ethiopic Palimpsests and the Curious Case of Peterrmann II Nachtr. 24’, delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature held in Boston in 2017, followed by Loren Stuckenbruck’s paper on ‘The Recoverable Text to 1 Enoch in Petermann II Nachtrag 24’.
e. One more interesting case is that of the *Sermo de transfiguratione* of Anastasius the Sinaite (CPG 7753), which is one of the most ancient attested homilies in Ethiopic. What makes this case extremely peculiar and actually unique is that the homily is attested written on wooden panels presently preserved in two churches of Lälibálá, where the panels have been variously reused (Fig. 2). There is some uncertainty about the exact number of the original panels – the homily is much longer than the fragments preserved – and their function, and even whether all of them attest the same text, due to the material loss they underwent, but the homily is explicitly attributed to Anastasius the Sinaite in the panel, which appears to contain the *incipit*. This set of wooden panels is contemporaneous with the period of King Lälibálá and presumably dates to the early thirteenth century. Besides the material aspect of the transmission, what is extraordinary is the role that this homily plays in determining a large part of the artistic programme devised by the king, which centred on the theology of Transfiguration. The most advanced art historical studies carried out so far have reconnected architectural and pictorial motifs to the text of the homily, but have not considered the whole text of the Ethiopic version. This text, however, appears to be preserved also in at least two later manuscripts, and the edition of this homily, which is an urgent desideratum, will illuminate an important episode of the cultural life of the early thirteenth century (Fig. 3).

5.3. Origins and geneses of the collections

The question of the *origins* and *geneses* of the earliest extant collections remains unanswered; we have, however, one pre-

---

---

50 All CPG volumes and supplements published so far, besides the Greek, mention only the Arabic and Slavonic versions. For a recent study, while a critical edition also of the Greek text is still missing, see Bucur 2013.

51 Panels A, B and C are in Beta Gabrä’el church and panel D is in Madhane ‘Alam church, according to the last reliable description by Mercier and Lepage 2013, 206, n. 57.

52 The fragments consist all in all of 86 lines (A 13, B 26, C 19 and D 19), see Gigar Tesfaye and Pirenne 1984, 108–114, who provided the first edition.

53 Lälibálá, not Lälibalá, is the correct spelling that should be observed. See Bausi 2018a, 441.

54 See Mercier and Lepage 2013, 169–207, particularly 180–183 on the wooden panels.

55 The edition is already being carried out. The two manuscripts were indicated by Lusini 1989a, 477, who did not reconnect them to the wooden panels of Lälibálá and did not give a CPG entry, but who provides other useful information on the Christian Arabic collection to which the two manuscripts are related: the Ethiopic manuscripts attesting the homily are London, British Library, Or. 774, of the fifteenth century (see Wright 1877, 227–229, no. 340, here p. 229), fol. 157v–165v (no. 32), and Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Ms. orient. fol. 3075, of the sixteenth century (see Hammerschmidt and Six 1983, 296–301, no. 161, here p. 300), fol. 133v–141v (no. 28). On the homiliaries see now Butts and Erho 2018.
cise case in which, for the absolutely first time, a manuscript from the church of ʿUrā Masqal shows a textual phase earlier than that of the archaic homiletic collections. One text already known from archaic homiliaries, edited as the Acts of Peter of Alexandria, appears to have been excerpted from a larger historical narrative that is preserved in this manuscript: this points with clear evidence to the transmission processes by which the typology of the archaic homiletic collections, or at least some of their texts, emerged.

6. Brief Conclusions

Being at the end of a long transmission chain, the Ethiopian literary tradition, in the course of its history from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages and beyond, has received many collections in different arrangements as they were created or even organised within other traditions, but especially in the Christian Arabic one. This latter, in turn, collected different traditions depending directly or indirectly on the Greek, Syriac and Coptic domains.57

1. Ethiopian homiletic collections therefore presumably reflect collections as they were originally organised, according to either author, topics or the liturgical calendar; all these possibilities are represented in Ethiopian manuscripts. This does not mean that no new collections were formed along these axes: this certainly happened, but it is much too early to present any systematic evaluation of which was the original contribution of Ethiopian collections in this domain.

