




Aneta Dimitrova (Sofia)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1973-8462>

## INTERLINEAR AND MARGINAL GLOSSES IN THE ATHONITE TRANSLATION OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM'S *DE STATUIS*\*

**Abstract.** According to a colophon in manuscript RM 3/6 from the Rila Monastery, a complete Slavonic translation of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on the Statues* was made on Mount Athos by the Serbian monk Antonije and copied by Vladislav the Grammarian in 1473. In fact, this is the earliest extant copy of a thorough revision of the first translation that was made in Preslav in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, and the text was partially translated anew after a different Greek source. All three preserved copies of this translation contain a number of explanatory glosses. Some of them refer to rare and archaic words, whereas others provide synonyms and better readings. In the article, close attention is paid to the 21 interlinear and marginal glosses as they occur in the Rila manuscript. The glosses are divided into four overlapping groups: I. Translations and explanations of Greek words; II. Biblical references; III. Synonyms; and IV. Varia. Eight of the annotations are discussed in detail in comparison to the Preslav translation and the Greek sources, with additional data from other medieval Slavonic texts. Since the practice of annotating was typical of the scribe Vladislav, some arguments were considered whether he was the author of the glosses. In most cases, the annotator was also a competent and observant editor, who usually corrected or updated the language according to his contemporary terminology.

**Keywords:** John Chrysostom, *De statuis*, Slavonic translation, manuscripts, glosses

### Translator and translation

John Chrysostom's homilies *On the Statues* (*Ad populum antiochenum / De statuis*, CPG 4330) were known to the medieval Slavic audience as *Andrianty* (АНДРИАНТЫ, АНДРИАНТИС, АДРИАНТИС, etc.) in three complete translations and in an

\* This study is financed by the European Union-NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project No BG-RRP-2.004-0008.



early collection of excerpts. The first full translation was made in Preslav in the 10<sup>th</sup> century (henceforth translation *P*), the second one originates from Mount Athos in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (henceforth translation *A*), and the third one was made in 17<sup>th</sup>-century Russia<sup>1</sup>. Unlike translation *P*, which is extant in at least 15 Russian manuscript copies from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>2</sup>, only three South Slavic manuscripts from the 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> century are known to contain translation *A*:

1. Manuscript 3/6 from the library of the Rila monastery, Bulgaria, 1473, Resava orthography (henceforth RM 3/6)<sup>3</sup>. Contents: 22 homilies *On the Statues* (ff. 1r–337r); nine more texts (ff. 338v–559v, see below).
2. Manuscript no. 97 (older inventory no. 10) from the “Holy Trinity” monastery near Pljevlja, Montenegro, 1485/1495, presumably Resava orthography<sup>4</sup>. Contents: same as RM 3/6<sup>5</sup>.
3. Manuscript no. 38 from collection no. 182 of A. Hilferding (Gil’ferding) in the Russian National Library, Saint Petersburg, Russia, 16<sup>th</sup> century (last 1/3), Resava orthography (henceforth Hilf. 38)<sup>6</sup>. Contents: 22 homilies *On the statues* (ff. 2r–168v), homily 1 without beginning; 17 homilies of John Chrysostom under the combining title of *Margaritai* (*Pearls*) (ff. 170r–194v), without end.

The earliest of the extant copies, manuscript RM 3/6, was written by the renowned scribe Vladislav the Grammarian in 1473. It is mostly famous for

<sup>1</sup> More information with additional literature about *P*, *A*, and their relationships, see in А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Два цялостни южнославянски превода на Златоустовия сборник Андриантти*, [in:] *Училищното евангелие на Константин Преславски и южнославянските преводи на хомилетични текстове (IX–XIII в.)*. Филологически и интердисциплинарни ракурси. Доклади от Международната научна конференция в София 25–27 април 2023 г., ed. Л. ТАСЕВА, А. РАБУС, И.П. ПЕТРОВ, София 2024 [= SB, 37], p. 365–386.

<sup>2</sup> A complete list see in А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Два цялостни южнославянски превода...*, p. 368–369.

<sup>3</sup> Е. СПРОСТРАНОВ, *Опис на ръкописите в библиотеката при Рилския манастир*, София 1902, p. 52–56; Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Опис на ръкописите на Владислав Граматик*, Велико Търново 1996, p. 49–63. I am grateful to the brotherhood of the Rila monastery and to the digital archive “Bulgarian Manuscript” at the Faculty of Slavic studies, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, for the opportunity to work with this manuscript.

<sup>4</sup> В. МОШИН, *Гирилски рукописи манастира Св. Тројице код Пљеваља*, ИЗ.ЕН 1–2, 1958, p. 255 (no. 97); Р. СТАНКОВИЋ, *Рукописне књиге манастира Свете Тројице код Пљеваља. Водени знаци и датирање*, Београд 2003, p. 7 (no. 10). Unfortunately, this manuscript has so far been inaccessible to me, but I am grateful to Ivan P. Petrov for the preliminary information about its glosses.

<sup>5</sup> А. ТУРИЛОВ, *Андриантти*, [in:] *Православная энциклопедия*, vol. II, Москва 2001, p. 410.

<sup>6</sup> В. МОШИН, *К датировке рукописей из собрания А.Ф. Гильфердинга Государственной публичной библиотеки*, ТОДЛ 15, 1958, p. 413; Ж. ЛЕВШИНА, *Рукописи сербского правописания Российской национальной библиотеки. Каталог*, Санкт-Петербург 2021, p. 51–52. A digital copy of the manuscript is available here: <https://nlr.ru/manuscripts/RA1527/elektronnyiy-katalog?ab=B938359E-302B-4C32-86B1-34A912A3DCE5> [30 IX 2024].

the Glagolitic fragments discovered in its binding, known as the Rila Glagolitic folia<sup>7</sup>. The main text of the manuscript, however, is mostly unexamined<sup>8</sup>.

The scribe Vladislav gave some information about the translation in a lengthy colophon on ff. 337v–338r. It says that the esteemed monk Antonije translated the homilies from Greek into Serbian in the Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos. It mentions also his mentor, his commissioner, other figures of authority, historical events, the name of the scribe, and the time of transcription. However, it does not specify the time of the translation itself. With the help of other scribal notes and records, the translator was identified by scholars as Arsenije / Antonije Bagaš (Pagasi), a descendant of a noble family from Vranja. This contemporary of Isaija of Serres was a monk in Vatopedi until the 1380s and was one of the restorers of St. Paul's monastery, together with Nikola Radonja (Branković)<sup>9</sup>.

From another scribal note in a manuscript from the Romanian Academy of Sciences no. 137 (Neamț 69), dated 1462, the same Antonije is known to have also translated a collection of homilies by Ephrem the Syrian (*Paraenesis*)<sup>10</sup>. The two homiletic collections translated by Antonije seem to have much in common. Both Chrysostom's *De statutis* and Ephrem's *Paraenesis* have early Old Church Slavonic translations dating from the Preslav period (10<sup>th</sup>-century Bulgaria). There have been contradictory suggestions about the nature of the relationships between the 10<sup>th</sup>- and the 14<sup>th</sup>-century translations of these texts, but convincing evidence shows that the "new translations" were in fact thorough revisions of the earlier ones, with some completely equivalent passages and others translated anew<sup>11</sup>. In both cases, the second translation is of limited distribution: there are three extant copies of *Andrianty* and only one manuscript containing this version of *Paraenesis*, all of them from the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and later. At the same time, *Andrianty* follows faithfully the Greek text in a version different from the sources of translation *P*, whereas the discrepancies between the newer and the older translations of *Paraenesis* are not supported by the known Greek tradition. For a better identification of Antonije as the translator of the two patristic works, a comparative linguistic and stylistic analysis should be made – a task beyond the scope of my present study.

<sup>7</sup> In 1845, 1880, and 1936, Viktor Grigorovič, Konstantin Jireček, and Yordan Ivanov discovered in total eight fragments of works by Ephrem the Syrian, dated in the 10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> century, see И. ГОШЕВ, *Рилски глаголически листови*, София 1956.

<sup>8</sup> Some linguistic features are discussed in А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Два цялостни южнославянски превода...*

<sup>9</sup> Ђ. ТРИФУНОВИЋ, *Лисац и преводилац инок Исаија*, Крушевац 1980, p. 19–22; Г. СУБОТИЋ, *Обнова манастира Светог Павла*, ЗРВИ 22, 1983, p. 207–254 (viz. p. 225–227).

<sup>10</sup> P. PANAITESCU, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R.*, vol. I, București 1959, p. 171–172.

<sup>11</sup> C. VOSS, *Die Handschrift Nr. 137 (69) der Nationalbibliothek Bukarest: eine bisher kaum bemerkte Neuübersetzung der Paränesis Ephraims des Syrers*, Pbg 19.2, 1995, p. 27–44; E. WEIHER, *Einige Bemerkungen und Ergänzungen zu neueren Arbeiten über die albulgarische Übersetzung der Paraenesis Ephraims des Syrers und ihre Überlieferung*, AnzSP 20, 1990, p. 135–145.

Identifying the translator of *De statu*s as Antonije Pagasi dates the translation *A* about a century earlier than its oldest surviving copy RM 3/6. However, it seems that Vladislav's manuscript is a first- or second-generation copy of the original translation<sup>12</sup>. It was copied in 1473 in Žegligovo monastery (Matejče) in Skopska Crna gora near Kumanovo, where Vladislav had lived and worked for ca. two decades. The manuscript contains a complete translation of 22 homilies *De statu*s (on ff. 1r–337r), including the so-called homily 20 (PG, vol. XLIX, col. 197–212, *Ad finem ieiunii*). The latter was omitted in the Preslav translation *P*, but it had an independent transmission in other homiletic collections.

