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1. Introduction

The beginnings of Slavonic literary culture go back to the ‘Apostles to the Slavs’, SS Cyril and Methodius, who were active from 863 until their deaths (Cyril in 869, Methodius in 885) in the central Balkan region north of the Danube, jurisdictionally dependent on Rome but based on Greek-Byzantine culture. For the purpose of spreading Christianity, Cyril and Methodius created a first Slavic alphabet, the ‘Glagolitic’ script, which is not based on the Greek alphabet except for the order of the characters, thus representing an independent invention. After their death, this script was supplanted by the ‘Cyrillic’ alphabet, which was developed in Bulgaria and reflects the Greek one, with some extra characters for the special sounds of Slavonic.

When Methodius had deceased, the small group of their disciples went to Bulgaria (under Khan Boris, 852–889), where a significant cycle of homilies in the Old Bulgarian language was composed in the western area of the territory, in the region of Ohrid, under the direction of bishop Kliment (d. 916), a pupil of Methodius. In the Apostles’ Vitae (Vita Cyrilli, Vita Methodii) preserved in the Old Slavonic language, in which the translation activity from Greek is reported (Vita Methodii, XV), works from the homiletic or hagiographic literature are not mentioned. The expressions found in the Old Slavonic Vita Methodii, which Grivec and Tomšič aptly render as ‘patrum libri’, does not correspond to a terminus technicus in early Christian literature. Several Paterika are known in the Old Slavonic tradition, e.g. the collection of apophthegms under the name Ἀνδρῶν ἁγίων βίβλος (the so-called Skitskij paterik), or the Dialogi de Vita et miraculis patrum italicorum (the Rimskij paterik), a work by Pope Gregory I (590–604) in the Greek translation of Pope Zacharias (741–752).

1 See Hannick 1997.
2 The overview by Mareš 1970, 25 remains fundamental even after almost half a century.
3 Grivec and Tomšič 1960, 235.
4 Miklosich 1870, 23; cf. also Schmid 1922, 1.
The homily attributed to Methodius is an _adhortatio_ to princes and judges and is intended as a lection for the Holy Week, a fact that cannot be justified on liturgical grounds.

The _Codex Clozianus_ (Fig. 1) is undoubtedly the oldest monument of Old Slavonic homiletics. It consists of two fragments in Glagolitic script, with a total of 14 folios, which are kept partly in Trento (Museo civico, 2476) and partly in Innsbruck (Ferdinandeum, Dip. 973). On the basis of the quire numberings they contain, it is assumed that the original codex comprised at least 488 folios, an extremely imposing and unusual size. The preserved part includes five homilies for the Holy Week, by John Chrysostom, Athanasius of Alexandria and Epiphanius of Salamis.

The main part of the manuscript, which is kept in Trento, was published by Bartholomaeus Kopitar in Vienna in 1836; the edition of the Innsbruck part by Franz Miklosich appeared also in Vienna, in 1860. A new and to this day still exemplary edition was prepared by Antonín Dostál in Prague in 1959.

As the oldest monument of Old Slavonic ecclesiastical culture (‘codicis glagolitici inter suos facile antiquissimi’, as Kopitar notes on the title page of his edition), the _Codex Clozianus_ illustrates both the connection between the Glagolitic script and the island of Krk in northern Dalmatia and the relationship to homiletics in the Cyrillic monuments of Bulgaria and Serbia from the thirteenth–fourteenth century.

Copied in the early eleventh century from a western Bulgarian model, it exhibits a type of Glagolitic script that stands in the transition between the old round Glagolica and the later rectangular Croatian script style and was therefore created, in the opinion of many researchers, on Croatian territory, for which, however, it is difficult to pinpoint scriptoria in the early epoch. The so-called _Glagolita Clozianus_ is indeed the only Old Slavonic manuscript of which we can say to this day that it was written on Croatian soil.