2. The specific case, however, of excerpting short pieces to serve as homilies from longer hagiographical compositions should be remarked.58 This process, in turn, is at times the result of more complex processes, since longer hagiographies are in some cases the expansion of an originally very short homiletic text: a case in point is the Gadla Libānos (Acts of Libānos), one of the oldest hagiographic texts known so far that is dedicated to an Ethiopian saint in the form of a gadl, the earliest recension of which is also attested in two of the codices trigemini, namely manuscripts EMML nos 1763, fols 110r–113v, and 8509, fols 43r–45v, plus manuscript EMML no. 7602, fols 126v–128v.59 There are several longer recensions of the Gadla Libānos that can be considered a variation on the theme of the shorter homily, which in turn is based upon the motifs of Gadla Gabra Krǝstos, i.e. the well-known Life of St Alexis.60

---

56 I learned of the manuscript from a 1999 documentation provided by Jacques Mercier, later digitised (among others) by Antonella Brita and finally by the Ethio-SPaRe project (digitised as manuscript UM-039), which also took care of its restoration.

57 See Bausi 2018b for an overview on multilingualism and translations in late-antique Ethiopia.

58 The inclusion of short notices in the Synaxarion is nothing but the last and most obvious phase of this development and trend, see Colin 1988, 310–314.

59 The text was edited by Getatchew Haile 1990 from manuscripts EMML nos 1763 and 7602; this short recension of the Acts of Libānos was not resumed in the edition and translation of the whole hagiographical dossier on St Libānos or Maṭāʿ (see Bausi 2003a, 2003b), because the third manuscript witness, EMML no. 8509, has not yet been accessible. For a synoptic presentation of the contents of the recensions, see Bausi 2003a, xxiv–xxvii.

60 See Cerulli 1969a, 1969b.
3. The most remarkable case presented by the Ethiopian tradition is exemplified by the *Acts of St Peter of Alexandria*, as mentioned before. This is the only case researched so far for which the two forms of the same narrative documenting the origin and the process of excerpting of a homiletic piece are fully preserved and documented:

a. The textual form before the process of excerption took place, i.e. the continuum of the longer narrative of historiographical genre of the *History of the Episcopate of Alexandria* in the manuscript of the *Aksumite Collection* (a canonical-liturgical collection), all the more precious since the Greek text is lost and we have only a partial Latin version, in manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-039 as part of the *History of the Episcopate of Alexandria*, within the *Aksumite Collection*.

b. The textual form after the excerption as a shorter homily (a *dǝrsān* as it is formally called), that was later included in the oldest homiletic liturgical collections attested since the thirteenth/fourteenth century at the latest, in manuscripts EMML nos 1763 and 8509, and manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-037 (Fig. 4). That this is the case and not the other way around is explicitly stated at the beginning of the *Acts of Peter*, where the narrative of the homily (*dǝrsān*) is given as from the ‘Synodicon of the (Christian) law’, *sinodos za-hagg*, which was probably also the name under which the *Aksumite Collection* was indicated.

---

61 See Bausi and Camplani 2016 for all details and complete references to date.

62 See Getatchew Haile 1980, 88; and the new edition with consideration of manuscripts EMML no. 8509 and Ethio-SPaRe UM-037, in Bausi and Camplani 2016, 266, apparatus, with a presumably reconstructed text as follows: *dǝrsān zapetros wamāriqos* (archaic form for *Mārqos*, see Bausi 2012, 64, § 24, and Bausi 2015b, 125, § 5, commentary) *wangelāwi nagara sinodos zaḥǝgg kamazǝ*, ‘Homily on Peter and the Evangelist Mark, narrative of the Synodicon of the Law, as follows’.
This is formidable evidence of how elements of the late antique Ethiopian (Aksumite) heritage, almost certainly translated from Greek Vorlagen, were re-used in later times in the form of short homilies, in this case starting from a historiographical text, and served in the liturgical service as a dǝrsān: probably a good example of what Arnaldo Momigliano, in his celebrated essay on the ‘caduta senza rumore dell’impero’ (‘fall of the empire without noise’), though in another context, called the ‘sacralizzazione della retorica’ (‘the sanctification of the rhetoric’). Moreover, this case alerts our attention to further possible cases for which we lack the documentation of the earlier and later textual phase.