The aforementioned colophon on ff. 337v–338r is followed by nine more homilies:

1. (ff. 338v–348r) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In Epistulam secundam ad Corinthios homilia xxv* (CPG 4429; PG, vol. LXI, col. 569–574); *inc.* **СЪМОТРИ СЪДЕ ПАКЪ ПАВЛА ОТРИЦАЮЩА СЯ.**
2. (ff. 348v–407r) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt* (CPG 4401; PG, vol. LII, col. 479–528; with its own table of contents and inner segmentation); *inc.* **БРАЧЕВЪСЦИН ОУБО ОТРОЦИ ИГДА ВЪ ОГНИЦН.**
3. (ff. 407r–457v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Ad Theodorum lapsum liber 1* (CPG 4305; PG, vol. XLVII, col. 277–320); *inc.* **КЪТО ДАСТЪ ГЛАВЪ МОЕН ВОДЪ.**
4. (ff. 457v–489v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De paenitentia 1* (CPG 4615; PG, vol. LX, col. 681–690, see *Zlatostruy*, app. 2<sup>13</sup>, same translation); *inc.* **ПРИСНО ОУБО ПОМИНАТИ БОГА ДОБРО И ЗЪЛО ДОБРО.**
5. (ff. 489v–501v) Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo compunctorius* (CPG 3908, Assemani 1: 28–40, see *Paraenesis*, no. 91<sup>14</sup>, revised translation); *inc.* **ПРИНДЪТЕ ЛЮБИМНИЦН ПРИНДЪТЕ ОТЬЦИ И БРАТНА МОГА.**
6. (ff. 501v–514r) Anastasius Sinaita, *Homilia de sacra synaxi* (CPG 7750; PG, vol. LXXXIX, col. 825–850); *inc.* **ПРИСНО ОУБО СВАТАЕГО ДОУХА БЛАГОДАТЬ.**
7. (ff. 514r–530r) Anastasius Sinaita, *Homilia in vi psalmum* (CPG 7751; PG, vol. LXXXIX, col. 1077–1116); *inc.* **ПОДОВАЮЩЕЕ ПОСТОМЪ НАУЖЛО УНСТАЕГО ПОКАЯННА.**
8. (ff. 530v–539v) Basilius Caesariensis, *Homilia in illud: Destruam horrea mea* (CPG 2850; PG, vol. XXXI, col. 261–278, see BHBS: 332); *inc.* **СОУГОУВЪ ИСТЪ ВИДЪ НСКОУШЕННИ.**

<sup>12</sup> Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Опис на ръкописите...*, p. 60; the author does not give explicit arguments for this suggestion.

<sup>13</sup> Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, София 2013, p. 107–108.

<sup>14</sup> Edited in *Paraenesis. Die altbulgarische Übersetzung von Werken Ephraïms des Syrers*, vol. IV, ed. G. ВОЈКОВСКИ, R. АЙЗЕТМÜLLER, Freiburg im Breisgau 1988, p. 154–196.

9. (ff. 540r–559v) Theodorus episcopus Andidorum, *De divinae liturgiae symbolis ac mysteriis* (cf. PG, vol. CXL, col. 417–468); inc. **ВѢДѢТИ ДЛЪЖЬНЪ ИСТЪ ВЪСѢКЪ ВЪРЪНЪИИ.**

Their transmission history is yet to be examined.

### Interlinear and marginal glosses in A

An interesting feature of translation A are the occasional interlinear and marginal glosses. They are found in Vladislav's manuscript, some of them (14 out of 24)<sup>15</sup> are present also in Hilf. 38 and apparently the third copy from Pljevlja is annotated as well. Twenty-one of the notes in RM 3/6 (which are the subject of this paper) are found in *De statuis*. They are unevenly distributed across the homilies, most of them are in red ink (18 in total), most are written between the lines. One note is a suggestion for a more correct reading, four are descriptive explanations of Greek words, and the others are synonyms, translations, and other variants.

Vladislav is known for his annotations in the books he copied, e.g. in the codices from the Rila monastery RM 4/14 (copied in 1456), RM 4/8 (1479), and RM 2/23 (last quarter of the 15<sup>th</sup> century), as well as in the manuscript Zagreb, HAZU IIIa47 (1469). Some of his notes are lengthy commentaries<sup>16</sup>, but more often they are short linguistic remarks, corrections, and single words. In some cases, he explicitly indicates what was attested in his source, e.g. RM 2/23, f. 175v **ЗАПЕЧАТИТИ**: *in marg.* **УТВЕРДИТИ, ѿ изводѣ**; RM 4/8, f. 360v **ИСПЫТАЛИВЫМЪ**: *in marg.* **ИСПЫТАТЕЛЮ**, **ИНДЕ**; f. 639r **ПРОСТЪРЪ**: *in marg.* **ПОЛАГАЕ, ИНДЕ**, etc. However, not all marginalia in Vladislav's manuscripts were authored by him, e.g. some of the notes written in red ink in the margins of HAZU IIIa47 and RM 4/14 were copied from a model text<sup>17</sup>. Bearing this in mind, the authorship of the marginal and interlinear glosses in translation A of *De statuis* is hard to be determined with certainty. Their presence in all three copies does not necessarily imply a common ancestor, because RM 3/6 is the oldest surviving copy that may have been the source for other manuscript witnesses. Besides, it seems that in some cases the annotator did not consult the Greek text, since several glosses deviate from the original meaning

<sup>15</sup> The first three are missing due to lost folios, the last three are in another text that is not attested in Hilf. 38, and four glosses are omitted, namely nos. 4, 9, 12, 17, see the list below.

<sup>16</sup> The annotations in the Zagreb codex were highlighted in earlier publications, cf. М. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Загребският ръкопис на Владислава Граматика*, СЛУНК 16–17, 1900, p. 325–338; Г. ДАНЧЕВ, *Владислав Граматик, книжовник и писател*, София 1969, p. 123–129.

<sup>17</sup> Convincing arguments see in L. SELS, *Manuscripts and Margins: The Case of the Late Mediaeval Slavonic Hexaemeron Collection or Šestodnevnik and its Greek Source Text*, [in:] *Caught in Translation. Studies on Versions of Late-Antique Christian Literature*, ed. M. ТОСА, D. ВАТОВИЦИ, Leiden–Boston 2020, p. 160–179 (esp. 167–172); ЕАДЕМ, *Gregory of Nyssa. De hominis opificio. О образѣ чловѣка. The Fourteenth-Century Slavonic Translation. A Critical Edition with Greek Parallel and Commentary*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2009, p. 73, 304–305.

(see nos. 5, 12, 17, 19). Therefore, they seem to be inserted by an editor (possibly by Vladislav himself), and not by the translator. Other notes, however, are indeed closer to Greek and suggest that they were part of the translation process or of controlled editing (see nos. 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16).

Here, I have divided the glosses into overlapping groups and I will briefly comment on some of them (in bold in the table below). The examples are given according to the Greek edition in *PG*, the first complete translation *P* (here according to MS Russian Academy of Sciences, Tek. 341, 1594), and the second translation *A* in Vladislav's copy RM 3/6. The captions are lemmatized, and the original orthography of the manuscripts can be seen in the table and in the citations.

no.	homily	Greek	Translation <i>P</i> (Tek. 341)	Translation <i>A</i> (RM 3/6)	Glosses in RM 3/6	notes
1	1	ῥοδωνιά	ЦВ'КТОВНОЕ СВ'КТОКННЕ (2v)	роуҗн (9r)	ШНПЦН	
2	1	ἔξωθεν παιδευσις	ВН'КШННΕ ΟΥВЕНІЕ (3v)	В'Н'КШННА ПР'КМОУДРΩСТЬ (10r)	В'Н'КШННΕ НАКАΖАНІЕ	<i>in marg.</i> , black ink
3	1	<b>στόμαχος</b>	СЫРНЦА (4v)	СТОМАХ' (12r)	ЖЕЛОУДЬЦЬ	<i>cf.</i> 1Tim 5: 23
4	2	πυκνή	УАСТЬ (22v)	УЕСТЬ (38v)	ГОУСТЬ	
5	9	Σκύθης	СКНФНСЬ (96r)	СКНФІН' (144v)	ТАТАРН ЖЕ	
6	9	(ώρα) ὥρων	ВРЕМЕННОЕ (97v)	ВР'ЕМЕНОМЬ (146v)	УАСОВОМЬ	
7	9	<b>φλέγμα</b>	ГН'КН҃ (sic! 99v)	ГЛЕНΟΥ (149v)	ХРАКОУТІН'К	marginal gloss in <i>P</i> гр'ѣхου, v.l. гл'кноу
8	10	σύλλογος	СЪБОРЬ (101v)	СЪБРАНІЕ (152v)	СЛОВІЕ	
9	10	τρόπις	ДНО (104v)	ЛОУКЬ (157r)	ГРЬБЬ	
10	10	ἕδαφος	ПОМОСТА (107v)	ЗЕМЛН (161v)	ПОДОУ	
11	11	ἐπιτήδειος	СТРΩННА (111r)	ΟΥХУЩРЕННО (166v)	ПРИКЛАДНО	
12	11	οὐκ ἄν ἦλθον	ВЫША В'ШЛН (113r)	ПРИШЛН ВН (169r)	ПРОУЗЪШЛН ВН	black ink
13	11	<b>ῥς</b>	ВЕРЬ (116r)	ННОКЬ (173v)	ВЕРЬ	<i>cf.</i> Ps 79: 14. <i>in marg.</i> , black ink
14	11	<b>Βελίαρ</b>	ВЕЛНІАРУ (117v)	СТР'БЛЦОУ (176r)	ВЕЛІАРОУ	2Cor 6: 15

