

Terje Helland (Tromsø, Norway)

SOME REMARKS REGARDING THE PLACE AND DATE OF
THE TRANSLATION OF THE SLAVONIC READING MENOLOGIA
AND THEIR TRANSMISSION TO RUSSIA

Various scholars, starting with Speranskij¹, Sreznevskij² and Archbishop Sergij³ have pointed out the interesting composition of the Slavonic reading menologia. Although the fact that the main part of the textual corpus of these reading menologia were copied from pre-metaphrastic monthly reading menologia could not be known to 19th-century scholars, since Ehrhard had not yet established the metaphrastic canon by that time, they did note the archaic language of the menologia and the uniqueness of their composition. D. Afinogenov, who has revisited their scholarly works, is to my knowledge the only modern scholar who has put forward a hypothesis regarding the provenance of the Russian menologia and the date of their translation, in particular with regard to the set of menologia found in the collections of the Saviour Monastery of Volokolamsk⁴. This is only one of the Russian monasteries which had several volumes of 15th- and 16th-century handwritten monthly reading menologia in its library. His hypothesis is that the Slavonic menologia found in the Volokolamsk collection originally comprised a ten-volume complex of menologia, whereby each month was covered by one volume, except the summer months of June, July and August, which were covered by a single volume; originally a monthly menologion for July, with a few June and August texts added to it. His hypothesis is essentially that a single ten-volume set of pre-metaphrastic menologia were translated into Church

¹ Сперанский, М. Н. Сентябрьская минея-четья домакариевского состава. – Сб. ОРЯС, 64, 1896, № 4, 1–23; Сперанский, М. Н. Октябрьская минея-четья домакариевского состава. – Изв. ОРЯС, 6, 1901, № 1, 57–87.

² Срезневский, И. И. Февральская книга Минеи четии древнего состава по списку XV века. – Сб. ОРЯС, 12, 1874, 377–391.

³ Сергий, архиеп. Полный месяцеслов востока. Т. 1–2. 2. изд. Владимир, 1901.

⁴ Афиногенов, Д. Е. Новгородское переводное четье-минейное собрание: Происхождение, состав греческий оригинал. – In: Abhandlungen zu den Grossen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij. Kodikologische, miszellenanalogische und textologische Untersuchungen. Bd. 2 (=Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertations. T. 49). Freiburg i. Br., 2006, 261–294.

Slavonic at the Studios monastery in Constantinople in the 12th century by order of Novgorod. He therefore uses the term „Новгородские минеи“ for the whole cycle of Russian reading menologia found in various collections of Russian monasteries and cathedrals, although the Troice Sergiev monastery, which has never been under Novgorod jurisdiction, has one of the largest transmitted collections. His explanation as to why the June and August menologia were not translated is basically that they were not available in the Studios monastery by the 12th century, because these volumes had previously been transferred to the Grottaferrata monastery south of Rome. The two transferred manuscripts are Vaticanus gr. 1671⁵, a reading menologion for August, and Vaticanus gr. 1667, a reading menologion for June⁶. The date of the transfer of these manuscripts from Constantinople to Italy is again used as an argument for the dating of the translation of the Slavonic menologia to the 12th century.

Although Afinogenov's hypothesis might seem convenient for some scholarly circles, in which it might be useful, amongst other things, to diminish the role of Bulgaria (and Poland-Lithuania) as the transmitter of Byzantine culture to Russia, I find it highly problematic to follow Afinogenov's argument on these issues for a number of reasons which I shall come back to below. It is, however, first necessary to comment on the methodology he used in studying these questions.

In his analysis, Afinogenov explicitly:

1. Overlooked the homiletic component of the menologia.
2. Overlooked the texts of Slavonic origin.
3. Assumed that a monthly reading menologion was the basis for any group of more than approximately 10 texts, which do not clearly have other sources, like the Synaxarion or other collections.
4. Stated that the VMČ of Makarij cannot serve as a basis for the study of the menologion tradition, because it contains so many texts of other origins.
5. Used as an *a priori* assumption, the complete menologia are viewed as a whole, and it is assumed that they arrived in Russia as a single complex.

The first point is based on the fact that the homiletic component was quite variable in both the Byzantine and the Slavonic tradition, and that the presence or absence of a particular text would prove little or nothing regarding the original content of the menologion. It is not difficult to agree with Afinogenov that the homiletic material in the menologia varied a lot; this was shown by Ehrhard⁷. However, as Ehrhard noted, the homiletic material was in many cases a later addition to the menologion tradition, and the presence of many homilies in a menologion would, in his view, be one sign that a menologion was of rather late date. Furthermore, the addition of particular homilies, including homilies of South Slavonic authors, is a sign that the Slavonic menologion tradition was

⁵ The manuscript was one of the four August menologia studied by Ehrhard, see: Ehrhard, A. Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Erster Teil. Leipzig, 1937, 673–676.