---

7 The whole question is dealt with by Nikolova 1995.
8 Cf. Bláhová 1973, as well as references to more recent relevant literature in Ilieva 2016.
11 Detailed analysis of the contents, with references to the Greek sources, in Bláhová 1973, 8–12.
12 Dostál 1959, 6.
14 Štefanić 1955, 153; see also Štefanić 1960, 251.
The manuscript was discovered in 1830 by the Austrian count Paris Kloc (or Cloz, hence the name Clozianus) from Trento in the episcopal library of the island of Krk (Veglia), the ‘cradle’ of Glagolitic culture, and handed over to Kopitar for his edition. According to a note in the Tridentine part of the manuscript, it was already on the island of Krk in 1500, in the possession of Ivan III Frankopan, Prince of Krk, who had yielded the island to the Venetians in 1480 as the last descendant of the branch of the Frankopans on Krk, shortly before his death in 1486.

No less remarkable is the fact that all the homilies contained in the Glagolitic Codex Clozianus – except, of course, for the anonymous sermon attributed to Methodius – are also attested in the Cyrillic tradition, not infrequently in a different translation or redaction. This includes manuscripts by Serbian and Bulgarian redactors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which will be discussed later on. More problematic with respect to the relationship between Slavonic homiletics in the Glagolitic and Cyrillic traditions is the extensive body of sermons in the Glagolitic breviaries of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries stemming from the Croatian cultural sphere. In contrast to the older layer of homiletics in the Cyrillic tradition and the only Old Slavonic Glagolitic homiliary, these are liturgical books following the Roman rite, which exhibit a completely different cycle of patristic lections. However, in the Glagolitic breviaries, texts of Greek origin, which are also known in the Cyrillic tradition of the Byzantine rite, are encountered as well. Unfortunately, the identification of these patristic lections in the Glagolitic breviaries has not made much progress so far. A basic study of the sources, as in the case of the Codex Suprasliensis (see below), is still a desideratum in the field. One of the difficulties consists in the fact that their Latin models must have been older than the textus receptus, which was generally adopted after the Concilium tridentinum (1545), and that these models are not extant. As a consequence, the patristic texts in the Glagolitic breviaries have remained much less explored than the Biblical pericopes. An example of this is the analysis provided in the printed edition of a breviary of 1491 by the excellent connoisseur of Glagolism, Josip Tandarić (1935–1986), who cites only the incipit of the respective homily after the name of the Church Father in question.

2.2 The Cyrillic homiliary Codex Suprasliensis

After the Codex Clozianus, the Codex Suprasliensis is the second-oldest representative of Old Slavonic homiletics and hagiography (Fig. 2). The Cyrillic codex, which was kept in the Supraśl monastery on the border between Poland and Belarus until the first half of the nineteenth century, dates from the eleventh century. It was probably produced in eastern Bulgaria in a scriptorium near the former capital Preslav. Occasionally, the Codex Suprasliensis is still dated to the tenth century. Vladimir Mošin points out that in the absence of dated Old Slavonic manuscripts from the eleventh century, exact dating criteria are missing, but emphasises that, palaeographically, the Suprasliensis is presumably older than the famous Old Russian Ostromir Gospels from the years 1056–1057. Today the incomplete codex, which was written by a single copyist named Retko, is divided into three parts: Ljubljana, National and University Library, Kopitar 2 (118 folios); St Petersburg, National Library of Russia (RNB), Q. II. I. 72 (16 folios); Warsaw, National Library, Zamojski 201 (151 folios). It is a homiletic-hagiographic collection for the month of March with homilies for Lent (from Lazarus Saturday on) and Easter (until Thomas Sunday). The texts recorded in it are of different origin and presumably not even of equal age. Because of its uniqueness and its importance for the typology of the homiletic collections, Ehrhard subjected the Codex Suprasliensis to a detailed analysis among the ‘Märzmenologien’. The size

---


16 Bláhová 1973, 8–12 deals comprehensively with this question.

17 See in general Ivšić 1925.

18 Tandarić 1993.

19 For a short reference to the representatives of Greek patristic literature in Glagolitic breviaries, see Hannick 2004.


