

ANNA GIOFFREDA – UGO MONDINI – ANDREAS RHOBY, *Die metrische Psalmenmetaphrase des Manuel Philes. Einleitung, kritische Edition und Indices* (Byzantinisches Archiv 44). Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2024. 443 pp. – ISBN 978-3-11-079302-4
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110796544> (open access)

• ANITA BELCHEVA, Centre for the Greek Language
(a.belcheva@greeklanguage.gr)

This eagerly anticipated volume brings to light for the first time 88 out of the 98 Psalms *metaphraseis* transmitted under the name of Manuel Philes. It results a research program of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, which was a part of a wider joint project with the University of Gent between 2018 and 2022.¹ Work in Vienna was supervised by ANDREAS RHOBY, with ANNA GIOFFREDA and UGO MONDINI as his successive collaborators; the three of them jointly produced the book under review. The volume is divided into three parts: comprehensive introduction, edition of the texts, appendices. The authorship of individual chapters is explicitly indicated in the Preface (p. ix).

Chapter One (pp. 3–5), written by ANDREAS RHOBY, begins with a brief yet informative overview of Manuel Philes' life and œuvre. Philes was the most prolific poet of the Palaeologan era and its bard par excellence. While he seems to have taken part in diplomatic missions as the emperor's envoy, his primary source of income must have been the writing of poetry, mostly on commission. Philes produced a wide variety of poems, among which the Psalm *metaphrasis* holds a considerable place. Other metrical *metaphraseis* by him include a reworking of the Akathist Hymn (App. 2), three *troparia* (Z 1, Z 2, Z 3), a fable (F 37), a poem based on Lucian's ekphrasis of a painting depicting the marriage of Alexander the Great with Roxane (App. 3), and a poem referring to Basil of Caesarea's homily *Ἐν λιμῶν καὶ ἀρχιμῶν* (V 014).²

ANNA GIOFFREDA's second introductory chapter of the Introduction (pp. 6–20) provides a comprehensive description of the manuscript witnesses, followed by useful remarks and conclusions on their relationships – topics

1. See the [website](#) of the joint project *Die Rezeption der Psalmen in der byzantinischen Dichtung: Buchepigramme und metrische Paraphrasen*.

2. For the sigla of the poems and the corresponding editions see pp. xi and 4n.11.

that were previously discussed concisely, but for the first time, by GÜNTHER STICKLER, and more recently in a detailed article by RHOBY and GIOFFREDA.³ The chapter largely repeats these previous studies and starts almost immediately with a description of the manuscripts. In my view, a smoother transition was needed here, briefly addressing the state of research and giving credit to STICKLER.⁴ I believe it would have been helpful to provide more information about the number of Philes' Psalms *metaphraseis*, the Psalms not included in his *metaphrasis*, and the precise content of STICKLER's edition.

Three manuscripts transmit all or almost all of the text: Vaticanus graecus 16 (siglum V), dated to the 14th–15th c., Londinensis Additional 17473 (siglum L), dated to the 15 c., and Athous Iviron 165 (siglum D), dated to the 15th–16th c. Codex V is a composite one and consists of 14 codicological units, seven of which were written by Cardinal Isidore of Kiev, as GIOFFREDA has shown in a previous article.⁵ The unit with the *metaphraseis* seems to have been produced at the beginning of the 14th c. by an anonymous scribe who belonged to the cycle of Maximus Planudes and who was probably connected with the patriarchal chancery of Constantinople. The sequence of the *metaphraseis* does not follow the biblical order of the Psalms, although some grouping is discernible (see the top of the diagram on p. 9). This discordance, or rather mismatch, was already considered by some scholars as evidence that Philes did not complete his work. Another strong indication for this is the transmission of *metaphraseis* MPs. 32, MPs. 46 and MPs. 47 in double version.⁶ Further examination of the seven main groups, compared with the indications of kathismata, leads GIOFFREDA to the plausible assumption that the disorder of the text is likely due to the loose structure of the codicological units from

3. GÜNTHER STICKLER, *Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase* (Dissertationen der Universität Wien 229). Vienna 1992, pp. 100–112; ANNA GIOFFREDA – ANDREAS RHOBY, *Die metrische Psalmenmetaphrase des Manuel Philes. Präliminarien zu einer kritischen Edition*. *Medioevo Greco* 20 (2020) pp. 119–141 (here pp. 123–131).