⁶ This manuscript was studied by Ehrhard as well, as one of five monthly June menologia partly preserved. See Ehrhard, A. Op. cit., 641–645.

⁷ Ibidem, 438–701.

influenced by Bulgarian and Serbian authors. Thus, I believe any serious scholar should also take into account the homiletic material, both the translated homilies and the original Slavonic homilies in the menologia. They help date a possible Byzantine prototype of the menologia, and they give important clues as regards the possible paths of transmission within the Slavia Orthodoxa.

This brings us to Afinogenov's second point; that the specific Slavonic textual material can be ignored. This is problematic not only in the case of the homiletic material, but even more so in the case of Slavonic lives of saints, and particularly the South Slavonic ones. The presence of texts written for Bulgarian and Serbian saints like John of Rila and Savas the Serb would hardly have been possible if the menologia were copied in Constantinople or Russia and had no link at all to the Bulgarian or Serbian literary heritage.

Afinogenov's third point is equally problematic. As Ehrhard showed, there were various forms of reading menologia in the Byzantine world. The presence of 10 texts for a given month is hardly sufficient to prove that the original was a monthly menologion. Menologia covering three or four months could also include more than 10 texts for a given month. Also, it is difficult to prove whether a set of half-monthly menologia could be the basis for the translation. A half-monthly menologion could appear for purely technical reasons; e.g. if there were too many folios for a particular month to be included in one manuscript.

Regarding the fourth point, Afinogenov is correct in his view of the VMČ. They are, as Makarij pointed out himself in the preface to each volume⁸, collected on the basis of several different sources. For the purposes of studying the content and origin of the reading menologia, it thus makes more sense to study the contents of pure (non-Makarian) reading menologia. However, Afinogenov breaks his own rule by using the textual quality of excerpts from three March texts from the VMČ to "prove" that the Russian March menologia are a distinct translation compared to the same texts found in the Codex Suprasliensis⁹. I shall come back to this point and show that the comparison of the March texts is a major flaw in his work, and that this error regarding the March texts is by itself evidence enough to refute his hypothesis. Indeed, it was already noted by Archimandrite Sergij that a manuscript in the same tradition as Codex Suprasliensis was the basis for the Slavonic menologia of the 15th and 16th centuries: „она служить основаниєм четихъ миней XV и XVI вековъ“¹⁰.

The fifth point is Afinogenov's own hypothesis that the various volumes of the reading menologia were translated and transferred to Russia as a single complex. I believe that the textual material transmitted to us is enough to assume that a full cycle of monthly reading menologia once existed in Slavonic translation. The cycle has been partly preserved and partly lost, something which has led to attempts to reconstruct it. The degree to which each volume was preserved by the 15th century was different for each monthly volume. The exact

⁸ See for example the foreword to the March volume in: *Die Großen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij, Uspenskij spisok. 1–11. März.* Ed. E. Weither et al. (= *Monumenta Linguae Slavicae dialectici veteris.* T. 39). Freiburg, 1997, 1r.

⁹ Афиногенов, Д. Е. *Op. cit.*, с. 276.

¹⁰ Сергий, архиеп. *Op. cit.* T. 1, с. 266.

content of the original translation cannot fully be restored, except for the month of March, and perhaps for February and July. Based on the presence of Uspenskij sbornik¹¹, and fragments in various manuscripts of the 13th and 14th centuries, the Russian menologia reconstructed in the 15th century were based on books that originally came to Russia at different points in time. At a certain point during the 15th century, there must have been a concerted effort to restore a full cycle of reading menologia covering the whole year. Some of the volumes thus needed to be restored almost from scratch, like the volumes for June and August, whereas others were only slightly revised and completed, as was the case with the months of September, December and May.

Various parts of the menologion tradition have been preserved in manuscripts all over Slavia Orthodoxa. If Afinogenov were right with his hypothesis, Russia itself would indeed have had the role of „культура посредница“, from where much of the hagiographic repertoire of Serbian, Bulgarian, Moldavian and Ruthenian manuscripts originated, rather than the other way around.

Some manuscripts were amended over time, with the addition of texts considered interesting by the various copyists. In general, the development of the menologion tradition in the Slavonic area was much the same as it had been earlier in Byzantium. The contents of each manuscript varied somewhat, and new saints were added, particularly from the Slavonic area. It is plausible to assume that the Archbishopric of Novgorod played a major role in the transmission of the reconstructed menologia. However, it cannot be proven that the texts were translated or edited there, nor is there any historical evidence that Novgorod ordered such books from Constantinople.