21 Mošin 1971, 62.


of the codex is unusually large: despite gaps before 5 March and at the end, it contains 48 sermons or saints’ lives, six of which have not yet been identified in Greek.\(^{25}\) Among other rare texts, it includes a homily for Palm Sunday by Patriarch Photius from the middle of the ninth century (Supr. No. 29), for which the Codex Suprasliensis is the only witness in the Slavonic tradition.\(^{26}\)

2.3 The Old Russian menologion Codex Uspenskij

The third-oldest Slavonic homiliary is the Uspenskij sbornik, a manuscript of Russian redaction from the end of the twelfth to the beginning of the thirteenth century (Moscow, State Historical Museum [GIM], Usp. 4 perg),\(^{27}\) the origin of which has not yet been clarified definitively (Fig. 3). The content and layout of the texts it contains also present some difficulties.\(^{28}\) Two features of the content should be emphasised. Firstly, the Uspenskij sbornik includes five homilies for the Holy Week that are also recorded in the Codex Clozianus, but with deviations suggesting that the Old Russian manuscript was not copied from the latter codex, but from a common Vorlage that did not survive.\(^{29}\) Secondly, the Uspenskij sbornik contains the oldest copy of the Vita of the Apostle to the Slavs, Methodius, and it also provides the narrative (Skazanie) about SS Boris and Gleb and the martyrdom of SS Vitus and Modestus, a hagiographic text whose origin is associated with Bohemia.\(^{30}\) Due to this peculiarity, the Uspenskij sbornik has been associated with the Czech Church Slavonic culture in the period after the founding of the Slavic-speaking monastery of Sázava in 1032.\(^{31}\)

An even stranger feature of the Uspenskij sbornik is its internal structure. It first contains saints’ lives for the month of May, from the 1\(^{st}\) (the beginning is lost) to the 16\(^{th}\). This is followed by homilies by John Chrysostom for the Holy Week and Easter, as well as sermons by Eusebius of Alexandria, Andrew of Crete, Gregory of Antioch, Cyril of Alexandria and Ephrem the Syrian. In this way, the homiletic part of the Uspenskij sbornik strongly differs from the type of the so-called Zlatoust, which contains only homilies by Chrysostom (‘Zlatoust’ in Slavic) and which will be discussed later on. A few further hagiographic texts contained in the Uspenskij sbornik refer to the months of April, June and October. This panegirik\(^{32}\) thus represents a special type whose characteristics cannot be explained.\(^{33}\)

One solution was offered by Marfa Vjačeslavovna Ščepkina, who identified its commissioner, a certain Princess Maria

---


Švarnovna of Černigov, who came from Moravia and died in Kiev in 1206. This suggests that the Uspenskij sbornik was a type of ‘family homiliary’.¹⁴

2.4 The South Slavic homiliary of Mihanović

There is one more homiliary of South Slavonic provenance and belonging to the Byzantine tradition that deserves to be discussed here. This is the Mihanović Homiliary from the end (or last quarter) of the thirteenth century (Zagreb, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts [HAZU], III c 19), which was added to the collection of the former South Slavonic Academy in 1865‒1867. The founder of the collection, Antun Mihanović (1796‒1861), had been the Consul of Austria in Thessaloniki and had acquired manuscripts in the Athos monasteries. Whether the homiliary named after him comes from the (Serbian) monastery of Hilandar or another Athonite monastery cannot be determined exactly.³⁶ The Mihanović Homiliary, which pertains to the oldest Serbian redaction of Ras (today Stari Ras), was probably based on an Old Bulgarian Vorlage,³⁷ it is a semi-annual collection (paenegirik or panegyrikon, as noted in its title) for the summer months (March to August), including the movable year from the 25 March on.³⁸ The Vorlage of this panegyrikon was dated by Rajko Nahtigal to the time of Methodius (d. 885) and related to the term ‘books of the fathers’ in the Vita Methodii, XV.³⁹ As evidence of an archaic layer in the Mihanović Homiliary, we may regard a homily by Pseudo-Gregory of Neocaesarea for the feast of the Annunciation on the 25 March (BHГ 1139n, CPG 1775), which was translated a second time in the circle of Patriarch Euthymius (Evtimijj) of Tărnovo in the late fourteenth century.⁴⁰ From the extensive contents of the Mihanović Homiliary, we may further mention a festive sermon for the prophet Elijah on the 20 July, which is attributed to Basil of Seleucia and attested only here in the Slavonic tradition (BHГ 575, CPG 6656),⁴¹ as well as a homily by John the Exarch (Ioan Prezviter) of Bulgaria from the turn of the ninth to the tenth century for the feast of the Ascension of Christ (Mih. fol. 82'). The youngest Byzantine author represented in this codex is Georgios, Bishop of Nicomedia from the second half of the ninth century, a contemporary of Patriarch Photius, with a homily on the Cross and the Blessed Virgin (Mih. fol. 23').

