having been written by a different author. Moreover, Parts Syrian Chronicles genre, which is not the case with regard to Part Three. A statements are referred to without mentioning the publica­
tions which occur throughout the book: at times, author's
memories, internal cross-references are incorrect, and occasional
misprints appear.

Some volumes comprise the edition and translation of Mēnra I of Barhebraeus’s Ethicon; Mēnra II-IV — which represent some four-fifths of the entire text — are to follow. Various aspects of Teule’s work will be discussed here, chief among which is the fact that we now have the opportunity to make a reliable assessment of Barhebraeus’s most popular work. As the editor indicates in the preface to the translation, the Ethicon has thus far been given scant attention by the scholarly world, perhaps because the work as a whole was never translated into a Western language. The Syriac was available as early as 1898 in Bedjan’s edition, which was copied for that of Çiček in 1985.1) But up until now scholarly discussions have concentrated on the translation of the two chapters of the Ethicon appended to Wensinck’s translation of the Book of the Dove.2) The present edition and translation solve the problem of the limited accessibility of the Ethicon, providing a solid basis for the study of the work itself and its place in the history of both Syriac and Arabic literature.

The Syriac text of the Ethicon, in part or in its entirety, is preserved in 42 manuscripts, and all of these are described in the introduction to the edition. In a concluding overview, Teule arrives at a provisional outline of the various branches of transmission (East Syrian and those that lack East Syrian characteristics, e.g., where the designation of Mary as Mother of God is not omitted) and also divides the manu­scripts which are used in the critical apparatus into families. Some 16 manuscripts have not yet been seen by the editor, presumably including the most valuable witness, ms. Bagh­dad (ool Mosul 99). Copied A.D. 1292, only 13 years after the composition of the Ethicon and 6 years after the author’s death, this manuscript was last seen by Father Fiey in Baghdad some time before 1973. Fortunately, two copies of ms. Baghdad survive in Western libraries, but up to now they have failed to provide a solution to all the textual problems Teule has encountered. When this difficulty is taken into account, together with the fact that the remainder of the text of the Ethicon has yet to be studied in depth, it was both cor­rect and sensible of the editor to postpone his judgement on the transmission of the text. Accordingly, Teule deemed it premature to give a stemma of the manuscripts. In accor­dance with the method proposed by R. Draguet, the text of one manuscript (here ms. Oxford Bodl. Syr. Hunt. 490, copied A.D. 1323), including its errors, has been chosen as the main text. All variants, as well as the proposed correc­tions, are mentioned in the apparatus. Where the basic manu­script is not followed in the translation, this is explicitly indicated in the notes to the translation.

The translation is preceded by an introduction dealing with several questions related to the history and composition of the Ethicon. Here the work is largely placed within the tradition of Arabic literature, with respect to both its history and its Nachleben. The latter is described in an overview of Arabic (Garshuni) translations of the Ethicon, ancient and modern, that testify to the popularity which Barhebraeus’s work enjoys to this day. This is also reminiscent of the broad transmission of the Syriac manuscripts and the Syriac edition of 1985.

The introduction continues with an investigation into the provenance of the title of the work (presumably based on the Aristotelian division of practical philosophy) and a survey of the contents of the entire Ethicon. This is followed by a discussion of Al-Ghazâlî’s ḫiyā’ “ultim ad-dīn as the main source of the Ethicon. Here, the observations made by Wensinck in 1919 are systematically elaborated:


2) A.J. Wensinck, Bar Hebraeus’s Book of the Dove together with some chapters from his Ethikon (De Goeje Fund 4), Leiden 1919, 85-133. The Book of the Dove has been translated from the Syriac text that is included in Bedjan, Ethicon, 519-99.
Barhebraeus not only cited copiously from the *Ihya‘*, but also used Al-Ghazālī’s structuring of ideas. This has resulted in an identical fourfold division of the book: Mēmra I: prayer and meditation (*Ihya‘*; ‘ibādāt); II: sustenance and purity of the body, worldly customs (‘ādār); III: purification of the soul from shameful passions (*muhlikāt*) and IV: embellishment of the soul with excellent qualities (*munjīyāt*). In this respect, it is noteworthy how Barhebraeus explains his sympathy for Al-Ghazālī in his *Chronicon*: “… And in his Greatest Work [the *Ihya‘*] he added many examples of the behaviour of the Desert Fathers. That is the reason why we mention him”. A synopsis of passages in Mēmra I of the Ethicon and their parallels in the *Ihya‘* is given in Appendix I to the translation.

The identification and discussion of biblical and patristic sources is confined largely to the notes to the translation and the index in Appendix II. The preparatory work done here may be expected to lead to a separate study by Teule, focusing on Barhebraeus’s place in Christian tradition. With regard to the Christian sources, the focus in the present work is on the tracing of the technical terminology, which often goes back to the translators of Evagrius of Pontus. In the work of Barhebraeus this idiom merges with, and is modified by, Arabic *calques* that can be identified with the aid of the *Ihya‘*. A provisional list of technical terms in Syriac and Arabic concludes the introduction (see also Wensinck, *Book of the Dove*, 137-42).

The aim which Teule set himself, i.e., to present a translation that provides a literal, yet intelligible rendering of the Syriac text, has, in my opinion, been fully achieved. Teule deliberately adopts the vocabulary that is coined by earlier translators of Syriac mystical texts. The English is transparent and does not presume to be more than a translation; where problems arise that would interfere with the reading one is referred to explanations in the notes.

The first volumes of the edition and translation of Barhebraeus’s Ethicon are a solid piece of work, on the one hand remaining within the limits which the editor set himself, and, on the other hand, breaking new research ground. As to the first observation, the cautious treatment of the problems of textual transmission and the absence of overly general characterisations of the work are worthy of mention. With respect to the second observation, the emphasis which Teule places on the reconstruction of the intellectual and spiritual context of the Ethicon, in which Syriac and Arabic traditions meet, and the different levels at which this problem is approached — lexically, stylistically and formally — is fruitful and of great value for all the disciplines involved. This result in turn sometimes may help to explain the high esteem in which the Syrian Christians held, and still hold, the Ethicon. Some minor critical remarks, however, are called for. In this review, several references are made to the work of A.J. Wensinck, who is often quoted by Teule himself. Wensinck’s work is still deserving of praise for its pioneering nature and its exposition of certain problems that have been taken up again by Teule. The latter, abiding by the standards of modern philology, has provided us with a new basis for the study of Barhebraeus’s spiritual writings, which

heightens our appreciation of Wensinck as the author of an important essay on the subject, i.e., his introduction to the Book of the Dove. In this sense, the two authors complement each other. Furthermore, Wensinck did a great deal of groundwork in identifying Barhebraeus’s sources and in compiling an initial list of technical terms (as referred to above). In this light, Teule could have acknowledged Wensinck’s achievements more generously, for example, in the preface to the translation.

Two final remarks are of a more practical nature. In the introduction to the translation (p. xxiii) it is noted that the numbers in bold type and *square brackets* in the translation refer to the edition. Neither system is used, however, and the references take the form of numbers in the margin. Another comment that should be addressed to the publisher as well: quite a few pages of the edition, in particular those that signal the beginning of a new chapter, display the results of a clumsy attempt at imitating the appearance of a Syriac manuscript (different type sizes in the headings), while trying to remain faithful to Western typographical conventions (use of indents). This style has also been applied to the translation, where the result is not as bad, but still far from elegant.

Amsterdam, January 1996

Dirk Kruijssen

---