7. Appendices

7.1. The state of research on manuscript EMML no. 1763

As appears from what I have shown, the remarkable manuscript EMML no. 1763 plays an important role in research on Ethiopic archaic homiliaries. Getatchew Haile described it thoroughly in the EMML catalogue published in 1981 and already started to publish a few selected pieces. Since the manuscript has been frequently studied since then, I would like to provide here a synopsis of all the pieces that have been published to my knowledge, arranged in the sequence of texts in the manuscript. Note that among the 280 leaves of the manuscript, only 20% of the whole homiliary has been published so far.

Fols 10rb–14ra: Homily by Minās, Metropolitan of Aksum, for the feast day of the Cross: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 112–125 (§ 3.1.1), along with manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-045, fols 77ra–78v, 120rb–15rb, 76ª and 75v; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 4ra–6ra (no. 2).

Fols 14ra–15ra: Homily by James of Sarug, ‘for (the feast of) the Cross’: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 126–129 (§ 3.2.1).

Fols 15ra–23ra: Anonymous Homily on the Appearance of the Image of the Cross to Caesar Constantine: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 130–149 (§ 3.3.1), along with manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-030, fols 29v, 31v, 28v and 35v.

Fols 23ra–27ra: Anonymous Homily on the Finding of the True Cross, for the feast day of Saint Helen: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 150–161 (§ 3.4.1), along with manuscripts Ethio-SPaRe UM-037, fols 115v–116v and UM-045, fols 75v–79v; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 6v–9v (no. 3).


Fols 36ra–37ra: Homily by Minās, Metropolitan of Aksum, on ’Abbā Yoḥanni: see Nosnitsin 2018, 299–300; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 16ra–17ra (no. 6).


Fols 79ra–80ra: The Acts of St Peter of Alexandria: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 1990; re-edited and collated with manuscripts EMML no. 8509, fols 21ra–22ra, and Ethio-SPaRe UM-037, along with the manuscript of the Aksumite Collection (manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-039) in Bausi and Camplani 2016.

Fols 84ra–86ra: Homily on Frumentius: ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 1979; see also Villa 2017; the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 22ra–23ra (no. 10).

---

63 See Momigliano 1973, 407, ‘la vecchia retorica si sacralizza e si avvicina al miracolo’ (‘the old rhetoric is sanctified and comes close to the miracle’).

64 See Getatchew Haile and Macomber 1981, 218–231.
Fols 110–113:

*Homily of 'Abbā 'Elayās, Bishop of Aksum on Maṭā':* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 1990; see also Bausi 2003a, xxiv; the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 43r–45v (no. 19).

Fols 123–124:

*Treatise by Athanasius of Alexandria on the Incarnation:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 197b, 73–82.

Fols 164–166:

*Anonymous Homily on the Finding of the True Cross, for 10 Maggābit:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 162–171 (§ 3.5.1), along with manuscript Ethio-SPaRe UM-050, fols 150r–152v; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 79r–81r (no. 33).

Fols 167–169:

*Homily by John (Chrysostom), for 12 Maggābit:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 172–181 (§ 3.6.1).

Fols 169–171:

*Anonymous Homily on the Holy Wood of the Cross, for 27 Maggābit:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 2017a, 182–187 (§ 3.7.1).