The Mihanović Homiliary from Zagreb is currently accessible only in an exquisite facsimile edition. A critical edition with Greek parallel texts remains a desideratum. However, the school of Rudolf Aitzetmüller has provided three dissertations with partial editions of this panegyrikon, which in total contains 64 sermons of Greek origin.⁴²

---

³⁴ Ščepkina 1972, 71 and 77.
³⁶ Mošin 1955b, 78; Mošin 1955a, 6.
³⁷ Ivanova-Mirčeva 1968.
³⁸ The movable (ecclesiastical) year encompasses the dates calculated on the basis of the movable feast of Easter. On the order of the texts, see Hannick 1981, 81.
³⁹ Nahtigal 1950; Grivec and Tomšič 1960, 235.
⁴¹ Ivanova 2008, 586, no. 1.
⁴² Two of them were published: Wezler 1971 and Hahn 1969.
3. Panegirik and Toržestvennik

The structure of the Slavic homiliaries corresponds to that of the Byzantine collections, the majority of which combine hagiographic and homiletic material arranged after the calendar from September to August, with or without inclusion of the movable ecclesiastical year from the beginning of Lent until the end of the Easter period (Sunday of All Saints). Depending on the number of texts (saints’ lives and homilies) they contain for specific days or for selected feasts, the Byzantine and Slavic homiliaries cover either the whole year or only half a year (September–February, March–August), a quarter, two months (as maybe in the Typika of History and Archaeology, 182), or one month. The usual name is panegyrikon, which in the Slavonic tradition is adapted as panagirik (for example in the collection of Djak Andrej from the year 1425, Sofia, National Church Museum), or the like. In Russian, a panegyrikon is styled toržestvennik, with toržesto rendering Greek πανήγυρις ‘feast’.

3.1 The South Slavonic Codex German

Special homiliaries for the feasts of the Lord and the Virgin have not achieved wide dissemination in the Slavonic tradition; their existence is mostly only deducible from Typika. One such special homiliary is the Codex German, a manuscript of Middle Bulgarian redaction from the year 1358/59 (Bucharest, Patriarhia Română, slav. 1), thus from a manuscript of Middle Bulgarian redaction from the year 1425, Sofia, National Church Museum of History and Archaeology, 182), or the like. In Russian, a panegyrikon is styled toržestvennik, with toržesto rendering Greek πανήγυρις ‘feast’.

43 Dobrev 1981, 32.
45 Čertoricjaja 1980 analyses eleven old collections of homilies, from the eleventh (Codex Suprasliensis) to the fourteenth century; see also Hannick 1981, 29.
47 Recently edited and studied by Popova and Miklas 2017.

The codex consisting of 296 parchment folios was analysed several times from the 1960s on by Romanian and Bulgarian researchers such as Ioan Iufu and Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva, and finally extensively studied and edited by Elka Mirčeva.

The name that this codex has received in the scholarly literature hints at an unsolved but extremely significant problem. In an extensive colophon added towards the end of the manuscript (fols 269v–270v), before the Life of St Georgios on 23 April (text no. 41), it is mentioned that a copyist with the curious name Ktioliboby (‘whosoever’) wrote the manuscript, which he calls sâbornik, in the time of Tsar Ivan Aleksandăr and that the compilation of the texts did not depend on his own decision (izvolenie), but was a result of the work (trud) of a metropolitan ‘German’ whose see is not named. For the time of the reign of Tsar Ivan Aleksandăr and of the emergence of the Codex German, the following patriarchs of the Bulgarian Church are known: Simeon I (about 1346), Teodosij II (about 1350), Ioannik II, who was previously the Hegumen of the monastery of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia in Târnovo, and finally Evtimij (about 1375–1393), but no German(os). It was therefore considered several times, also in view of the linguistic archaisms of the Codex German, that the composition of the texts might have taken place not in the time of Tsar Ivan Aleksandăr but earlier, perhaps even during the Old Bulgarian period. This extremely important question cannot be solved here, but a hitherto overlooked fact should be taken into account: a certain Germanos is attested as a metropolitan of Traianopolis, the metropolis of the ecclesiastical province of the Rhodopes, for the years 1351–1356; he signed the Tomos of 1351, which, under the authority of Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos and of Patriarch Kallistos I, defended the teachings of the Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, Gregory

48 Kalužniacki 1899, 55ff.
49 Iufu 1960; Ivanova-Mirčeva 1965.
50 Mirčeva 2006, in particular the bibliography 243–252.
51 Mirčeva 2006, fols 269v–270v.
52 Cacov 2003, 19.
53 Comprehensive discussion of the different positions in Mirčeva 2006, 49–60.
Some text from the image:

Palamas. The personality of Germanos of Traianupolis and his activities remain otherwise unknown.

