

Francis J. Thomson (Antwerp, Belgium)

THE SYMEONIC FLORILEGIUM — PROBLEMS OF ITS ORIGIN,  
CONTENT, TEXTOLGY AND EDITION, TOGETHER WITH AN  
ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE EULOGY OF TZAR SYMEON

The ninthundredth anniversary of the earliest Slav codex of a florilegium which was translated from Greek between 914 and 927<sup>1</sup> at the express command of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria, viz. codex 1043 (formerly 31D) of the Russian Synodal collection copied in 1073, was marked by a conference held at Leningrad 31 October — 1 November 1974<sup>2</sup> and it was subsequently agreed that the Russians should publish a facsimile of the codex and the Bulgarians undertake a printed edition of both the Slavonic and Greek texts. After extensive restoration in 1978-1981 a superb facsimile edition appeared in 1983<sup>3</sup> and now the printed edition of the text has been published as the first of three volumes; the second will contain a complete lexicon of the translation and the third the Greek text. Before examining the actual edition, let us briefly review the nine articles prefaced to it.

In the "Cultural and Historical Significance of Symeon's Miscellany"<sup>4</sup>, an article already published in 1989<sup>5</sup>, the late and much lamented P. Dinekov

<sup>1</sup> The *terminus post quem* is the final entry in the list of rulers at the end of the codex on f. 266r, viz. Constantine (V, 908/911-959) and Zoc (914-919/20). This list is not a later addition to the florilegium — on this see below — and thus the theory advanced by Левочкин, И. „Отечские книги“ и Изборник Святослава 1073 года. — Советское славяноведение, 1985, № 6, 76-80, sec p. 78, that the translation was made in Moravia by Methodius is aberrant. The *terminus ante quem* is Symeon's death in 927.

<sup>2</sup> The papers were published in Изборник Святослава 1073 г. Сборник статей. М., 1977.

<sup>3</sup> Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Факсимильное издание. М., 1983. The accompanying volume has the subtitle: Научный аппарат факсимильного издания.

<sup>4</sup> In Сборник (the abbreviation used here for the work under review), 9—17. Each of the articles is accompanied by résumés in Russian and English. The English is on the whole quite good with only occasional obscurities, e. g. *the Bulgarian ruler was well acquainted not only with Byzantine literature, and philosophy but also with those of Antiquity (17)*. Clearly this must read either . . . *not only with Byzantine but also with Classical . . .*, or . . . *and philosophy of Byzantium, but also . . .* Why we have to have names such as *Knyaz Svetoslav (98)* and *George Chirovoskos (33)* instead of Prince Svyatoslav and George Choiroboskos (or Choiroboskos) is unclear. The titles of the articles as given in the English résumés are used here for reference purposes.

<sup>5</sup> Динев, П. Проблеми на старата българска литература. С., 1989, 226—236. It should be noted that it repeats much of what he wrote in his Симеоновиат (Светославо-виат) Изборник от 1073 г. в развитието на българската литература. — Старобългарска литература, 5, 1979, 3—9 а Russian version of which is found in Изборник (see above p. 2), 272-279, including some of the same mistakes, e. g. that 10,000 epistles are ascribed to Isidore of Pelusium (13; cf. 1979, 6; 1977, 277). The most ever ascribed to him is *almost three*

gives a succinct outline of the importance of the translation for the development of Slav culture and the Old Bulgarian language. One or two of his assertions must, however, be rejected as inaccurate, e. g. the idea that the translation of George Choïroboscus' *De tropis poelicis* is found in codices other than those of the Symeonian florilegium<sup>6</sup>, a claim repeated here also by A. Mincheva<sup>7</sup>, but rightly denied by K. Ivanova<sup>8</sup>. This is only one of the many examples of contradictions between the articles which should have been eliminated by better editing. Another example is Dinekov's claim that John the Exarch played a major role in the translation of the florilegium<sup>9</sup>, which is contradicted by the results of an analysis by A. Mincheva<sup>10</sup>. The most serious misconception in Dinekov's article is, however, his mistaken belief that the concluding entry in the 1073 codex on ff. 264<sup>r</sup>-266<sup>r</sup>, viz. *ЛѢТОПИСЬЦЪ ВЪ КРАТЪЦѢ ОТЪ ЛЕВЪ*

*ГОУСТА ДАЖЕ И ДО КΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΑ Η ΖΩΙΑ, ЦѢРЬ ГРЪЦЬСΚΩΝ ΗΧ* is a ninth-century Bulgarian compilation similar to the *ЛѢТОПИСЬЦЪ* of Constantine of Preslav<sup>11</sup>. Quite apart from the fact that there is no obvious link between the latter work and Constantine<sup>12</sup>, the Greek original of the *ЛѢТОПИСЬЦЪ* is found in two of the Greek codices of the florilegium, viz. *Laura Γ 115* and *Coislin 120*<sup>13</sup>, and it was obviously translated at the same time as the rest of the florilegium and is not a later addition, as both Ivanova<sup>14</sup> and Mincheva<sup>15</sup> also incorrectly claim.

In her article "Symeon's Miscellany as a Literary Work"<sup>16</sup>, K. Ivanova situates the florilegium amongst similar Byzantine miscellanies and surveys its contents. Unfortunately she rarely indicates the Greek sources and in places reveals that she does not know them all. She thus vaguely says that the three *indices librorum canonicorum et prohibitorum* on ff. 252<sup>r</sup>-253<sup>r</sup>, 253<sup>r</sup>-<sup>v</sup> and 253<sup>v</sup>-254<sup>r</sup> were *probably taken from some ecclesiastico-canonical work*<sup>17</sup>. In fact they are: a) an excerpt from John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*<sup>18</sup>; b) Gregory of Nazianzus' *Carmen dogmaticum XII*<sup>19</sup>; c) pseudo-Isidore of Pelusium's *De LX libris et quinam extra illos sint*<sup>20</sup>. Or again, she identifies the entry on ff. 243<sup>v</sup>-

*thousand* by Severus of Antioch, confirmed by Suidas, while the edition in Migne, J. P. *Patrologia graeca* (=PG), t. 78, has 2012, 19 of which are duplicates.

<sup>6</sup> Сборник, 13—14.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 175—178.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>12</sup> See Thompson, F. Constantine of Preslav and the Old Bulgarian Translation of the 'Historia ecclesiastica et mystica contemplatio' Attributed to Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople. — *Palaeobulgarica*, 1986, № 1, 41—48, see p. 47, n. 52.

<sup>13</sup> In the latter codex the ending of it is missing. It has been edited by Бибииков, М. Сравнительный анализ состава „Изборника Святослава 1073 г.“ и его византийских аналогов. — *Византийский временник*, 51, 1990, 92-102, see 99-100. The Slavonic text differs slightly from the Greek, but there is no reason to suspect that these differences are due to the Slav translator since some of the variants are found in other Greek *chronica minor*, see Янева, П. За изворите на *Летопись кратъцъ в Изборника 1073*. — *Palaeobulgarica*, 1987, № 3, 98—104, see 103—104; she also edits the beginning of the Greek text preserved in *Coislin 120*, *ibid.*, 100. Speculation as to why it is found after the colophon in the 1073 codex, e. g. by Lunt, H., *On the Izbornik of 1073*. — *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 7, 1983, 359—376, see p. 364, n. 17, is pointless.

<sup>14</sup> Сборник, p. 30.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 18—33.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>18</sup> Ed. PG, t. 94, 1177—1180.