My argument will start with a comment on the history of the transmission of the texts for the March volume, and I shall also present textual evidence from an important text from the October menologion, which may illustrate how the texts changed through their transmission history in the Slavia Orthodoxa. If it were true that the texts of the Suprasliensis and the March texts of the Russian menologia represent two different translations, then both sets of translations must have been made on the basis of the same Greek pre-metaphrastic March menologion. All transmitted pre-metaphrastic menologia studied by Ehrhard show that each particular manuscript had a distinct content. Since the content of the Russian menologia is almost identical with the content of Codex Suprasliensis, except for the days when Codex Suprasliensis has lacunas, both translations must thus have been made from the same source, but several centuries apart. This would be too great a coincidence. Based on the content of the March volume alone, it may be considered proven that the March texts in the various Russian menologia generally stem from the same tradition as Codex Suprasliensis.

There are significant textual differences between some of the texts in Codex Suprasliensis and the Russian menologia of the 15th and 16th century. These textual differences, which only concern a few of the texts in the March menologia,

¹¹ Князевская, О. А., В. Г. Демьянов, М. В. Лапон, С. Котков. Успенский сборник XII–XIII вв. М., 1971.

are so large that Afinogenov came to the conclusion that they are different translations. However, he generalized this and thought the same was the case for all the March texts. The textual differences between Codex Suprasliensis shown by Afinogenov are taken from what he says are three random texts, the Martyrion of Kondratios (BHG 359), the Martyrion of Vasilios and Kapitios (Not in BHG), and the Life of Gregory, Pope of Rome (BHG 721), and he only shows the Slavonic text, without reference to the Greek source. The differences are largely orthographic, but they also concern syntax, word order and morphology. They are so significant that it is not immediately obvious, that it is the same translation. Differences like these show the difficulty a scholar faces when studying translated texts with a long transmission history in the Slavonic area. When referring to the Russian menologia, I have in mind in particular the 16th-century reading menologion from the Kirillo-Beloozersk monastery, RNB Kir.-Bel. 13/1252¹² and a March menologion originally from the Holy Trinity Lavra at Sergiev Posad, RGB MDA 6 (92)¹³. They are textually very close to the Volokolamsk menologion referred to by Afinogenov, but contains more texts.

Of the three texts mentioned by Afinogenov as representing a different translation from Codex Suprasliensis, he is probably only correct in the case of the Martyrion of Vasilios and Kapitios of Chersonnesos. Together with the Life of James the monk and the Life of Aninas, it is one of three texts not attributed to a specific date in Codex Suprasliensis, added after the homily part of the manuscript. None of them is found in the same translation in the Russian menologia; the Life of James the monk is not known to me in the Russian tradition at all, whereas the Life of Aninas is found in a clearly different translation in the Russian menologia. Virtually all the other texts in Codex Suprasliensis are very close textually to the Russian menologia, and it is immediately evident that they represent the same translations, but there are some which show textual differences.

Afinogenov's choice of the martyrion of Kondratios as an example to illustrate a text allegedly translated in the 12th century is particularly ironic. The text is found in a famous fragment of only two folios; a Russian parchment manuscript, RNB Pogodin 64, dated to the beginning of the 11th century; one of the oldest surviving Eastern Slavonic texts¹⁴. The Slavonic text as it is found Zaimov and Kapaldo's edition of Codex Suprasliensis is quite different from the corresponding Greek text shown in parallel. Bojadžiev presents a detailed comparison of the readings of Pogodin 64¹⁵ with the corresponding readings of Codex Suprasliensis and the Greek version, and shows that there are some textual differences, some of which are purely orthographic, others more semantic. How-

¹² This manuscript remains unstudied. It is only listed and dated in the typewritten catalogue of the Russian National Library: Библиотека Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря. Т. 2. Л., 1985, с. 433.

¹³ Леонид, архим. Сведение о славянских рукописях, поступающих из книгохранилища Св. Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры в библиотеку Троицкой духовной Семинарии в 1747 году. Вып. 1. М., 1887, 42–46.

¹⁴ See: Бояджиев, А. Житието на св. Кондрат – първоначалната история на неговия славянски текст и развитието на старобългарската правописна система с голям ер. – В: Кирило-Методиевски студии. Кн. 10. С., 1995, 46–81.