no.	homily	Greek	Translation P (Tek. 341)	Translation A (RM 3/6)	Glosses in RM 3/6	notes
15	12	ἀρτηρία	срѣшнѣныта (122v)	ар'тнрїамь (183v)	напонтельные жнлы	
16	13	ἐπιστημονικός	ραζοφμνα (131v)	χοφ'δοжника (197r)	в'бднтелпа	
17	16	Σκύθαι	ски-ѿδ (159v)	скв-ѿбхъ (237v)	татар'бх'	
18	17	τρίβων	оуһнтельскоуо рһзоу (168r)	трїевонн (250r)	трїевонн, нже пр'блндрь вд'банїа	<i>in marg.</i>
19	18	τὸ ἥμισυ	пвалъ (174v)	поль (259v)	множестве	
20	19 (20 in A)	τρίβων	тривона (183r)	трїевона (294v)	вд'банїе пр'блндрь нлнмоще:~ ннїа знаменїа такоже пїсмена	<i>in marg.</i>
21	19 (20 in A)	σταθμός	м'бры (188v)	стаѿмоуе (302v)	прагы. рекше врата градоу	2Reg 25: 18

### Group I. Translations and explanations of Greek words (nos. 3, 5, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21)

There are many untranslated Greek words in *A* (some are also present in the earlier translation *P*), but not all of them are annotated. Some Greek loan-words had probably already become part of the Slavic languages and did not need explanation (e.g. στομαχъ), but others were rare or ambiguous in meaning (e.g. τριβωνъ or стаѿмоуе).

#### στόμαχος – *P* сърише, *A* στομαχъ, *supra l.* желѣдць

*PG*, vol. XLIX, col. 19 ἀλλ' ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις σώμασι καὶ ζῶντες (*v.l.* καὶ ζῶντες *om.*) καὶ τετελευτηκότες τοσαύτην ἐπιδειγμένοι δύναμιν, στομάχον καταπεσό-ντα οὐκ ἀνέστησαν (*in other bodies, even dead, they showed such power, but they did not resuscitate a failing stomach*)

*P* (f. 4v): нѡ в тѣхъ днѣ телесе хъ ѿ оумерша тѡлнкѣ сїлоу показоуѡща, съриша же ѡп'аша не во з'внгоста

*A* (f. 12r): нъ въ тѡуждѣ т'блесѣ н скон'авше се тѡлнкѡу показавше снлоу. στομαχ' же ннспад'шїн не в'ставнше

*supra l.* желѡудць

The first homily of the series comments on the Apostolic saying *use a little wine for the sake of your stomach* (οἶνον ὀλίγω χρῶ διὰ τὸν στόμαχον, 1Tim 5: 23) and this quotation is repeated several times throughout the text. The gloss is added only once in a sentence that is not part of the quotation. The alteration **сѣрициѣ / стомахъ** goes back to the earliest Slavonic translations of the biblical quotation. The Greek loan-word **стомахъ** in 1Tim 5: 23 is found in manuscripts of the Apostolos containing the archaic translation and the Mount Athos revision, e.g. in the Apostolos books of Slepče and Šišatovac (complete lectionaries, 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> c.), in Matica Apostolos (continuary, 13<sup>th</sup> c., with linguistic features typical of the Preslav literary school), in the Ostrog Bible (1581, representing the Athonite revision), etc.<sup>18</sup> The other reading **сѣрициѣ** is found in Tolstoj Apostolos (continuary, 14<sup>th</sup> c., representative of the Preslav revision), as well as in the edition of the Christopolitan Apostolos (the manuscript is from the 12<sup>th</sup> century and contains the continuatory text of the Apostolos), in which, however, this part was supplemented by the editor from a 15<sup>th</sup>-century Apostolos with commentaries (GIM Sin. 18) due to lost folios<sup>19</sup>. The word **сѣрициѣ** is attested also in typical Preslav texts, such as Tsar Symeon's florilegium in its earliest copy of 1073 (*Izbornik*), John the Exarch's *Hexaemeron* (but also **стомахъ**), *Contra Bogomilos* of Presbyter Cosmas, *Life of Theodore of Stoudios*, *Zlatostruy* collection (homilies no. 28 and 44), and others. It is no surprise that **сѣрициѣ** is the preferred variant in the Preslav translation of the homilies *On the Statues*, and the Greek loan-word **стомахъ**, known since the earliest period, was used in the 14<sup>th</sup>-century translation from Mount Athos.

In the sentence cited above, Vladislav the Grammarian wrote in red ink **желудьць** above **стомахъ**. The word **желудьць** means 'stomach' and is attested in a few other medieval sources, including homily 117 from the *Zlatostruy* collection, a 14<sup>th</sup>-century copy of the florilegium *Melissa*, and the same Apostolic quotation (1Tim 5: 23) in a 14<sup>th</sup>-century copy of the *Pandects* of Nikon of the Black Mountain<sup>20</sup>. The diminutive form **желудьць** is how the word is preserved in modern Serbian and Croatian<sup>21</sup>. In the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the audience must have been familiar with the Greek word **стомахъ**, which is present nowadays in nearly all languages in the Balkans. Its annotation with **желудьць**, a Slavic word that remained in use in Serbian, is in accordance with several other examples of translation and explanation of Greek terms in *A*.

<sup>18</sup> This lexical variation is not noted in I. Hristova-Šomova's study on the Apostolos, but she gives a very useful characterization of the manuscripts and the groups to which they belong, cf. И. ХРИСТОВА-ШОМОВА, *Службеният Апостол в славянската ръкописна традиция*, vol. I, *Изследване на библейския текст*, София 2004, p. 737.

<sup>19</sup> Аем. КАЛУЖНИАСКИ, *Actus epistolaeque apostolorum palaeo-slovenice. Ad fidem codicis Christopolitani saeculo XII scripti*, Vienna 1896, p. 243.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, vol. V, Москва 1978, s.v. желудьць.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. П. СКОК, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb 1971–1973, s.v. želudac.



**ἀρτηρία: P соушнѣнѣиѣ, A арτηрѣнн, supra l. напонтельнѣиѣ жнлѣи**

PG, vol. XLIX, col. 131 ἴν' οὖν ἅπασαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τὴν διάπλασιν ἐπέλωμεν καὶ τὴν ἐν ἐκάστῳ μέλει σοφίαν εὖρωμεν, τῶν νεύρων, τῶν φλεβῶν, τῶν ἀρτηριῶν τὴν διανομὴν, τὴν θέσιν, τὴν διάπλασιν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπᾶντων, οὐδὲ ἐνιαυτὸς ὀλόκληρος ἡμῖν ἀρκέσειεν ἂν πρὸς τὴν ἐξηγήσιν ταύτην (*in order to describe with precision the structure of man and to find the wisdom of every limb, the distribution, the setting of the sinews, of the veins, of the arteries, the formation of everything else, an entire year will not suffice for such a narrative*)

P (f. 122v): да оубо все ѡлѣе по ѡпасѣю зданіе скажеиѣ, н в кѡѣждо оудѣ прѣрѣсть ѡбрѣиѣиѣ жнлѣиѣ кровѡвнѣиѣ соушнѣнѣиѣ, разданіе пѡложениѣ сданіе иѣѣ вѣѣхѣ. но лѣтѡ цѣло наиѣ довлѣетѣ оубо на касаніе се.

A (f. 183v): да оубо вѣсе нже ѡлѣа съ ѡпасѣѡ създаніе прѡндеиѣ. нже н вѣ кониѣко оудѣ прѣмоудрѡвѣсть да обрѣиѣиѣ. нже жнлаиѣ. нже кровѡтоуниѣиѣ жнлаиѣ. нже арѣтрѣиѣиѣ. разданіе. пѡложениѣ. създаніе нже иѣѣиѣ вѣѣѣиѣ, ни лѣтѡ вѣсе съврѣшениѣ наиѣ довлѣетѣ оубо кѣ сказанію сеиѡу.

supra l. напонтельнѣиѣ жнлѣи

In homily 12, Chrysostom discusses the wonders of Creation and the incomprehensibility of God's providence and mentions the constitution of the human body. The scribe Vladislav added **напонтельнѣиѣ жнлѣи** above **арѣтрѣиѣиѣ**. The Greek loan-word **арѣтрѣиѣиѣ**, although scarcely attested, was probably known to educated Slavs throughout the Middle Ages. It was used several times by John the Exarch in *Hexaemeron* in its main meaning 'windpipe, trachea', and again in Middle Bulgarian translations, such as *Dioptra*, Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*<sup>22</sup>, and Andrew of Crete's *Homilia de humana vita et de defunctis* (see note 40 below, in the same paragraph as **χρακοτѣиѣиѣ**, together with **крѡвѣиѣиѣ жнла**). However, there were many other Slavic words in medieval literature denoting blood vessels, e.g. **ѡдоѡаждѣ**, **жнла**, **вѣтрѣиѣиѣ**, **вѣтрѣиѣиѣиѣ**, **вѣтрѣиѣиѣиѣ жнла**, **крѡѡѡѡаѡа жнла** in Pseudo-Kaisarios<sup>23</sup>, **крѡѡѡѡаѡа жнла**, **крѡѡѡѡѡѣиѣ** in *Hexaemeron*, etc. Sometimes it is hard to differentiate between **φλέψ** 'vein, blood vessel', **ἀρτηρία** 'artery', 'trachea', and **νεῦρον** 'sinew', 'nerve', but the most common term used in all these meanings both in early and in later literature is the word **жнла**. An explanatory adjective specifies the contextual meaning of **жнла**, which is also the case of Vladislav's gloss. The explanation **напонтельнѣиѣ жнлѣи**, here meaning specifically 'blood vessels', and not 'windpipes', is less ambiguous than **арѣтрѣиѣиѣ**. I am not aware of another attestation of the phrase **напонтельнѣиѣ жнлѣи** in this meaning. The corresponding term in the earlier translation P **соушнѣнѣиѣиѣ** (possibly from \***соушнѣиѣ**, cf. **крѡѡѡѡѡѣиѣ**, the possessive genitive case is rendered with adjectives) is a *hapax legomenon*, as well.