<sup>19</sup> Ed. PG, t. 37, 472—474 (also t. 138, 924).

<sup>20</sup> Ed. PG, t. 1, 515—517.

246<sup>v</sup> as an excerpt from Theodoret of Cyrrihus' *De theologia sanctae Trinitatis et de oeconomia*<sup>21</sup>, whereas it is made up of a series of passages from book 5 of his *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*<sup>22</sup>. She equally vaguely states that the four excerpts from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oratio XL* on ff. 120<sup>v</sup>-122<sup>v</sup> have a text similar to that of the earliest translation of his homilies<sup>23</sup>, whereas in fact they are later interpolations into the florilegium from that translation<sup>24</sup>.

Of all the articles the longest is K. Kuev's "Origins and Circulation of Symeon's Miscellany"<sup>25</sup>, which contains a survey of most of the codices of the translation. In each case only a few of the entries -- selected apparently at random -- are described, and for no obvious reason the corresponding entries in the 1073 codex are every time given in a parallel column so that the description of the entries in the latter codex is constantly repeated. Clearly all that was required was in each case to point out the variations from the 1073 codex. Nowhere does he state which codices he is describing *de visu* and he frequently contradicts not only other descriptions but even his own, e. g. first he states that *Vilnius 260* has 292 folia with the beginning and one folio in the middle missing<sup>26</sup>; he then states that a) the list of contents is on ff. 288<sup>v</sup>-294<sup>v</sup><sup>27</sup> and b) there are two gaps in the middle of the codex<sup>28</sup>, and he finally proceeds to describe the missing first entry in the codex<sup>29</sup> without informing the bewildered reader that he has in fact taken this information from the list of contents at the end of the codex<sup>30</sup>. Or again, he claims that all 16th-century codices are Russian<sup>31</sup>, whereas he has already listed *Rumanian Academy 310* as being Serbian<sup>32</sup>.

His descriptions are, moreover, frequently inaccurate. To give but four examples:

1) the dating of *Cyril of Beloye Ozero 5/1082* to 1445<sup>33</sup> was already shown in 1885 to be a misreading of the word *Amen* in the colophon<sup>34</sup> and the codex is of the late 15th -- early 16th century. It is also incorrect to state<sup>35</sup> that many folia are missing;

<sup>21</sup> Ed. PG, t. 75, 1148--1189.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. PG, t. 83, 336--556, see p. 441, 448, 453, 457, 477, 480, 481--484.

<sup>23</sup> Сборник, p. 24, n. 28.

<sup>24</sup> Compare Сборник, 436--440, and the earliest Slavonic translation of *Oratio XL*. Ed. A. Будилович. XIII слов Григория Богослова в древнеславянском переводе по рукописи Императорской Публичной Библиотеки XI века. СПб., 1875, 73--110, cf. 82-83, 80, 81, 86--87.

<sup>25</sup> Сборник, 34--98. As is often the case in Kuev's articles, he inserts whole passages taken from previous articles; compare, to give but two examples, *ibid.*, p. 34 and 56 with К у е в, К. Археологически бележки за разпространението на Симеоновия (Светославовия) сборник в старите славянски литератури. -- Старобългарска литература, 5, 1979, 38-56, cf. p. 38 and p. 50.

<sup>26</sup> Сборник, p. 73.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>30</sup> This becomes clear when his description is compared with that in Д о б р я н с к и й, Ф. Описание рукописей Виленской публичной библиотеки, церковно-славянских и русских. Vilnius, 1882, 432--439, see p. 432.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70. It is in fact Wallachian.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48. Incidentally he wrongly, *ibid.*, p. 46, gives its number as 1/1082.

<sup>34</sup> See M a s i n g, L. Studien zur Kenntnis des Izbornik Svjatoslava vom Jahre 1073 nebst Bemerkungen zu den jüngeren Handschriften. -- Archiv für slavische Philologie, 8, 1885, 357--395; 9, 1886, 77--112, see 373-374; Р о з о в, Н. О датировке и локализации Кирилло-Белозерского списка Изборника Симеона--Святослава. -- В: Русско-болгарские связи в области книжного дела. Сборник научных трудов. (=Актуальные проблемы книговедения, 5). М., 1981, 22--35.

<sup>35</sup> Сборник, p. 46.

2) he first states that *Volokolamsk 138 496*<sup>36</sup> has 306 folia and contains the *second* part of the florilegium on ff. 216<sup>r</sup>-306<sup>v</sup><sup>37</sup> and then proceeds to describe entries allegedly on ff. 216<sup>r</sup>-234<sup>r</sup> of the codex which in fact correspond to the entries on ff. 27<sup>r</sup>-38<sup>r</sup> of the 1073 codex, viz. the *first* part of the florilegium<sup>38</sup>. In fact the codex has only 197 ff. (of which the first and last are blank) and contains the second part of the florilegium<sup>39</sup>, so what Kuev is here describing remains a mystery;

3) the statement that *Rumanian Academy 72* is closer to the 1073 codex than *Rumanian Academy 310*<sup>40</sup> is patently wrong since both originally had the same entries from the florilegium but the ending of 72 is missing and it now breaks off in the middle of Hesychius of Jerusalem's *In Christi natalem* (in the 1073 codex on f. 250<sup>r-v</sup>), whereas 310 continues on to pseudo-Epiphanius of Salamis' *De XVI prophetarum vita et obitu* (in the 1073 codex on ff. 254<sup>v</sup>-261<sup>r</sup>). Moreover, he fails to point out that *Hilandar 382* -- which he optimistically dates to the late 13th century<sup>41</sup> -- contains the same entries as 310;

4) he ends his description of *Rumyantsev 6* by stating that 18 entries are missing after c. 3 of the entry ascribed to Theodore of Raithu. In fact it is only 18 cc. which are missing, the first 14 of which constitute the ending of that entry (which is a compilation based largely on Theodore's *Praeparatio* and John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*), and then follow entries corresponding to those on ff. 241<sup>v</sup>-247<sup>v</sup> of the 1073 codex. In his description of *Solovki 399 86*, moreover, he fails to point out that this latter codex has precisely the same gap.

His criteria governing the selection of codices to be described in detail seem to be as haphazard as those governing the choice of entries to be described: why describe in detail a 1857 copy of *Yegorov 745*, viz. *Rogozhsky Cemetery 16*<sup>42</sup>, and a 1891 copy of *Ovchinnikov 108*, viz. *Pryanishnikov 193*<sup>43</sup>, but dismiss in a few words a 1818-1819 copy of the 1073 codex itself, viz. *Rumyantsev 356*<sup>44</sup>, and fail even to mention a 19th-century copy of the latter codex, viz. *State Public Library F. I. 275*? If he includes a detailed description of a copy of the entries on ff. 4<sup>r</sup>-9<sup>v</sup> of the 1073 codex made in the 19th century by I. Blinov, viz. *Nikiforov 637*<sup>45</sup>, why not include the copies of ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-2<sup>v</sup> and of 264<sup>r</sup>-266<sup>v</sup> made by A. Vostokov and O. Bodyansky respectively?<sup>46</sup> Moreover, there is not even a mention of the late 16th -- early 17th-century codex *Ossolineum 41*, which has all the florilegium except for the first three prefaces and the final appendix<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> Not 137/496, as he gives, *ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 56-57.

<sup>39</sup> See Г р я з и н а, Л. и Н. Щ е р б а ч е в а. *К текстологии Изборника 1073 г.* (По рукописям Государственной библиотеки СССР им. В. И. Ленина). — *Изборник* (see above p. 2), 56-89; see 74-80.