The sâbornik that is known as the Codex German contains 44 homilies and saints’ lives for the Lord’s and the Virgin’s feasts, as well as those of the main saints for the entire liturgical year, beginning with the Protevangelium Jacobi (inc. mut.) for the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary on the 8 September and ending up with the commemoration of the Decapitation of John the Baptist on 29 August, celebrated with a homily by Anatolius of Thessalonica from the tenth century. Authored by a tenth-century homiletic, this last text, which is also recorded in the Mihanović homiliary, should not be overlooked in an attempt to date the ‘compilation’ of the Codex German.

3.2 Chrysostomica in the Slavonic tradition

Since the very beginning of Slavic literacy, the collections of homilies associated with the name of John Chrysostom were much better known amongst the Slavs than special homiliaries like the Codex German. A precise delimitation of the various types of Chrysostomian collections is not always possible though. In what follows, I will provide only some elements of the complex history of these collections, since a precise description of the many problems would require constant recourse to the Greek models, which is not possible in the present context. I have gone into these questions in more detail elsewhere.

3.2.1 Zlatostruj

One collection of homilies that goes back to the oldest layer of Old Russian literature is the one known as zlatostruj (St Petersburg, RNB, Q. Π. I. 74), which is unfortunately preserved only as a fragment of four folios so that a characterisation of its typology is not possible. It has been named zlatostruj Byčkov after its previous owner, Afanasij F. Byčkov, then the director of the Imperial Public Library in Saint Petersburg (1882–1899).

A considerably larger fragment of the same collection, comprising 198 folios (with the beginning and end missing), is preserved in the codex St Petersburg, RNB, F. Π. I. 46, from the twelfth century. On the basis of preliminary work by Vasilij Malinin, Grigorij A. Il’inskij was able to reconstruct the typology of the Byčkov Fragment, concluding that the zlatostruj (i.e. χρυσόστομος ‘streaming with gold’) homiliary was a collection of ascetic and ethical writings, dating from the time of the Bulgarian Tsar Simeon (893–927) and containing, in the complete redaction, 137 sermons by Chrysostom. Moreover, Il’inskij could show some striking similarities with the collection of eclogues about Chrysostom authored by Theodore Daphnopates in the tenth century. Two redactions of the zlatostruj can be distinguished, both being preserved in both the South Slavonic and the Russian traditions. The Byčkov fragment may well belong to the shorter redaction and thus represent the oldest surviving version of this collection in the Slavic tradition.

3.2.2 Zlatoust

Another collection of sermons by John Chrysostom bears the common name zlatoust (i.e. χρυσόστομος ‘golden mouth’), even if texts by other authors, such as Amphilochius of Iconium, Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria and Emperor Leo VI (886–912), may be represented in them. The most common type of zlatoust provides homilies for Lent and, separately, for Easter. Another type contains sermons for the Sundays of the ecclesiastical year based on the kyriakodromion or evangelie učitel’noe; this is already attested in the work of the Bulgarian priest Constantine Sotrudniki RNB 1995, I, 115–123 (O. D. Golubeva). Svodnyj katalog 1984, no. 74. Malinin 1878.

It seems that this designation did not appear before the sixteenth century: Slovar’ russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv. 1979, VI, 13.

Il’inskij 1929, 41.


of Preslav from the beginning of the tenth century. The *zlatoust* is a fixed homiletic collection only by its structure; in its contents, it offers a larger selection of texts, some of them of Slavic origin.

The distinction between a *zlatoust* and a *panegyrikon* / *toržestvennik* is not always clear. This is already evident in the case of the ‘*zlatoust Jagić*’ (Saint Petersburg, RNB, Q. II. I. 56) from the third quarter of the thirteenth century. This is a homiletic collection for the whole year (September to August), including the movable year after the feast of the *Hypapante* on 2 February. Some texts it contains are attributed to Kliment of Ohrid (about 830–916). According to Francis Thomson, who introduced the term ‘*Sinai florilegium*’, no other Slavonic manuscript offers the same selection of texts.