Fols 201–204:

*Easter Homily by Philo of Carpasia,* ed. and tr. in Raineri and Tedros Abraha 2003, along with manuscript BL Or. 8192, fols 72r–77v; see also Voicu 2004; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 99r–102r (no. 40).65

Fols 224–227:

*The Acts of St Mark:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 1981; re-edited with remarks by Lusini 2009, also on the basis of a further manuscript witness, Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana, Martini et 5 (= Zanutto no. 2), fols 82r–89v; see also Lusini 2002a, 2006; on manuscript Martini et 5, see Lusini 2002b, 171–176, and Mazzei 2017. The emergence of further manuscripts makes a new edition of this text an urgent desideratum.

Fols 258–259:

*Homily of Lulayanos, Bishop of Aksum, on the Holy Fathers:* ed. and tr. in Getatchew Haile 1985, along with manuscript BL Or. 8192, fols 119r–120r; probably the same text as in manuscript EMML 8509, fols 139r–140r (no. 49).

Fols 270–272:

*XIV Cathedral Homily of Severos of Antioch:* see Proverbio 2001, 518, along with manuscripts EMML 8509, fols 151r–153r (no. 52), and BL, Or. 8192, fols 134r–136r.

7.2. A review of the occurrences of CPG and BHG references in the Encyclopaedia Aethiopica

‘Anaphoras’, *EAe*, I (2003), 251a–253b (Habtemichael Kidane) (*CPG* 1737, 1732, 1743); ‘Athanasius’, *EAe*, I (2003), 392a–393b (Witakowski) (*CPG* 2101, 2122); ‘Didasqysyla’, *EAe*, II (2005), 154a–155a (Bausi) (*CPG* 1730, 1731, 1735, 1738); ‘Ephesus, Council of’, *EAe*, II (2005), 329a–331a (Bausi) (*CPG* 8620–8867, 8910–8941, but identified in Ethiopic 8744); ‘Epiphanios of Salamis’, *EAe*, II (2005), 336a–338a (Witakowski) (*CPG* 3744–3807, but no specific identification in Ethiopic); ‘Eusebios of Caesarea’, *EAe*, II (2005), 454a–456a (Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 3465 plus others, but not in Ethiopic); ‘Eusebios of Herakleia’, *EAe*, II (2005), 456a–b (Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 6141); ‘Evagrius’, *EAe*, II (2005), 457a–459a (Bausi) (*CPG* 2430–2482, but identified are only 2451, 2435, 2481, 2447, 2452, 2430); ‘Gregentius’, *EAe*, II (2005), 4570a–459a (Bausi) (*CPG* 8620–8867, 8910–8941, but identified in Ethiopic 8744); ‘Eusebios of Caesarea’, *EAe*, II (2005), 454a–456a (Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 3465 plus others, but not in Ethiopic); ‘Eusebios of Herakleia’, *EAe*, II (2005), 456a–b (Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 6143); ‘Evagrius’, *EAe*, II (2005), 457a–459a (Bausi) (*CPG* 2430–2482, but identified are only 2451, 2435, 2481, 2447, 2452, 2430); ‘Gregentius’, *EAe*, II (2005), 889b–891a (Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 7008, 7009); ‘Gregory of Nazianzos’, *EAe*, II (2005), 891a–892b (Witakowski) (*CPG* 3010, 3032 plus unidentified 3010–3125); ‘Gregory of Nyssa’, *EAe*, II (2005), 892b–894a (Witakowski) (*CPG* 3158, 3161 plus unidentified 3135–3226); ‘Husarā Māsqāl’, *EAe*, II (2005), 1045a–1046a (Bogdan Burtea and editorial board) (*CPG* 4525); ‘Heraclius’, *EAe*, III (2007), 14a–15a (Basil Lourié and Fiaccadori) (*CPG* 7793); ‘Hippolytus’, *EAe*, III (2007), 35a–36b (Bausi) (*CPG* 1742, 1872, 1925 = 4611); ‘Historiography’, *EAe*, III (2007), 288b–291b (Bausi) (possibly to be identified, *CPG* 4518, 4521, 4570, 4565, 4736, 4859, 4862, 4867, 4913, 4914, 4929, 4935, 5023, 5150, 5175; certainly identified *CPG* 4522, 5150, 7385, Suppl. 5150.3); ‘John Chrysostom’, *EAe*, III (2007), 293a–295b (Witakowski) (51 different