<sup>40</sup> *Сборник*, p. 70.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39. Elsewhere he more realistically dates part of the codex to the 14th century, see К у е в, К. Съдбата на старобългарската ръкописна книга през вековете. С., 1986<sup>2</sup>, 114, no. 33.

<sup>42</sup> *Сборник*, 91 -- 92.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 93-94.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94-95.

<sup>46</sup> State Library, Moscow, f. 36, box 1, nos. 40 and 39 respectively.

<sup>47</sup> Descriptions of this much neglected codex are to be found in К е т р з у њ с к и, W. *Catalogus codicum manuseriptorum Bibliothecae Ossolinianae Leopoliensis*. I. Lemberg,

His selection of witnesses to the indirect tradition, viz. codices with only a few entries from the florilegium, is limited (for no apparent reason) to three, viz. *Sophia 1285*, *Synodal 558*, and *Synodal 561*. Not merely could the list be greatly expanded, e. g. for the 15th century *Barsov 619* and *1395*, *Moscow Diocese 367* and *Undol'sky 1*; for the 16th *Barsov 311* and *630*, *Chertkov 346*, *Kievan Theological Academy 154* (a Serbian codex) and *Trinity Sergius 214*, but he has omitted the late 14th — early 15th-century *Trinity Sergius 2*, which with its ten entries from the florilegium is the earliest witness after the 1073 codex to any part of the full redaction of the florilegium.

The weakest aspect, however, of the survey is the lack of any attempt to divide the codices into redactions and on the basis of the material given here it would be impossible for any such division to be attempted. For this reason a brief account of the textology of the florilegium has been appended to this review.

Quite apart from the inaccuracies in the descriptions of the codices, issue can be taken with many other statements made in the article. Thus, he greatly exaggerates the role played by Konstantin Kalaydovich in the "discovery" of the codex on 10 June 1817 in the library of the New Jerusalem Monastery of the Resurrection<sup>48</sup>. Joseph Dobrowsky had consulted it there in 1792 and was the first to publish both an excerpt of the translation and the colophon of the codex<sup>49</sup>. He claims that the first scholar to link the codices *Cyril of Belye Ozero 75/1152*, *Sophia 1285* and *Tolstoy II. 100* with the Symeonian florilegium was N. Rozov in 1969<sup>50</sup>, whereas all three are included in N. Nikolsky's list of 1906<sup>51</sup>, to which list Kuev himself elsewhere refers<sup>52</sup>. He calls O. Bodyansky's partial edition of the text together with the Greek originals and some Latin translations in 1883 *valuable*<sup>53</sup>; in fact it is an unmitigated disaster: both the Slavonic and Greek texts are Bodyansky's own totally artificial constructs, a strange mixture of variants arbitrarily chosen from various codices and his own conjectures, while the Latin translations have been taken from other editions and are often not emended and thus correspond to neither the Greek, nor the Slavonic. L. Masing rightly concluded his review of the edition with the words:

. . . *das vorliegende erste Heft . . . bei der so vielfach, um nicht zu sagen überall, hervortretenden Systemlosigkeit und dem Mangel an Kritik in der An-*

1881, p. 32, and Я ц и м и р с к и й, А. Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности. Т. I. Петроград, 1915, 368—370.

<sup>48</sup> Сборник, 36—37.

<sup>49</sup> Viz. *regula 283* of Basil of Caesarea's *Regulae brevius tractatae* found on ff. 32r-33r of the codex, ed. J. Dobrowsky. *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris quae quum apud Russos, Serbos aliosque ritus graeci, tum apud Dalmatos Glagolitas ritus latini Slavos in libris sacris obtinet*. Vienna, 1822, 673—675; for the colophon see *ibid.*, p. 673. On Dobrowsky and the codex see М о и с е е в а, Г. и М. К р б е ц. Йозеф Добровский и Россия. (Памятники русской культуры XI—XVIII веков в изучении чешского слависта). Л., 1990, 120—124.

<sup>50</sup> Сборник, p. 78, 54 and 50-51, respectively, with reference to Р о з о в, Н. Старейший болгарский „Изборник“ и его русская рукописная традиция. — Известия Академии наук СССР. Серия литературы и языка, 1969, № 1, 75—78, see p. 77, 77—78 and p. 76 respectively.

<sup>51</sup> Н и к о л ь с к и й, Н. Материалы для повременного списка русских писателей и их сочинений (X—XI вв.). СПб., 1906, 19—21, see p. 20, nos. 9, 7 and 10 respectively.

<sup>52</sup> Сборник, p. 90.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38: ценно. L u n t, H. *Izbornik* (see above p. 13), p. 359, n. 1, even calls it *scholarly*.

*lage und Durchführung, sowie bei der alle Grenzen des Entschuldbaren weit übersteigenden Incorrectheit des dargebotenen Inhalts einen wissenschaftlichen Werth mit zweifelloser Entschiedenheit NICHT repräsentiert*<sup>54</sup>.

Kuev's speculation about how the translation may have gone to Russia<sup>55</sup> is quite pointless: it has constantly to be stressed that the circumstances in which any particular surviving Bulgarian codex went there are known only from 1655-1656 on<sup>56</sup>. Some of these shortcomings of Kuev's article must surely be ascribed not to the late scholar himself but to the editors' failure to revise what was apparently only a draft and not the final version.

In her article "On the Palaeographic Characterization of the Miscellany of 1073"<sup>57</sup>, E. Kotseva rightly stresses that the 1073 codex as the second earliest dated East Slav codex — only the Ostromir evangeliary of 1057 is earlier — is of immense value for palaeography, all the more so since it was copied in Kiev, whereas the Ostromir codex was copied in Novgorod. Her belief that errors in numbering in the florilegium, viz.  $\bar{\rho}$  instead of  $\bar{\rho}\lambda$  (f. 207<sup>r</sup>),  $\bar{\rho}\lambda$  not  $\bar{\rho}\lambda\Gamma$  (f. 209<sup>v</sup>),  $\bar{\rho}\Pi$  not  $\bar{\rho}\Pi\varsigma$  (f. 223<sup>r</sup>), and the jump from  $\bar{c}\varsigma$  on f. 103<sup>v</sup> to  $\bar{o}\zeta$  on f. 104<sup>v</sup> are evidence of transliteration from Glagolitic is unacceptable: in the latter case a scribe merely misread  $\varsigma$  as  $\sigma$ , while in the former consultation of the facsimile edition reveals that originally the numbering was correct but later the last letters were erased. This does not, however, exclude the possibility of a Glagolitic exemplar and in her article B. Velcheva draws attention to some orthographic traits which point in that direction<sup>58</sup>. Kotseva's theory that some palaeographic features indicate that some entries were translated before others<sup>59</sup> must be utterly rejected — the entire collection of entries exists in one Greek florilegium which was clearly translated at one time and any internal palaeographic differences can be adequately accounted for by the work of more than one translator and more than one scribe of later exemplars.