¹⁵ RNB Pogodin 64 is edited in: Тот, И. Х. Житие Кодрата. – Studia Slavica Hungarica, 21, 1975, 237–275.

ever, only in the English summary of the article does he conclude that there are two translations based on two different Greek versions of the text. His article is concerned more with linguistic analysis than with the question of whether the two texts represent two different translations. Now, since the Russian menologia have a translation which differs from the one found in Codex Suprasliensis too, it is worthwhile examining which version of this text they follow, RNB Pogodin 64, or Codex Suprasliensis. I therefore present some of the examples shown by Bojadžiev and add the readings in the Russian menologia as they are found in VMČ¹⁶, which represents a text almost identical with the non-Makaritan menologia.

1. Pogodin 64 1a 1–7 ... ПѢХЪ а тѢВѢ, ЗЪРА ТВОЕГО ДРЪЗНОВЕННІА • СКОРѢ ОУБО
 ПРЕЛОЖИ СЛ • КОНДРАТЪ РЕЧЕ • МОЕ ДРЪЗНОВЕННЕ • НИ ТЪІ • НИ РЪЪ • НИ НИЪ КТО •
 ОТЪНАТИ ОТЪ МЕНЕ МОЖЕТ •; (om. Supr.); VMČ 94cd 6 ТРПѢХЪ о тѢВѢ, ЗРА ТВОЕ
 ДРЪЗНОВЕНІА • СКОРѢ ОУБѢ ПРѢЛѢЖИСА • КОНДРА РЕЧЕ • МОЕ ДРЪЗНОВЕНІЕ • НИ ТЫ •
 НИ ЦАРЬ ТВО НИ НИЪ КТѢ • ѠНАТИ Ѡ МЕНЕ МОЖЕТЬ.
2. Pogodin 64 1a 10–11 Н ПО ДЪСТѢ РАСПАТИ; Cod. Supr. 100, 29–30 Н НА ДЪСТѢ
 ПРОТАГЪШЕ; VMČ 94cd 13 Н ПО ДЕСѢ РАСПАТИ.
3. Pogodin 64 1a 12–13 РЪЦИ СВОЕ НИМА; Cod. Supr. 101,1 ПОВѢЖДЪ СИ НМА; VMČ
 94cd 14 РЪЦИ СВОЕ НИМА.

The Russian menologia in these and all other cases I investigated follow the readings of Pogodin 64 rather than Codex Suprasliensis, and represent a text essentially identical with Pogodin 64. This is obviously extremely significant. The Martyrion of Kondratios is together with the Martyrion of Thekla in the September menologia¹⁷, the only text in the Russian menologion tradition which can positively be traced to the Kievan period. Pogodin 64 is a Russian manuscript, but the text is identified as a Bulgarian translation by various scholars as early as the 19th century¹⁸. The martyrion of Kondratios is one of the texts in the March menologion found in a somewhat different version in Codex Suprasliensis and the Russian menologia. However, since the oldest witnesses of the text are of approximately the same age, it is not immediately obvious which one is older. One significant result of Bojadžiev's research is that the version in Pogodin 64 presents readings which in many cases are closer to the Greek original than Codex Suprasliensis. Whether these are two different translations, or whether one of the two versions represents a revision of the first is an important question. However, it is probably a Bulgarian matter: the Russian scribes have contributed little to the development of the text, and certainly almost nothing after Pogodin 64 was written.

The significant textual differences can have arisen for different reasons. The orthographic variations are obvious. The orthography of the various forms of the Church Slavonic language underwent significant transformations from the beginning, in the 10th or 11th century, until the 16th century, in all the Slavonic

¹⁶ Die Großen Lesemenäen..., 93cd–98cd.

¹⁷ See: Т о т, И. X. Житие Феклы. – Studia Slavica Hungarica, 22, 1976, 233–270.

¹⁸ See, e.g., J a g i ć, V. Zur Berichtigung der altrussischen Texte. I. Das Fragment der Passio s. Condrati. – Archiv für slawische Philologie, 4, 1882, 224–228.

countries where the Cyrillic alphabet was in use. A copyist in the 16th century would use the orthography of his time when copying older manuscripts. However, if he copied very old manuscripts, some traits of their older orthography could influence him too. In the case of the Codex Suprasliensis however, I believe the main reason why the copies of the 16th century are textually so different, is the awkward language of the original Preslav translation, which is so literal that it is difficult to understand. What was poor Bulgarian in the 10th century, must have been considered almost incomprehensible to a Russian of the 16th century. I believe that the editor of the Russian menologia in the 15th century may have modernised the language and made it more comprehensible.

