

Nicephori Callisti Xanthopuli *Historia ecclesiastica*. Vol. I: libri 1–6. Edidit ALBRECHT BERGER (*Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 57/1). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2022. 532 pp. – ISBN 978-3-7001-9245-9.

Nikephoros Xanthopulos. *Das Gedicht auf die jüdische Geschichte*. Herausgegeben von ALBRECHT BERGER (*Münchener Arbeiten zur Byzantinistik* 5). Munich: utzverlag 2022. 209 pp. – ISBN: 978-3-8316-4973-0.

- ELENI KALTSOGIANNI, University of Ioannina (ekaltsog@uoi.gr)

Nikephoros (Kallistou) Xanthopoulos is one of the most prolific authors of the early Palaeologan period, his work however has been rather underestimated in the past, mainly due to its compilatory character and the subsequent “lack of originality” (according, of course, to modern criteria). Only in the last two decades Xanthopoulos’ various writings and especially his *opus maximum*, the *Historia ecclesiastica*, have attracted more systematic scholarly attention, as it is evident from the number of research projects, conferences and studies dedicated to the author and his work that appeared recently. The volume under consideration is the result of a major project undertaken jointly by the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Institut für Mittelalterforschung/Abteilung Byzanzforschung) and the Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich (Institut für Byzantinistik), in order to prepare a new critical edition of Xanthopoulos’ *History* for the series *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. The edition of this voluminous work, which comprises in total 18 books, will be published in four parts; the first part, edited by ALBRECHT BERGER and covering books 1–6, appeared in print in late 2022 and will be discussed below.

The volume opens with a preface (pp. 7–8) signed by both “heads” of the project, ALBRECHT BERGER and CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER, and a relatively brief, yet concise introduction (pp. 11–35), summarizing the results of the older and most recent research on Xanthopoulos and his work. After a short biographical sketch of the author followed by a comprehensive list of his oeuvre in the first chapter (pp. 11–16), the second (and lengthiest) chapter of the introductory part focuses on the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the basic issues regarding either the work as a whole or, more specifically, the books 1–6 (pp. 17–32). The individual sections of this chapter deal with subjects such as the manuscript tradition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*,

which survives in a single 14th century codex,<sup>1</sup> the problem of its dating, its content and sources, as well as the certain manuscript models used by Xanthopoulos, that is the copies of the works of the older church historians (Eusebios, Socrates, Sozomenos, Euagrius and Theodoros Anagnostes) that the author probably had at his disposal either directly or indirectly. A special section is dedicated to some chronological issues arising from Xanthopoulos' *History* in connection with the "peculiar" way certain dates are given in the *codex unicus* transmitting the text, where the world years – in contrast to the other chronological data – have not been marked systematically by the main scribe but were mostly added by later hands. The last three sections of this part touch very briefly on the reception of the *Historia ecclesiastica* before 1453, the sources of the books 1–6 and the editorial history of the work.

In the third and final part of the introduction the editor presents the *ratio edendi*. Since the *Historia ecclesiastica* is preserved in a single manuscript, the codex *Vindobonensis Historicus gr. 8*, which dates from the late 1320s and is thus very close (almost contemporary) to the author's lifetime (although it cannot be identified with the official copy of the work that Xanthopoulos presented to the Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos, as shown by CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER<sup>2</sup>), the edited text reproduces in all aspects that of the *codex unicus*. This editorial principle is in line with the current trend in editing Byzantine texts, which developed in the recent decades and aims at giving to the printed texts a historically more correct form.<sup>3</sup> In this respect, special attention is paid to the *usus scribendi* and the *usus interpungendi* of the manuscripts. Both parameters are considered in the present edition, although not thoroughly discussed in the relevant introductory chapter. With regard to orthography/accenuation, for example, the editor refers only to the *scriptio continua* of certain adverbial expressions, which are either written as one word (e.g., καθεκάστην, κατακράτος, καταμέρος, τανῶν, τοπαράπαν) or, more often, as a word unit whose parts

---

1. See below.

2. See CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER, Nikephoros Xanthopoulos und der Codex unicus seiner *Historia ecclesiastica* (ÖNB, Cod. Historicus graecus 8). In: CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER – SEBASTIANO PANTEGHINI (eds), *Ecclesiastical History and Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 37). Vienna 2015, pp. 141–173.

3. For the relevant discussion, see ANTONIA GIANNOULI – ELISABETH SCHIFFER (eds), *From Manuscripts to Books. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Textual Criticism and Editorial Practice for Byzantine Texts* (Vienna, 10–11 December 2009) (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 29). Vienna 2011.

