

## Īliyā al-Ġawharī, Īliyā of Damascus

The following is intended to be the definitive conclusion, as far as I am concerned, of the discussion “On the Dating of Īliyā al-Ġawharī’s *Collectio canonica*”, which begun with my note in *Oriens Christianus* 68, 1984, p. 213 f.<sup>1</sup>, and was carried on by H. Kaufhold in the same journal, pp. 214-217.

The objections raised by Kaufhold against my thesis are themselves not unobjectionable. As for Īliyā, it was not my purpose to examine his personality in depth; the problem of the *Collectio* is an internal one, and bears on relative chronology. I suspect that Kaufhold failed to read with due attention what Levi della Vida wrote about the acephalous codex (now part of the reassembled Vat. Ar. 1492) containing the *Tasliyyat al-aḥzān*, dated by him to the 9th century: “... prior to Assemani’s time [the cod.] had existed autonomously, since it appears as No. 23 in an inventory of the Arabic MSS of the Vatican (Library) drawn up between 1569 and 1574 by the keeper Federico Ranaldi with the assistance of his brother Marino; here (the cod.) is given the title ‘Helias Giouhari de curandis affectibus animae’, undoubtedly translating an Arabic title that must have been on the no longer extant first folio of the codex”<sup>2</sup>. Kaufhold’s statement that “Der Beiname ‘al-Ġawharī’, den Levi della Vida verwendet, findet sich, soweit ich sehe, in den betreffenden Handschriften nämlich nicht” (p. 216, and note 7: “Die Hs. Vat. Arab. 1492 ist unvollständig und gibt den Namen des Verfassers nicht an”) is partial and misleading. Actually, he accepts the identification of Īliyā “Metropolitan of Damascus” of Vat. Arab. 157, f. 2<sup>v</sup>, with Īliyā b. ‘Ubayd “Bishop of Jerusalem”, later “Metropolitan of Damascus” of ‘Amr b. Mattā (i.e., ‘Alī b. ‘U. of Ibn al-Muqaffa’ : the hypothesis, for which “spricht eine gewisse Wahrscheinlichkeit”, would be confirmed by Ibn an-Nadīm’s *Fihrist*); Kaufhold then proceeds to identify the latter with the homonymous

1 Owing to causes beyond the author’s control, a few misprints were left in the text; p. 213, l.(ine) 7, should read: ‘l-‘Abbās al-Faḍl | l. 9: fī | n(ote) 1, l. 2: *Studies, Presented* | l. 3: *Browne* | n. 2, l. 1: ca. 1349 | n. 3, l. 1: p. 388 | l. 3: *Rechtssammlung* | n. 4, l. 2: 250f. | n. 5, l. 1: explicit | l. 4: *l’Archevêché* | l. 8: *Zuhārin* | ASSEMANI | l. 13: p. 235 | n. 6, l. 2: pp. 426 a-429 a | l. 3: 152f. || p. 214 n. 7, l. 8: [1955], I, p. | notes 42-43 | n. 8: note 1, and GRAF, p. 152 | n. 9, l. 4: p. 552 [88]. 5 = 11 | n. 10, l. 1: p. 235, and GRAF.

2 “... in epoca anteriore ad Assemani aveva avuto consistenza autonoma, giacché figura al n° 23 di un inventario dei manoscritti arabi della Vaticana redatto tra il 1569 e il 1574 dal custode Federico Ranaldi, assistito dal fratello Marino, e ivi gli è dato il titolo ‘Helias Giouhari de curandis affectibus animae’, che indubbiamente è traduzione di un titolo arabo il quale doveva trovarsi nel primo foglio del codice, oggi scomparso” (*Mél. Tisserant*, II, p. 346; cf. note 5).



“Bishop of Jerusalem” to whom other MSS attribute the *Tasliyyah*. Now, if this last ʿĪliyā — “Helias Giouhari”! — “mit Elias ibn ʿUbaid identisch sein könnte” (p. 216), it must follow that the “Urheber” of the “Kanonesammlung” is precisely ʿĪliyā al-Ġawharī, who is in any case to be distinguished from the “Metropolitan of Jerusalem” author of the *Iġtimāʿ al-amānah*, cod. Vat. Ar. 657, ff. 4-15 (the *nisbah* may be a coincidence or an erudite gift, but certainly “hatte der nestorianische Bischof von Jerusalem zu der in Frage kommenden Zeit noch nicht den Titel Metropolit”, p. 215 and note 5).

As for the texts allegedly neglected by me (“... ohne auf den Befund in der Handschrift [Vat. Ar. 157] einzugehen”, p. 217), I would have expected Kaufhold to produce much more decisive evidence of the groundlessness of my remarks. I did not discuss those texts — nor do I intend to do so now — because, even if they were entirely or only partially interpolated, there is no reason why what follows an interpolation need also be regarded as an addition or an interpolation. It is of little importance that the “Liste der nestorianischen Katholikoi”, ff. 79<sup>v</sup>-81<sup>v</sup>, ends with Mar Makkīhā (II, 1257-65); the date of the codex, written in the second half of the 13th century (Graf II, p. 133), leads us to conclude that the matter in question is no more than a simple updating (at most, it provides us with a terminus for the MS as a whole). Similarly, another hand added the names of Makkīhā’s successors: Denḥā, Yahbāllāhā, and Timothy (II, 1318-33). Nor can it be ruled out a priori that also the “Verzeichnis der nestorianischen Metropolitien und ihrer Suffragansitze”, ff. 82-83<sup>v</sup>, underwent the same kind of retouching and additions (on the whole, it reflects a very old “order”: on this, see the example cited in my “Yemen nestoriano”, in *Studi in onore di E. Bresciani*, ed. S.F. Bondi & Al., Pisa, n.d., pub. 1985, p. 195ff.). Those who copied such documents could hardly resist the temptation of revising and updating them.

Lastly, the example of Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib is not any the less probatory because John IV’s writings inserted in the *Fiqh an-Naṣrāniyyah* are “übrigens andere als in der Hs. Vat. 157” or because, as Kaufhold insinuates, “wir nicht genau wissen, ob die Texte an die Sammlung des Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib nicht ebenfalls nachträglich angehängt wurden” (p. 217). Such doubts and remarks, like the statement of Msgr. Scher (p. 217 and note 13), cannot be taken into serious consideration. Here too, “actori onus probandi”.

Gianfranco FIACCADORI