But this is a process that began earlier, and I shall present an example from the October menologion that may illustrate the process that started in the South Slavonic area. In some cases the revisions must have been made in the same place where the original translation was made and where the Greek protograph was available to be used for revisions of the original translation. Revisions like that of the Martyrion of Kondratios referred to above may be the result of a discourse in Preslav about translation technique, or the result of a kind of quality control of the translation work, resulting in several different versions of each translated text.

Unlike the March menologion, the texts in the October menologion are found in South Slavonic manuscripts from the 14th century. Even the Serbian manuscripts containing menologia for the autumn months show traits of the same development as many of the Russian manuscripts, but they also show many specific readings. I have in mind in particular the important 14th-century Dečani 94, which is a reading menologion for September-November and contains about 50 translated hagiographic texts¹⁹. In almost all cases, the texts represent the same translations as the various Russian monthly menologia for September, October and November. A few of the texts are of particular interest as they may show how a text developed over time in the Slavonic areas. One such text is the Life of Hilarion the Great (October 21). It is part of almost all October menologia and is preserved in a number of manuscripts written in Serbia, Bulgaria, and Russia, and the text is also found outside the menologion tradition.

The Life of Hilarion the Great is a text originally written in the 4th or early 5th century in Latin by the Church Father Jerome. There are three Greek translations, which are quite different from each other (BHG 751z, BHG 752, BHG 753), originally possibly going back to two original translations, although the exact relationship between them seems unclear and is disputed, but this is not important for our purposes here²⁰. One translation is known to have been made during Hilarion's lifetime by a certain Sofronios, but it is not clear which translation this is. There is also a version of Symeon Metaphrastes, which has not

¹⁹ I am indebted to Klimentina Ivanova, who originally advised me on this extremely interesting manuscript collection. The manuscript is dated to the 1340s or 1350s. See: Г р о з д а н о в и ћ - П а - ј и ћ, М., Р. С т а н к с в и ћ. Рукописне књиге манастира високи Дечани. Водени знаци и датирање. Београд, 1995, 34–35.

²⁰ See: S t r o u t, R. The Greek versions of Jerome's Vita Sancti Hilarionis. – In: O l d f a t h e r, W. A. Studies in the text tradition of St. Jerome's vitae patrum. Urbana, 1943, 312–394.

been published (BHG 755). The Church Slavonic versions are translations of BHG 753, which Strout calls “the free translation, version 2” and which occurs in only four Greek manuscripts and, in my view, there is really only one translation of it into Church Slavonic²¹. Strout knew of a Church Slavonic translation of this version based on some help she received from John Kivko and Roman Jakobson, and presented a stemma including a Church Slavonic translation, which is the one found in the VMČ²² and which she shows is closest to the Greek manuscripts Parisinus gr. 1540 (11th century) and Vaticanus 1589 (10th century).

Strout based her comparison of the Greek and Latin versions on parts of the text in four 16th-century manuscripts only, GIM Car. 174, GIM Usp. 986, RNB Sof. 1317, and RNB Kir.-Bel. 1285²³. The first three of these manuscripts are indeed the three manuscripts of the VMČ; the other is the version found in the menologion tradition discussed above. It is indeed highly probable, although Strout does not say so explicitly, that Jakobson and Kivko worked with the published text of the VMČ, rather than with the manuscripts themselves. This text is the result of the “correction” of the VMČ text based on RNB Kir.-Bel. 19/1258, due to mistakes in folio order in the prototype of the VMČ text. Strout’s findings should not be disputed however: a quick comparison of the text, as it is published in the Sobornik of Nil Sorskij²⁴, shows that all the chapters of the Greek “free translation, version two” have been translated, and that in all cases where there are significant differences between the Greek manuscripts, the Slavonic version follows the readings of the two aforementioned Greek manuscripts. The text in the Sobornik is close to the version quoted by Tvorogov, in the 17th-century RNB Solov. 814/924. This latter manuscript is indeed probably a copy of the text of Nil Sorskij, who possibly revised his text slightly compared to its immediate prototype, as he did in the case of several other texts. Nil Sorskij probably did not use a menologion as a prototype; the version in the Sobornik is closer to Pogodin 71b than to the version in the VMČ. The Serbian manuscript D also presents all chapters of the Greek archetype, but it is clearly somewhat different from the version in the Russian manuscripts.

Tvorogov maintains that there are at least two Slavonic translations of the Life of Hilarion, and asserts that they are based on different Greek prototypes. Tvorogov also maintains that the version published in the VMČ is copied from a manuscript with the folios out of order. Then, in the printed edition of the VMČ, the 19th-century editor of the VMČ corrected it based on one of the menologia mentioned above, RNB Kir.-Bel. 19/1258, which however represents a version of the life closer to Pogodin 71b. He bases his assumption on a com-

²¹ *Ibidem*, 339–394.

