
This erudite work comprises English translation of the Izbornik of 1076 and seven sermons attributed to the eleventh-century homilist Grigorii; the Philosopher, "a hitherto unknown author of the first century of literary activity." (p. II) It also includes an introduction to edificatory literature and a textological survey of the Izbornik and related manuscripts by Veder, as well as a textological survey of Grigorii’s sermons by Turilov. The translations are supplemented by hundreds of footnotes (mostly identifying sources), textual notes to the Izbornik, an index of bibli cal references, and a bibliography.

The Izbornik ('Miscellany'), the third oldest dated Slavic manuscript, was copied from a Bulgarian antegraph, which, according to Veder, was itself compiled from Slavonic compilations and translations of Greek religious writings. Grigorii’s sermons were original East Slavic works written in the 1060s that survive only in Muscovite copies of the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries. Their textual distribution suggests that they were used not only in services but also, like the Izbornik, in individual reading. According to Veder (p. xviii), the purpose of both works was edification - "to lead the soul to salvation and to the vision of the glory of God." While one might argue that almost any church book had this purpose, Veder’s discussion sheds valuable light on the structural peculiarities of explicitly edificatory texts. In his view, the lack of connectedness in works such as the Izbornik actually promoted the search for edification, since the "continuous association and disassociation" of themes compelled the reader to meditate on and hence internalize the content. (pp. xviii, xxxii) However, it is never made clear whether these "disturbances of textual coherence" (p. xx) were intentional or simply epiphenomena of the compilation process.

As Veder states in the introduction (p. lvi), his goal was not to translate the sources of the Izbornik but rather to "reflect the reception of those texts by users removed in time from their antegraphs by at least a century" — that is, to render the considerably reworked versions found in the Slavonic compilation. However, it would seem that he does not always follow this goal consistently. In effect, he is rendering the sources rather than the Izbornik when he uses English translations of the Bible for "direct quotations." (pp. lv-lvi) For example, in "How sweet are Thine oracles to my throat! more so than honey to my mouth" (p. 4; Psalm 118: 103), the phrase "to my throat" is contraband from L. C. L. Brenton’s translations of the Septuagint; it does not appear in the Izbornik.

Veder also departs from his stated goal, in my view, by supplying readings from source texts or later manuscripts not only when there are genuine lacunae but also when passages are omitted that he reconstructs for the antegraphs (cf. pp. 171-77). These supplied readings are not always preferable to the original. For example, the passage translated as "praise him and [give him] what he lacks" (p. 66) makes equal sense without the interpolation — "praise even that which he does not have," with i interpreted as a particle rather than a pronoun. Another case appears in "Seek what is of the spirit, contemplate spiritual and not earthly things, knowing
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that . . . all are equal, both the rich and the poor" (p. 19; cf. the textual note on p. 172). The word "seek" should be in brackets; the Izbornik passage has only pomyshliai 'contemplate.' Doukhov'naago, which is rendered as "what is of the spirit," is actually an animate accusative parallel to doukhov'naia: "Contemplate the spiritual man and spiritual things rather than earthly ones." This un-doctored reading fits well into the context, which concerns the spiritual irrelevance of wealth.

I checked several sections of the translation (pp. 3-12, 63-67, 96-97, and scattered passages elsewhere) against S. I. Kotkov's edition of the Izbornik and found them to be accurate, on the whole. In a few cases I disagreed with Veder's interpretation — e.g., in the opening reading, "Therefore rebuke those who do not study, saying . . . and for the same reason praise yourself, saying . . ." (p. 4) "Praise yourself" would be odd advice coming from a medieval writer. In fact, both of the main verbs, which form a sequence with aorist reche 'he said' (in the translation, "it is said," p. 3) in the preceding sentence, are probably aorists rather than imperatives: "he rebuked [pokhoulil . . . he gloried/was glorified [sam sia pokhvalil. . .] without any connotation of boasting; cf. pokhvalite sia v' imia sviajto ego "Glory ye in His holy name" (Psalm 104: 3), translating a Greek medio-passive. In Stavonic texts the subject of a verb is often omitted when its referent is a topic of the passage. As these particular verbs occur in an exposition of Psalm 118 and tag excerpts from that psalm, their subject is understood to be the psalmist, the first person of the quotations. The same is true of the previous five cases of reche that introduce excerpts from Psalm 118, which are translated as impersonal verbs (p. 3).

Another reading that gave me pause was "When you speak with the saints, ask them about the things of the spirit; but if not with such, then speak of the things of the spirit by yourself." (p. 27) The word rendered as "saints" (sviajty) clearly refers to people who are physically present, since bes'adovati 'converse' denotes a verbal interchange; thus it would perhaps be preferable to translate it as "holy men," especially given the subsequent contrast with the "man who lives heedlessly." (ibid.) In the second clause, the translation makes it seem as if the reader were advised to have a conversation with himself. What is negated here is not the verb but the word tacami "such": "If you are with those who are not such [i.e., holy], then you yourself converse spiritually [with them]." In other words, when you are with the holy, listen to their spiritual advice; when you are with the unholy, give them spiritual advice.

Veder's translation generally stays close to the original wording — at times so much so that it is almost a transposition, with little or no interpretation. Some of these verbatim renditions can be difficult to understand — for example, "Do not gaze at a virgin lest you be scandalized by her penalties." (p. 48) As should, perhaps, have been stated in a footnote, this reworked quotation from Sirach 9: 5 alludes to the Mosaic rule that any man who seduced a virgin had to pay her father the customary bride-price (Exodus 22: 15-16 and Deuteronomy 22: 28). The