4. See STICKLER, *Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase*. Cf. also the reviews of his work: SOFIA KOTZABASSI, *Βυζαντικά* 13 (1993) pp. 299–301; MARINA LOUKAKI, *Ελληνικά* 45/2 (1995) pp. 405–406; MARC LAUXTERMANN, *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 45 (1995) pp. 369–372.

5. ANNA GIOFFREDA, *I testimoni delle Metafrasi dei Salmi di Manuele File*. *Isidoro di Kiev, Gerardo di Patrasso e il suo sodale Stamazio*. *Segno e Testo* 19 (2021) pp. 339–370.

6. On this, see STICKLER, *Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase*, pp. 100–101 and LAUXTERMANN (as in n. 4), pp. 369–372.

which they were copied, and that the initial order of this presumed prototype must have corresponded to the order of the Psalms in the liturgy of the Orthodox Church. The chapter continues with an outline of the other main manuscripts preserving the *metaphraseis*. Codex L contains all texts and in the same order as in V, except for MPs. 67, which is omitted. GIOFFREDA has argued in a meticulous study that the scribe of the codicological unit in L is Gerardo from Patras.⁷ The fact that the texts share mostly the same headings, some common errors, as well as some incorrect abbreviation expansions led her to the conclusion that the unit with the *metaphraseis* delivered on the codex in question is a direct copy of that in V.

The third main manuscript through which the texts have come down to us is D. It is a composite, miscellaneous manuscript, preserving the *metaphraseis* with some lacunae, but in the same sequence as the Psalms in the Bible. Its scribes have been identified as Gerardo from Patra and a certain Stamatios.

Besides the three aforesaid codices, some of Philes' *metaphraseis* are attested elsewhere: Vaticanus graecus 952 contains MPs. 103, 3, 37, 62, 102, 50, while three other codices, viz. Monacensis graecus 56, Athous Pantokratoros 6, and Constantinopolitanus Panaghias 130, transmit only MPs. 103.

The last subsection of Chapter One deals with the relationships between the three principal witnesses V, L, and D. Given that the units with the *metaphraseis* in L and in D are written by Gerardo from Patras (in D he appears to have collaborated with a certain Stamatios), and that the texts of both share some *Bindefehler* against V, while D presents some *Trennfehler*, GIOFFREDA reasonably concludes that L is an apograph of V, and that D is an apograph of L.

UGO MONDINI wrote the three next extensive chapters of the Introduction, which address the language, the metre, and Philes metaphrastic technique. On pp. 21–57, MONDINI explores the linguistic features of the *metaphraseis* marking the first attempt to study Philes' language.⁸ To the best of my knowledge, his is one of the few systematic approaches of this kind. The scarcity of studies similar to MONDINI's is due to the general conviction

7. GIOFFREDA, I testimoni delle Metafrasi dei Salmi di Manuele File, pp. 352–354.

8. For some aspects of Philes' vocabulary, see: MARTIN HINTERBERGER, Worlds Apart? Theodore Metochites, Manuel Philes, and Stephanos Sachlikes Compared. In: KRYSTINA KUBINA (ed.), Poetry in Late Byzantium (The Medieval Mediterranean 139). Leiden – Boston 2024, pp. 23–64 (here pp. 38–45).

that Byzantine Koine was fairly conservative and inert⁹ – an impression which is only generally true. For this reason, the language of Byzantine literature or, to be more precise, the diversity of literary idioms¹⁰ that jointly form the so-called high style, has been studied only sporadically, if at all. This makes MONDINI's approach highly valuable. Furthermore, probably in agreement with the other co-authors, he seems to follow the latest editorial trend in publishing Byzantine texts: respect the *usus scribendi* and generally adhere to it.