<sup>22</sup> L. SELS, *Gregory of Nyssa. De hominis opificio...* (Index Slavonic-Greek, p. 3).

<sup>23</sup> Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Диалозите на Псевдо-Кесарий в славянската ръкописна традиция*, София 2006, p. 245.

τρίβων – Ρ οϚυνητελѣскага рѣза, А трѣвонѣ, *in marg.* трѣвонн, нже прѣмѣдрѣин-  
хѣ о дѣанннѣ

PG, vol. XLIX, col. 173–174 Ποῦ νῦν εἰσὶν οἱ τοὺς τρίβωνας ἀναβεβλημένοι, καὶ βαθὺ γένειον δεικνύντες, καὶ ρόπαλα τῇ δεξιᾷ φέροντες (*Where are now those dressed in threadbare cloaks, showing off a long beard and carrying a staff in their right hand*)

P (f. 168r): гдѣ нынѣ сѣтъ нже оϚυνηтелѣскоу рѣзоу вѣстыкающе н гѣсѣтѣ вѣрѣ  
показующе, н сѣтпы деснищамн носѣще

A (f. 250r): гдѣ оубо ѿнѣа сѣтъ нже трѣвонн о дѣанннѣ. н глѣбокы брады по-  
казоуше. н дрѣколѣе вѣ деснищн носѣще  
*in marg.* трѣвонн, нже прѣмоу дрѣ о дѣаннѣ

τρίβων – Ρ трѣвонѣ, А трѣвонѣ, *in marg.* о дѣанннѣ прѣмѣдрѣинхѣ нмѣще  
нѣинѣ знаменнѣ такоже писмена

PG, vol. XLIX, col. 189 Ὡς οἱ γε τῶν ἕξωθεν φιλόσοφοι τῶν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ καὶ ταῖς τῶν μίμων παιδιαῖς οὐδὲν ἄμεινον διάκεινται, τοῦ τρίβωνος καὶ τοῦ πώγωνος καὶ τῆς στολῆς οὐδὲν πλέον ἔχοντες ἐπιδείξασθαι. (*The pagan philosophers are no better than those performing on stage and in childish games of actors, who have nothing more to show than the threadbare cloak, the beard, and the robe*)

P (f. 183r): а еликоже оубо вѣшннхѣ филосѣ, скѣмрачѣ н подражателѣ  
дѣтскнхѣ, ннннмѣже не оубе трѣвонн н брады і ѡдежда ннѣсѣже лнше нмѣще  
показати.

A (f. 294v): Ико нже нзвѣтъ прѣмѣдрѣин, нже вѣ лицемѣрн н нже шѣгауѣ  
наказаннн ннѣто лоуѣше прѣлежѣтъ. трѣвонн н брады н одежѣн, ннѣто лнкоже  
нмоуше показати.

*in marg.* о дѣаннѣ прѣмѣдрѣннѣ нмоуше:~ ѿнѣа знаменнѣ такоже писмена:~

In homilies 17 and 19, there is a comparison between the vain appearance of pagan philosophers and the genuine inner wisdom of Christian monks. In describing the philosophers, John Chrysostom uses a well-known trope: they are recognized by their threadbare cloak, beard, and staff<sup>24</sup>. The annotator's explanations in these examples are among the longest marginal notes in the manuscript. They refer to the Greek word τρίβων 'worn garment, threadbare cloak', which is often used in Greek literature describing mainly the garments of Cynic and Stoic philosophers. Their cloaks and beards were so recognizable that it was the default representation of philosophers in the theatre<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> A more detailed study on this topic see in A. ДИМИТРОВА, *Четене с разбиране: за философите с брада, тояга и вехта наметка в Златоустовите беседи За статуите (Андрианти)*, [in:] *Четивото за миряни в южнославянския репертоар XIV–XVIII в.*, София 2024 (in print).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. John Chrysostom (PG, vol. XLVIII, col. 1035): καὶ φαίνεται φιλόσοφος κόμην ἔχων ἐν τῷ προσωπεῖῳ and *he appears to be a philosopher because his mask has long hair* (a beard?). The second example, cited above, gives the same idea.

In Slavonic translations, this word is rendered in various ways. In Gregory of Nazianzus' funeral oration for St. Basil the Great (Oratio 43, cap. 17) *τριβων* is used metaphorically (those wearing the "philosophical cloak", i.e. the philosophers) and it is translated as *рѡза знаменѡта*<sup>26</sup>. Pseudo-Kaisarios also mentions *the threadbare cloak, the beard, and the staff*, symbols of philosophical life (*τοις ὀργάνοις τῆς διδασκαλικῆς πολιτείας*), in the Preslav translation of the *Dialogues* rendered as *болгарьство н рѡза н жеزلъ*<sup>27</sup>. This meaning of *τριβων* is avoided or remained unrecognized in the *Chronicle* of George Hamartolos, where the corresponding words are *искоуѣтъ* 'temptation' and *сѣдѡна* 'grey hair'<sup>28</sup>.

The phrase *οὐνητελѣскаѡ рѡза* 'teacher's dress', used in translation *P* in the first example, is in accordance with the other occurrences of *рѡза* in the texts from Preslav cited above, and the adjective *οὐνητελѣскаѡ* should be interpreted as 'philosophical'. The other counterpart, the Greek loan-word *τρηβωνѣ*, is not attested in other Slavonic texts. In both occurrences in *A*, the gloss is not a simple translation, but an explanation of the term, a footnote: *трѣвонн, нже прѣмодрѡѡ ѡдѣканѡа* "tribones, philosophers' garments", and *ѡдѣканѡе прѣмѡдрѡѡ нмѡуѣе:~ нѡа знаменѡа ѡкоже пѣсмена* "having philosophers' garments, now symbols, like letters". The last phrase seems a little obscure. The definition of the philosopher's threadbare cloak as a sign, a symbol, corresponds to the general use of this trope – it is one of philosophers' characteristic features, an abstraction. A similar meaning is present in the phrase of Gregory of Nazianzus *рѡза знаменѡта* "a symbolic dress" (or "the proverbial cloak"). It is the outer appearance of pagan sages, as opposed to the genuine wisdom of Christians, like *писмена* 'letters', as opposed to the true Spirit, cf. 2Cor 3: 6 *нже н ѡудѡвѣлн насѣ слѡужитѣлѡ новоѡ завѣтоѡ, не писмени, нѣ доухѡ, писмѡ бо ѡмирѣцѣлѡетѣ, а доухѣ живѡтѣ* *He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant – not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.*

**σταθμός** – *P* *лѣрѡѡ*, *A* *стаѡѡмоѡс*, *supra l.* *прагѡѡ*. *рѣкѡше* врата градоѡ

*PG*, vol. XLIX, col. 194 *καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν Σορέα τὸν ἱερέα τὸν πρῶτον, καὶ τὸν Σαφᾶν τὸν ἱερέα τὸν δεῦτερον, καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς τοὺς φυλάσσοντας τὸν σταθμὸν* (*And the captain of the guard took Seraiah the chief priest, and Zephaniah the second priest, and the three keepers of the door* 2Reg 25: 18)

<sup>26</sup> А. Будилович, *XIII слов Григория Богослова в древнеславянском переводе по рукописи Императорской публичной библиотеки XI века. Критико-палеографический труд*, Санкт-Петербург 1875, р. 29; А.М. Бруни, *Византийская традиция и старославянский перевод Слов Григория Назианзина*, vol. I, Москва 2010, р. 167.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Я. Милтенов, *Диалозите на Псевдо-Кесарий...*, р. 491.

<sup>28</sup> В.М. Истрин, *Книги временъныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе. Текст, исследование и словарь*, vol. I, Текст, Петроград 1920, р. 238, 385.

*P* (f. 188v): и пѡѡша сарѣю ѡнстѣтелѡ старѣншаго, и сафѡу ѡнстѣтелѡ вѣтора-  
гѡ, и трѣи хранѡщаѡ мѣры

*A* (f. 302v): и вѣзешѣ сарѣѡ иерѣѡ прѣваго. и сафѡѡ иерѣѡ вѣтораго. и трѣхѣ, иже  
хранѣщѣхѣ стафѡмѡуѣ

*supra l.* прагы. рекше врата градоу

In homily 19, John Chrysostom rebukes taking oaths and supports his admonitions with Old Testament citations. One of them is 2Reg 25: 18 about the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The three doorkeepers are referred to as τὸς φυλάσσοντας τὸν σταθμὸν and the translations vary. The word σταθμός originates from the root \*steh<sub>2</sub>- ‘to stand’ and has several meanings, including ‘dwelling’, ‘station’, ‘pillar, doorpost, threshold, door’, ‘weight, balance’. This variety can be seen in some of the earliest Slavonic translations, e.g. ‘weight, balance, scales, standard’: мѣра in *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, *Hamartolos’ Chronicle*, etc., мѣрѡ in the *Prophetologion* of Grigorovič (Is 28: 17), Ez 4: 10, 16, вѣсѣ in Joseph Flavius and *Hamartolos*, оуставѣ (for στάθμιον) in *Hamartolos*, etc.; ‘threshold, door’: подебѡ in the *Prophetologion* of Grigorovič (Prv 8: 34; Ex 12: 7), in Is 57: 8, in Antioch’s *Pandects*<sup>29</sup>.