²² Великие Минси Четъи, собранные всероссийским митрополитом Макарием. Октябрь, дни 19–31, СПб., 1880, col. 682–1732. See also С е р г и й, архиеп. *Op. cit.* Т. 2. Ч. 2, 453–454.

²³ Strout quotes the number 1285, a mistake that goes back to the edition of the VMČ. The editor has compared the text in the VMČ manuscript with Kir.-Bel. 19/1258 rather than 1285 and the incorrect number stems from the editor of the VMČ rather than from Strout. See Т в о р о г о в, О. В. Древнерусские четъи сборники XII–XIV вв. – ТОДРЛ, 44, 1990, с. 211.

²⁴ Л ё н н г р е н, Т. П. Соборник Нила Сорского. Ч. 2. М., 2002, 79–158.

parison of the translation of chapter 41 of the Greek prototype in the VMČ and in RNB Pogodin 71b²⁵. It is easy to agree with Tvorogov that there are at least two traditions of the text in Church Slavonic translation; however, they are based on the same aforementioned Greek version, and they probably represent one original translation of the text.

When studying a hagiographic text like the Life of Hilarion, one must bear in mind that the original was written in Latin by the Church Father Jerome. His style is different from that of his contemporary Greek hagiographers, and it is more ornamented than the early Byzantine simple style. Probably for this reason, most Greek translations are quite free, often simplifying the Latin. Only the so-called Samos translation is fairly literal, but it is only transmitted in one single manuscript of the 16th century (BHG 751z), and it is probably a much later Greek translation of the Latin text²⁶. Still, even the freer Greek translations present a significantly more complex text, from a linguistic point of view, than most other Byzantine hagiographic texts from the early Byzantine period. Thus, the Slavonic translator faces additional problems when translating this text. It could indeed be the case that the original Slavonic translation was so awkward for later readers that it was thoroughly revised by later scribes. In order to examine this question, it is necessary to go into some detail, which includes the comparison of passages from various early manuscripts. Fortunately, the text is preserved in several early manuscripts, including some South Slavonic manuscripts of the 14th century, amongst them the NBKM 1039²⁷, as well as D. Since there are so many early Slavonic textual witnesses to the text, from various places, it becomes more feasible to come to clear conclusions about the history of its transmission in the whole Slavonic area. The following presents a short comparison between three important Slavonic textual witnesses, Pogodin 71b, D, and S1, and the corresponding passages in the published Greek text of version 2, free translation.

Greek (all manuscripts) Inc: Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ φίλου τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰλαρίονος τὴν πολιτείαν ἀναγράφεσθαι μέλλων, ταῖς ἐκείνου πρεσβείας τὸν Κύριον παρακαλῶ, ὥστε διὰ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δοθῆναι μοι λόγον,

RNB Pogodin 71b (P) Inc: Бл̑жен̑наго и друга б̑жїа иларїѡна житїе се напнсаѣи хота того млт̑мн гд̑ѣ молю са ѣако же д̑х̑мь него даѣи ми слово,

RNB Sof. 1385 (S) Inc: Бл̑жен̑наго и дру̑га б̑жїа иларїона житїе начинаю спнсаѣи, млт̑вамн его млю са гвн дасть ми д̑х̑омь своимь дано ми б̑дет слово,

Dečani (D) Inc: Бл̑жен̑наго и дру̑га х̑ва иларїѡна житнн начинаю спнсаѣи, млт̑вамн него млю се гвн дасты ѣмь д̑х̑омь твомнм дано ми б̑дет слово,

VMČ Inc (Edition)²⁸: Блаженногo и друга божїа Иларїона житїе начинаю списати молитвами его молюся Господеви да Святымъ Духомъ своимъ дано ми будетъ слово,

²⁵ Stout, R. Op. cit., p. 389. See also Tvorogov, O. B. Op. cit., 211–212.

²⁶ Stout, R. Op. cit., 311–332.

²⁷ Стоянов, М., Хр. Кодов. Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека. Т. 3. С., 1964, 246–252.

²⁸ Великие Минеи Четьи, октябрь, дни 19–31, стб. 1682.

RNB Kir.-Bel. 19/1258 (K) Inc (Edition): Блаженного и друга божіа Иларіона житіе писати хотя молитвами его молюся Богови яко да Духомъ его дано ми будетъ слово,

Chapter 2 starts as follows:

Ἰλαρίων τοίνυν ὁ ἅγιος τῷ μὲν γένει ἦν παλαιστίνος, ἀπὸ κώμης Οὐαθᾶ, κειμένης ἀπὸ πέντε μιλίων τῆς πόλεως Γάζης πρὸς νότον.