I will restrict myself to mentioning as briefly as possible the key linguistic features discussed by MONDINI (pp. 21–33):¹¹ traces of iotacism; new adverbs formed through elision (ἀπαρχῆς, καθάπαξ, καθεκάστην etc.); hiatus generally but not systematically avoided; krasis used at times not only to avoid hiatus, but also for syllable reduction (κἀγώ, κᾶν etc.); final /n/ at the end of datives and verbal forms, but only if the following word begins with a vowel; γίνομαι and γινώσκω rather than γίγνομαι and γινώσκω; words with the consonant group -σσ-/-ττ- not always written the same way; same for words beginning with σ/ξ (σύμπας and συμπαντας, but also ξύμπαντος and ξύμπαντας). With regard to accentuation,¹² MONDINI notes that the nouns κρίμα and πρόθυμος appear in the *metaphrasis* as κρῖμα and προθύμος. The circumflex of the noun κρῖμα indeed does not agree with that of the Psalms (κρίμα), but in my view need not be taken as a significant peculiarity of Philes' language in general. As for προθύμος: first, it is not a noun but rather an adjective, and second, in MPs. 85 (lines 16–17) it seems to function as an adverb: ὁδήγησόν με, κύριε, τῇ μυστικῇ σου τρίβῳ | κἀγὼ πορεύσομαι τῇ σῇ προθύμος ἀληθείᾳ. The correct form is therefore προθύμως and the text should be amended. Other forms worth mentioning are the imperative ἴδε instead of ἰδέ and πέρι instead of περὶ (in MPs. 39.21 καὶ γραφῆς πέρι λέγεις likely serves to ease pronunciation, though it

9. On Byzantine Koine, see GEOFFREY HORROCKS, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Chichester 2010, pp. 220–230; also MARTIN HINTERBERGER (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Byzantios. Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 9). Turnhout 2014.

10. I have borrowed the term 'literary idiom' from MARC LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres*, II (Wiener byzantinistische Studien 24/2). Vienna 2019, p. 267.

11. I hope that the current state of research justifies the length of my list.

12. On Byzantine accentuation, cf. JACQUES NORET, *L'accentuation byzantine : en quoi et pourquoi elle diffère de l'accentuation « savante » actuelle, parfois absurde*. In: MARTIN HINTERBERGER (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (as in n. 9), pp. 96–146.

could also be a result of scribal interference). Adjacent stress is typically avoided. The narrow pronunciation of the proclitics and enclitics results in forms such as: τουλοιποῦ τόνῳ, τοπρίν, τομηδέν, διαπαντός, διατοῦτο, κατακράτος, καταμέρος, καταμόνας, παραβραχύ etc. MONDINI also briefly discusses the accentuation of the discourse markers¹³ δέ and γάρ, which appear either stressed or unstressed and shift their position for rhythmical purposes. The indeclinable μέν and οὔν always carry an accent. The enclitic particle τε never appears after a proparoxytonic or properispomenon. As far as the clitics are concerned, the discussion also includes personal pronouns, the indefinite pronoun τις, the verbs εἰμί and φημί, and the adverbs ποτε and πῶς.

A separate subchapter deals with the declination of nouns, adjectives and pronouns (pp. 34–38): there are double vocative forms σῶτερ / σωτήρ, θεέ / θεός; the strong form of personal pronouns predominates over the weak one and is employed for emphasis, as well as to meet rhythmic requirements; Attic forms and possessive adjectives are used; the indefinite adjective τις serves as a marker of indeterminacy, as well as a metrical ‘filler’. Furthermore, demonstrative pronouns, in particular the forms οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, ὅδε, are used to replace αὐτός of the Septuagint text. Regarding the suffixes, I shall confine myself to mentioning that Philes uses numerous derivative nouns with -ουργός or -ουχία, such as παντουργός, πλαστουργός and κληρουχία. He also employs locative adverbs with -θεν, replacing formations with the prepositions ἀπό and ἐκ/ἐξ (e.g. Αἰγυπτόθεν).

Attention is drawn also to verbs and participle (pp. 38–42). The augment and the conjugation have few peculiarities. Aorist and perfect are treated as equivalent, i.e. the former is generally replaced by the latter, with a preference for monolectic reduplicated forms (τεταπεινωμένοις and the like): MONDINI notes that this shows Philes’ use of high-register language. Future tense in the Septuagint Psalms text can be replaced with present or with θέλω / ἔχω + infinitive. For avoidance, only μή / μή δε is used with the imperative and subjunctive. The auxiliary verbs ἔχω and εἰμί are used in periphrastic constructions.