Whether the four miniatures at the beginning of the first part of the 1073 codex on ff. 1<sup>v</sup>, 2<sup>r</sup>, 3<sup>r</sup> and 3<sup>v</sup> and the two at the beginning of the second on ff. 128<sup>r</sup> and 128<sup>v</sup> were copied from the codex prepared for Symeon or reflect a later Byzantine style has long been a matter of controversy among art historians. In her article "Illumination of Svetoslav's Miscellany of 1073"<sup>60</sup>, L. Mavrodinova favours the former school of thought, but concludes that since those of the second part are more archaic than those of the first, the miniatures in the original 10th-century codex were either copied from two separate exemplars or else those of the first part were retouched in the mid-10th century<sup>61</sup>. Her theory that the miniatures on ff. 128<sup>r</sup>, 3<sup>v</sup>, 3<sup>r</sup> and 128<sup>v</sup> represent the Fathers of the First, Second, Third and Fourth Oecumenical Councils respectively<sup>62</sup> is ingenious but will scarcely meet with universal approval. The article provides a clear picture of the various points at issue and it is a pity that it is marred by inaccurate references, e. g. her assertion that I. Levochkin in 1980

<sup>54</sup> Archiv für slavische Philologie, 8, 1885, 549—572, see p. 572.

<sup>55</sup> Сборник, 35—36.

<sup>56</sup> See Thomson, F. The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus': The Myths and the Enigma. — Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 12-13, 1988-1989, 214—261, see 238—239.

<sup>57</sup> Сборник, 99—112.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 142.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 110.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 113—129. It is accompanied by 29 black and white plates.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 126.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 116—117.

claimed that the ornamentation had been copied from the codex made for Symeon<sup>63</sup>, whereas in fact he stated the reverse<sup>64</sup>.

In her article "Orthography of Svetoslav's Miscellany of 1073 and Its Old Bulgarian Parallels"<sup>65</sup>, B. Velcheva distinguishes between no less than six different orthographies on the basis of scribal preferences for *ц* or *шт*, *ы* or *ѣ*, *ѣ* or *ѣ*, *ѣ* or *ѣ*, *ѣ* or *ѣ*, *ѣ* or *ѣ* and *ѣ* or *ѣ*. Of the incredible meticulousness with which she has studied the codex there can be no doubt, but it must be born in mind that the same East Slav scribe will tend to keep closer to the orthography of his exemplar whenever the text being copied is obscure and he will therefore in places retain the Old Bulgarian orthography, in others replace it. There is no need to challenge the conventional view that the codex was copied by two scribes, viz. A: ff. 1<sup>v</sup>-86a14; 263c23-d2 (c27-d2 of which is over an erased text), 264a25-266b9 and sundry minor corrections throughout the codex as well as the titles of the miniatures; B: ff. 86a14-263c22; 263d3-264a24. Although the colophon on f. 263c26-29 was copied by A, who obviously supervised B. Velcheva is almost certainly right in concluding that since the colophon is in the third person not the first, viz. *написа Іѡаннѣ*, it was B who was John, not A<sup>66</sup>.

To a certain extent some of the phenomena described by Velcheva are again dealt with by R. Pavlova in her article "Eastern Slavonic Linguistic Features in the Miscellany of 1073"<sup>67</sup>. These features, as could be expected, include confusion of nasals, pleophony and the usual morphological changes, e. g. masculine/neuter instrumental singular in *ѣмѣ* not *омѣ*, feminine genitive singular in *ѣ* not *ѣ*. It is interesting to note that scribe A's orthography contains more East Slavisms such as the use of *ѣ*, *ѣ* and *ѣ* than B's<sup>68</sup>.

One of the few glaring mistakes in the English of the résumés is the translation of the title of A. Mincheva's article "Старобългарският книжовен език в Симеоновия сборник по преписа от 1073 г." by "Eastern Slav Linguistic Features in Symeon's Miscellany According to the Copy of 1073"<sup>69</sup>, but even if the title had been correctly translated it would have been something of a misnomer since although she does deal with linguistic features such as supines, prepositionless locatives, enclitics and postposed definite articles, much of the article is devoted to a discussion of the translator's approach to his task as revealed by a study of the florilegium. In this she is much influenced by E. Weiher, to the point of repeating his occasional slip, e. g. that there are no explanatory glosses<sup>70</sup>. What about, for example, *днотн рѣкъше нарѣдникѣ* on f. 96<sup>r</sup>? She rightly notes the different approaches to translation found in the

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., p. 113, n. 2.

<sup>64</sup> Левочкин (sic) И. Изборник Святослава и его славянский протограф. — Старобългарска литература, 8, 1980, 46—49, see 49. This is not the only inaccurate reference in the footnote.

<sup>65</sup> Сборник, 130—145.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 138. In support of this she quotes Lunt, viz. *Izbornik* (see above p. 13), p. 360, n. 6; but he is not the only scholar to reach this conclusion; see, for example, Жуковская, Л. Загадки записи Изборника Святослава 1073 года. — Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому. М., 1987, 45—62, see p. 59.

<sup>67</sup> Сборник, 148—161.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 151—152.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 162—181, cf. p. 162, and 181.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 176; cf. Weiher, E. Zur sprachlichen Rezeption der griechischen philosophischen Terminologie im Kirchenslavischen. — *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie*, 6, 1972, 138—159, see p. 148.

Symeonic florilegium and John the Exarch's works<sup>71</sup>, but her conclusion on the basis of the presence of certain lexical items that the translation is a product of the "Preslav school"<sup>72</sup>, is just one more example of a failure to distinguish between "dialect" and "school of translation". Quite apart from the fact that her list of "Preslavisms" includes items usually considered to be "Ochridisms", e. g. **АЛЪКАТИ**<sup>73</sup>, these vocabulary differences are dialectal, not metaphrastic. Proof of the existence of a "school of translation" requires the establishment of a list of certain metaphrastic solutions peculiar to it, both lexical, e. g. Graecism v. calque, etymological translation v. contextual, constant use of one term v. synonyms, and syntactic, e. g. the rendering of a Greek possessive genitive by an adjective v. genitive, of a passive by a reflexive v. a participle plus auxiliary, of an infinitive construction by the same v. a finite construction, of a participial construction by the same v. a subordinate clause, etc. Even if these criteria had been established — and they have not — the use of the terms "Preslav" and "Ochrid" to denote the different schools would be misleading since it would be an absurd proposition to consider that all translators working in East Bulgaria had one approach and all those in West Bulgaria another. Mincheva herself has elsewhere pointed out that in a large literary centre such as Preslav various approaches to translation were employed<sup>74</sup>. Since the translation was made for Symeon, it was in all probability made in East Bulgaria, but this is a purely geographical fact which says nothing about the existence of any particular "school of translation". Despite this criticism, the article is a valuable contribution to the study of the approach to translation revealed in the florilegium and it is a pity that the Slavonic examples quoted are marred by frequent misprints<sup>75</sup>.

The bibliography of studies devoted to the florilegium between 1824 and early 1988 compiled by V. Khristova<sup>76</sup> is useful as an introduction to the subject but is by no means exhaustive. It omits many important items<sup>77</sup>, includes works irrelevant<sup>78</sup> and never published<sup>79</sup>, as well as the same thing more than once<sup>80</sup>, and teems with errors<sup>81</sup>. It is especially intriguing to note that she has omitted all reference to Yu. Begunov's 1983 bibliography of 154 studies de-

<sup>71</sup> Сборник, 175—178.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 171—173.

<sup>73</sup> See Мирчев, К. Историческа граматика на българския език. С., 1963, с. 50. The equivalent „Preslavism“ is **посттнтн**.

<sup>74</sup> Mincheva, A. Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung von Simeons „Zlatostruj“. — In: Studien zur Literatur und Kultur in Osteuropa. Bonner Beiträge zum 9. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Kiew. (=Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven, 18). Cologne, 1983, 171—183, see 182—183.