(usually two) are joined with a hyphen. Both scribal practices are adopted in the edited text; in the second case, the hyphen used by the scribe is rendered with a low dash, a practice not applied so far in modern editions (e.g., τῶ\_όντι, το\_λοιπὸν/του\_λοιποῦ, ἐκτου\_ράστου, ἐπιτο\_αυτὸ, τῶ\_τότε, ἐκτου\_σχεδὸν, το\_πρῶτον/τα\_πρῶτα, το\_πλέον, το\_δεύτερον, το\_μεταταῦτα, το\_τελευταῖον, ἐν\_ὅποιῳ\_δήποτε, ὅθεν\_δήποτε, το\_ἐξεκείνου, του\_δεῦρο, το\_μεν\_πρῶτον). Another “innovative” editorial choice is the preservation of the double grave accent on ὁ μὲν/ὁ δὲ, when used as pronouns,<sup>4</sup> as well as on the particles ἄν/κἄν, a choice that deviates from the practice followed by almost all modern editors,<sup>5</sup> who (usually tacitly, but even in cases where they point out the phenomenon) opt for a single gravis.<sup>6</sup> As for the enclitic use of δὲ (especially in its elided form),<sup>7</sup> BERGER also keeps consistently to the usus of the manuscript and the same applies to accentuation of enclitics in general. Basically, all Byzantine conventions concerning orthography (i.e., breathings, spelling, accentuation etc.) are retained in the present edition,<sup>8</sup> it would be more convenient for the reader, however, if the relevant editorial principles were analysed or, at least, codified in the introductory section.

More innovative, compared to other modern editions, is the way the punc-

4. Cf. JACQUES NORET, Notes de ponctuation et d’accentuation byzantines. *Byzantion* 65 (1995) pp. 69–88, here pp. 79–81.

5. On this Byzantine orthographical convention, see KONSTANTINOS OIKONOMAKOS, Ἀγαθὸν τὸ διτονεῖν? *Byzantion* 75 (2005) pp. 295–309.

6. For example, in his recent edition of Michael Psellos’ *Chronographia* DIETHER REINSCH explicitly states that the double accent on μὲν, δὲ and ἐπεὶ is not adopted in the printed text, where it is rendered with a simple gravis; see Michaelis Pselli *Chronographia*. Herausgegeben von DIETHER RODERICH REINSCH. Band 1: Einleitung und Text (Millennium-Studien 51). Berlin – Boston 2014, p. XXXIII. A different practice, on the other hand, has been adopted by EIRINI-SOPHIA KIPIDOU in the edition of the *Martyrium of the Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiopolis* attributed to Theophylaktos of Ohrid: KIPIDOU adds a comma after ὁ μὲν/ὁ δὲ when these bear a double accent; see Θεοφύλακτος Αχρίδος, *Μαρτύριο των δεκαπέντε μαρτύρων της Τιβεριοπόλης*. Κριτική έκδοση, απόδοση στα νέα ελληνικά και υπομνηματισμός EIRINI-SOPHIA KIPIDOU (Κείμενα Βυζαντινής Λογοτεχνίας 8). Athens 2015, pp. 38–39. This alternative practice is attested by Byzantine manuscripts as well, although to a lesser extent than the use of double gravis; cf. OIKONOMAKOS, Ἀγαθὸν τὸ διτονεῖν (as in n. 5), pp. 304–305.

7. 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* (Byzantios. Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 9). Turnhout 2014, pp. 96–146, here p. 124 (with references to older literature).

8. Some minor exceptions will be discussed below.

tuation of the manuscript is represented in the printed text of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The basic principle followed by most editors in the last decades suggested that each punctuation sign in the printed text should correspond to a sign, though not always the same sign, in the manuscript(s).<sup>9</sup> In this respect, most “problematic” was the rendering of signs such as the middle and low dot, which were represented either by the modern comma or, especially in the most recent editions, by high dot,<sup>10</sup> as well as the semicolon (;), which was occasionally represented by comma.<sup>11</sup> In the present edition BERGER goes a step further and reproduces almost identically the punctuation of the *Vindobonensis*. To give a few examples, the middle and the low dot found in the manuscript are represented by the respective type symbols; the high dot is not substituted by the modern full stop, as was the practice so far, but is rendered with a superscript dot; the blank space following a high dot (usually at the end of a major declamatory unit<sup>12</sup>) is equally reproduced in the printed text, while the colon (:) and the semicolon are retained as well and keep their original function. The complex punctuation system of the *Vindobonensis* has been meticulously analysed some years ago by SEBASTIANO PANTEGHINI, one of the project collaborators who is also responsible for the edition of books 7–9 of Xanthopoulos’ *History*,<sup>13</sup> the system applied in the present edition is explicitly based on his analysis, however, as in the case of orthography/accenuation, there is no explanation of the principles followed and/or the correspondence between the typographical and the manuscript signs. A short recapitulation of

---

9. Cf. Nicephori Blemmydae Autobiographia sive Curriculum Vitae necnon Epistula Universalior cuius editionem curavit JOSEPH A. MUNITIZ (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 13). Turnhout 1984, p. LIII.