The high number of compound words, such as μισθαποδοσία, ὀπωροφυλάκιον, χαρακόβλυστος etc., is also underlined and aptly associated with the high literary style of the *metaphrasis*. It is also noteworthy that, in compar-

13. For the term see JORIE SOLTIC, Late Medieval Greek πάλιν: A Discourse Marker Signalling Topic Switch. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013) pp. 390–419, here pp. 390–392 (see also pp. 393–394).

ison with the text of the Psalms, verbal prefixes in Philes' text may be lost, added, or even altered.

A separate subsection (pp. 44–45), appropriately placed just before the syntactical and metrical commentaries, addresses the punctuation of the main manuscript (V) and that of the modern edition. MONDINI stresses that V generally follows the rules of Dionysius Thrax' *Ars Grammatica* (Τέχνη γραμματική), while in the critical edition its punctuation is adjusted to the currently accepted rules.¹⁴ In this sense, two separate words written with hyphen in the manuscript appear as a single word in the edition (cf. f. 136r ὁδο ποιήσατε, MPs. 67.9 ὁδοποιήσατε). I would have preferred a clearer distinction between the *usus scribendi* and the *ratio edendi*, the roles of *teleia*, question mark, *hypostegme*, *hypodiatole*, and *mese*. In this respect, the comma is used cautiously and sparingly. However, with non-restrictive elements or direct addresses, it should be added before and/or after them to improve the flow of the text; consider, for example MPs. 5.26 (σε, τὸν), MPs. 6.1 (με, τὸν), MPs. 7.6 (ἐπευδοκεῖς, ὁ), 7.17 (δῆμου, σε τὸν ἄπειρον, συναγωγή), 7.36 (ἀνασκάψας), MPs. 9.40 (λαμπρῶς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, πάλιν), 9.53 (θεὸν, τὸν), 9.57 (βελτίων), 9.60 (πικρίας), 9.62 (βαθυπλούτων), MPs. 50.4 (κακίαν), 50.34 (σὺ, τὴν Σιών ἀγάθυνον, ὁ), MPs. 69.1 (βοήθειαν, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, πρόσχες), 69.6 (εὐθέως), MPs. 66.12 (ευλογῆσαι), MPs. 11.1 (καλοῦ, σῶζε με, παντοκράτορ), 11.17 (οὐκοῦν, φυλάξαις ... τηρήσαις), 11.20 (σύ δε, κατὰ ... σου), MPs. 15.24 (με, τὸν σὸν, εἰς), MPs. 17.1 (Σε, τὸν ... ἐμόν, ἐκθύμως), 17.11 (σε, τὸν), and so on. There are also occasions where a comma should be transferred from one position to another within the same line: MPs. 102.2 (also in the table on p. 91) ναί, κρότει μεγαλύνουσα, ψυχὴ μου, τὸν δεσπότην] ναί, κρότει, μεγαλύνουσα ψυχὴ μου, τὸν δεσπότην; and with the same wording repeated across several verses: MPs. 41.11/41.27/42.13 (also in the table on p. 93) ἔνεκα τίνος σκυθρωπὴ, ψυχὴ μου, χρηματίζεις;] ἔνεκα τίνος, σκυθρωπὴ ψυχὴ μου, χρηματίζεις; MPs. 102.44/103.1 (also in the table on p. 92) εὐλόγει μεγαλύνουσα, ψυχὴ μου, τὸν δεσπότην] εὐλόγει, μεγαλύνουσα ψυχὴ μου, τὸν δεσπότην. The participle *μεγαλύνουσα* and the adjective *σκυθρωπὴ* depend directly on the noun *ψυχὴ* and cannot be separated from it, as they jointly form the direct addresses.

An essential supplement to the exploration of the language and its style is the subchapter on syntax (pp. 45–57), which is divided into two dis-

14. On Byzantine punctuation in general, see JACQUES NORET, *Notes de ponctuation et d'accentuation byzantines*. Byzantion 65 (1995) pp. 69–88.