---

65 I base this indication on Sergew Hable Selassie 1988, 73, but note that Voicu 2004, 5, n. 3, gives fols 92–105, I do not know exactly on which basis.
entries; CPG 4305, 4334, 4336, 4342, 4440, 4519, 4522, 4525, 4560, 4570, 4580, 4588, 4602, 4654, 4681, 5190.6, 5190.8, 5832, 7385, extensively based on Proverbio 1998; note that Witakowski 2008, 223 states that no Ethiopic version of Chrysostom’s homily is mentioned in CPG; ‘Melchizedek’, EAE, III (2007), 914b–916b (Bausi) (CPG 2252, spuriously attributed to Athanasius); ‘Nestorius’, EAE, III (2007), 1169a–1171a (Fiaccadori) (CPG 5665–5676 and Suppl. p. 368, but no identification); ‘Qerǝllos’, EAE, IV (2010), 287a–290a (Bausi) (CPG 1764, 3765, 3744, 4206, 5218, 5219, 5228, 5249, 5250, 5280, 5339, 5792, 5800, 6121 (only in Ethiopic), 6127, 6145 (only in Ethiopic), 6132, 6143, 6310, 6486, 6712, Suppl. no. 5246); ‘Qwǝsqwam (Koskam, Kōskam) in Ethiopian tradition’, EAE, IV (2010), 318a–b (Bausi) (CPG 2628); ‘Särgis Abǝrgawi’, EAE, IV (2010), 530a–531b (Fiaccadori) (BGH 167, 1662).

ABBREVIATIONS


EMML = Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library, Addis Ababa and Collegeville, Minnesota, Hill Monastic Microfilm Library.
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18 – Canones: The Art of Harmony. The Canon Tables of the Four Gospels, edited by Alessandro Bausi, Bruno Reudenbach, and Hanna Wimmer

The so-called ‘Canon Tables’ of the Christian Gospels are an absolutely remarkable feature of the early, late antique, and medieval Christian manuscript cultures of East and West, the invention of which is commonly attributed to Eusebius and dated to first decades of the fourth century AD. Intended to host a technical device for structuring, organizing, and navigating the Four Gospels united in a single codex – and, in doing so, building upon and bringing to completion previous endeavours – the Canon Tables were apparently from the beginning a highly complex combination of text, numbers and images, that became an integral and fixed part of all the manuscripts containing the Four Gospels as Sacred Scripture of the Christians and can be seen as exemplary for the formation, development and spreading of a specific Christian manuscript culture across East and West AD 300 and 800.

This book offers an updated overview on the topic of ‘Canon Tables’ in a comparative perspective and with a precise look at their context of origin, their visual appearance, their meaning, function and their usage in different times, domains, and cultures.

20 – Fakes and Forgeries of Written Artefacts from Ancient Mesopotamia to Modern China, edited by Cécile Michel and Michael Friedrich

Fakes and forgeries are objects of fascination. This volume contains a series of thirteen articles devoted to fakes and forgeries of written artefacts from the beginnings of writing in Mesopotamia to modern China. The studies emphasise the subtle distinctions conveyed by an established vocabulary relating to the reproduction of ancient artefacts and production of artefacts claiming to be ancient: from copies, replicas and imitations to fakes and forgeries. Fakes are often a response to a demand from the public or scholarly milieu, or even both. The motives behind their production may be economic, political, religious or personal – aspiring to fame or simply playing a joke. Fakes may be revealed by combining the study of their contents, codicological, epigraphic and palaeographic analyses, and scientific investigations. However, certain famous unsolved cases still continue to defy technology today, no matter how advanced it is. Nowadays, one can find fakes in museums and private collections alike; they abound on the antique market, mixed with real artefacts that have often been looted. The scientific community’s attitude to such objects calls for ethical reflection.