10. See, for example, ATHANASIOS ANGELOU, Manuel Palaiologos, Dialogue with the Empress Mother on Marriage. Introduction, Text and Translation (Byzantina Vindobonensia 19). Vienna 1991, p. 23; DIETHER RODERICH REINSCH, What should an editor do with a text like the *Chronographia* of Michael Psellos? in: *Ars Edendi Lecture Series*. Vol. II. Stockholm 2012, pp. 131–154, here pp. 145–146; REINSCH, Michaelis Pselli Chronographia (as in n. 6), pp. XXXIV–XXXV; Theodorus Metochites, Orationes. Ediderunt IOANNIS POLEMIS et ELENI KALTSOGIANNI (Bibliotheca Teubneriana 2031). Berlin – Boston 2018, p. XVII.

11. Cf. REINSCH, What should an editor do with a text like the *Chronographia* of Michael Psellos (as in n. 10), pp. 145–146 and id., Michaelis Pselli Chronographia (as in n. 6), p. XXXV.

12. On this term cf. ANGELOU, Manuel Palaiologos (as in n. 10), p. 23.

13. See SEBASTIANO PANTEGHINI, La prassi interpuntiva nel *Cod. Vind. Hist. gr.* 8 (Nicephorus Callisti Xanthopulus, *Historia ecclesiastica*): un tentativo di descrizione, in GIANNOULI – SCHIFFER, From Manuscripts to Books (as in n. 3), pp. 127–174.

the main points of PANTEGHINI's analysis, along with specific examples showing how the punctuation of the manuscript is rendered in the typescript, would be more helpful for a non-specialist reader, in order to follow (and understand) the flow of the text.

The edition of the first six books of the *Historia ecclesiastica* covers in total 429 pages. The Greek text is accompanied by four apparatuses: i) an apparatus including the dates of certain historical events mentioned in the text; ii) an apparatus fontium; iii) an *apparatus criticus*; iv) an apparatus incorporating the various readings transmitted by the codex *Parisinus gr.* 515 (a direct copy of the *Vindobonensis* which was prepared by Henri III Estienne to be used as basis for the first printed edition of Xanthopoulos' *History*), the *editio princeps* of 1630 and the text printed in the *Patrologia Graeca* (vols. 145–147).

The *apparatus criticus* is basically negative and contains mainly the scribal errors and other peculiarities of the *Vindobonensis* (e.g., the use of iota subscriptum, the passages marked with ση[μείωσ]αι or ὠραῖον in the margins etc.); it also includes the critical (marginal) notes of Iohannes Langus, who used the codex as basis for the first Latin translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* published in 1553.<sup>14</sup> Once again, a more detailed presentation in the preface of the rules followed by the editor with regard to the manuscript readings that are preserved or corrected would make BERGER's editorial choices more comprehensible. In fact, the editor is very conservative in the way he treats the text and his emendations are relatively few and cautious, concerning in most cases obvious spelling or grammatical errors; some of these errors had already been pointed out by Langus in his marginal notes (e.g. Pr.118 τὸ [τῶ] χρεὼν λειτουργήσας; IV.15.10 τῆ [τῆς] ἐν Κορίνθῳ; IV.16.11 ἃ καὶ γραφὴ [γραφῆ] περιέσχεν; IV.17.113 τῶ ξύλω [ξίφει] διαταθεῖσα; VI.5.8 Καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς [ἑαυτὸν] ἐπέγραφον; VI.23.13–14 ὧν τινα [ὄν τινα] ἡμεῖς μὲν, συντόμως ὑπομνηματίσομεν). Only rarely BERGER makes conjectures based on Nikephoros Xanthopoulos' main source, the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebios; thus, in IV.17.83 he adds the word ἄξιος (ἐὰν ἦς <ἄξιός> φησι) with explicit reference to Eusebios, while in IV.18.35 he “corrects” the transmitted τὸν διάβολον to αὐτὸν, a reading found in the respective passage of Eusebios as well

14. Cf. CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER, *Miscellanea codicum Graecorum Vindobonensium II: Die griechischen Handschriften der Bibliotheca Corviniana in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Provenienz und Rezeption im Wiener Griechischhumanismus des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 34). Vienna 2014, pp. 291–310, here pp. 297–298.

