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The volume contains a collection of forty-seven contributions of pupils, friends and colleagues dedicated to Michel Tardieu (b. 1938) on the occasion of his retirement from the chair of “Histoire des syncrétismes de la fin de l’Antiquité” occupied from 1990 to 2008 at the prestigious Collège de France. Formerly “Directeur d’études” on “Gnose et manichéisme” at the “Section des Sciences Religieuses de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études” from 1976 to 1990, in the course of his career Tardieu has carried on the extraordinary attempt of combining a profound interest for the late antique Mediterranean, Near and Middle Eastern cultures with the cultivation of a variety of linguistic domains – Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, several Iranian languages, up to Chinese – also taking into consideration, whenever possible, the respective production in oral texts. He has extensively dealt with the history of religions and thought, from the late fortune of Platonism to Gnosticism, with particular focus on the Nag Hammadi texts, Manichaism, and Zoroastrianism, in their continuous interaction with classical culture and paganism, Christianism, and magic.


Within the wide spectrum and the rich variety of subjects touched upon in the volume – faithfully reflecting Tardieu’s interests and therefore ranging from the religious history of the Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquity, to the history of philosophy and magic, Gnosticism and Manichaism, Islam, Iranian and Central Asian civilizations, on which it is impossible to detail here – one slot is also occupied by a contribution precisely devoted to Ethiopian Studies, i.e. Robert Beylot’s “Un témoin éthiopien inédit du Gradus 5 de Jean Climaque, Collegeville EMML 1939, Folio 102v–113v”, pp. 91–107: and to Beylot one has to be really grateful for hav-
ing let Ethiopian Studies appear in such a wonderful panorama of contributions on religions and thought of Late Antiquity and Near East, where Ethiopia too deserves some place indeed.

Beylot has provided the most welcome text edition with annotated translation of the already catalogued, yet almost unnoticed, fifth section – “On the people who are in penance” – of the well known ascetic work *Klimax* (or *Scala* ‘Ladder’, in 30 ‘steps’, i.e. sections, but *dorsan* ‘homily’ in the Go’aż version) by the seventh-century monk John Climacus, or John “of the Ladder” (from the name of his main work), abbot of the Sinaite monastery of Raithu, on the shores of the Red Sea. Transmitted by ms. EMML no. 1939, 14th/15th cent., fols. 102ra–113vb, the text (the fifth section alone is transmitted) is one of the very scanty traces of John Climacus’s writings in the Ethiopic literature. The piece is all the more important for two reasons: 1) Beylot supposes that the Go’aż version is based upon a Greek *Vorlage*, and the text is one more to be numbered in the little, yet continuously increasing number of Go’aż versions directly depending upon a Greek *Vorlage*; 2) the Sinaite origin of the Greek original text (in turn translated in several languages of the Christian Orient, particularly Syriac and Arabic, cp. p. 91, nn. 1–2) points to possible direct links and literary relationship between Ethiopia and Sinai even in later Aksumite times, i.e. seventh century.

The edition of the text consists in a careful transcription of the *codex unicus*. Having the possibility to check the edition on the microfilm of the manuscript, I noticed only the following errors: p. 101, l. 5 from the bottom: corr. *EβIֶhAחN* into: *EβIֶhAחN* (reading of the ms. and expected form); pp. 101, l. 1 from the bottom–102, l. 1: *יֶטּוֹר* (correct reading, but *טויַו* in the ms.); p. 102, l. 20: corr. *יֶהוָה* into: *יֶהוָה* (reading of the ms. and expected form); *ibid.* l. 22: corr. *בַּמִּי* in *בַּמִּי* (reading of the ms. and expected form); p. 103, l. 20: corr. *הֹוּ* into: *הֹוּ* (reading of the ms., probably due to erroneous copying of an archaic *הֹוּ*, but the expected reading is *הֹוּ*); p. 105, l. 7 from the bottom: corr. *תֵּלְכַּה* into: *תֵּלְכַּה* (reading of the ms. and expected form); p. 106, l. 20 from the bottom: corr. *לֵלְכַּה* into: *לֵלְכַּה* (reading of the ms. but erroneous form) into: *לֵלְכַּה* (expected form); p. 107, l. 6: corr. *טֵּלְכַּה* into: *טֵּלְכַּה* (reading of the ms. also presupposed by the translation, omitted by the editor *per homoeoteleuton*). In several cases the frequently occurring word *יְהוָה* is clearly written *יְהוָה* in the manuscript (e.g., p. 103, l. 14 from the bottom; p. 104, l. 3; p. 105, ll. 14, 30, and 1 from the bottom; p. 106, l. 10 from the bottom; p. 107, l. 5, and l. 5 from the bottom): yet, the editor – to the contrary of what he has done in other cases – has always normalized it into *יְהוָה*.
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