The word has 54 occurrences in the Septuagint in all of these meanings<sup>30</sup>. In the sentence cited above it means ‘threshold, doorpost’ (2Reg 25: 18). Translation *P* renders the word as мѣра ‘measure’, and a different mistake or misunderstanding is attested in the same Old Testament verse in the so-called *Archives Chronographicon*: и трѣи стрѣгоущѡѡ ѡнсло мѣдѡноѣ and *three keeping the copper number*<sup>31</sup>. Translation *A* uses the Greek word стафѡмѡуѣ – a borrowing, which is unattested in other Slavonic texts. Above the line, a translation and an explanation were added: прагы. рекше врата градоу “threshold, i.e. the gates to the city”. The word прагы ‘threshold’ is unambiguous and comprehensible and it shows Vladislav’s (or the commentator’s) understanding of the Old Testament citation and its context.

In the last two examples of this group, nos. 5 and 17, there are two occurrences of тѡтѡри above the original скѡн. These glosses will not be discussed here.

<sup>29</sup> The examples are listed in the dictionaries *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (*Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*), vol. I–LII, ed. J. KURZ et al., Praha 1958–1997; И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, vol. I–III, Санкт-Петербург 1893–1912, and in the indices of the editions.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. J. LUST, E. EYNIKEL, K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart 2003, s.v. σταθμός.

<sup>31</sup> М. ТОТОМАНОВА-ПАНЕВА, *Книги Царства в славянската хронографска традиция*, София 2019 [= КМс, 27], p. 87. The author suggests another initial translation: трѣи... ѡнсломиѣ дѣно *three in number... foundation*, but it does not correspond to the source text either.

## Group II. Biblical references (nos. 3, 13, 14, 21)

Some of Vladislav's glosses are connected directly or indirectly to a biblical quotation. Two of these cases were presented in the previous group (no. 3 *A* *CTOMAXЪ*, *supra l.* ЖЕЛЪДЪЦЬ, cf. 1Tim 5: 23, and no. 21 *A* *CTAΦЪMOYC*, *supra l.* ПРАГЪМЪ. РЕКЪШЕ ВРАТА ПРАДОУ, 2Reg 25: 18). The other two are the only instances in the homilies *De statuis*, in which the gloss coincides with the earliest translation *P* and deviates from *A*.

ὄς – *P* ВЕРЬ, *A* ННОКЪ, *in marg.* ВЕРЬ – cf. Ps 79: 14

*PG*, vol. XLIX, col. 125 Τὰ ἄλογα πάλιν ἐν τῷ σώματι τὰ ὄπλα ἔχει, οἷον ὁ βοῦς τὰ κέρατα, τοὺς ὀδόντας ὁ ὄς ὁ ἄγριος, τοὺς ὄνυχας ὁ λέων (*animals have weapons in their own bodies, just like the ox has its horns, the wild boar its tusks, the lion its claws*)

*P* (f. 116r): ВЕЗСАВНАА ПАКН В ТЕЛЕСН УРОУЖІА НАУПЪ, ТАКЪЖЕ СЕ ВЛАЪ РОГЫ, ЗΟΥБЫ ВЕРЬ ДНВІН, НУГЪТЫ ЛЕВЪ.

*A* (f. 173v): ВЕЗ'САОВЕСНАА ПАКЫ ВЪ Т'КЛЕСН НМОУТЪ УРОУЖІА. СНОУВЪ. ВОЛЪ, РОГЫ. ЗΟΥБЫ ННОКЪ ДНВІН. ЛЪВЪ, НОКЪТЫ.

*in marg.* ВЕРЬ

In homily 11, John Chrysostom describes the constitution of man, to whom God gave everything he needs, despite the fact that some animals are better equipped with weapons. Several beasts are mentioned, and the Greek ὁ ὄς ὁ ἄγριος 'wild boar' is rendered accordingly as ВЕРЬ ДНВНН in translation *P* and in Vladislav's gloss. The noun ВЕРЬ (sometimes in the phrase ВЕРЬ ДНВНН or ВЕРЬ ОУЪ ЛЖА) is attested in many Slavonic texts, such as the Psalter, 13 homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus, *Dialogues* of Pseudo-Kaisarios, Antioch's *Pandects*, Hamartolos' *Chronicle*, *Dioptra*, etc. It is present in Ps 79: 14 ἐλυμήνατο αὐτήν σὺς ἐκ δρυμοῦ καὶ μονιὸς ἄγριος κατενεμήσατο αὐτήν *The boar out of the woods uproots it, and the (single) wild beast of the field devours it*, the oldest translation has both words ВЕРЬ and ННОКЪ: УЗОБА I ВЕРЬ ОУЪ ЛЖА, ИНОКЪ ДНВВЫ ПО'КЛЪ ЕСТЪ (according to the Sinai Psalter). The word ННОКЪ 'single, lone' corresponds to μονιός in the Psalter, meaning 'a lone beast', probably a neologism in the Septuagint<sup>32</sup>. It is used as an adjective in 10<sup>th</sup>-century Old Bulgarian translations, such as works of John the Exarch, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory of Nazianzus. It means 'monk' in the translation of the *Nomokanon* in 14 titles and this is the main meaning in the later texts, e.g. in the *Dioptra*, in the works of Patriarch Euthymius, etc.

<sup>32</sup> J. LUST, E. EYNIKEL, K. HAUSPIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon...*, s.v. μονιός; *Slovník jazyka...*, s.v. инокъ. About the meaning of the root нн- 'one' and its use in compounds, see Л. ТАЦЕВА, *Хроно-топѣт на старобългарските композита с ин- 'един'*, Pbg 46.1, 2022, p. 51–80.

The 14<sup>th</sup>-century Athonite translator of *De stautis* chose the word **ннѡкѣ** for the Greek **ὄς** ‘boar, wild swine’ in a sentence that has no direct connection to the biblical verse. However, both the use of **ннѡкѣ** in *A* and Vladislav’s gloss **вепрь** can be ascribed to an indirect influence from the Psalter, where these two words are side by side.

**Βελίαρ** – *P* **вєлїарѣ**, *A* **сѣрѣльцѣ**, *supra l.* **вєлїарѣ** – 2Cor 6: 15

*PG*, vol. XLIX, col. 126 Τίς οὖν κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος, ἢ τίς συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαρ; (*Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial?*)

*P* (117v): **каа ѡбєцнна оубо свѣтѡу кѡ тмѣ, нн кѡє сѣрѣлшєнїє хѡу кѣ вєлїарѡу.**

*A* (176r): **коє оубо прнѡбєцнєнїє свѣтѡу кѣ тѣмѣ. нн коє сѣрѣлсїє хѡу кѣ сѣрѣлцѡу.**

*supra l.* **вєлїарѡу**

In homily 11, John Chrysostom advises against taking oaths and adds a citation from 2Cor 6: 15. In this verse, Paul mentions one of devil’s names Beliar / Belial. The Hebrew word **בְּלִיָּא** ‘belīya ‘al’ ‘worthlessness’ was not recognized as a proper name in the Old Testament and was translated in various ways in the Septuagint as παράνομος, λοιμός, ἄφρων, ἀσεβής, ἁμαρτωλός, ἀνομία etc. (cf. Deut 13: 14; Judg 19: 22; 1Sam 1: 16; 2: 12; 10: 27; 25: 17; 2Sam 16: 7, etc., 27 occurrences altogether)<sup>33</sup>. The name **вєлїарѣ** is attested in Old Church Slavonic translations both in the Apostolos (e.g. in the Christinopolitan, Slepče and Šišatovac manuscripts and in the same New Testament verse in Symeon’s florilegium of 1073), and in other contexts, e.g. in Suprasliensis. The translator of *A* monk Antonije must have known the quotation from Paul’s second epistle to Corinthians well. Nevertheless, in his translation **Βελίαρ** is rendered as **сѣрѣльцѣ**. It is an attempt at creating a new calque in order to be as close to the source text as possible. Apparently, the Hebrew word **βελίαρ** was erroneously etymologized from the Greek root of **βέλος** ‘arrow’, hence the rendition **сѣрѣльцѣ** ‘shooter’. The interlinear gloss can be explained either as a remnant from the process of translation, or as an indication that the scribe Vladislav recognized the New Testament verse and restored the correct reading **вєлїарѣ**.

<sup>33</sup> Fr. BROWN, S.R. DRIVER, C.A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the Hebrew Lexicon of W. Gesenius as Translated by E. Robinson*, Oxford 1939 (<sup>1</sup>Oxford 1906), p. 116. See a more detailed commentary and literature in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. I, ed. G. KITTEL, trans. et ed. G.W. BROMILEY, Grand Rapids 1978 (<sup>1</sup>Grand Rapids 1964), p. 607. In some instances, the Old Church Slavonic translation deviates considerably from this meaning because of an itacistic error **λοιμός** – **λιμός**, e.g. in 1Sam (1Kng) 10: 27, 1Sam (1Kng) 25: 17 and others, cf. M. ТОТОМАНОВА-ПАНЕВА, *Книгу Царства...*, p. 67.

