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Obviously, there is little to say on the work, i.e., the rightly famous Historia Aethiopica, Francofurti ad Moenum 1681 (hereafter HAe) by the great scholar Job Ludolf (1624–1704), a milestone in Ethiopian Studies and a masterpiece in historiography. The merit of having attracted fresh attention on this pillar of knowledge, erudition and patient research on ancient and contemporary sources (one might remember Rochus Zuurmond’s words, Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum: The Synoptic Gospels, Äthiopistische Forschungen 27, Stuttgart 1989, I, p. xiv: “Working at the present edition I have consulted their [Ludolf’s and August Dillmann’s] oeuvre almost every day”), is probably the great merit of this almost integral French translation (hereafter HÉth), promoted by Joseph Tubiana, and conducted by three Latinists of the University of Bordeaux and two Ethiopianists of the INALCO. The declared aim of the translation (the Nouvelle histoire d’Abyssinie …, Paris 1684, being in fact an abridged version of the Latin original) is that of making accessible the work to those who are not familiar with the special Latin language of the 17th cent. scholars (“latin tardif qui n’a pas beaucoup été étudié et donc difficile à comprendre”). For the moment, book first (out of four) is presented in a very beautiful volume, corresponding to 90 pages (tables included, very nicely reprinted here), out of the total 336 of the whole HAe (the substantial Commentarius was published later in 1691, with 677 pages, tables included).

Somehow useful and pleasant as it might be, the HÉth raises, however, some perplexities. Unless the volume is addressed to curious cultivated people (what does not seem to be the editors’ intention, who state, p. 9: “Le développement actuel des études éthiopiennes a rendu nécessaire une traduction française sérieuse”), professional Ethiopianists shall still make recourse to the HAe for a number of reasons. Honestly, Ludolf’s Latin does not seem to pose particular problems, and good command of Latin, and also

Aethiopica 13 (2010)
of Greek, still remains essential for “normal” Ethiopianists: not only because no deep understanding of Ethiopic (Goʾǝz) is possible without the usage of August Dillmann’s (Latin!) *Lexicon linguæ Aethiopicæ*, Lipsiae 1865, but esp. because the most important literary language of Ethiopia, i.e., Goʾǝz, is based upon translations from the Greek and its study is consequently strictly related to Classical and Biblical Studies: an average scholar should be able to check directly Vorlage and parallels of Ethiopic texts. Moreover, the study of ancient and medieval Ethiopia is continuously interlaced with sources in Latin: even more, all that has to do with premodern Ethiopia belongs in a tradition of studies where the knowledge of Latin is laced with sources in Latin: even more, all that has to do with premodern Ethiopia belongs in a tradition of studies where the knowledge of Latin is essential, as it is for all Christian Oriental Studies; not to say that Latin has been used as the normal literary language for centuries, till the translation volumes in the CSCO series at the beginning of the 20th cent.: Enno Littmann’s, Carlo Conti Rossini’s, Ignazio Guidi’s Latin risks to be even worse than Ludolf’s.

Unfortunately, the editorial care of the volume is far from perfection and sometimes not really satisfactory. P. 19: the Italics of Ludolf’s *HAe* text, a normal old-fashioned way to render emphasis, is curiously considered a calque of the *rubra* of the Ethiopic mss. – P. 23: the dates of Nicolao Godinho, author of the *De Abassinorum rebus ..., Lugduni 1615, are 1561–1616, not: “1633–1712”. – P. 24: the work by Johannes Isaac Pontanus, *Origenum Francicarum libri VI*, Hardervici 1616, is quoted as: “De Origenum Francicarum libri VI”, probably by influence of Ludolf’s paraphrastic title: “de Francorum Orig.” (also in *HAe* I,1,5, n. l: “de Francorum origine”); more correctly on p. 32, n. 6: “Origenum Francicarum”, where “Origenum Francicarum libri” would have been better. – P. 31, n. 1: as in many other occurrences, very short explication notes are sometimes inserted in square brackets in the footnotes, in this case concerning the traditional etymology of Abyssinia (from Arabic ḥababa): “[étymologie contestée par Conti Rossini]”. One may wonder whether these insertions make sense: on one hand, they are insufficient (the nude reference to “Conti Rossini” is too concise, and very different hypotheses have been advanced even after him); on the other hand, their absence may ingenerate the idea that the relevant thesis of *HAe* on the matter is still valid, whereas the importance of the work, albeit still authoritative in many subjects, is that of a “classic” which should be critically and historically evaluated, and cautiously used. Some concise paragraphs with short essential bibliography and few words illustrating the “state of the art” on various topics would have been much more useful than some scattered dishomogeneous glosses.

– P. 31 ff.: there is no consistency in the transcription of ’ (‘alef) and ‘ (‘ain). – *Ibid.*: there are several erroneous readings of Goʾǝz words, as well as erroneous transcriptions: e.g., p. 31: *hisča* instead of *hisča*; p. 39, no. 25: *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; p. 40, no. 9: “[nafＡs mawca]” inst. of “[nafＡs mawca]”; p. 52, no. 29, l. 1 of the poem: *kāʾ* inst. of *kāʾ*; p. 75: (cp. *HAe* I,8,31) *ṭāʾ* inst. of *ṭāʾ*; (32) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ* (the same error occurs many other times); (33) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; (34) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; (36) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; (39) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; (41) *ḥāʾ* inst. of *ḥāʾ*; one could continue, but this short list can give an idea. – P. 32, n. 8: “Stephanus de Ur-
bibus [auteur grec] dans son livre περὶ πόλεων” (!): from the translation it appears that “Stephanus de Urbibus” is considered the name of an author, while “De urbibus” is the translation of the Greek (thus, correctly) “περὶ πόλεων”, cp. HAE I,1,6, n. (n): “Stephanus in libro περὶ πόλεων”; but here, as in other cases, the Greek has not been written in the modern scholarly way (seemingly, not even understood): cp. p. 32, n. 10: “αξίωματος” (!), by misunderstanding of HAE I,1,9, n. (p): “ἀξιωματος”.

To summarize, despite some shortcomings, one has to appreciate the courageous initiative of making such a classic in Ethiopian Studies like the HAE more accessible. It is only to be hoped that a more satisfactory editorial care will be applied in the following chapters.
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Ammirevole per chiarezza di impostazione e sobrietà tipografica, precisione delle descrizioni – affidate a specialisti di ciascuna area linguistico-culturale – e ricchezza degli indici, il catalogo è stato curato da Renate Würsch, che ha coordinato il lavoro e scritto anche la utile introduzione.