tinct yet complementary sections: syntactic constructions and syntactical arrangement. The first one begins with *schema atticum*, which Philes either retains, in accordance with its prototype, or creates in places where the Psalms lack or even omit it. *Anacolutha* are sometimes retained but generally eliminated. Regarding the cases, Philes seems to follow, with certain exceptions, the Septuagint text. As for the prepositions, ἀνά is used only in adverbial expressions; ἀπό and ἐκ are often interchangeable; the Psalms' prepositional phrase ἐν τινι may be rendered in the *metaphrasis* with dative, accusative or the prepositions παρά, μετά, κατά and ὑπό; διά is replaced in most of the cases; περί and σύν are usually used instead of καί; περί can be replaced with ὑπέρ; in two cases πρός appears to be combined with genitive. On many occasions, there appears a syntagm consisting of verb + participle or verb + infinitive. The *parataxis* of the Psalms can be retained or altered. Conjunctions and discourse markers are, in many instances, shifted as follows: ὅτι > γάρ, καί > δε, διὰ τοῦτο > λοιπόν/τουλοιοῦ; πάλιν does not serve as a discourse marker, since it appears always emphasized, while πλὴν behaves as such. Numerous *asyndeta* are replaced by *polysyndeta*; elliptical clauses are transformed into phrases with an explicit verb and vice versa; the Septuagint construction τοῦ + infinitive occurs transformed in various way in the *metaphrasis*; in many cases the conjunction ἄν < ἐάν is used instead of εἰ and clauses with subjunctive and with optative seem to be used interchangeably; direct speech always concludes with a colon or at the end of a verse. As for the syntactic arrangement, MONDINI observes that the text flows smoothly. A phenomenon that contributes crucially to this is the unstable position of certain sentence components, namely: the genitive could be founded anywhere in the sentence, without a determiner to precedes it; the positioning of pronouns is similarly flexible; the conjunctions and the relative pronouns are to be found usually at the beginning of a colon; *anastrophe*, *hyperbaton*, and topicalization by right-dislocation¹⁵ are commonly used.

The fourth chapter (pp. 58–73) provides a thorough presentation of the metrical features of the decapentasyllable (*politikos stichos*) of the *metaphrasis*. As STICKLER has rightly emphasised, Philes' choice of this metrical structure is dictated by the length of his prototype – the cola of the Psalms

15. For this phenomenon in relation to Medieval Greek, see DAVID HOLTON – GEOFFREY HORROCKS – MAJOLJINE JANSSEN – TINA LENDARI – IO MANOLESSOU, *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge 2019, pp. 2023–2025.

could hardly fit into shorter dodecasyllables.¹⁶ Applying the rule of isosyllabia, all verses consist of 15 syllables, although in three certain and similar cases MONDINI has noticed hypometric lines (MPs. 12.8, 78.15, 79.12). Caesura is mostly preceded by an oxytonic or proparoxytonic ending of the first hemistich, while oxytonic ending do not appear at all. A useful table on p. 61 compares the *metaphraseis* with Philes' other poems written in decapentasyllables,¹⁷ but also with some vernacular poems. It shows that the rates of this phenomenon are even higher and thus confirms the above. As far as the accent of the rhythmical patterns is concerned, I will limit myself to noting that, regardless of the words' accent, there are three primary rhythmic patterns before the caesura: with stress on the first, second, or fourth syllable (cf. table I.4.8 on p. 63). Furthermore, when an accent appears on the third, fifth, or eighth syllable of the verse, it is usually neutralized by the stresses of the surrounding words. The two accents of the second colon could be separated by two or three, but also by a single syllable, while stress on the eleventh and thirteenth syllable is avoided. The colas seem to be joined in a variety of combinations, a fact which led MONDINI to the conclusion that the rhythm does not follow a stable pattern. As far as the number of words including in each colon, I have the impression that the term 'word' is used both for morphological and phonological words, i.e., word clusters (p. 70); therefore, it seems that these two terms become interchangeable, a fact which is slightly confusing. It has, however, been reasonably argued that the caesura does not actually end a

16. See STICKLER, Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase (as in n. 3), p. 99.

17. According to MONDINI (p. 60n.5), the other Philes' poems written in decapentasyllable are: App. 16, App. 17, App. 18, App. 31, F 106a, F 107, F 109, F 110, F 111, F 112, F 210, F 215, F 256, F 265, G 1, G 12, G 13, G 17, G 22, H, Ias., M 079 (for the sigla of the poems and their corresponding editions see p. xi). It should be noted, however, that App. 017 and App. 018 could hardly be attributed to Philes; they have been published by EMMANUEL MILLER (ed.), *Manuelis Philae Carmina ex codicibus Escorialensis, Florentinus, Parisinus et Vaticanis*, II. Paris 1857, pp. 376–379 from the manuscript Paris. gr. 192, where both are delivered under the heading Τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων. Furthermore, M 8 and the distich F 155.A, vv. 3–4, should also be added to the above list (the first two lines of F 155.A are written in dodecasyllable). Regarding the poems published by MANOUEL GEDEON (ed.), *Μανουὴλ τοῦ Φιλῆ ἱστορικὰ ποιήματα. Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 3 (1882/1883), pp. 215–220, 244–250, 652–659 (those bearing siglum G), the second poem of that edition, G 2, which can be found on pp. 219–220 of GEDEON's publication, has been omitted. Its addition gives the right numbering to the poems with the siglum G: G 1, G 2, G 13, G 14, G 18 and G 23 (cf. STICKLER, Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase, p. 7).