In these examples (ὄς – *P* νεῖρη, *A* ηνοκτ̃, *in marg.* νεῖρη and Βελίαρ – *P* βελιηαρ̃, *A* στρ̃ελεμ̃, *supra l.* βελιηαρ̃) the 10<sup>th</sup>-century translation *P* and the glosses in translation *A* attest identical readings. It does not necessarily mean that the scribe was familiar with the earlier translation, because both sentences refer to biblical citations. However, some of the other glosses suggest that the annotator may have had access to the Greek homilies *On the statues* (e.g. nos. 2, 6, 8, etc.).

### Group III. Synonyms (nos. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10)

In a number of cases, the glosses are synonyms that have no obvious advantage over the original readings. They offer a glimpse into the origination of variant readings in the transmission history of medieval texts in general. One of these examples is discussed in detail below.

#### φλέγμα – *P* γλ̃ενη̃, *A* γλ̃ενη̃, *supra l.* χρακοτηνη̃

PG, vol. XLIX, col. 109 Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἡμετέρων ταῦτα γίνεται, καὶ χολῆς αὐξανομένης τίκτεται πυρετὸς, καὶ τῷ παντὶ ζῳῷ λυμαίνεται· καὶ φλέγματος πλεονάζοντος πολλὰ νοσήματα φύεται, καὶ διαφθείρει τὸ ζῶον. (*But this happens in respect to our bodies, and if the bile increases, fever appears and harms the entire organism, and if the phlegm is too much, many diseases emerge and destroy the living creature*)

*P* (f. 99v): н о телес̃εχ̃х̃ нашин̃х̃ се бывае̃т̃, н крог̃υνη̃ѣ раст̃υпи раждает̃ са̃ ωг̃нь н всак̃ъ жнвот̃ъ пωг̃оубладе̃т̃, н гн̃ѣн̃ѣ (*sic! in marg.* н г̃р̃εχ̃ς, *alii* γλ̃ενη̃ς) мн̃ожащю̃ са̃ мн̃ωг̃н̃ ιαζ̃α в̃ъ̃з̃раста̃ю̃т̃ н рас̃οраде̃т̃ жнвот̃ъ

*A* (f. 149v): н̃ѣ о т̃ѣлес̃εχ̃х̃ оубо̃ нашин̃, с̃ѣ̃а̃ б̃ыва̃ю̃. н̃ жа̃т̃υн̃ оубо̃ мн̃оже̃щю̃ се̃ ра̃жда̃ет̃ се̃ не̃дог̃ѣ, н̃ в̃ъ̃се̃ жнвот̃но̃е̃ в̃р̃ѣд̃н̃. н̃ гл̃ен̃о̃у̃ мн̃оже̃щю̃ се̃, мн̃ωс̃н̃ не̃дог̃зы̃ н̃з̃раста̃ю̃т̃ н̃ раст̃а̃ѣва̃ю̃т̃ жнвот̃но̃е̃.

*supra l.* χρακοτηνη̃ѣ

Homily 9 discusses the wonders of the Universe and its Creator, one of them being the balanced and harmonious coexistence of opposite elements. At one point, John Chrysostom alludes to the Hippocratic humoral theory and the connection between the bodily fluids and health.

The theory of Hippocrates (ca. 460–370 BCE), developed and popularized by Galen (ca. 129–216 CE), was well known and widely accepted in all parts of Medieval Europe, including the Slavic world. According to this theory, the body consists of four fluids, or humours (blood, yellow bile, black bile, phlegm), that have specific properties (hot and wet, hot and dry, cold and dry, cold and wet), and correspond to the four seasons (spring, summer, autumn, winter), stages of human life (childhood, youth, maturity, old age), and natural elements (air, fire, earth, water)<sup>34</sup>. Their balance or imbalance influences the body's well-being, the moods,

<sup>34</sup> The literature on this topic is vast, see, e.g., J. JOUANNA, *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers*, Leiden–Boston 2012 [= SAM, 40]. Particularly on John Chrysostom (with additional

etc. It is often in this physiological context that the word ‘phlegm’ is used, but it can also mean ‘fluid, moisture’ in a more general sense.

In the sentence cited above, both translations have **ГЛѢНЪ**. The word is attested in 10<sup>th</sup>-century translations from Preslav with the meanings ‘phlegm’, ‘pus’, or ‘fluid’, e.g. in John the Exarch’s *Bogoslovie* (*Nebesa*), Tsar Symeon’s florilegium of 1073 (*Izbornik*), *Zlatostruy* (homily 23), in homilies by Ephrem the Syrian and Gregory of Nazianzus, and in the *Life of John Chrysostom*<sup>35</sup>. Later attestations of **ГЛѢНЪ** are rare and its presence in the Athos translation of *Andrianty* may be attributed to the influence of the earlier 10<sup>th</sup>-century translation **P**<sup>36</sup>. It is preserved in some of the Slavic languages and dialects (e.g. in Czech and Slovenian), but in others (such as Serbian and Croatian) it was replaced by different words.

Apparently, from the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards, other synonyms denoting ‘phlegm’ were preferred. For instance, in book 5 of *Dioptra* of Philippos Monotropos (in its Middle-Bulgarian 14<sup>th</sup>-century translation), the humoral theory is discussed again and this particular fluid is called **ХРАКАННЕ, ХРАКОТНА, ФЛЕГМА, СЛОУЗЪ**<sup>37</sup>. Another medieval text dealing with physiological matters is the so-called **Галново на Ипократа** (*Galen’s Interpretations of the Doctrine of Hippocrates*, Greek text untraced, earliest Serbian and Russian copies from the 15<sup>th</sup> century), in which two words for ‘phlegm’ are used – **ФЛЕГМА** and **МОКРОТА**<sup>38</sup>. According to a relatively late dietary calendar, which draws a direct connection between seasons, bodily fluids, and food,

---

bibliography): C.L. DE WET, *A Case of (Galenic?) Natural πνεῦμα in a Late-Antique Homily of John Chrysostom?*, *Akro* 67, 2022, p. 87–100. In the Slavic tradition: Цв. КРИСТАНОВ, Ив. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Естествознанието в средновековна България (Сборник от исторически извори)*, София 1954, p. 516–525.

<sup>35</sup> See Fr. MIKLOSICH, *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865, s.v. **ГЛѢНЪ**. One of the examples, noted as “greg.-lab. 91”, is from the *Translation of the relics of John Chrysostom* in a 14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript from the Ukrainian National Library in Lviv, MB 81, f. 91. It is the last part of the *Life of John Chrysostom*, which was sometimes copied separately, cf. BHBS, p. 454, but the same sentence with this word is found also in the unpublished part of the complete text, translated in the 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> century, cf. E. HANSACK, *Die Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos des Georgios von Alexandrien in kirchenslavischer Übersetzung*, vol. I–III, Würzburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1975–1984 [= *MLSDV*, 10.1–3].

<sup>36</sup> See A. ДИМИТРОВА, *Два цялостни южнославянски превода...*

<sup>37</sup> Fr. MIKLOSICH, *Lexicon...* Since the fifth book of *Dioptra* is not yet critically published, I could only verify the use of **ХРАКАННЕ, ХРАКОТНА** in two of the two hundred manuscripts, cf. H. MIKLAS, J. FUCHSBAUER, *Die kirchenslavische Übersetzung der Dioptra des Philippos Monotropos*, vol. I, Wien 2013 (nos. 14 and 22 on their list). All examples can be found in the searchable online edition of *Dioptra* at [https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/textcorpus/show/doc\\_160](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/textcorpus/show/doc_160) [28 IV 2024].

<sup>38</sup> Цв. КРИСТАНОВ, Ив. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Естествознанието...*, p. 516–525; А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Разсъждения на Гален върху учението на Хипократ*, [in:] *Естествознание*, София 1992, p. 441–442; В. МИЛЪКОВ, *Древнерусские апокрифы. Памятники древнерусской мысли: исследования и тексты*, Санкт-Петербург 1999, p. 454–476; И. КУЗИДОВА-КАРАДЖИНОВА, *Диетологичните текстове в средновековната славянска книжнина. Предварителни бележки*, [in:] *Кирило-Методиевски четения 2019*, София 2020, p. 139–153 (viz. p. 141, 145).



in March *phlegm leaves the man and blood fills his body* (earliest known copy MS no. 115 from the National Library in Plovdiv, 1674, see f. 617r  $\bar{\omega}$   $\bar{\nu}\lambda\kappa\alpha$   $\chi\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\alpha$   $\bar{\omega}\chi\delta$ )<sup>39</sup>. Various other apocryphal and popular texts concerning calendars, diet recommendations, medical advice etc., were compiled in miscellanies and copied for the use of the general public, but their textual history is so complicated and understudied that it is impossible at this stage to systematize the data about their vocabulary. However, the examples cited above demonstrate that  $\chi\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\alpha$  is the dominant South Slavic term for 'phlegm' in the 14<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>40</sup>.