(though with no direct reference to the latter). Similar emendations, based on Eusebios and concerning primarily orthographical/grammatical errors could have been adopted, in my view, in seven more cases: I.11.13 ἑτέρου παιδοποιουμένου (ἑτέρω παιδοποιουμένω); II.17.25 καὶ τίνα (τίνι) εἶδη; III.16.26–27 ἐξ οὗ φῶναι τοῦτον (ταύτην) καὶ πρότερον ὁ λόγος ἰστόρησεν; III.30.19 ὃς (οὗς) καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου ἐπιδημήσας τῇ Ῥώμῃ; V.13.27 τοῦ πλείστην (πλεῖστον) ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις ἐπίδοσιν ἐσχηκότος; VI.4.28 ἢ ἔνεκα τοῦ μὴ σχίσαι μαρτυρία (μαρτυρίου); VI.20.6–7 οὐχ ὅπως τῶν ἐπιλύπων (ἐπιλοίπων)· ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἴ τις περιχαρῆς ὢν, οἰηθείη μάλιστα. Moreover, following amendments (some of them already proposed by Langus or appearing in the manuscript as corrections made by the scribe at a later stage) could have been made as well: Pr.705–706 καὶ γ' ἔστω τὸ (τῷ) μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν ἐφικέσθαι δυναθῆναι τινα προσηκόντως γράψαι; I.5.17 κατὰ τὸν (τήν), οὗ τῇ κλήσει σεμνύνεται; I.36.7 μουῦν τὲ καὶ βαπτίζειν] an μουεῖν scribendum?/sic V pro μουεῖν; III.25.39 τὸ (τῷ) χρεῶν λειτουργήσαι; III.28.3 τὸ (τῷ) χρεῶν ἐλειτούργησεν; III.29.39 ὑποδεξαμένω (ὑποδεξάμενον); IV.8.11 διακειμένους (διακειμένη; cf. Eusebios, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV, 23.2: ἧς [sc. πολιτείας] ὀλιγορήσαντας ἐλέγχει ὡς ἂν μικροῦ δεῖν ἀποστάντας τοῦ λόγου); V.29.9 χριστιανούς (χριστιανοῖς). On the other hand, there are some conjectures/“corrections” which seem not to be necessary. For example, in II.43.8 BERGER rejects the reading ἐν τῷ παρόντι τόμῳ transmitted by V and changes it to ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τόμῳ, a change which actually corrupts the meaning of the text, since the reference here is made to ch. 15 of the second, that is the “current” volume of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. In the same vein, ἄπο (προαιρέσεως) in V.3.9 should not be “corrected” to ἀπὸ (προαιρέσεως); ἄπο is equal to ἄποθεν/ἄπωθεν, which means “afar”;<sup>15</sup> thus, the meaning of the clause “οὐ μὴν γε καὶ ἄπο προαιρέσεως τῷ παιδὶ ταῦτα ἦσαν” is “(all) these, however, were not far from the child’s own purposes/plans” and fits perfectly in the context.

In all, despite those questionable editorial choices discussed above, BERGER’s edition offers a most reliable text of Xanthopoulos’ *History* with the exception of some misreadings/typographical errors listed below:

Prooemium: 134 ὑχομένω] εὐχομένω cod.; 601 ἢ γὰρ] ἢ γὰρ cod.

Book I: c.53 (= 15.1) Ἡρώδης] Ἡρώδης cod.; 1.78 ἠκιστα] ἠκιστα cod.; 1.122 ἢ δὴ] ἢ δὴ cod.; 1.145 ἅπαντα] ἅπαντα cod.; 1.205 Ἑλένης] Ἑλένης cod.; 4.132 ὃν ἐφίλει] ὃν ἐφίλει cod.; 5.34 χριστιανὸς] χριστιανούς cod.; 7.23 ἔτος] ἔτος cod.; 8.14 ἔκτον] ἔκτον cod.;

15. Cf., e.g., *Suidae Lexicon* A 3244: «ἄπο: πόρρω, μακρὰν» and A 3606: «ἄπο τοῦ πράγματος: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄποθεν».

10.15 εἴλετο] εἴλετο cod.; 11.72 εἶτ' οὖν] εἶτ' οὖν cod.; 12.34 ὄντως] ὄντως cod.; 17.50 ἔλαττον] ἔλαττον cod.; 19.34 ὄμμασι] ὄμμασι cod.; 24.10 ἄτ' ] ἄτ' cod.; 25.16 ἄπασι] ἄπασι cod.; 25.21 πρὸ δόξαν] πρὸς δόξαν cod.; 25.30 εἶπετο] εἶπετο cod.; 29.24 ὄλος] ὄλος cod.; 30.81 ἄμα] ἄμα cod.; 34.60 ὄθεν] ὄθεν cod.