<sup>75</sup> E. g. the quotations of the text on ff. 35<sup>r</sup> and 44<sup>v</sup> on p. 178; compare the edition on pp. 265 and 284.

<sup>76</sup> Сборник, 182—190.

<sup>77</sup> E. g. Lunt's article of 1983, see above n. 13, and Masing's review of Bodyansky's partial edition, see above n. 54.

<sup>78</sup> E. g. nos. 9 and 33.

<sup>79</sup> No. 133.

<sup>80</sup> No. 134 is a later edition of no. 82, of which no. 87 is a Russian version with minor variants; no. 10 is merely the offprint of no. 13.

<sup>81</sup> To give but a few examples: Karinsky's book of 1925 is given under 1825 (no. 3); the pages of the articles in Изборник (see above n. 2) are virtually all wrong (see nos. 98, 101—102, 105, 111, 113, 117); in no. 166 the pages are not given (=pp. 5—17); in no. 13 p. 238=p. 283, etc.

voted to the florilegium<sup>82</sup>, especially since it is obvious that she has made copious use of it<sup>83</sup>.

A striking feature of these introductory articles is that they do not give any precise idea of what the aim of the compiler(s) of the florilegium was and thus provide no clue as to why Symeon ordered it to be translated. On the one hand Kuev claims that it reflects:

цялата тогавашна византийска догматическа, нравствена, хуманитарна, юридическа, културна литературно-теоретическа и т. н. мисъл<sup>84</sup>, while on the other Ivanova more modestly states:

Ако Изборникът се оценява според неговото място във византийската книжнина, то наистина е скромно и несъизмеримо с най-значителните литературни факти. Гръцкият протограф на Изборника в сравнение с високите постижения на енциклопедизма през X в. действително е представител на една по-популярна, по-онароднена богословска мисъл.<sup>85</sup>

In fact an analysis of the contents of the florilegium reveals it to be no chance collection of snippets of knowledge, but a well-planned and carefully compiled work built up around Anastasius Sinaita's *Interrogationes et responsiones de diversis capitibus a diversis propositae*.

The first section consists of ten prefaces to Anastasius' *Interrogationes* summarizing the Christian faith in very logical order:

1) on the necessity of faith in the triune God and on the nature of His Trinity;

2) on the relations between the three persons of the Trinity;

[3] a marginal scholium on 2 which in Slavonic has been incorporated into the text<sup>86</sup>];

4) on the difference between essence and substance and on the two natures of Christ;

5-7) more on the natures of Christ;

8) on the incomprehensibility of God who is known only by faith;

9) a confession of faith;

10) an outline of the decisions of the Oecumenical councils. Then follow Anastasius' *Interrogationes* in their commonest redaction in 88 questions<sup>87</sup>. Once again the selection and order of the questions follow a logical order and they can be divided into two groups:

A. QQ 1-22 are genuine Anastasian questions and deal with basic moral questions: 1-2 on the marks of a true Christian; 3-4 on sin and forgiveness; 5 on whether non-monks can be saved; 6 on confession; 7 on communion; 8 on fornication; 9-10 on worldly punishments; 11-15 on the proper use of worldly

<sup>82</sup> Бегунов, Ю. Выборочный библиографический список литературы об Изборнике 1073 года, published in the Научный аппарат (see above p. 3), 75-79.

<sup>83</sup> E. g. in no. 18 she gives the same mistaken reference to pp. 121-123 (=p. 121); in no. 139 she reproduces the same two misprints, viz. *sullogai* and *particularities*, which should read *sullogai* and *particularités*.

<sup>84</sup> Сборник, p. 34.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>86</sup> Later Greek codices, e. g. *Parisinus graecus 1259 A*, f. 13v, of the 14th century, have also inserted it into the text and it is possible that one such codex was used for the Slavonic translation.

<sup>87</sup> The edition published in PG, t. 89, 312-824, is of a later, rare redaction with 154 questions. The seven unnumbered questions, viz. 98a-b, 100a-c, 105a, and 109a, are an addition from another source by Jakob Gretser (1562-1625), from whose 1617 edition (via a 1740 reprint) Migne took the text.

riches; 16 on secular authorities; 17 on misfortune in life; 18-22 on death and damnation.

B. QQ 23-88 are pseudo-Anastasian and deal with questions which could arise when reading the Scriptures, e. g. if everything which God made is good, why are some animals unclean (Q 26)? Why was Moses prohibited from entering the Holy Land because of only a minor sin (Q 37)? Since the Lord says that we are not defiled by what we eat, why should we not eat meat during fasts (Q 74)? These questions can be subdivided into two groups: 1) QQ 23-53 dealing with the Old Testament, basically in the order of the OT books, beginning with Genesis; 2) QQ 54-88 dealing with the New Testament, which can be further subdivided into two series: a) QQ 54-61 on the epistles, once again basically in their Biblical order; b) QQ 62-88 on the gospels arranged mainly in the chronological order of Christ's life from His circumcision to His resurrection.

The final section of the florilegium consists of 24 appendices to Anastasius' *Interrogationes*, once again no mere random selection:

1-3 deal with the philosophical definition of terms important in any discussion of Trinitarian doctrines;

4, viz. George Choïroboscus' *De tropis poeticis*, was not included for any abstract literary reasons, but explains the use of figures of speech as the preface to

5, which deals with the use of allegory in the Bible;

6-9 deal with the doctrine of the Trinity;

10-16 deal with the precise chronology of Christ's earthly life. (To view 14, viz. John of Damascus' *De mensibus macedonicis* (an excerpt from his *De fide orthodoxa*) and 15, viz. idem. *De mensibus diversis*, as anything other than entries containing kalendar data of relevance to Christ's life is to be perverse); 17-19 deal with the canon of Scripture;

20-24 are five chronological lists with the names of notable persons from creation, viz. Adam, down to the time the florilegium was compiled, viz. Constantine V (908/911-959) and Zoe (914-919.920), intended to reveal the continuity of history as *Heilsgeschichte*.

It is perfectly obvious that the florilegium was compiled with the aim of providing a guide to Christian faith and behaviour for the lay Christian and all information which it contains, be it historical, astrological, botanical, zoological, or whatever, was subordinate to that end. The contents were eminently suited for the instruction of the newly converted Bulgarians and there is no reason to doubt the statement of the eulogy of Symeon added to the florilegium that he not only ordered it to be translated, but also used its contents to instruct his nobles in the faith. Since the precise meaning of this colophon has frequently been misunderstood, a translation has been appended to this review. It has been suggested that Symeon himself was involved in the selection of the entries for the florilegium<sup>88</sup>, a theory which cannot be proved but is not entirely impossible since the textology of the Greek original clearly shows that it was compiled in the late 9th or early 10th century. At all events, the recent theory that the name of Symeon, preserved in the eulogy only in the 15-16th-century codex *Cyrl of Beloye Ozero 5/1082*, refers to Symeon the Proud (1316-

<sup>88</sup> Е. г. Георгиев, Е. К вопросу о возникновении и составителях Изборника Симеона-Святослава, известного по рукописи 1073 года. — Изборник (see above n. 2), 263—272, see 266—267.

1353), Grand Prince of Vladimir (1341/1342-1353),<sup>89</sup> can be dismissed as it is based on the incorrect assumption that the concluding **ΛΕΥΘΟΠΗΣΥΣ**, by which the translation can be dated to the early 10th century, is a later addition<sup>90</sup>.