In the Rila manuscript, Vladislav wrote  $\chi\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\eta\kappa$  in red ink above the word  $\gamma\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\gamma$ . The remark looks like a vernacular "translation" of a literary lexeme, but it is rather an adequate substitution of dated terminology. This is well demonstrated in the next example from homily 10, in which the humoral theory is explained again:

PG, vol. XLIX, col. 113 Καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἡμέτερον τὸ βραχὺ τοῦτο καὶ μικρὸν ἐκ τεττάρων συνέστηκε στοιχείων, θερμοῦ μὲν τοῦ αἵματος, ξηροῦ δὲ τῆς χολῆς τῆς ξανθῆς· καὶ ὑγροῦ μὲν τοῦ φλέγματος, ψυχροῦ δὲ τῆς μελαίνης χολῆς (*And this temporal and small body of ours consists of four elements, hot, that is the blood, dry is the yellow bile, wet is the phlegm, and cold is the black bile*)

**P** (f. 103v):  $\text{HE BO H}\bar{\omega}$   $\text{T}\bar{\beta}\text{E}\text{LO}$   $\text{NASH}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\text{XOY}\bar{\Delta}\text{O}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\text{CE}$   $\text{H}$   $\text{M}\bar{\alpha}\text{LO}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\bar{\omega}$   $\text{YETY}\bar{\rho}$   $\text{C}\bar{\omega}\text{T}\bar{\omega}\text{H}\bar{\eta}\text{T}$   $\text{C}\bar{\alpha}$   $\text{COC}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\text{B}\bar{\eta}\text{T}\bar{\beta}$ ,  $\text{T}\bar{\epsilon}\text{P}\bar{\lambda}\text{M}\bar{\alpha}$   $\text{OY}\bar{\beta}\text{O}$   $\text{KPOB}\bar{\eta}$   $\text{COY}\bar{\chi}$   $\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}$   $\text{JE}$   $\text{KPY}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\text{POY}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\Sigma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\text{H}$   $\text{MOKP}\bar{\alpha}$   $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ ,  $\text{CTY}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}$   $\text{KPY}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$

**A** (f. 155v):  $\text{HEO}$   $\text{T}\bar{\beta}\text{E}\text{LO}$   $\text{NASH}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\text{HJE}$   $\text{M}\bar{\alpha}\text{LO}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\text{H}$   $\text{XOY}\bar{\Delta}\text{O}\bar{\epsilon}$ ,  $\text{C}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}$   $\bar{\omega}$   $\text{YETY}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\chi}\bar{\eta}$   $\text{C}\bar{\beta}\bar{\Sigma}\text{TOH}\bar{\eta}\text{T}$   $\text{CE}$   $\text{C}\bar{\beta}\bar{\Sigma}\text{TAV}\bar{\beta}\bar{\chi}\bar{\eta}$ .  $\text{T}\bar{\omega}\text{P}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\text{G}\text{O}$   $\text{OY}\bar{\beta}\text{O}$ ,  $\text{KPY}\bar{\beta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ .  $\text{COY}\bar{\chi}\bar{\alpha}\text{G}\text{O}$   $\text{JE}$ ,  $\text{J}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}$   $\text{Y}\bar{\rho}\bar{\tau}\bar{\beta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}$ .  $\text{H}$   $\text{MOKP}\bar{\alpha}\text{G}\text{O}$   $\text{OY}\bar{\beta}\text{O}$ ,  $\text{X}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\eta$ .  $\text{CTOY}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\text{G}\text{O}$   $\text{JE}$ ,  $\text{Y}\bar{\rho}\bar{\tau}\bar{\beta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$   $\text{J}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}$ .

<sup>39</sup> I. KUZIDOVA-KARADZHINOVA, *Dietary Calendars in the Slavic Middle Ages: A Case Study*, SCer 11, 2021, p. 269–282 (see a picture from the same manuscript, but for the month of February, on p. 280); A. БОЯДЖИЕВ, *Поправка на зодиите*, [in:] *Естествознание...*, p. 312, 486. I am grateful to Irina Kuzidova-Karadzchinova for all the unpublished materials she generously shared with me.

<sup>40</sup> The list of examples is by no means exhaustive. Another occurrence of  $\chi\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\alpha$  is found in a homily by Andrew of Crete, *Homilia de humana vita et de defunctis* (CPG 8192, BHG 2103p), whose Slavic translation is well attested in numerous copies from the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards of the so-called Lenten Triodion Panegyrikon of the new recension (e.g. in manuscripts Hilf. 34, 14<sup>th</sup> century, f. 46r, Kopitar 5, 1574, f. 37v, etc.), see К. ИВАНОВА, Е. ВЕЛКОВСКА, *Хиландарская рукопись № 404 (предварительные заметки к истории новоизводных триодных панигириков на Афоне)*, [in:] *Афон и славянский мир. Сборник I*, Святая Гора Афон 2014, p. 235–255. There are two more occurrences of 'phlegm',  $\chi\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\eta\alpha$  and  $\text{C}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\omega}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\Sigma}$ , in one of the additional homilies in RM 3/6, *Ad Theodorum lapsam liber I* (CPG 4305), on f. 432r–v (another copy of the text is probably available in a 14<sup>th</sup>-century Bulgarian manuscript GIM Voskr. 105-bum., see *Иоанн Златоуст в древнерусской и южнославянской письменности XI–XVI веков. Каталог гомилий*, ed. Е. ГРАНСТРЕМ, О. ТВОРОГОВ, А. ВАЛЕВИЧЮС, Санкт-Петербург 1998, no. 191; this translation has not been studied yet).

In this case, the word *χρακοτήνη* is part of the main text, preferred by the Athonite translator Antonije in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The use of *глѣнѣ* a few folios before that should be considered a remnant from the underlying 10<sup>th</sup>-century translation.

Other examples of synonym glosses include variants such as no. 1 *ῥοδωνιά* ‘rose-garden’ – *Р* *цвѣтѣвъннѣ свѣтѣннѣ* (literally ‘flower shine’), *А* *роужи* (cf. lat. *rosa*, gr. *ῥόδον* ‘rose’), *supra l.* *шнпѣци* (*шнпѣкѣ* ‘rose’ is attested as early as Suprasliensis, John the Exarch’s *Bogoslovie*, Pseudo-Kaisarios, etc.; and the same gloss *шнпѣкѣ* for *ρῆζα* is found in another manuscript written by Vladislav, RM 4/14, f. 45r); no. 4 *πυκνή* ‘frequent, thick’ – *Р* *вѣстѣ*, *А* *вѣстѣ* (attested in Suprasliensis), *supra l.* *гжстѣ*; no. 9 *τρόπις* ‘ship’s keel’ – *Р* *дѣно* ‘bottom’, *А* *лжкѣ* ‘bow, arch’, *supra l.* *грѣбѣ* ‘back’; no. 10 *ἔδαφος* ‘ground, foundation, bottom’ – *Р* *помостѣ* (attested in Pseudo-Kaisarios, Symeon’s florilegium of 1073, and others), *А* *земля*, *supra l.* *подѣ*. The general trend in these glosses is towards clarification and, in most cases, updating of the language.

**Group IV. Varia (closer to Greek: nos. 2, 6, 8, 11, 16; further from Greek: nos. 5, 12, 17, 19)**

Many glosses are difficult to classify. Some of them suggest that the annotator had access to the Greek original (i.e. the annotations were made by an editor, a scribe, or the translator himself), e.g. no. 8 *σύλλογος* ‘assembly’ – *Р* *сѣборѣ*, *А* *сѣбѣраннѣ*, *supra l.* [*сѣ*] *словнѣ*, in which the addition *словѣ* above *сѣбѣраннѣ* corresponds better to the Greek root *-λογος* in *σύλλογος*; in no. 6 *ῥα* (*ῥῶν* ‘of the hours’) – *Р* *врѣменинѣ* ‘temporary, temporal’, *А* *врѣмя* (*врѣмениномѣ* ‘of the times’), *supra l.* *часѣ* (*часовомѣ* ‘of the hours’), the gloss is a literal translation of the Greek word. In other cases, however, the notes deviate from the original, hence they can hardly be ascribed to the translator, e.g. the preference *тапѣри* over *сквѣн* in nos. 5 and 17 (see above). In no. 19 *τὸ ἥμισυ* ‘half’ – *Р* *полѣ*, *А* *полѣ* ‘half’, *supra l.* *мѣножѣстѣво* ‘(greater) amount, majority’, John Chrysostom says that half of the Lenten period has passed, referring to the time of pronouncing his homilies; since this is homily 18 out of 22, Vladislav must have calculated that more than half of the time had passed.

These examples open the floor for discussion about the influence from the Greek text and the first translation *Р* on the marginal and interlinear notes. Vladislav may have used the Greek sources, but there is no indication that he was familiar with the Preslav translation. There remains the possibility that some of the glosses may originate from the translator, a previous editor, or another scribe – a hypothesis that cannot be proven at this stage of research.

## Conclusions

The 14<sup>th</sup>-century Athonite translation *A* of John Chrysostom's *De statuis* is a precise and sometimes literal rendition of its Greek sources, occasionally showing traces from the underlying Old Bulgarian translation *P*. The author of the interlinear and marginal glosses (who may have been the scribe of the 15<sup>th</sup>-century copy Vladislav the Grammarian) kept the original reading of his source even when he disagreed with it, and added occasional notes in the margins and between the lines without any consistent pattern. The notes are distributed unevenly across the homilies, and there are many other instances in which he chose not to annotate. In most cases, he was a competent and observant editor, who usually corrected or updated the language according to his contemporary terminology. Even if Vladislav was not the sole author of the glosses in RM 3/6, they deserve a more detailed study, especially in comparison with the other manuscripts that are known to have been written by him.