Book II: c.68 (= 24.1) ἔω] ἔω cod.; 2.17 ἦσαν] ἦσαν cod.; 6.18 ἦσαν] ἦσαν cod.; 12.10 μνήμης ἄξιον [περὶ Ἰακώβου] ἱστορεῖ] instead of introducing in the text the phrase περὶ Ἰακώβου into square brackets, the editor should rather note in the *apparatus criticus*: post ἄξιον V primum περὶ Ἰακώβου scripsit, deinde delevit; 13.38 διῆξε] διῆξε; 16.18 ἔξω] ἔξω cod.; 16.63 οἶ] οἶ cod.; 17.30 ῶ] ῶ cod.; 18.6 οὗτος] οὗτος cod.; 19.26 ἐξ ἐθνῶν] ἐξ ἐθνῶν cod.; 19.45 εἶκασε] εἶασε cod.; 19.48 διὰ Σαμοθράκης <καὶ> τῆς Νεαπόλεως] καὶ should not be put into acute-angle brackets, since it is already transmitted by V; 21.22 ἦχῳ] ἦχῳ cod.; 31.37 ἔνδον] ἔνδον cod. 33.28 αὐτή] αὐτή cod. 33.31 ἔκ τε] ἔκ τε cod.; 38.39 ἀπήεσαν] ἀπήεσαν; 39.10 ἦ] ἦ cod.; 42.39 ἦν σοι] ἦν σοι cod.; 44.32 αὐτή] αὐτή cod.; 46.23 ἦ Ματθαῖος] ἦ Ματθαῖος cod.

Book III: 2.4 οἶ γε] οἶ γε cod.; 3.19 αὐτὸν] αὐτῶν cod.; 8.4 ἔξεστι] ἔξεστι cod.; 8.16 πατουμένη] πατουμένη cod.; 11.31–32 τῷ νεῶ] νεῶ; 14.11 τῶν] τῶν cod.; 16.9 οὖσαν] οὖσαν cod.; 22.4 ἦσαν] ἦσαν cod.; 28.16 ἔχουσι] ἔχουσιν cod.; 32.28 οἶ] οἶ cod.; 35.51 ἐξ] ἐξ cod.

Book IV: 1.6 παρετθη] παρετάθη cod.; 5.34 ὄμως] ὄμως cod.; 11.13 ἀτρεπτικὸς] ἀποτρεπτικὸς cod.; 17.59 (*apparatus criticus*) ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἀπατηθεὶς, εἰς δυσσέβειαν οὕτως χωρεῖ] ἐκεῖνος· γὰρ ἢ νικηθεὶς· εἰς δυσσέβειαν αὐτῶν χωρεῖ cod.; 17.64 ἦν] ἦν cod.; 18.26–28 the phrase ἐκεῖνοι – οὐδαμνοὶ should be put into quotation marks; 22.26 ἐν] ἐν cod.; 22.31 ἦν] ἦν cod.

Book V: 19.26 μόνους] μόνους cod.; 24.21 παρ' ἦν] παρ' ἦν cod.

Book VI: c.16 (= 8.1) ἦν] ἦν cod.; 3.41 ἱερεῦσι] ἱερεῦσι cod.; 8.2 ἦ δὴ] ἦ δὴ cod.; 27.18 κατεπεγούσαν] κατεπεύγουσαν cod.; 27.22 οἶ γε] οἶ γε cod.; 33.10 ἀνηρημένων] ἀνηρημένων cod.; 34.31 the phrase ὃν Παῦλος – διεδέξατο should not be italicized.

Some additions (and corrections) could also be made to the *apparatus fontium*:

Prooemium: 18–22, 64–65, 129–131, 207–208, 294–296: references concerning the imperial orations of Theodoros Metochites should rather be made to the most recent edition of the author's rhetorical works by POLEMIS – KALTSOGIANNI;<sup>16</sup> 151ff.: the passage drawn from Simocates covers l. 151–171 (χαλινῶ – φρυαττόμενος); 178 εἶδος – ἄξιον τυραννίδος: cf. Eurip. *fr.* 15.2.; 279–281 καὶ τῆς γῆς – τὰ σπέρματα: cf., e.g., Ps.-Nonnus *Scholia mythologica* or. 4, 67, *Suidae Lexicon* P 50 et al.; 364–367 ὁ μὲν – καθήμενον: cf. Plut. *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* 329d; 367–368 πρὸς δ' ὅτι – Ἀλέξανδρον: cf. Plut. *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* 330d–e; 393–394 στῦλος – εὐσέβειαν: cf. Exod. 13.21–22; 395 θεῖον ἄλας: cf. Mt. 5.13, Marc. 9.50, Luc. 14.34; 528–529 ἄ καὶ ἐς

16. Cf. above n. 10. Similarly, as regards Metochites' poem addressed to Nikephoros Xanthopoulos discussed in the introduction (p. 16 with n. 39) reference should also be made to the edition of Metochites' poems by IOANNIS POLEMIS; see Theodori Metochitae Carmina. Edidit IOANNIS POLEMIS (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 83). Turnhout 2015.