Another major omission revealed by this survey of the prefatory articles is the fact that there is no study devoted to the Greek original. We are told that the Greek text in volume 3 will be based on *Coislin 120* and *280*, *Vaticanus graecus 423* and *Ambrosianus L 88 sup.*<sup>91</sup>, but no reason for this choice is given and at least two more codices will have to be included if the edition is to be critical, viz. *Patmos 109*, which is just as early as *Coislin 120*, and *Laura Γ 115*, which is the only codex to preserve the entire text of the final entry. The edition will clearly have to be based on *Coislin 120*, which is the closest to the Slavonic translation<sup>92</sup>. To the codices already traced<sup>93</sup> must be added the 13th-century *Ambrosianus H 257 inf.*, which on ff. 161<sup>v</sup>-254<sup>r</sup> has all the entries as far as that ascribed to Theodore of Raithu<sup>94</sup>.

The actual edition of the text<sup>95</sup> is a diplomatic one of the text in the 1073 codex, the sole changes made being the division of the *scriptio continua* into words and the inclusion of superscribed words in the line. To censure the editors for failing to produce a critical edition based on all available codices would not merely be an unjust criticism for not fulfilling a task which they had not set themselves, it would also be to set the cart before the horse: a critical edition of the Greek is a prerequisite for a critical edition of the Slavonic and it is earnestly to be hoped that when the former has been given in the third projected volume, the editors will continue their labours to produce the latter in a fourth volume. Despite this, it seems to this reviewer that the editors should at least have added from another codex — possibly in a different script — the passages missing in the 1073 codex because of the loss of folia. To assist in the reading of obscure passages they also referred to microfilms of the *Vilnius 260* and *Hilandar 382* codices as well as — a most regrettable decision — Bodyansky's partial edition<sup>96</sup>.

It is also claimed that a complete and consistent comparison was made with the Greek text in *Coislin 120* and *Vaticanus graecus 423* by P. Yaneva<sup>97</sup>. Unfortunately even a cursory glance at the text reveals that this comparison was neither complete, e. g.

16b23 **ВЪСЪЖДЕ** = **ВЪСЪЖДЕ** **К**, cf. *πανταχού* (ἐστίν)

<sup>89</sup> Thus Жуковская, Л. Загадки . . . (see above p. 66), p. 48, and *eadem*, *Изборник 1073 года. Судьба книги, состояние и задачи изучения*. — *Изборник* (see above p. 2), 5—31, see p. 9.

<sup>90</sup> See above. There are other reasons for dismissing the theory, eg. Symeon of Vladimir never used the title of tsar; the *Cyril of Beloye Ozero codex* contains many original readings which cannot go back to the 1073 codex. These need not, however, be examined here.

<sup>91</sup> *Сборник*, p. 7.

<sup>92</sup> And not *Vaticanus graecus 423* as suggested by Семенов, I. Remarks on the Diffusion of Byzantine Scientific and Pseudo-Scientific Literature among the Orthodox Slavs. — *Slavonic and East European Review*, 59, 1981, 321—345, see p. 332, p. 27.

<sup>93</sup> See Бибиков, М. Анализ (see above p. 13), *passim*; to which should be added Бибиков, М. Оксфордский список византийского прототипа „Изборника Свято-слава“. — *Византийский временник*, 52, 1991, 168—170, on *codex Barocc. 206*.

<sup>94</sup> Martini, E. and D. Vassi. *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosiani*. T. 2. Milan, 1906, 1108—1117.

<sup>95</sup> *Сборник*, 201—725.

<sup>96</sup> On its highly unreliable nature see above. They also refer to Ye. Piotrovskaya's 1977 edition of the final entry and to B. Angelov's 1977 and K. Kuev's 1986 editions of the eulogy of Symeon, see *Сборник*, p. 193.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 193: Пълна и последователна съпоставка.

229c16-17 ΠΟΔΒΛΑΓΑΚΤΕ ΣΑ = ΠΟΔΒ ΛΑΓΑΚΤΕ ΣΑ, cf. ἡ "ὄλα" τίθεται  
 239d3-4 ΒΕΔΕ ΒΕΔΕ<sup>5</sup> ΔΕΛΟ ΤΟ. Footnote 5 states: Така е в рѣкописа.  
 It should have read (were it required): Така е в грѣцкия текст, cf. οἶδα, οἶδα  
 τὸ πρᾶγμα, not consistent, e. g.  
 41c9 ΒΕΞΕΡΑΧΗΗ.<sup>1</sup> Footnote 1 correctly states that this is a scribal error, cf.  
 ἀγαμία. Why then is there, for example, no footnote at  
 8c15 ΒΕΛΗΥΣΤΕΩΜΕ stating that it is a mistake for ΚΟΛΗΥΣΤΕΩΜΕ, cf. ποσότητι,  
 or at  
 225b25 ΣΖ ΛΟΥΧΙΑΚΜΖΙΜΗ pointing out that this is a scribal error for ΣΖ ΣΖΛΟΥ-  
 ЧΙΑΚМΖΙМИ, cf. μετὰ συμβεβηκότων. In this last example the editors have pro-  
 duced a new ghost word, viz. \*ΛΟΥΧΙΑΚМОК for συμβεβηκός, usually translated  
 by ΣΖΛΟΥΧΙΑН, occasionally by ΣΖΛΟΥΧΙΑННЕ.

Occasionally, on the other hand, consultation of the Greek has led to the  
 silent correction of the translator's errors, e. g. in the list of proper names on  
 f. 138<sup>v</sup> the editors give:

c21-22 ΔΦΡΗΥ· ΚΕ ΒΗΖΑΚΗΝΥ·  
 d 8-9 САВАФА· АФУ АСТАВАФУ·

It is true that the Greek reads Ἄφροϊ καὶ Βιζακῆνοϊ and Σαβαθά, ἀφ' οὗ ὀδ' Ἀστα-  
 βάροι, but the punctuation clearly reveals that the translator read \*Κεβίσα-  
 κηνοϊ and \*Ἄφουασταβάροι, mistakes which should have been recorded in the  
 footnotes.

Since the above errors were spotted by chance, a careful comparison was  
 made of the text on one page of the edition, viz. p. 687 with f. 247<sup>r</sup>, with  
 the original Greek, i. e. not with the ultimate sources of the texts, *in casa*  
 the ending of an excerpt taken from bk. V, c. 12 of Irenæus of Lyons' *Contra*  
*haereses libri quinque*<sup>98</sup> on ff. 246<sup>v</sup>-247<sup>r</sup> and the beginning of an entry on  
 f. 247<sup>v</sup> ascribed to Augustine<sup>99</sup>, but with a critical text of the Greek flori-  
 legium<sup>100</sup>. This gave the following result:

a8-9 НЗОУТРЪН НЗВЗНОУ should read НЗОУТРЪ Н НЗВЗНОУ, cf. ἐνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν;  
 a20 ОГНЬНЪ ВЕС ТОГО should read ОГНЬ НЪ ВЕС ТОГО, cf. τὸ πῦρ οὐ χωρὶς  
 τούτων, where НЪ is clearly a scribal error for НЄ, which should have been  
 indicated in a footnote;  
 b26-27 Н НРЪБОЖЕСТВЕНЪЕМЪ СЖШТНН should read Н ПРЪ БОЖЕСТВЕНЪЕМЪ  
 СЖШТНН, cf. καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας, where ПРЪ is an error for ПРН.

