

EMILIO BONFIGLIO

'New Perspectives on the Classification and Identification of the Pseudo-Chrysostomica in the Greek and Oriental Traditions'

Influential narratives of John Chrysostom's life and works (Baur 1929-1930, Kelly 1995, Brändle 1999) have primarily relied on 18th-c. editions (reprinted in *P.G.*) and other new critical editions published in the *Sources Chrétiennes*. These latter, however, account for the smaller part of the Chrysostomian corpus (mainly treatises), excluding the numerous exegetical homilies. While philologists have long held the notion of a Chrysostomian text transmitted in a sort of 'vulgata' fixed at an early stage and needing little improvement, recent scholarship has altered the borders of the Chrysostomian corpus, demonstrating that many 'authentic' writings owe their current shape to compilers who collected homilies of diverse provenance (not necessarily preached in series), and that a more nuanced concept of authenticity should replace traditional categories of 'authentic', 'dubious', and 'spurious'.

This paper discussed issues of Chrysostomian authorship using John's homilies on the first exile [CPG 4396-9] as a case study. First, a reassessment of the criteria previously endorsed in the identification of *pseudo-Chrysostomica* and a reinvestigation of both direct and indirect tradition effectively challenged the idea of a stable Chrysostomian text, concluding that greater importance should be given to the interdependence of Greek originals and neglected Latin, Armenian, and Syriac translations, for textual *and* hermeneutical assessment of the Greek text. Second, the relationship between *pseudo-Chrysostomica* and genuine texts was proved closer than thought in the past, arguing that production and circulation of texts might not have been entirely controlled by Chrysostom himself. Third, a different balance between centre and periphery, Constantinople as place of production of texts *versus* Latin, Armenian, and Syriac peripheries as cultural areas of reception and preservation of more complete/authentic text, was suggested. Finally, it was argued that a separation of Greek and Latin philology *versus* Oriental philology should not be maintained for 21st-c. Late Antique and Byzantine Scholars.