τρίχα – ἥρμοσται: cf. Greg. Naz. *Or.* 18, 39 (PG 35, 1037B); 766–767 δρόσου – Αερμών: cf. Ps. 132.3; 774–775 ἀδικίαν – λαλεῖν: cf. Ps. 72.8; 829 κατόπιν – ἐρχόμενος: locus communis, cf., e.g., Ael. Arist. *Or.* 8, 55.22; 845–846 τῆ τῶν πρωτοτόκων ἐκκλησία: cf. Hebr. 12.23.

Book I: 2.23 and 34.10: τῷ ἀκινδύνῳ τῆς σιωπῆς: locus communis, cf., e.g., Ael. Arist. *Or.* 46, 143.17–18; 13.79–80 ἀνηνύτοις ἐπιχειρῶν: locus communis, cf., e.g., Io. Chrys. *In Matthaeum hom.* 7, 3 (PG 57, 75.54); 22.10–11 (cf. 23.30, 32.32, 34.5–6 et al.) τεράτων καὶ σημείων: cf. Exod. 7.3 et 11.2, Deut. 4.34 et al., Ps. 77.43 et al., Sap. Sol. 8.8 et 10.16, Is. 8.18 et 20.3, Jer. 39.20 et 21, Dan. 4.2 et 6.28, Mt. 24.24, Marc. 13.22, Io. 4.48, Act. 2.22 et al., Rom. 15.19, II Cor. 12.12, II Thess. 2.9, Hebr. 2.4; 27.15–16 καὶ καλέσαι – Σιών: cf. Is. 61.2–3; 32.3–4 ἐν παραβύστῳ καὶ γωνία: locus communis, cf., e.g., Io. Chrys. *In epistulam ad Hebraeos hom.* 31, 4 (PG 63, 217.32–33).

Book II: 30.41 πάντα – λόγου: the corresponding passage is found in l. 663 of the prooemium (not in l. 633–634); 40.9 κάλλει ὥραϊος: cf. Ps. 44.3; 40.54 τῆ σαγήνη – ζωγρήσας: cf. Mt. 13.47.

Book III: 11.11: the note “ἀγῶνος] recte ἀγωγῶ?” should be placed in the *apparatus criticus*; 11.26 ὄφρων καὶ σκορπίων: cf. Luc. 10.19; 16.16 (cf. IV.17.7–8, V.30.30 et al.) τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν: cf. I Tim. 6.12 and 13; 24.15 λίθον ἐπὶ λίθῳ: cf. Mt. 24.2, Marc. 13.2, Luc. 19.44 and 21.6; 35.86 θυσία καὶ ὀλοκαύτωμα: cf. Exod. 10.25 and 18.12, Lev. 14.20 et al.; 36.13–14 κῦαθῳ – ἐκμετρεῖν: locus communis, cf., e.g., Greg. Naz. *Or.* 28, 27.

Book IV: 29.10 the note “Ποντικὸς] recte Ποτιτὸς” should be placed in the *apparatus criticus*.

Book V: 3.48 ἐκ πρώτης βαλβίδος: proverbium, cf. CPG I, 33 and II, 61, KARATHANASSIS, pp. 153–154; 29.19–20 τὴν παρὰ τῆ θαλάσση – ἀναμετρεῖν: locus communis, cf., e.g., Greg. Naz. *Or.* 14, 29 (PG 35, 897D) and *Or.* 31, 8.

Book VI: 3.5 πάντα – ἐκίνει: the corresponding passage is found in l. 663 of the prooemium (not in l. 625–626); 35.23–24 ἐν καθέδρῳ πρεσβυτέρων: cf. Ps. 106.32.

The volume concludes, as usual, with three indices: i) *nominum propriorum*; ii) *locorum Sacrae Scripturae*; iii) *locorum aliorum operum*. In the last pages we find two plates with photographic reproductions of the folios 10<sup>r</sup> and 11<sup>r</sup> of the *Vindobonensis*.