## Bibliography

- BOJADŽIEV A., *Popravka na zodiite*, [in:] *Estestvoznanie*, Sofija 1992, p. 312, 486.
- BROWN FR., DRIVER S.R., BRIGGS C.A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the Hebrew Lexicon of W. Gesenius as Translated by E. Robinson*, Oxford 1939 (1<sup>st</sup> Oxford 1906).
- BRUNI A.M., *Vizantijskaja tradicija i staroslavjanskij perevod Slova Grigorija Nazianzina*, vol. I, Moskva 2010.
- BUDILOVIČ A., *XIII slovo Grigorija Bogoslova v drevneslavjanskom perevode po rukopisi Imperatorskoj publičnoj biblioteki XI veka. Kritiko-paleografičeskij trud*, Sankt-Peterburg 1875.
- DANČEV G., *Vladislav Gramatik, knižovnik i pisatel*, Sofija 1969.
- DE WET C.L., *A Case of (Galenic?) Natural πνεῦμα in a Late-Antique Homily of John Chrysostom?*, "Akroterion" 67, 2022, p. 87–100, <https://doi.org/10.7445/67--1048>
- DIMITROVA A., *Četene s razbirane: za filosofite s brada, tojaga i vehta nametka v Zlatoustovite besedi Za statuite (Andrianti)*, [in:] *Četivoto za mirjani v južnoslavjanskija repertoar XIV–XVIII v.*, Sofija 2024 (in print).
- DIMITROVA A., *Dva cjalostni južnoslavjanski prevoda na Zlatoustovija sbornik Andrianti*, [in:] *Učitelnoto evangelie na Konstantin Preslavski i južnoslavjanskite prevodi na homiletični tekstove (IX–XIII v.). Filologičeski i interdisciplinarni rakursi. Dokladi ot Meždunarodnata naučna konferencija v Sofija 25–27 april 2023 g.*, ed. L. TASEVA, A. RABUS, I.P. PETROV, Sofija 2024 [= *Studia Balcanica*, 37], p. 365–386.
- GOŠEV I., *Rilski glagoličeski listove*, Sofija 1956.
- HANSACK E., *Die Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos des Georgios von Alexandrien in kirchenslavischer Übersetzung*, vol. I–III, Würzburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1975–1984 [= *Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris*, 10.1–3].

- HRISTOVA B., *Opis na rākopisite na Vladislav Gramatik*, Veliko Tārnovo 1996.
- HRISTOVA-ŠOMOVA I., *Služebnijat Apostol v slavjanskata rākopisna tradicija*, vol. I, *Izsledvane na biblejskija tekst*, Sofija 2004.
- Ioann Zlatoust v drevnerusskoj i južnoslavjanskoj pis'mennosti XI–XVI vekov. Katalog gomilij, ed. E. GRANSTREM, O. TVOROGOV, A. VALEVIČJUS, Sankt-Peterburg 1998.
- ISTRIN V.M., *Knigy vremen'nyja i obraznyja Georgija Mniha. Hronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjanorusskom perevode. Tekst, issledovanie i slovar'*, vol. I, *Tekst*, Petrograd 1920.
- IVANOVA K., VELKOVSKA E., *Hilandarskaja rukopis' № 404 (predvaritel'nye zametki k istorii novoizvodnyh triodnyh panigirikov na Afone)*, [in:] *Afon i slavjanskij mir. Sbornik I*, Svjataja Gora Afon 2014, p. 235–255.
- JOUANA J., *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers*, Leiden–Boston 2012 [= *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, 40], <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004232549>
- KAEUŽNIACKI Aem., *Actus epistolaeque apostolorum palaeo-slovenice. Ad fidem codicis Christinopolitani saeculo XII scripti*, Vienna 1896.
- KRISTANOV CV., DUJČEV IV., *Estestvoznaniето v srednovekovna Bālgarija (Sbornik ot istoričeski izvori)*, Sofija 1954.
- KUZIDOVA-KARADZHINOVA I., *Dietary Calendars in the Slavic Middle Ages: A Case Study*, "Studia Ceranea" 11, 2021, p. 269–282, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.11.13>
- KUZIDOVA-KARADŽINOVA I., *Dietologičnite tekstove v srednovekovnata slavjanska knižnina. Predvaritelni beležki*, [in:] *Kirilo-Methodievski četenija 2019*, Sofija 2020, p. 139–153.
- LEVŠINA Ž., *Rukopisi serbskogo pravopisanija Rossijskoj nacional'noj biblioteki. Katalog*, Sankt-Peterburg 2021.
- LUST J., EYNIKEL E., HAUSPIE K., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart 2003.
- MIKLAS H., FUCHSBAUER J., *Die kirchenslavische Übersetzung der Dioptra des Philippos Monotropos*, vol. I, Wien 2013.
- MIKLOSICH FR., *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865.
- MIL'KOV V., *Drevnerusskie apokrify. Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj mysli: issledovanija i teksty*, Sankt-Peterburg 1999.
- MILTENOV Y., *Dialozite na Pseudo-Kesarij v slavjanskata rākopisna tradicija*, Sofija 2006.
- MILTENOV Y., *Zlatostruj: starobālgarski homiletičen svod, sāzdaden po iniciativa na bālgarskija car Simeon. Tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, Sofija 2013.
- MILTENOVA A., *Razsāždenija na Galen vārhu učenieto na Hipokrat*, [in:] *Estestvoznanie*, Sofija 1992, p. 441–442.
- MOŠIN V., *Čirilski rukopisi manastira Sv. Trojice kod Pljevalja*, "Исторijski zapisi" / "Istorijski zapisi" 1–2, 1958, p. 235–260, <https://istorijskizapisi.me/artwork/the-new-issue-of-istorijski-zapisi-1-2-1958-is-published-ecrits-historiques/> [30 IX 2024].
- MOŠIN V., *K datirovke rukopisej iz sobranija A.F. Gil'ferdinga Gosudarstvennoj publičnoj biblioteki*, "Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы" / "Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury" 15, 1958, p. 409–417.
- PANAITESCU P., *Manuscritele slave din Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R.*, vol. I, București 1959.
- Paraenesis. Die albulgarische Übersetzung von Werken Ephraims des Syrers, vol. IV, ed. G. BOJKOVSKY, R. AITZETMÜLLER, Freiburg im Breisgau 1988.
- SELS L., *Gregory of Nyssa. De hominis officio. О образѣ чловѣка. The Fourteenth-Century Slavonic Translation. A Critical Edition with Greek Parallel and Commentary*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2009.

- SELS L., *Manuscripts and Margins: The Case of the Late Mediaeval Slavonic Hexaemeron Collection or Šestodnevnik and its Greek Source Text*, [in:] *Caught in Translation. Studies on Versions of Late-Antique Christian Literature*, ed. M. ТОСА, D. БАТОВИЋ, Leiden–Boston 2020, p. 160–179, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004417182\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004417182_010)
- СКОК Р., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb 1971–1973.
- Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.*, vol. V, Moskva 1978.
- Slovník jazyka staroslověnského (Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae)*, vol. I–LII, ed. J. KURZ et al., Praha 1958–1997.
- СПЕРАНСКИЈ М., *Zagrebskijät räkopis na Vladislava Gramatika*, “Сборник за народни умотворенија, наука и книжнина” / “Sbornik za narodni utovorenija, nauka i knižnina” 16–17, 1900, p. 325–338.
- СПРОСТРАНОВ Е., *Opis na räkopisite v bibliotekata pri Rilskija manastir*, Sofija 1902.
- СРЕЗНЕВСКИЈ И., *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka po piš'mennym pamjatnikam*, vol. I–III, Sankt-Peterburg 1893–1912.
- СТАНКОВИЋ Р., *Rukopisne knjige manastira Svete Trojice kod Pljevalja. Vodeni znaci i datiranje*, Beograd 2003.
- СУБОТИЋ Г., *Obnova manastira Svetog Pavla*, “Зборник Радова Византолошког Института” / “Zbornik radova Vizantološkog Instituta” 22, 1983, p. 207–254.
- ТАСЕВА Л., *Hronotopät na starobälgarskite kompozita s in- 'edin'*, “Palaeobulgarica” 46.1, 2022, p. 51–80.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. I, ed. G. KITTEL, trans. et ed. G.W. BROMILEY, Grand Rapids 1978 (Grand Rapids 1964).
- ТОТОМАНОВА-ПАНЕВА М., *Knigi Carstva v slavjanskata hronografska tradicija*, Sofija 2019 [= Кирило-Методиевски студии / Kirilo-Methodievski studii, 27].
- ТРИФУНОВИЋ Ђ., *Pisac i prevodilac inok Isaija*, Kruševac 1980.
- ТУРИЛОВ А., *Andrianty*, [in:] *Pravoslavnaja ènciklopedija*, vol. II, Moskva 2001, p. 410, <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/115376.html> [1 X 2024].
- VOSS C., *Die Handschrift Nr. 137 (69) der Nationalbibliothek Bukarest: eine bisher kaum bemerkte Neuübersetzung der Paränesis Ephraims des Syrsers*, “Palaeobulgarica” 19.2, 1995, p. 27–44.
- WEIHER E., *Einige Bemerkungen und Ergänzungen zu neueren Arbeiten über die altbulgarische Übersetzung der Paraenesis Ephraims des Syrsers und ihre Überlieferung*, “Anzeiger für slavische Philologie” 20, 1990, p. 135–145.

**Aneta Dimitrova**

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”  
Department of Cyrillo-Methodian Studies  
15 Tsar Osloboditel Blvd.  
1504 Sofia, Bulgaria  
[anetagd@uni-sofia.bg](mailto:anetagd@uni-sofia.bg)