semantic unit, as does the verse; isometry is applied everywhere, while enjambment is generally avoided.

The next chapter of the Introduction offers a meticulous analysis of Philes' metaphrastic method (pp. 74–99).¹⁸ This is the most interesting section of the volume, as it enables the reader to move beyond the text to the systematic linguistic and stylistic approach that shaped it, revealing the secrets of the poet's craft. Philes' *metaphrasis* involves various adaptations in two distinct yet interconnected directions, namely, language and meter. The linguistic modification entails a transition from the Septuagint to the Byzantine Koine, or the so-called learned medieval Greek, while the metrical transformation reflects a shift from the Septuagint Psalms' verse structure to the stress pattern of the decapentasyllabic verse. MONDINI highlights, among other things, the most common verbs with their derivative forms and the most likely combinations with corresponding nouns (see the list on p. 77). Another way of adopting the Psalms' wording is by converting coordinated phrases into participle constructions or by transforming main clauses into subordinate ones and vice versa, for instance: Ps. 4:6.2 καὶ ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ κύριον → MPs. 4.15 ὥς τούτῳ πεποιθότες; Ps. 5:3.3 ὅτι πρὸς σὲ προσεύξομαι → MPs. 5.3 πρὸς σὲ γὰρ δὴ προσεύξομαι (see the tables on pp. 78–79).

As far as the technique of *metaphrasis* is concerned, MONDINI notes that the ratio between the verses of the prototype and those of Philes' could be summarized as follows: 1:1, 2:1, 2 units or cola:2. Apart from cases where the wording of the Psalms is retained roughly or partially, MONDINI identifies six essential, yet conservatives, ways in which the poet treats the text of his prototype, namely, (1) insertion of adjuncts to both the noun and the verb, (2) insertion of adjuncts even in a different position with a change of the syntactical structure, (3) additions or omissions of nouns in the vocative, pronouns, or elements of the noun or verb phrase, (4) reworking and restatement of the Psalms' wording, or even (5) radical interference with it, including amplification and reduction,¹⁹ change of the verb person which often implies a shift in subject, or simply (6) paraphrasing the Septuagint

18. There are many studies on *metaphrasis*, for instance: DARIA D. RESH, Toward a Byzantine Definition of *Metaphrasis*. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 55 (2015) pp. 754–787 (here p. 786); LAUXTERMANN, Byzantine Poetry (as in n. 10), p. 225–228, and the volume ANNE ALWIS – MARTIN HINTERBERGER – ELISABETH SCHIFFER (eds), *Metaphrasis* in Byzantine Literature. Turnhout 2021.

19. I suggest a correction in MPs. 3.7 of the verb form ἠνωτίσω to ἠνωτίσας (see below).

verses. Monidini pays special attention to the reworking of the *metaphraseis*, and especially of those transmitted in double form: MPs. 32, MPs. 46 and MPs. 47. According to him, their second version, namely, MPs. 32 II, MPs. 46 II and MPs. 47 II, seems closer to the prototype.

A special subchapter deals with the *metaphrasis* as a Psalter (pp. 100–107). Its first section (pp. 100–104) examines the technique and high quality of the *metaphrasis*, reiterating to some extent points discussed in the preceding pages. The second section (pp. 104–107) explores the *metaphrasis*' strong literary aspirations, likely intended for private reading and for personal use, as is the case with most surviving Byzantine Psalters – despite the fact that the Odes are not included in it.²⁰ The treatment of the text as such is mainly based on doxai and kathismata preserved in the main manuscript (V), the poems' ordering, and the use of the term ψαλτήριον in its heading. MONDINI's hypothesis that the emperor Michael IX Palaiologos might have commissioned the *metaphrasis* – given his known patronage of Philes' most extensive poem Περί ζώων ιδιότητος – appears highly plausible.