In connection with the edition of the first six books of the *Historia ecclesiastica* BERGER also prepared an edition of one more work of Xanthopoulos dealing with Jewish history (which is actually the subject of the books I–II of his *Ecclesiastical History*): it is a long poem comprising 1663 dodecasyllable verses and covering the history of the Jews from the beginning of the world to the fall of Jerusalem to the Romans in 70 A.D. The poem is based on the historical books of the Old Testament and the works of Flavius Iosephus, which Xanthopoulos “used” indirectly through the Byzantine *Epitome* and the chronicle of John Zonaras. Xanthopoulos composed this work shortly before 1309, that is before he began working on the *Histo-*



*ria ecclesiastica*. The new critical edition of the poem appeared also in 2022; thus, since the work shares (to an extent) a common subject with Xanthopoulos' *History*, as noted above, a brief discussion of this publication will follow, as a supplement to the review of BERGER's main editorial enterprise.

The study is divided into two parts: an introduction (pp. 9–40) and the critical edition of the poem accompanied by a parallel translation in German (pp. 41–193). The first (and lengthiest) chapter of the introduction deals with Xanthopoulos' sources. As already mentioned, in the first part of the poem (ch. 1–17) the author draws primarily on the historical books of the Old Testament adding material from Byzantine chronicles, of which only those of John Zonaras and George Synkellos can be explicitly identified. The second part (ch. 18–20) corresponds, in terms of content, to Flavius Iosephus' *Antiquitates* and *Bellum Iudaicum*, which, as BERGER has shown in a previous article as well,<sup>17</sup> Xanthopoulos did not use in the original but via the chronicle of Zonaras; as regards the latter, Xanthopoulos knew it, in all probability, through a collection of excerpts, which he supplemented with material drawn from other, mostly unidentified, sources.

After a brief analysis of the metrical features of the poem in the second chapter (pp. 25–26), the third chapter of the introduction focuses on the transmission of the text (pp. 27–34). Xanthopoulos' poem on Jewish history is preserved in two 14th-century manuscripts: i) the codex *Bodleianus auct.* E.5.14 (= A), dating from 1303–1309 and produced in the author's circle, and ii) the codex *Vaticanus gr.* 166 (= V), which is of a slightly later date and represents a second branch of the tradition, going independently from A back to the archetype; a third, now latent, manuscript, which belonged to the same family as V, was used by Hieronymus Guntius as basis for the first printed edition of the poem in 1536.<sup>18</sup>

BERGER's edition is principally based on A. As in the case of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, BERGER follows modern editorial practices and reproduces

---

17. See ALBRECHT BERGER, Nikephoros Kallistu Xanthopulos und die jüdische Geschichte. In: ALBRECHT BERGER – SERGEI MARIEV – GÜNTER PRINZING – ALEXANDER RIEHLE (eds), *Koinotaton Doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204–1461)* (Byzantinisches Archiv 31). Berlin 2016, pp. 1–15.

18. See HIERONYMUS GUNTIUS (ed.), *Cyri Theodori Prodromi epigrammata ut uestustissima, ita pijssima, quibus omnia utriusq(ue) testamenti capita felicissime comprehenduntur, cum alijs nonnullis, quae Index uersa pagella singillatim explicat*. Basel 1536, fol. ρ 2<sup>v</sup>–σ 7<sup>r</sup>.

in the edition the “peculiarities” of A concerning orthography and accentuation. In the same vein, the punctuation of the manuscript is also preserved in the printed text, although not as faithfully as in the edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Thus, the high dot marking the end of a verse is omitted in cases of enjambment or it is rendered by modern full stop at the end of a period or a paragraph, while the low dot used in cases of enumeration is replaced by comma. Nevertheless, the individual editorial principles are more clearly described than in the edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*.

Being the product of a meticulous study of the manuscript tradition, the new edition of Xanthopoulos’ poem offers, as expected, a more reliable text than the edition of GUNTIUS and the text reproduced in the *Patrologia Graeca* (vol. 147). Misreadings and other errors of the previous editions are systematically noted in the *apparatus criticus*. Once again, BERGER is very conservative and cautious in making (or even suggesting) critical amendments, which he usually just notes in the *apparatus criticus* without adopting them in the edited text. For example, in 19.377 the manuscripts transmit the reading πάλαι (ὁ δ’ Ἀγρίππας ἐγγονος Ἡρώδου πάλαι) and BERGER notes in the *apparatus* “πάλαι] an πάλιν?”, but he does not adopt the suggested correction in the Greek text; however, in the translation of the specific verse he seems to adopt the reading πάλιν, since he uses the word “wiederum” (Agrippas aber wiederum, ein Enkel des Herodes). Similar emendations could be suggested also for the following passages:

Chapter 2: 30 Εὐα πρόφασις ὄφις] recte Εὐα; 63 παροινία Χάμ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς αἰσχύνῃ] an αἰσχύνῃ? (αἰσχύνῃν is the reading transmitted by A<sup>ac</sup> and G).