P: Ларіонъ убо стъин родомъ въ убо палестининъ отъ сн оуафъи сѣда на ѣ поприщѣхъ отъ града газьска.

S: Нларіѡн убо стын родомъ палестининъ ѿ веси ноуфа суца вдале ѿ града газьскаго ѣ попришь...

D: нларіѡн бо стын родомъ бо въ палестинианннъ ѿ всен зовомые нота суца ѿ града даліе газьскаго ѣ попришь...

VMĀ: Иларій убо святой родомъ палестининъ, отъ веси Іуѡа, суца вдалѣ отъ града Газьскаго 10 попришь...

K: Иларіон убо святой родомъ палестининъ, отъ веси Іуафы, суца вдалѣ отъ града Газьскаго на пяти поприщахъ....

The difference in incipit between the Slavonic manuscripts is again typical. Pogodin 71b is a representative of a text very close to the original translation. It is extremely literal, retaining the syntax and even the word order of the Greek original. It is the only one retaining the original translation of κειμένης into сѣда, which is a strange way to use this Slavonic word, which has then been changed into суца.

S, which represents the non-Makarіan reading menologion tradition, has a version of the text where the original translation is slightly revised and made much easier to read, at least for a modern reader. It has a more distinct Slavonic syntax and a free word order compared to the Greek original. But it is faithful to the original when it comes to rendering the meaning of the individual passages. D, the earliest South Slavonic witness to the text, again has its own particular readings, which make it differ significantly from the Russian manuscripts. Still, it shows a development of the text from the original translation, which shows some uniformity with the Russian menologion tradition. However, the Russian textual tradition of the text originates from South Slavonic manuscripts closer to the original than D is.

It is indeed quite interesting that even an experienced scholar like Tvorogov could come to the conclusion, that the two traditions of the text represent two distinct translations of the text. This is the same view as Afinogenov took, studying the March texts. In my view, however, the main corpus of the menologion cycle represents a typical Preslav type of translation, which is so literal that later Slavonic editors of the menologion cycle felt it necessary to revise it thoroughly; a revision that started in the South Slavonic area, and possibly continued in Russia, and possibly included some Russification of the language. In the case of only a few texts is it possible to prove that later revisions of the Slavonic translations were made with the help of the Greek original.

The comparison of the VMĀ and the representatives of the non-Makarіan menologion tradition show that the revision of the text was not (only) undertaken by Makarіj's scribes, but was mainly the result of earlier efforts. This is

the same finding, indeed, as with many other texts. In the case of the Life of Hilarion it can be shown that the development of the text from the original translation to the version found in the VMĀ happened in stages. The text found in RNB Kir.-Bel. 19/1258 is shown in footnotes to the text of the VMĀ, and represents something between the text of Pogodin 71b and the text found in VMĀ. In VMĀ some of Hilarion's miracles are deleted from the text and these are retained in the text of Pogodin 71b and K. Some scholars often point to the possibility that Russian copyists compared old translations with the Greek original and corrected them. But such scholars virtually never present evidence of this, and I believe that most comparisons of different versions of texts do not provide such evidence; neither is there any evidence that there were any significant numbers of copyists in Russia with enough knowledge of the Greek language to make such corrections, nor any libraries with any significant number of Greek manuscripts.

Since only fragments of the monthly October menologion have been preserved in the Greek tradition, it is rather difficult to say with complete certainty which Greek version of the Life of Hilarion the Great was originally part of the pre-metaphrastic monthly menologion. However, Parisinus gr. 1540, which together with Parisinus gr. 1506, represents the Greek version closest to the Church Slavonic translation, and in Ehrhard's view originally comprised a single manuscript, is one of only two examples of two-monthly pre-metaphrastic menologia for the months of September and October²⁹. The Slavonic translation of the Life of Hilarion can thus certainly be linked to the pre-metaphrastic menologion tradition, although not specifically with the one-month type.

The September menologia represent additional evidence regarding the development of the Slavonic menologia. The Russian September menologia, and I have primarily in mind the Russian September menologia T=RGB TSL 663, V=RGB Vol. 590, K=RNB Kir.-Bel. 16/1255, and M=RGB MDA 88, are obviously based on a pre-metaphrastic menologion. However, a lacuna probably appeared in an early example of it for September 27–29, which was later filled in with metaphrastic texts on Chariton the confessor and Kyriakos the Hermit, and a text which does not belong in the September menologia at all, the Life of Zosimas. Only the Ruthenian manuscript L, originally stemming from the Suprasl monastery, now in the collections of the Lithuanian Academy in Vilnius, F 19 N 79 (192) from the 16th century preserves the original texts³⁰. It is a menologion covering the months of September to November on 663 folia, and it contains much of the same textual material for the autumn months as the Russian menologia. L retains the pre-metaphrastic vitae of Chariton and Kyriakos and is possibly the only Slavonic witness to these texts. If the September volume of the reading menologion was copied in Constantinople by order of Novgorod, why are the original texts for the end of September only preserved in a Ruthenian manuscript?