The second part of the volume (pp. 109–363), a critical edition of the *metaphrasis*, is the collaborative work of ANNA GIOFFREDA and UGO MONDINI. It begins with MONDINI's brief presentation of the *ratio edendi*. As mentioned, the editors generally adhere to the main manuscript (V). This adherence extends also to the ordering of the texts, which notably differs from that of the Septuagint, thus causing some inconvenience to the reader. Although this preference is certainly respectable, I believe that following the order of the Septuagint Psalms would have been a better choice. Such an arrangement would also have the advantage of placing the double-version poems consecutively, thereby facilitating a more straightforward and efficient comparative reading of both texts. The apparatus criticus records some variants and marginal paratext additions, but mostly the scribal errors of the apographs L and D, which may provide some supplementary insights into the transmission of the *metaphrasis* during the 15th and 16th centuries, but do not contribute to the critical reconstruction of Philes' text (hence their inclusion in the apparatus could have been omitted). The *metaphrasis* of Ps. 103, previously published by STICKLER in two distinct versions, is here tacitly edited as one. While an initiated scholar will have no diffi-

20. On Byzantine Psalters, see GEORGI PARPULOV, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters*, ca. 850–1350 AD. Plovdiv 2014. – Footnote 13 (p. 106) says that the Psalter in the codex Vat. gr. 343, written in the vernacular, does not contain the Odes; in fact the Odes are found there on ff. 132r–143v.

culty in following the editors' preference, some explanations of their choice would not have been out of place.

The edition of Philes' poems is accompanied by a Psalms text derived from three sources: (1) RAHLFS' edition of the Old Testament, (2) HOLMES and PARSONS' edition of the Old Testament, and (3) a single manuscript from Philes' lifetime (Vaticanus Ottobonianus graecus 294).²¹ MONDINI has fully explained in a recent article the way he combined them.²² His synthetic text is not actually attested by any single codex, yet closely aligns with Philes' *metaphrasis*. While such an adaptation involves the challenging effort of reconstructing a presumed prototype, I shall restrict myself to commenting on the edition of Philes' text proper.

Regarding the graphical convention, the editors retain the lowercase form for nomina sacra as used in RAHLFS' edition of the Septuagint. However, I believe it is preferable for Θεός and Κύριος to be capitalised. Four verbal types resulting from crasis should have been written with coronis, namely, MPs. 77.103 (also on the table on p. 78) προϋθηκεν] προϋθηκεν; MPs. 34.26 (also on the table on p. 86) προϋφερον] προϋφερον; MPs. 17. 10 προϋφθασαν] προϋφθασαν; MPs. 16.27, 20.5 προϋφθασας] προϋφθασας; MPs. 70.21.

I recommend the following improvements to the text:

MPs. 3.7 τὴν γὰρ φωνὴν μου τὴν κρυπτὴν ἐξ ὅρου [ἡνωτίσω] ἡνωτίσας (also on p. 90);
 MPs. 36.52 [ὅλης ἡμέρας] ὅλην ἡμέραν ὁ χρηστὸς οἰκτεῖρει καὶ δανείζει;
 MPs. 38.20 κωφεύσας οὐ λελάληκα· σύ γὰρ τὸ πᾶν [εἰργάσω] εἰργάσας;
 MPs. 85.11 σοὶ [τίς θεὸς] τοῖς θεοῖς παρεμφερῆς οὐκ ἔστι, παντοκράτωρ;
 MPs. 59.7 τοῖς μέντοι φοβουμένοις σε παρέσχε[ς] [τι] τὸ σημεῖον;
 MPs. 71.34 τῷδ' ἐνευλογηθήσονται πάντα [κοινῇ] κοινὰ τὰ γένη.