3.2.3 Andriantis, Margarit, Agirist

There are two further Chrysostomian collections, which can be better distinguished in terms of contents. *Andria(n)titis* designates the corpus of homilies addressed by Chrysostom to the people of Antioch (*CPG* 4330). This collection, which survives in both Russian and South Slavonic manuscripts, was translated by Antonie, a pupil of Starec Genadie from the Athonite monastery of Vatopedi around the middle of the fifteenth century, as reported by the famous Old Serbian copyist Vladislav Gramatik in a note in his copy of the *andriantis* in the Codex Rila 3/6 of 1473.

Vladislav Gramatik also provides valuable information about a second Chrysostomian collection. This is the *margarit* (‘pearl’) containing, among other texts, the five homilies *De incomprehensibili* (*CPG* 4318), the homilies *Adversus Iudaos* (*CPG* 4327) and *De Lazaro conciones* (*CPG* 4329) and the four *Sermones in Job* (*CPG* 4564). In the miscellaneous manuscript Zagreb, HAZU III a. 47, dated 1469, Vladislav Gramatik mentions that the translator of the

---

68 Tvorogov and Čertorickaja 1985, 246–249.
69 Cf. Tvorogov 1985 with an analysis of the contents, without any reference to the Greek parallels.
70 *Svodnyj katalog* 1984, no. 392; Jagić 1898.
73 A precise analysis of the contents is found in Hannick 1981, 33.
4. Conclusion: the importance of the Slavonic tradition for the Quellenforschung

Slavic homiletics is grounded in the Byzantine tradition and thus in the tradition of the Greek Church, which had its golden age in late Antiquity with Church Fathers such as John Chrysostom, Proclus of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus and many others. One of the characteristics of the Slavic homiletic collections, whose typology is, of course, inseparable from the development of the Byzantine tradition, is that they preserved Greek texts, especially from the Byzantine period, that have been lost in the original Greek version. A single example may suffice to illustrate this. For the feast of the Theophania and the Baptism of Christ on the 6 January, Slavic homiliaries contain a sermon by Bishop Julian of Tavia (Tabia) from the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), which is completely unknown in Greek. This homily has also been transmitted in Georgian. In his 1911 edition of the great Menaion, a work of the Metropolitan Macarius (Makarij) of Moscow from the mid-sixteenth century, the orientalist Boris Alexandrovitch Turaev was able to use the Georgian text to establish the Old Russian version. The Slavonic translation of the homily of Julian of Tavia on the baptism of Christ was made in the fourteenth century in a circle of literati around Evtimij of Tărnovo in Bulgaria and is already preserved in South Slavonic manuscripts from the last quarter of the fourteenth century. The Greek source is lost.

The above observations will have shown that the Slavic homiletic collections have preserved much that can help clarify the problems that the Greek tradition still offers. It is therefore very much to be welcomed that the monumental work by Mauritius Geerard, the Clavis patrum Graecorum (CPG), which is frequently quoted in the present contribution, referred to the Slavic tradition whenever possible.

REFERENCES


—— (1973), Nejstarší staroslověnské homilie (Syntax a lexikon) (Prague: Academia; Studie československé Akademie, 11).


Bolonić, Mihovil (1980), Otok Krk, kolijevka glagoljice (Zagreb: Kršćanska Sadašnjost; Analecta croatica christiana, 12).

Cacov, Boris (2003), Archiereite na Bălgarskata Pravoslavna Cărkva (Sofia: Princeps).


Christova, Borjana (1996), Opis na răkopisite na Vladislav Gramatik (Veliko Tărnovo: Izdatelstvo ‘PIK’).


78 Cf. Van Esbroeck 1975, 297–299; the Georgian homily is already attested in a palimpsest from ca. the seventh century (ms. S-3902 of the K. Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi), cf. Jost Gippert, this volume, 86.
Malinin, Vasilij (1878), *Issledovanie Zlatoustrojja po rukopisi XII veka imperatorskoj publicnoj biblioteki* (Kiev: Tipografija V. Davidenko).


—— (1870), *Vita S. Methodii russico-slovenice et latine* (Vienna: Braumüller).