Chapter 3: 6 Ὁ Μωϋσῆς ἐκκλητὸς εἰς ἄλλα θίβῃ] an ἔκλυτος?

Chapter 4: 1 Τὰ κατ’ Ἀαρὼν καὶ γόνους τούτους δύο] recte τούτου (cf. the translation “über Aaron und seine beiden Söhne”).

Chapter 10: 25 Ἰωνάθαν παῖς τοῦ Σαοὺλ τραπεῖς μάχαις] an τραφεῖς?

Chapter 12: 28-29 Φυλῶν μερισμὸς τῶν δέκα, μαστιγία· / Ἱεροβοὰμ, Ῥοβοὰμ ἀποστάτης] an μαστιγίας? (in this case the high dot at the end of the verse should rather be omitted).

Chapter 19: 301 αὐτόν τ’ ἀναιρεῖν Ἡρώδη ἐγνω δέον] recte Ἡρώδης (cf. the translation “Herodes hielt es für nötig, ihn im Gefängnis zu töten”); 392 καὶ τὴν Ἀγρίππα λαμβάνει τετραρχίαν] recte λαμβάνειν; 20.67 ἀστὴρ κομήτης ἐμφορῆς τόμῳ ξίφει] recte τομῶ.

Chapter 20: 141 ἀλλ’ ἡ φθορὰ πάλιν δε τοῖς Ἰουδαίους] an ἄλλη?

The parallel German translation that accompanies the edition of the poem is very useful for the comprehension of the text, which, as BERGER admits, due to its strong brevity and its formulaic language presents both for the translator and the reader several difficulties. Nevertheless, the Greek text is

very accurately rendered into German in most cases, except for the passages listed below:

Chapter 2: 6 κἂν σύμπαν ἐξήνεγκεν ἀθρόον λόγῳ: und führt alles auf einmal durch sein Wort aus] selbst wenn/obwohl er alles auf einmal durch sein Wort ausführte.

Chapter 5: 17 Σκοποὶ Χαναὰν, καὶ τεράστιον βότρυς: Späher von Kanaan und die riesige Traube] und etwas Wunderbares, die Traube.

Chapter 6: 8 ἔπαρσιν ἄγγειν: sich um Erhebung zu bemühen] die Arroganz zu unterdrücken.

Chapter 8: 16 ὃν Ἰαήλ ἔκτεινε πασάλου ζῖφει: denn Iael mit dem Pflock als Schwert tötete] den.

Chapter 9: 3 φεύγουσα λιμοῦ τὴν βίαν τὴν παμφάγον: auf der Flucht von der alles verzehrenden Gewalt der Seuche] der Hungersnot.

Chapter 13: 63 τῶν συμμάχων Ἀχαζ τε καὶ Ἰουδαίας: den Bundesgenossen von Achaz und Judäa] der Bundesgenossen.

Chapter 18: 146 ληφθεὶς δὲ τίνει δίκας ἀθλίως τάλας: wird entlassen und erleidet ein elendes Schicksal] wird gefangengenommen.

Chapter 19: 173 τὸν δ' Ἀντίγονον ζῶντα λαβὼν εὐθύμῳς: nimmt Antigonos wohlgemut gefangen] nimmt Antigonos wohlgemut <lebend> gefangen; 228 ἄγει παρ' αὐτὸν: führt sie von ihm heim] zu ihm; 253 φιλόκαλος δ' ὢν: weil er die Ehre lieb war] ihm; 360 στολὴν ἱερὰν: das goldene Gewand] heilige; 376 ὁ Γάιος ἄνεισιν ἀρχὴν εἰς κράτους: Gaios übernimmt mit Macht die Herrschaft] die Macht der Herrschaft; 383 δεθεὶς φυλακῆ παρεπέμφθη τῷ τέῳς: war er damals in Gefängnis geschickt worden] war er damals <gefesselt und> ins Gefängnis geschickt worden.

Chapter 20: ἐξ οὗ στασιάσαντες οἱ δῆμοι τότε: dessentwegen dessen das Volk einen Aufstand macht] dessentwegen das Volk einen Aufstand macht.

In conclusion, we have to do with two important publications that contribute significantly both to the field of text editing and that of Byzantine studies in general. They both constitute useful tools for researchers and readers as well, in order to approach the personality and work of an eminent late Byzantine scholar such as Nikephoros Xanthopoulos. Modern editions and studies for the rest of Xanthopoulos' writings still remain an important *desideratum*, as a means to re-estimate the author's contribution to the literary production and the intellectual life of his time.

#### **Keywords**

Nikephoros Xanthopoulos; ecclesiastical history; edition; Jewish history; translation