The following misreadings /typographical errors should also be considered:

MPs. 4.2 εἰσήκουέ[ς] μου] εἰσήκουσέ[ς] μου V;
 MPs. 9.17 to be added in the app.: ἐτάσεις] ἐτάσης V);
 MPs. 144.39 ταύτων] τούτων V;
 MPs. 12.1 to be added in the app.: ὦ] ὦ V;
 in the app., MPs. 16.25 should be emended, with the the verse number

21. Cf. the sigla on pp. 112–115.

22. UGO MONDINI, Manuel Philes und die Psalmen im griechischen Mittelalter. Der synoptische Psalmentext in der Edition von Philes' Psalmenmetaphrase. In: FELIX ALBRECHT – REINHARD KRATZ (eds), *Editing the Greek Psalter*. Göttingen 2024, pp. 523–537.

changed from 25 to 23: 16.25] 16.23;
 MPs. 21.9 κατησχύθησαν] κατησχύνθησαν (to be added in the app.: κατη-
 σχύνθησαν] κατησχυνύθησαν V;
 MPs. 21 vv. 24 and 25 should be reversed;
 MPs. 77.132 Σαλώμ] Σηλώμ V;
 MPs. 78.20 the full stop at the end of the verse is superfluous;
 MPs. 80. 27 ἡμαῖς] ἐμαῖς;
 MPs. 31.4 τῷ] τοῦ V; MPs. 33.25 πονεροῦ] πονηροῦ V (to be amended also
 in the Introduction on p. 48, as well as in the table on p. 470);
 MPs. 37.1 in the app.: V transmitted also the right reading θυμόν;
 MPs. 82.10 Ἰσμαυλίταις] Ἰσμαηλίταις V;
 MPs. 82.20 Ὠρεῖβ ... Ζεῖβ] Ὠρήβ ... Ζήβ V;
 MPs. 84 θύμου] θυμοῦ V;
 MPs. 49.8 καλήσει] καλέσει V (to be amended also in the Introduction on
 p. 72);
 MPs. 54.29 μεσεμβρίαν] μεσημβρίαν V;
 MPs. 55.12 to be added in the app.: μηθενός] in marg. correxit, in textu
 praebet μηδενός V;
 MPs. 58.34 καὶ] μὴ V;
 MPs. 61.16 λαϊκός] λαϊκός V;
 MPs. 68.12 αἰσχυθείησαν] αἰσχυνθείησαν V;
 MPs. 68.57 τῷ δ' ἄλγητῶν τραυμάτων μου] τῷ δ' ἄλγει τῶν τραυμάτων μου
 V;
 MPs. 101.52 ἐν ἔτεσι ἐστῶσιν] ἐν ἔτεσιν ἐστῶσιν V;
 MPs. 105.18 δυνειστείαν] δυναστείαν V.

Two appendices accompany the edition of the text (pp. 364–376); they in-
 clude corresponding lines from Michael Psellus' poems on Psalms 1 and 54
 (ed. WESTERINK), which appear in the manuscripts D and V as paratexts.
 The volume's third part also features some helpful aids to the reader (pp.
 379–470): (1) an index incipitorum, (2) a comparative index of the Psalms
 with their corresponding Philes' poems, (3) index of the altered elements
 and an index nominum notabiliorum. Regarding the nomina notabilia, the
 following observations should be considered: the reading προθύμος (MPs.
 85.17) transmitted by V should be amended to προθύμως (as already sug-
 gested above). The term συναγωγίμον (MPs. 103.54) in the text is not a
 noun, but an adjective: ἐκεῖ διαπορεύονται συναγωγίμοις πλοῖα; therefore,
 the meaning of the phrase συναγωγίμα πλοία is 'cargo ships' or 'freighters'.
 As for the compound adjective χαρακόβλυστος (MPs. 80.33), its first com-
 ponent χάραξ (Gen. χάρακος) signifies, among other things, a plant that

cuts, and thus refers to a thorny or wild plant. Therefore, χαρακόβλυστος would be better translated as ‘something that gushes forth from wild plants’. Thus, in Philes’ verse καὶ μέλι χαρακόβλυστον ἐχόρτασεν ἀφθόνως, the adjective applies to the word ‘honey’, making it clear that it refers to wild-flower honey. This sense corresponds to a metaphor in the Septuagint prototype: καὶ ἐκ πέτρας μέλι ἐχόρτασεν αὐτούς (Ps. 80.17).

The book closes with a general index, lists of tables and figures, an index of manuscripts, and a bibliography. It will undoubtedly form an excellent tool not only for further scholarly research but also for teaching at the graduate and postgraduate levels. Its publication is highly welcome, and the authors/editors deserve our heartfelt gratitude.

Keywords

late Byzantine poetry; *metaphrasis*