There is also a corruption which can only be solved by reference to other  
 Slavonic manuscripts: in

a22-24 ВЪСЕ СЕ ТРОКЕ НЕ ТОЖДЕ КЕ КОУПННО ЖЕ СА РАЖДАЮТЬ renders τὰ τὰ πάντα  
 οὐχ ἑαυτὰ ἀμοιβαδὲ γεννώσιν. If the<sup>1</sup> deviation ТОЖДЕ КЕ is correct, then КЕ is

<sup>98</sup> This passage is one of the surviving fragments of the original, the complete text of  
 which is found only in a Latin translation; the sole critical edition of the passage is that in  
 Rousseau, A., L. Doutreleau, and C. Mercier. Irenée de Lyon. Contre  
 les hérésies. Livre 5. Vol. 2 (=Sources chrétiennes, 153). Paris, 1969, 142-148.

<sup>99</sup> It in fact contains three Trinitarian metaphors, the first of which has been taken  
 from Vigilius of Thapso's *Contra Felicianum Arianum de unitate Trinitatis*, see Migne, J. P.  
 Patrologia latina. T. 62, 333-352, see p. 337. The sources of the other two metaphors have  
 not been traced but neither is from any work by Augustine.

<sup>100</sup> Based on *Coislin 120, Vaticanus graecus 423, Patmos 109, Escorial R. III. 2* and  
*Vaticanus Ottob. gr. 408.*

corrupt for  $\eta$  and the translators probably read  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ . It is possible, however, that the division is incorrect and  $\tau\omicron\text{ж}\Delta\epsilon\eta$  is a scribal error. The page also contains one misreading, viz.  $\Theta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\tau\eta\eta\alpha$ , which is corrected in the list of misprints to  $\Theta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\tau\eta\eta\alpha$ <sup>101</sup>.

To extrapolate from the above sample and conclude that the edition contains c. 1000 mistakes including a sprinkling of ghost-words would be unfair, but it must serve as a warning to the editors NOT to compile the lexicon to be published in the second volume before they have completed the edition of the Greek and compared the text properly with it. The present edition is clearly only a working one which will be superseded when a critical edition appears, but it will do much in the meantime to stimulate scholarly interest in one of the most important of Old Bulgarian translations. It is also to be hoped that some of this interest will be directed to the second translation of the same florilegium made into Middle Bulgarian in the 14th century<sup>102</sup>.

#### APPENDIX I

##### A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE TEXTOLOGY OF THE SYMEONIC FLORILEGIUM

The codices can be divided into three main redactions, the Complete (CR), the South Slav (SR) and the Abridged (AR), of which only CR preserves all the contents of the Greek florilegium. All codices of CR go back to an archetype into which four passages taken from the Slavonic translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oratio XL* had been interpolated and can be divided into two families:

A. Codices with the full text. These can be further subdivided into two groups which go back independently to the archetype of CR:

1. *Synodal 1043* of 1073, *Synodal 275*, its apograph of 1403, and *Barsov 309* of 1519, an indirect apograph of *Synodal 275*. *Synodal 1043* is the sole codex to contain (ff. 264<sup>r</sup>-266<sup>r</sup>) the final entry of the Greek florilegium. *Synodal 275* is valuable mainly for the text now missing in *Synodal 1043*, while *Barsov 309* contains the text missing in *Synodal 275* between ff. 83 and 84, which is part of the text also missing in *Synodal 1043* between ff. 130 and 131.

2. *Cyril of Beloye Ozero 5/1082* of the 15th-16th c. (16th century) and *Volokolamsk 138/496* of the 16th c. The former is the sole codex to contain the original forms both of the two lists of contents prefaced to each half of the florilegium (ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-6<sup>r</sup>, 199<sup>r</sup>-205<sup>v</sup>) and of the eulogy of Symeon (f. 6<sup>v</sup>). Although it only contains the second half of the florilegium *Volokolamsk 138/496* is valuable for the variants of group 2.

Two other codices belong to family A, viz. *Tolstoy II.100 (Q. I. 208)* of the 15th c. and *Cyril of Beloye Ozero 75/1152* of the 16th, both with unique omissions. Their value for the restoration of the text is uncertain.

B. Codices going back to an archetype in which the two halves of the list of

<sup>101</sup> See the list of misprints 726—728, see 728. It is by no means exhaustive, e. g.  $\text{ИВАННЪ}$  for  $\text{И ИВАННЪ}$  (24a23-24);  $\text{ТЪХЪ}$  for  $\text{ТЪХЪ}$  (246a1).

<sup>102</sup> On this see Thomson, F. Les cinq traductions slavonnes du *Libellus de fide orthodoxa* de Michel le Syncelle et les mythes de l'arianisme de saint Méthode, apôtre des Slaves, ou d'Hilarion, métropolitain de Russie, et de l'existence d'une Eglise arienne à Kiev. — *Revue des études slaves*, 63, 1991, 19—54, see 28 and 44—46.

contents had been combined and with two gaps in the text, viz. pt. ii, the end of c. 68 to the end of c. 71, and most of c. 191 (corresponding to ff. 163<sup>r</sup>-164<sup>r</sup> and 252<sup>r</sup>-253<sup>r</sup> of the 1073 codex). These codices can be placed into three groups depending upon where the combined list of contents has been placed:

1) at the beginning: *Przemysł L. F. 8* (now *Polish National Library, Akcesja 2699*) of the 16th c. and *Ovchinnikov 108* of 1619;

2) at the end: *Vyg 168* of the 15th c., *Vilnius 260* of the 16th c., *St. Nicholas' Conforming Monastery 34* of the 18th c.;

3) before Athanasius Sinaita's *Interrogationes: Yegorov 745* of the 17th c. The two codices which may be of some value are *Vyg 168*, which is the earliest of B, and *Przemysł*, whose language has many Bulgarisms. Although *Uvarov 757*, a Moldavian codex of the 17th c., only preserves part of the florilegium (equivalent to ff. 131<sup>r</sup>-258<sup>r</sup> of the 1073 codex) it is the sole codex of CR which is not East Slav and, if it is not simply a copy of an East Slav codex, it may be of some value.

To which family two further codices of CR belong, viz. *Museum of Ukrainian Art, Lemberg, 489* of 1589 and *Ossolineum 41* of the 16th-17th c., is uncertain.

The South Slav redaction has none of the prefaces to Anastasius' *Interrogationes*, but it has preserved the latter text without the interpolations from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oratio XL* as well as all the appendices except the last one, albeit in a variant order. It has no table of contents. It is preserved in two Serbian codices of the 14th c., viz. *Hilandar 382* and *Rumanian Academy 72* and one Wallachian one of the 16th c., viz. *Rumanian Academy 310*.

The Abridged redaction like SR has none of the prefaces nor a list of contents. Its text of Anastasius' *Interrogationes* is also without the interpolations from Gregory's *Oratio* but there are in addition various minor omissions as well as one major one, viz. the text corresponding to ff. 179<sup>r</sup>-184<sup>r</sup> of the 1073 codex. Of the 24 appendices it only has five, viz. nos. 1 (only the first 3 of the 17 cc.) and 6-9. It is found in three East Slav codices, viz. *Rumyantsev 6* of the 15th c., *Stroyev 66* of the 16th and *Solovki 399/86* of the 17th, of which at least the Rumyantsev codex is valuable as its language has preserved many archaic features.

For the indirect tradition of the text see above.