²⁹ Ehrhard, A. Op. cit., p. 407.

³⁰ Добрянский, Ф. Описание рукописей Виленской Публичной библиотеки. Вильна, 1882, 106–115.

Sept 27 or 28: Life of St. Chariton the Confessor (BHG 301) (TKVM)³¹ Inc:

Мнози оучительства нже благо и ако Божови любовно пожнвшнхъ образи, отъ
нхъ же оубо есть хошемын... (BHG 300z) (L) Многа оубо вчена добръ живши
моу сказаня ...

Sept 28: Life of Zosimas (BHG 2476)³² (VM) Inc: Пришедшию Метаноу коумьсоу
Ларгитинскоу в Кнанкыно, хотащы емоу нти на востокъ приведенъ бысть нбкыш...

Sept 29: Life of Kyriakus the Hermit (BHG 464) (TKM)³³ Inc: Благословиащнхъ
та, рече къ Авраамоу Божъ, благослова и проклинаюшнхъ та прокляноу... (BHG
463) (L) Шелца и вербхъ вацшаго многажды в велнцѣ Евфимви в зренѣнѣмь
многo словесн памать сътвори...

The analysis of the March text is in itself enough to refute Afinogenov's hypothesis on the origin of the Russian menologia. However, many of his other arguments are also unconvincing. The date of the translation of the menologia is based on his dating of the transfer of the two aforementioned Grottaferrata manuscripts from Constantinople. In Afinogenov's view, the reason that there is no June and August menologion is that there were no pre-metaphrastic menologia for those months in Constantinople, or at least not in the library of the Studite monastery, by the 12th century, because the last copies had been sent to Grottaferrata. One must, however, bear in mind that there are as many as four or five copies of pre-metaphrastic menologia for each of those months in existence even to the present. Although it is not possible to prove that any of those manuscripts were in Constantinople in the 12th century, it is implausible to assume that there were none. The libraries of Constantinople were the largest and richest in Byzantium before the Latin conquest in 1204, and it is not plausible to assume that there were no copies of pre-metaphrastic menologia in the city during that period simply because we know that two manuscripts had already been transferred to Italy. The production and sale of manuscripts was a major business in many Byzantine monasteries.

Afinogenov's methodology, by which he ignored all Slavonic texts, may also have complicated matters for him. Almost all the monthly volumes contain specific Slavonic texts. The South Slavonic texts are not numerous in many of the Russian menologia, but they are diverse, ranging from texts on the Slavonic apostles, the Bulgarian Life of John of Rila, and lives of the Serbian national saint, Sava. In addition, there are numerous encomia to various feasts written by John the Exarch, Gregory Camblak and others. The menologia seem to be the product of a development within the Slavonic area, where elements from several periods and areas have been included, but where the main part of most months is the translated pre-metaphrastic text.

This can be shown to be the case for the various copies of the May menologion. The transmitted copies of the May menologion can be shown to have been copied from various sources, including a manuscript in the tradition

³¹ This is the version of Symeon Metaphrastes.

³² This saint is not commemorated on this day in the Byzantine tradition. His feast days are January 4 and April 18.

³³ This is the version of Symeon Metaphrastes.

of Uspenskij sbornik and a manuscript of the same tradition as the Russian March menologia, as well as a few texts not belonging to the month of May or March at all.

НЯКОИ БЕЛЕЖКИ ОТНОСНО МЯСТОТО И ВРЕМЕТО НА ПРЕВЕЖДАНЕ
НА СЛАВЯНСКИТЕ ЧЕТИ-МИНЕИ И ТЯХНАТА ТЕКСТОВА ТРАДИЦИЯ В РУСИЯ

(Резюме)

Авторът на статията показва, че руските чети-миней водят началото си от един преславски превод на целия цикъл от предметафрастови месечни чети-миней. Текстовете различия между някои творби в Супрасълския сборник и съответните произведения в руските миней са още от XI в. и са резултат от работата на българските преводачи. По този начин се опровергава хипотезата на Д. Афиногенов за произхода на превода на славянските миней.

*Терие Хеланд
Университет в гр. Громсьо*