Petkov, Kiril (2008), *The Voices of Medieval Bulgaria, Seventh-Fifteenth Century: The Records of a Bygone Culture* (Leiden: Brill; East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450, 5).


*Slovak* ruskogo jazyka XI–XVII vv., vol. 6 (1979) (Moscow: Nauka).


Štefanić, Vjekoslav (1960), *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka* (Zagreb; Djela Jugoslavenske Akad. znanosti i umjetnosti, 51).


Trifunović, Djordje (1990), *Azbučnik srpskih srednjovekovnih književnih pojmova*, 2nd ed. (Belgrade: Nolit).


Picture Credits

Homiletic Collections in Greek and Oriental Manuscripts – Histories of Books and Text Transmission from a Comparative Perspective
by Jost Gippert and Caroline Macé
Fig. 1: © Iviron Monastery, Mt Athos, Greece.
Fig. 2: © Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City.

The Earliest Greek Homilies
by Sever J. Voicu
Fig. 1: © St Catherine’s Monastery, Mt Sinai, Egypt.
Fig. 2: © Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City.

Gregory of Nyssa’s Hagiographic Homilies: Authorial Tradition and Hagiographical-Homiletic Collections. A Comparison
by Matthieu Cassin
Fig. 1: © Iviron Monastery, Mt Athos, Greece.

Unedited Sermons Transmitted under the Name of John Chrysostom in Syriac Panegyrical Homilies
by Sergey Kim
Fig. 1: © Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City.
Fig. 2: © Berlin State Library – Prussian Cultural Heritage, Berlin, Germany.
Fig. 3: © Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City.
Fig. 14: © Berlin State Library – Prussian Cultural Heritage, Berlin, Germany.
Fig. 15: © British Library, London, UK.
Fig. 16: © Berlin State Library – Prussian Cultural Heritage, Berlin, Germany.

The Transmission of Cyril of Scythopolis’ Lives in Greek and Oriental Hagiographical Collections
by André Binggeli
Figs 1–4: © St Catherine’s Monastery, Mt Sinai, Egypt.
Fig. 5: © British Library, London, UK.

A Few Remarks on Hagiographical-Homiletic Collections in Ethiopian Manuscripts
by Alessandro Bausi
Fig. 1: © Ethio-SPaRe. ‘Cultural Heritage of Christian Ethiopia. Salvation, Preservation, Research’, Universität Hamburg.
Fig. 2: Courtesy of Jacques Mercier.
Fig. 3: © Berlin State Library – Prussian Cultural Heritage, Berlin, Germany.
Fig. 4: © Ethio-SPaRe. ‘Cultural Heritage of Christian Ethiopia. Salvation, Preservation, Research’, Universität Hamburg.

Cod.Vind.georg. 4 – An Unusual Type of Mravaltavi
by Jost Gippert
Fig. 1: © Iviron Monastery, Mt Athos, Greece.
Fig. 2: © St Catherine’s Monastery, Mt Sinai, Egypt.
Figs 3–8: © Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, Georgia.
Figs 9–19: © Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Austria.
Fig. 20: © Iviron Monastery, Mt Athos, Greece.
Fig. 21: © Korneli Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, Georgia.
Fig. 22: © Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Austria.
Fig. 23: © Iviron Monastery, Mt Athos, Greece.
Figs 24–25: © Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Austria.

The Armenian Homilies. An Attempt at an Historical Overview
by Bernard Outtier
Figs 1–3: © Matenaradan – Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Yerevan, Armenia.

Preliminary Remarks on Dionysius Areopagita in the Arabic Homiletic Tradition
by Michael Muthreich
Figs 1–3: © St Catherine’s Monastery, Mt Sinai, Egypt.
Figs 4–5: © State and University Library Göttingen, Germany.
Fig. 6: © Bibliothèque Orientale, Beirut, Lebanon.

Compilation and Transmission of the Hagiographical-Homiletic Collections in the Slavic Tradition of the Middle Ages
by Christian Hannick
Fig. 1. © Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum, Innsbruck, Austria.
Fig. 2: © National Library, Warsaw, Poland.
Fig. 3: © State Historical Museum (GIM), Moskow, Russia.
Fig. 4: © St Catherine’s Monastery, Mt Sinai, Egypt.
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.

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.