## APPENDIX II THE EULOGY OF SYMEON

The circumstances of the translation of the florilegium and the use which Symeon himself made of the latter are recounted in the anonymous eulogy. Since this has frequently been misunderstood — as various mistranslations of it show — it is here translated as closely as possible into English. Since English, not being a highly inflected language, cannot express thoughts so tersely, occasional words to clarify the meaning have been added between brackets. No attempt has been made to reproduce the iambic trimeters of the original.

The Slavonic text is simply the best of the three known copies, viz. that on ff. 263<sup>v</sup>-264<sup>r</sup> of *Synodal 1043* (=S2), into which the occasionally superior readings of *Cyril of Beloye Ozero 5/1082* (=C) and of the text on f. 2<sup>v-r</sup> (*sic*)



the thoughts<sup>2</sup> hidden in the depth of this most difficult<sup>3</sup> book<sup>4</sup> of Basil<sup>5</sup>, very wise in (his) thoughts,<sup>6</sup> commanded me — a good-for-nothing in learning<sup>7</sup> — to make the change of the language<sup>8</sup> (while) preserving in another way the identity of his<sup>9</sup> thoughts, which<sup>10</sup> he<sup>11</sup>, having collected (them) like an industrious bee from each flower of the text<sup>12</sup> into his magnanimous<sup>13</sup> heart, pours from his lips like sweet honey before the nobles for the enlightenment of their minds<sup>14</sup>, seeming to them (to be) a new Ptolemy, not by religion<sup>15</sup>, but rather by (his) desire and on account of the collection of all the most venerable<sup>16</sup> divine books by which he, having filled his chambers<sup>17</sup>, (has) made

<sup>2</sup> *разумъ* corresponds to τὰ νοήματα.

<sup>3</sup> *многостръпътънъ* corresponds to πολυσκολιός, literally *most convoluted*.

<sup>4</sup> Since *кѣннги* is *plurale tantum* this could be rendered: *these . . . books*.

<sup>5</sup> The reference to Basil has perplexed many scholars and given rise to much speculation including the completely arbitrary idea that the eulogy was originally composed for John the Exarch's *Hexaemeron*, based largely on Basil of Caesarea's *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, argued most recently by Партнов, Z. Похвала царю Симеону, ее автор и византийские образцы. — Старобългарска литература, 10, 1981, 88—94. The most obvious explanation is to be found in the title of the florilegium: *Съборъ отъ много оцъ. Тълкованна . . . съложена на паметъ и на готовъ отвѣтъ*. This is then followed by the title of the first entry: *Сѣлаго Васнана отъ того еже на съномна о стѣемъ дусъ*. The translator read and intended his readers to understand: *Съборъ . . . на готовъ отвѣтъ сѣлаго Васнана. Отъ того . . .*

<sup>6</sup> To interpret the phrase *кѣннгъ премѣдраго Васнана въ разумѣхъ* to mean *книги според тълкуванията на премѣдрия Васнана*, thus *Din* and *Duj*, cf. *Pet: nach der Deutung des uberaus weisen Basileios*, is to do violence to the text.

<sup>7</sup> In most editions of *Снычннвѣдѣю* has been written as one word, viz. *ignoramus*. However, the dative singular of a masculine noun in -нн is -ни, not -ню, and hence this can only be the instrumental singular of the feminine *вѣдѣ*, literally *knowledge*, here in the sense *learning*.

<sup>8</sup> This meaning of *рѣчь* may be uncommon, but it is by no means unknown, see *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* (=LLP). T. 3. Prague, 1982, p. 663.

<sup>9</sup> Viz. Basil's. The impossibility in English of distinguishing between *εγω* and *εκον* leads to ambiguities.

<sup>10</sup> The claim that *ѣже* refers to *кѣннгъ* thus *Lvo* 179, makes no sense either semantically or syntactically.

<sup>11</sup> Viz. *Симеон*.

<sup>12</sup> For *пѣсаннѣ* in the sense of *text*, *work* see LLP, III, 519. To understand it in the sense of *Holy Scripture*, as do *Din*, *Duj*, *Kal* and *Pet*, is to distort the meaning. *Vai: de la lecture* is too free, while *Ang: На книжнината* is too vague.

<sup>13</sup> *Вѣльмысальнъ* corresponds to *μεγαλόνοος*, for which English has no precise equivalent and *magnanimous* corresponds more to *μεγαλόψυχος*.

<sup>14</sup> *Kal: вразумляя их своими мыслями* is completely wrong.

<sup>15</sup> Viz. paganism. To render *вѣрою* literally as *by faith* would be most ambiguous in English. The rendering in *Lvo*, 185: *не по убеждению, а больше желанием* is obviously erroneous.

<sup>16</sup> In theory the epithet in *С*, *многочастнын*, viz. *πολυμερής*, would suit in the metaphorical sense of *diverse*, as opposed to the literal *composite*, but in view of the following epithet *divine*, the original reading was probably that in *S1*.

<sup>17</sup> *Полата* can mean *palace* and has been so rendered, see *Kal* and *Vai*, but it also renders words such as *δομάτιον*, *κοιτών*, *ὑπερῶν*, and was clearly understood by the scribe of *Synodal 1043* in 1073 in that sense as he altered it in *S1* to *каѣтъ*, which can mean *house*, *chamber*, *store* and even *treasury*, but not *palace*.

for himself an eternal memory. May the reason for (his) receiving this memory<sup>18</sup> be for his pious soul like the reward of crowns<sup>19</sup> of blessed and holy men in the infinite age of ages<sup>20</sup>.

Франсис Дж. Томсън (Антверпен, Белгия)

СИМЕОНОВИЯТ СБОРНИК — ПРОБЛЕМИ НА ПРОИЗХОДА, СЪДЪРЖАНИЕТО, ТЕКСТОЛОГИЯТА И ИЗДАВАНЕТО МУ, КАКТО И АНГЛИЙСКИ ПРЕВОД НА ПОХВАЛАТА НА ЦАР СИМЕОН

(Резюме)

Издаденият през 1991 г. Симеонов сборник и придружаващите го девет статии са разглеждани критично, като се оспорват някои от изказаните в тях становища, например че **ΛΥΓΟΠΝΗΣΥΣ** е по-късна прибавка или че преводът е плод на т. нар. „Преславска школа“. Анализът на съдържанието сочи, че Сборникът представлява грижливо планирана и систематична компилация. Разглеждането на Похвалата на цар Симеон, английският превод на която е включен, разкрива, че тя е била често погрешно тълкувана, и хвърля нова светлина върху някои неясноти, като например защо в Похвалата Сборникът се споменава като дело на св. Василий. Твърдението в Похвалата, че Симеон лично е участвувал в подбора на гръцките текстове, е напълно приемливо. Приложен е и кратък преглед на текстологията на Сборника.

---

<sup>18</sup> Literally: *May receiving the cause of the memory*. ВНК has been taken in the sense of *always*, see *Din*: за да се възприема всякога този спомен, but it ignores the case of **ПАМАТН**. *Kal* ascribes an unchristian motive to Симеон: *Дабы память это почитали*, while *Duj* simply ignores the text: *заради тая негова памет*.

<sup>19</sup> In both S2 and S1 the word is in the dative plural. С has the ambiguous **кѣнцѣм**, but this is no justification for rendering it as though it was an instrumental singular **кѣнцѣмъ** governed by **бѣдан**, as in *Din*, *Duj*, *Kal* and *Pet*.

<sup>20</sup> S1 and K add *Amen*, which is almost certainly a scribal automatism as it does not agree with the dodecasyllabic structure of the line.